

Whitepaper: A Summary of the Neurobiological and Psychological Impacts of Human Trafficking Trauma on Child Victims and the Implications for Court Proceedings

Second Edition

January 17, 2025

Panagiota Caralis MD, JD

Professor of Medicine

Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami

Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff

Miami Veterans Health System

Brenda Mezick, JD

Director Human Trafficking Unit

Office of the State Attorney for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit

I. Introduction

Human trafficking is modern-day slavery, the trade in human beings. Under U.S. and Florida law, human trafficking includes the unlawful practice of transporting, soliciting, recruiting, harboring, providing, enticing, maintaining, purchasing, patronizing, procuring, or obtaining persons by the use of force, threats of force, fraud, or other forms of coercion.^{1, 2, 3} Human beings are trafficked for purposes of sexual exploitation, forced labor, or other means of commercial profit. The global scope of human trafficking is significant. According to the U.S. State Department, some 27 million people globally are victims of human trafficking.⁴ In the U.S., human trafficking is recognized as the second fastest-growing criminal enterprise, after the drug trade, with profits estimated at over \$32 billion.⁵

The U.S. Department of Justice has reported that more than half of all sex trafficking victims in the U.S. are 17 years old or younger.⁶ Between 100,000 and 300,000 children— at the average entry age of 12⁷— are prostituted each year in the United States.⁸ Since the inception of the Office of the State Attorney for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit's Human Trafficking Unit in November 2012, 35% of victims in filed prosecution cases have been minors. In 2024, 70% of the victims assisted by the Office of the State Attorney for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit's Human Trafficking Task Force were minors. Human trafficking causes significant physical and mental trauma to children with long-lasting health consequences.

II. Medical Effects of Human Trafficking on Victims

A number of studies have identified the serious and often complex medical effects of human trafficking on victims.^{9, 10} Research indicates that victims of human trafficking often have a variety of physical and mental health problems.¹¹ Physical health issues in this population can include chronic headaches, memory loss, gastrointestinal problems, chronic pain, broken bones, head and neck trauma, infectious diseases, sexually transmitted infections, dental problems, respiratory illness, unhealthy weight loss due to food deprivation and poor nutrition, pregnancy, pelvic inflammatory disease, and other gynecological problems.^{10, 12, 13, 14} Studies have found that 76 percent of female survivors of sex trafficking report being physically assaulted and 67 percent report being sexually assaulted while they were trafficked. In addition to physical consequences, victims of human trafficking often experience severe and complex mental health problems as a result of the trauma they have endured. Similar to victims of domestic violence and other traumatic experiences, many victims of human trafficking suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD).^{13, 14} Studies have shown that victims of trafficking

also suffer from mood, anxiety and dissociative disorders, as well as substance abuse. Among the most devastating health consequences for victims of crime, especially for children, is the destruction of their sense of safety or security. For child victims of human trafficking, the trauma-related injuries can be compounded by their limited understanding of the issue of human trafficking and the significance of their own victimization. Since their concept of “self” is not fully formed, child victims often blame themselves. Victims of human trafficking lack social support and are stigmatized by friends, family, and social institutions, which further exacerbates their mental health concerns.^{14, 15}

III. Trauma-Related Mental Illness of Victims of Human Trafficking

The majority of research related to the impact of the trauma of human trafficking on this population has focused on significant levels of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD).^{10, 13} The trauma that trafficking victims have experienced includes witnessing and enduring actual or threatened serious injury, threats to self and others, and even death. These events involve intense fear, helplessness, and horror that mimic the feelings experienced in combat situations and war.¹⁶ Both adults and children can be diagnosed with PTSD and their symptoms are similar. (Table 1)^{17, 18}

Table 1 PTSD Associated symptoms and the Percent of Trafficked Women Ranking These Symptoms as Severe

<u>Symptom</u>	<u>%</u>
Recurrent thoughts/memories of terrifying events	75
Feeling as though the event is happening again	52
Recurrent nightmares	54
Feeling detached/withdrawn	60
Unable to feel emotion	44
Jumpy, easily startled	67
Difficulty concentrating	52
Trouble sleeping	67

Feeling on guard	64
Feeling irritable, sudden outbursts of anger	53
Avoiding activities that remind them	61
Inability to remember part/most of traumatic event	36
Loss of interest in daily activities	46
Feeling as if they don't have a future	65
Avoiding thoughts/feelings associated with trauma	65
Sudden emotional/physical reaction when reminded	65

Studies have shown that children might initially respond to trauma through a “fight or flight” response, but those who face long-term trauma without relief can respond with immobilization followed by dissociation.¹⁸ Some evidence suggests that girls are at higher risk for re-victimization than boys, while boys are more likely to develop aggressive behavior as a result of their victimization.¹⁹

Additionally, victims with physical and sexual abuse trauma histories have also been found to have higher rates of dissociative disorders. These disorders are characterized as a disruption in the usually integrated functions of consciousness, memory, identity, or perception.¹¹ A European study revealed that 63 percent of victims had memory loss.¹⁸ Dissociation is often seen in children with histories of complex trauma. They mentally separate themselves from the experience. They may perceive themselves as detached from their bodies and as being somewhere else in the room as they watch what is happening to them. They are in an altered state that appears not quite real or as if it is happening to someone else. They may lose all memories or sense of the experiences that happened to them, resulting in perceived gaps in time and in their personal history. At its extreme, a child may cut off or lose touch with various aspects of him or herself. Dissociation can affect a child’s ability to be fully present in activities of daily life and can significantly affect the child’s sense of time and continuity. As a result, it can have adverse effects on learning, behavior, and other social interactions. The child appears to be “spacing out” or not paying attention. Although this is assessed to be a psychological defense mechanism in response to stressful situations or trauma, neurobiology trauma research is elucidating physiologic pathways and changes in brain development to account for this phenomenon.²⁰

Children who have experienced complex trauma have difficulty identifying, expressing, and managing emotions and may have limited language for “feeling” states. The same neurobiological changes have been shown to alter trauma victims’ emotional and physiological responses to baseline situations and minor stresses, resulting in unpredictable or explosive responses.^{19, 21} Traumatized children may react to a reminder of a traumatic event with trembling, anger, sadness, or avoidance. Reminders of traumatic events may be everywhere in the environment. Children may react powerfully to these triggers and have difficulty calming down when upset.²² Children are often vigilant and guarded in their interactions with others and are more likely to perceive situations as stressful or dangerous. These defensive postures start out as protective when an individual is under attack but with repetitive, continuous stress, this posture becomes problematic when it evokes intense reactions even when the situation does not warrant such a response. They also experience the flipside, which is emotional numbing to threats in the environment. This makes them vulnerable to more victimization. Evidence suggests that these neurobiological changes, which have occurred as a result of childhood trauma, have long-term effects and can present as long-term psychological problems.²³

IV. Neurobiology of Trauma

When traumatized, youth can suffer from body dysregulation, either over or under-responding to sensory stimuli. They may be hypersensitive to sounds, smells, touch or light. They may also experience the reverse-- an anesthesia in which they are unaware of pain, touch or internal physical sensations. When faced with a stressful situation, their reaction increases physiological hormones such as catecholamines, which form the basis for the “fight or flight” response. Over time their systems automatically, uncontrollably manifest extreme stress: heart pounding, rapid breathing, sweating, and pallor. They may “shut down” entirely out of proportion to a simple stressor, as if all circuits are overloaded, and become unresponsive or detached. As a result of the body’s dysregulation, a traumatized child may behave in ways that appear unpredictable, oppositional, volatile, irrational, overly dramatic, and extreme. On the other hand, they also can be perceived as over-controlled, cold, rigid, unusually compliant, or complicit with adults. Additionally, studies have revealed structural changes in the brain, including the storage of trauma memories, which then can be triggered through non-threatening experiences and are associated with a hyper-physiologic alarm response (increased heart and respiratory rates).²⁴ Because paired associations have been created in these regulatory parts of the brain, a pattern of incoming sensory information may be interpreted as “danger” and acted upon in parts of the brain (brainstem, midbrain, thalamus) prior to it ever reaching the higher cortex. These phenomena are at the center of automatic trauma-related “flashback” responses. The brain has a multitude of complex stress responses, including anxiety, facial expressions, disequilibrium, depression, and cognitive dysfunction. These children may manifest deficits in language development and abstract reasoning skills. As a result, they are often labeled as learning-disabled. The research, however, reveals that these difficulties with cognitive organization are a result of their constant state of arousal. When their

bodies and minds have learned to be in chronic stress response mode, they may have trouble thinking a problem through calmly and considering multiple alternatives. They may find it hard to acquire new skills or take in new information. They may struggle with sustaining attention or curiosity or be distracted by reactions to trauma reminders. Information that is stored in their cortex is inaccessible in the midst of the brain's perception of threatening experiences.

V. Legal Implications of the Medical Effects of Trauma on Children

The common behaviors demonstrated by children with traumatic stress often leave them vulnerable to re-victimization during courtroom proceedings. The adaptive feature of the threat response system is the capacity to generalize from a threatening event to other experiences with similar features. Unfortunately, this very adaptive capacity is at the core of the emotional, behavioral, and physiological symptoms that develop following a traumatic experience. Neural systems respond to prolonged, repetitive activation by altering their neurochemical and micro-pathology (neural synapse changes), organization and functioning. These presumed molecular mechanisms mediate memory, learning, and the body's responses. Following traumatic events, children will experience persistent emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and physiological signs and symptoms related to shifts in their internal physiological homeostasis. The longer the activation of the stress-response systems (or the more intense and prolonged the traumatic event), the more likely there will be permanent changes in these neural systems. At the very least, the abnormal persistence of adaptive responses becomes maladaptive. In some instances, the symptoms become so severe, persistent, and disruptive that they reach the level of clinical mental disorders.^{19, 22}

These children display anger, irritability, defiance, and oppositionality toward authority, which may lead them to lie, deny experiences of harm/trauma, and avoid talking about the history. They are distractible, have difficulty following through with tasks, suffer from poor concentration, and appear detached and uninvolved. They engage in high-risk behavior (e.g. substance use, promiscuity, rule-breaking, self-mutilation, impulsivity) and remain isolated from others, giving the appearance that they chose to be in these situations. These manifestations are related to their trauma and the neurobiological effects of repetitive and constant stress and fear. They have emotional and mood dysregulation (depression/anxiety), hyperarousal, and hyper-physiologic survival (fight/flight) responses that get their needs met but are impossible to turn off. They "re-experience" the emotions and trauma with even the slightest of triggers, so they may go to extremes to avoid the experience. They have developed negative beliefs about themselves, caregivers and adults, and adopted a world view based on traumatic experiences. They use pain numbing and disassociation, which make them appear disinterested, uninvolved, and uncaring. They have difficulty regulating attention and cognition with real gaps in memory. Poor self-concept and overreliance on others make child victims dependent, as they try to please others constantly. New criteria for PTSD added to the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) include symptoms of behavioral and mental avoidance. These symptoms include emotional

numbing (inability to recognize emotions, feeling detached from other people, amnesia for important parts of traumatic events, belief that one's life will be cut short), new symptoms involving persistent negative beliefs about oneself, distorted blame of self or others for traumatic events, and emotional distress.²⁵ All of these symptoms can easily be misunderstood and exploited in adversarial situations.

The atmosphere of the deposition and the courtroom can be threatening, confusing, and frightening for children. The psychological, emotional, and behavioral consequences of these experiences can be profound, but may go unrecognized by legal personnel who come before the court without a real understanding of the impact of trauma on child development, beliefs, and behaviors. Testifying is a stressful experience for any witness and even more so for a child. Additional emotional stress for traumatized children can occur as a result of being in this situation. Numerous child-victims of human trafficking suffer secondary, and often unnecessary, trauma while going through the legal process. The goal of medical therapy is for victims to work through their trauma and put the experience behind them. The legal system requires that victims remember the experience, often in excruciating detail, and keep it fresh in their minds for the duration of the prosecution. Unfortunately, the deposition and courtroom process is adversarial and intimidating. Children are made to re-live their traumatic experiences over and over again, which can itself become a traumatic experience.

When a child grows up afraid or under constant or extreme stress, the immune system and body's stress response systems are heightened and, when exposed to seemingly ordinary levels of stress, these systems automatically respond as if the individual is under extreme attack. The repeated questioning and reviewing of the details by the defense during the deposition is meant to expose inconsistencies in the witness' testimony. The concern here is that these traumatized children, by the very nature of their trauma, will experience amplification in their stress. The complexities and potential harm to the child are more than theoretical. Studies have shown the impact of this trauma on neurobiological networks and brain development. There have been major changes made to the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, DSM-5's to include criteria for the diagnosis of PTSD in children. They clarify that, for children, intrusive re-experiencing symptoms reflecting unwanted distressing memories and flashbacks may induce reenactment of the trauma in play. This post-traumatic play is different from reenactment in that it is a literal representation of the trauma and involves compulsively repeating aspects of trauma and results in increasing anxiety, including flashbacks and nightmares.²⁶ During depositions we actually re-create the setting of re-experiencing these unwanted distressing memories through repetitive questioning and making the child relive the experience in detail. Testifying in court can amplify trauma for child victims.^{25, 27} Between 1986 and 1988, Dr. Goodman and her team of researchers from the University of California Davis, studied the behavioral patterns of over 200 children involved as victims in child sex abuse prosecutions.²⁸ They interviewed 174 of the victims as young adults (between 1997 and 2001), looking at their memories of the events, searching for correlations between their state as young children at the time of the prosecution

and their later mental health. Certain conditions during the prosecution were the strongest predictor of later traumatization. In children who testified multiple times and were subject to intense questioning, the team found correlations with later defensive avoidance and internalization problems, such as depression.²⁸

Through the years, courts and legislatures have acknowledged these issues and attempted to provide “safeguards” for children’s testimony: testifying in a special court room, allowing them to be separated from the defendant, allowing specific hearsay evidence, and providing a special intermediary to be with the child.²⁹ Medical experts are realizing that these alone may not be enough to protect child victims of trauma from being re-traumatized. Additionally, because of the neurobiological changes in these victims, the adequacy of the testimony also may be compromised.

Under the best of circumstances, children typically disclose traumatic events with significant reluctance and great emotional distress to people with whom they have developed sufficient trust. Trauma experts know that sensitive timing and pacing is required in order to avoid leaving the child feeling too exposed, too vulnerable, or too overwhelmed with the potential for re-traumatizing the child. The courtroom full of strangers and authority figures, answering questions from lawyers trying to extract information from them in excruciating detail, and other attorneys challenging their veracity and/or hoping to confuse them is likely to create an environment that may further psychologically damage the child and harm his or her best interests. It is understandable that not only do children dissociate (the mind distances itself from the experiences that are too terrifying or emotionally overwhelming to absorb at the time), but it is not uncommon for children to manifest “psychogenic amnesia” where memory is further disrupted as a result of being re-traumatized. When children shift into this acute traumatic dissociation state, their behavior is manifested by changes in breathing patterns, with rapid, shallow breaths, similar to panic attacks; restricted body movements-looking stiff or frozen; lack of eye contact or shifting eye, glassy stares; and dramatic reduction in verbal output until they are incoherent or unresponsive. They may suddenly not be able to process cognitively or use age appropriate language because they are reliving traumatic experiences in their mind.^{30, 31} They are expected to participate in a highly verbal process when testifying but are silenced because of the neuroscience of trauma. At the same time, their lower brain is mobilized by the stress response to survive and is telling their body to react physiologically as if they are being assaulted. This stress can interfere with how well they can recall and describe what has happened and respond to questions.

In cases of human trafficking involving children, it is often the child’s testimony that is the most crucial part of the prosecution’s case. Since the child may be the only real witness against the suspected trafficker, successful prosecution depends on how credible the child will be. This is especially true when there is no forensic evidence available and the case rests on the child’s word against the suspect’s. A defense attorney may interrogate the child in an attempt to shake his or her confidence or otherwise suggest that the child was coached into making

false or inaccurate statements about the client. The defense attorney's motivation to cast as much doubt as possible on the child's statements is strong. Traumatized children, by virtue of the neurobiological effects of the traumatic experience, are more likely to be confused by the approaches used by the defense. Trauma therapists establish safety with child victims and forge a strong, trusting relationship before children can tell the story of what happened to them. When the disclosure is forced by the pressures of the legal process, when there is no time to build a safe and trusting relationship, and when sensitivity to timing and pacing is lacking, the risk of re-traumatization increases. Legal proceedings, no matter how changed in order to accommodate children, are not by nature sensitive to timing and pacing of the witness.

While a deposition can be done with the utmost care and respect, it still exposes these children to re-experiencing their trauma. Questioning during depositions can be aggressive, strategic and selective, and in the case of children use developmentally inappropriate, complex language and repeated questions with subtle variations for the purpose of demonstrating inconsistencies in the verbalization of children. Children also respond better to open-ended questions than questions that can only be answered by "yes" or "no."³² Child trauma authorities have stated that "if one sets out intentionally to design a system for provoking symptoms of posttraumatic disorder, it might look very much like a legal proceeding."³³

VI. Criminal Discovery Depositions of Child Victims

Protection of child witnesses is a substantial and compelling interest of the state. Enabling the child to communicate with the trier of fact by reducing the emotional trauma that the child suffers is in the best interests of the child. It is also more likely to preserve testimony free of the emotional and neurobiological effects of trauma that create distortions and misperceptions in the testimony³⁴ which would better serve the truth-seeking function of the legal process.

The Florida legislature enacted an amendment to Florida Statute § 92.55 for the protection of minor victims of a sexual offense from criminal discovery depositions which took effect July 1st, 2023.³⁵ This amendment requires a court, before a defendant may take a discovery deposition in a criminal proceeding of a victim of a sexual offense who is under the age of 16, to conduct a hearing to determine whether it is appropriate to take a deposition of the victim and, if so, whether to order any limitations or other specific conditions under which the victim's deposition may be conducted.

Pursuant to Florida Statute § 92.55, (6)(b), in determining whether it is appropriate to take a deposition of a victim of a sexual offense who is under the age of 16, the court must consider:

1. The mental and physical age and maturity of the victim.
2. The nature and duration of the offense.
3. The relationship of the victim to the defendant.
4. The complexity of the issues involved.

5. Whether the evidence sought is reasonably available by other means, including whether the victim was the subject of a forensic interview related to the sexual offense.
6. Any other factors the court deems relevant to ensure the protection of the victim and the integrity of the judicial process.

The Legislature further created a presumption that if the victim of a sexual offense is under the age of 12, the taking of a victim's deposition is not appropriate if:

1. The state has not filed a notice of intent to seek the death penalty; and
2. A forensic interview of the sexual offense victim is available to the defendant.³⁶

If the court determines the taking of the victim's deposition is appropriate, in addition to any other condition required by law, the court may order limitations or other specific conditions including, but not limited to:³⁷

1. Requiring the defendant to submit questions to the court before the victim's deposition.
2. Setting the appropriate place and conditions under which the victim's deposition may be conducted.
3. Permitting or prohibiting the attendance of any person at the victim's deposition.
4. Limiting the duration of the victim's deposition. Any other condition the court finds just and appropriate.

The Court must enter a written order finding whether the taking of the deposition of the victim is appropriate. If the court finds that the taking of the deposition of the victim is appropriate, the order must include any limitations or other specific conditions under which the victim's deposition must be conducted.³⁸

The importance of this breakthrough reform for the protection of children under the age of sixteen cannot be overstated. It is, however, the most minimum protection. Given that most human trafficking minor victims are older, 15, 16, or 17 years of age at the time of arrest, most are not included in the protection or will age out by the time defense criminal depositions commence. Nor did the amendment correct remnant language that challenges, if not disallows the State, from using the pre-existing protection language in F.S. 92.55 for older minor victims.

The right of a defendant to take a criminal discovery deposition is a marginal practice within the United States. Criminal defendants have no constitutional right to discovery depositions. The federal government only permits depositions to be taken in exceptional circumstances.³⁹ Thirty-five states do not permit the taking of a criminal discovery deposition by a defendant. Currently, Florida is one of only six states, Florida, Missouri, Vermont, North Dakota, Iowa, and Indiana, which permit the taking of criminal discovery depositions by right without leave of the court.^{40,41,42,43} In 2020, Indiana restricted criminal discovery depositions for defendants accused of sexual offenses against children.⁴⁴ In 2017, North Dakota enacted the protection that a victim may refuse to participate in a deposition requested by the defendant or the defendant's attorney.⁴⁵ In 2009, Vermont enacted a protection that eliminated depositions

of minor victims under the age of sixteen in sexual assault cases except under special circumstances.⁴⁶ Only Iowa and Missouri have no protections for child victims to guard against needless trauma inflicted through compelled discovery depositions.⁴⁷

Nine states, Texas, Wisconsin, Montana, New Hampshire, Arizona, Ohio, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Washington, allow criminal discovery depositions but only by leave of the court. Within these nine states, five states have enacted additional victim reforms. Arizona and Ohio both permit a victim the right to refuse to submit to a criminal discovery deposition.^{48, 49} In Nebraska, sexual assault victims may request to have an advocate of the victim's choosing to be present during a deposition.⁵⁰ Washington requires special protections be afforded to child victims, including the provision of easy-to-understand language about the proceedings, and the presence of victim advocates.⁵¹ New Hampshire eliminated criminal discovery depositions of all children under the age of sixteen with no exceptions.⁵²

Since 1970, the American Bar Association (ABA) has not recommended criminal discovery depositions by right. It recommends depositions in criminal cases only when no writing has been furnished to the defense summarizing the relevant knowledge of the person sought to be deposed, adequate to prevent surprise at trial, and then only if it is necessary in the interests of justice.⁵³ The ABA Standard for Criminal Justice Administration regarding depositions is as follows:

Standard 11-5.2 Discovery depositions

(a) On motion of either the prosecution or the defense, the court should order the taking of a deposition upon oral examination of any person other than the defendant, concerning information relevant to the offense charged, but only upon a showing that:

- (i) the name of the person sought to be deposed has been disclosed to the movant by the opposing party through the exchange of names and addresses of witnesses or has been discovered during the movant's investigation of the case; and
- (ii) no writing, summarizing the relevant knowledge of the person sought to be deposed, adequate to prevent surprise at trial, has been furnished to the movant; and
- (iii) the movant has taken reasonable steps to obtain a voluntary oral or written statement from the witness, but the witness has refused to cooperate in giving a voluntary statement; and
- (iv) the taking of a deposition is necessary in the interests of justice.

(b) The defendant may not be present at the deposition unless the court orders otherwise for good cause shown.

(c) The procedure for taking a discovery deposition, including the scope of the examination, should be in accordance with express rules to be written for depositions in criminal proceedings.

(d) Unless otherwise stipulated by the parties, a discovery deposition should be admissible at a trial or hearing only for the purpose of contradicting or impeaching the testimony of the deponent as a witness.

(e) A person whose deposition is sought should have the right to move to quash on the ground that compliance would subject the person to an undue burden, or would require the disclosure of material that is privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure, or would otherwise be unreasonable.⁵³

Florida requires State prosecutors to produce all witness statements defined to include police and investigative reports, written or recorded, and reports or statements of experts.⁵⁴ Unlike Florida, a number of the majority of the states that permit criminal discovery depositions do not provide for discovery of witness statements or police reports. Iowa and Nebraska do not provide for discovery of witness statements.^{55, 56} Indiana, North Dakota, and Montana do not provide for discovery of police reports.^{57, 58,}

59

Criminal discovery depositions were first authorized by Florida's Rules of Criminal Procedure in 1968 before the advent of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) technology. The 1990's ushered in major funding for neuroscience research and was declared by President H.W. Bush to be the decade of the brain.⁶⁰ The groundbreaking study of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE Study) by the Center for Disease Control and Kaiser Permanente was published in 1998.⁶¹ Neuroscience research has dramatically improved our understanding of brain development and the physiological effects of trauma and toxic stress. The 1989 and 1996 substantive amendments to Florida's criminal discovery deposition rule, however, were made well before neuroscience research became widely available.

These advances in the neuroscience of trauma prompted the ABA in 2014 to urge the development of trauma-informed, evidence-based approaches and practices on behalf of justice system-involved children and youth who have been exposed to violence, including victims of child abuse and neglect or other crimes. The ABA further urged state bar associations to work with judges, lawyers, and other professionals with subject matter expertise in trauma-informed systems of care, to develop and implement training programs for judges, child welfare attorneys, prosecutors, defense counsel, and law students that will enable them to integrate trauma knowledge into daily legal practice and integrate and sustain trauma awareness, knowledge, and skills in practice and policies.⁶²

A criminal discovery deposition is an inherently adversarial practice. The protections within the Florida's Rules of Criminal Procedure have focused on protecting a witness being deposed from a bad faith examination or from a deposition being conducted in such a manner as to unreasonably annoy, embarrass, or oppress the witness. These protections, however, fall short of addressing the physiological effects of trauma. During

depositions we create a setting of re-experiencing distressing memories through invasive, explicit, and detailed questioning. It is now basic scientific knowledge that traumatic experiences cause the release of stress hormones that divert energy from higher functioning centers of the brain to provide more energy to the heart and muscles for enhanced survival functioning, commonly referred to as the fight, flight, or freeze response. Questioning about a trauma incident can force victims and witnesses of traumatic events to re-experience these events. This re-experiencing of traumatic events can cause the release of stress hormones during deposition.

These responses are physiological and beyond a child's control. If allowed to continue unrecognized, they can result in the child experiencing anger or frustration, confusion or difficulty in verbalizing thoughts. Child victims and witnesses are particularly vulnerable in deposition settings because they may not have the language, insight, or empowerment to ask for help when they are experiencing emotional distress. Children, because they are developmentally and socially less empowered than adults, may perceive that they cannot defend themselves or run. Their bodies may more commonly react by "freezing" which is medically known as progressing towards or entering a dissociative state. A child in this state may regress, withdraw into themselves, and appear blank, lifeless or numb. In an extreme response, they may shut down and lose the ability to answer questions.^{63, 64}

What is required of victims in Florida's criminal justice system is substantial. At a minimum, there are investigative interviews by law enforcement officers, who produce formal statements and often reports summarizing these statements. Victims may again meet with prosecutors at a pre-filing conference. Victims are required testify at deposition. Victims may often meet with prosecutors in preparation for deposition and trial. If there is a conviction, victims may be asked to give statements to the Department of Corrections for the pre-sentencing report and may make statements at sentencing. The pressure on the victims to testify and relive the events over and over again is significant. Mental health clinicians and criminal justice professionals have expressed concern about the re-victimization of child victims who testify in criminal cases. Other states have enacted several statutory "reforms" intended to minimize victimization. Several studies indicate that innovative techniques benefit not only children's mental health but the accuracy of their testimony as well.^{65, 66}

In 2016, the Florida Legislature amended s. 92.54 to increase the maximum age a minor victim or witness may be eligible to testify at trial by closed-circuit television upon a showing that they will suffer at least moderate emotional or mental harm due to the presence of the defendant from 15 to 17. Despite s. 92.54 now including all minor victims and witnesses, Florida's protection of minors from criminal discovery depositions is more limited and restrictive.

As discussed above only minor victims of sexual offenses under the age of 16 have the protection of a court review before a discovery deposition may be granted. Under s. 92.55, any party, parent, guardian, attorney, guardian ad litem, or other advocate on behalf of a victim or

witness of a sexual offense under the 18 may move the court for a protection order. The statute requires, however, that the order be “necessary to protect the victim or witness in any judicial proceeding or other official proceedings from severe emotional or mental harm due to the presence of the defendant if the victim or witness is required to testify in open court.”⁶⁷ The statute does specify that the order may relate to the taking of depositions as a part of a civil or criminal proceeding.⁶⁸ Defendants, however, are no longer permitted to be present at depositions in criminal proceedings.⁶⁹

The “presence of the defendant” language is a remnant from an earlier version of Criminal Procedure Rule 3.220 prior to 1989 which permitted defendants to be present during criminal discovery depositions. The application of this statute to depositions in criminal proceedings with this remnant language creates an issue. An interpretation from the plain reading of the text is that s.92.55, which was enacted in 1985, now only applies to criminal discovery depositions when defendants move pro se and represent themselves.⁷⁰ Additionally, the right of a defendant to confront witnesses at trial is a constitutional right. It is inconsistent and unreasoned to require a higher burden to protect minors from criminal discovery depositions that are not constitutionally required.

Moreover, moderate harm was the standard adopted by the Florida legislature for the enactment of s. 92.54, the closed-circuit protection. A showing of “severe emotional or mental harm” as is required under s. 92.55 almost always requires these victims and witnesses to be submitted to psychological examinations. The results of these examinations must be disclosed to the opposing party prior to a judicial hearing on a motion for a protective order. Should any confidentially protected abuse, abandonment, or neglect records or mental health records be relied upon by the forensic psychologist, they also become discoverable. Thus, in order to attempt to protect a witness under s. 92.55, the privacy of the victim must necessarily be invaded as a condition precedent.

VI. Conclusion

Research on the impact of trauma on the neurobiology and development of the brain in children has identified serious and often complex mental health effects on child victims. The legal process can compound the traumatic experience for these child victims. A growing body of research has emerged that helps to clarify our understanding of court-related stressors and the relative harms of various procedures. Due to the growing incidence of human trafficking, more prosecutions involving children who are complexly traumatized have brought increased awareness and concern regarding Florida’s criminal discovery deposition procedures. Unlike the majority of states in the nation and contrary to the ABA Standard, Florida permits depositions by right of child victims and witnesses in criminal cases. We respectfully request that the Florida Bar Association, Supreme Court, and Legislature examine the current body of research and consider expanded protections that would include minor victims of sexual offenses who are age 16 and 17.

REFERENCES

- ¹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, *Human Trafficking*, <https://www.ice.gov/features/human-trafficking> (last visited Jan. 15, 2025).
- ² 18 U.S.C. §1591(a)(2015) also includes “advertising” ; 22 U.S.C. §7102(11 and 12)(2015).
- ³ §787.06(2), Fla. Stat. (2015).
- ⁴ U.S. Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *Trafficking in Persons Report 2013*, at 7 (June 2013), <https://www.state.gov/reports/2024-trafficking-in-persons-report/> (last visited Jan. 15, 2025).
- ⁵ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Characteristics Of Suspected Human Trafficking Incidents, 2008-2010* (Apr. 2011), <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/cshti0810.pdf> (last visited Jan. 15, 2025).
- ⁶ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention, Literature Review: Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children/Sex Trafficking, at 3 (2014) (citing Bureau of Justice Statistics data), <http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/CSECSexTrafficking.pdf> (last visited Jan. 15, 2025).
- ⁷ Office of the Inspector General. "The Federal Bureau of Investigation's Efforts to Combat Crimes against Children." *Chapter 4: Non-Cyber Sexual Exploitation of Children*. Federal Bureau of Investigation, January 2009. <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/FBI/a0908/chapter4.htm> (last visited Jan. 15, 2025).
- ⁸ Smith, L.A., Vardaman, S.H., Snow, M.A. “America’s Prostituted Children.” *The National Report on Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking*. Vancouver, WA and Arlington, VA: Shared Hope International, May 2009. https://sharedhope.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/SHI_National_Report_on_DMST_2009.pdf (last visited Jan. 15, 2025).
- ⁹ Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (2003, September) Medical examination and treatment for victims of sexual assault. Evidence –based clinical practice and provider training (Report to Congress: AHRQ Publication No. 03-R210). Rockville, MD.
- ¹⁰ Alexander, M. P., Kellogg, N. D., & Thompson, P. (2005). Community and mental health support of juvenile victims of prostitution. In S. W. Cooper, R. J. Estes, A. P. Giardino , N. D. Kellogg, & V. I. Vieth (Eds.), *Medical, legal and social science aspects of child sexual exploitation: Vol. 1* (pp. 397-421). St. Louis, MO: G. W. Medical Publishing, Inc.
- ¹¹ Clawson HJ, Dutch N.M., & Williamson E., 2008 *National symposium on the health needs of human trafficking: Background document*. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- ¹² Family Violence Prevention Fund, 2005; *Turning pain into power: Trafficking survivors’ perspectives on early intervention strategies*. San Francisco, CA.
- ¹³ International Organization for Migration, 2006; *Breaking the cycle of vulnerability: Responding to the health needs of trafficked women in east and southern Africa*. Pretoria, South Africa.
- ¹⁴ Estes, R. & Weiner, N. (2001). *The commercial sexual exploitation of children in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- ¹⁵ Office for Victims of Crime. *First Response to Victims of Crime: A Guidebook for Law Enforcement Officers*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, July 2010, p. 58.

-
- ¹⁶ American Psychiatric Association (APA) (2005, January). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-V-TR (94th Ed). Washington DC.
- ¹⁷ Arroyo, W (2001). *PTSD in children and adolescents in the juvenile justice system*. In S. Eth (Ed). PTSD in children and Adolescents (Vol. 20, pp. 59-86). Arlington Va: American Psychiatric Publishing Inc.
- ¹⁸ Zimmerman C., Hossain M., Yun K., Roche B., Morison, Watts C., (2006). Stolen smiles: A summary report on physical and psychological health consequences of women and adolescents trafficked in Europe. London: London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.
- ¹⁹ Perry, B., (2007). Stress, Trauma and Post-Traumatic Stress disorders in Children. www.ChildTrauma.org
- ²⁰ Pfefferbaum B., (1997). Post-traumatic stress disorder in children: A review of the past 10 years, *J of the American Academy of child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 36(110), 1503-1511.
- ²¹ Bovin M.J., Gold S.D., Jager-Hyman, S., Marx B.P., & Sloan, D.M. (2008). Tonic Immobility Mediates the Influence of Peritraumatic Fear and Perceived Inescapability on Posttraumatic Stress Symptom Severity among Sexual assault survivors. *J of Traumatic Stress*, 21(4);402-409.
- ²² Perry BD, Pollard, RA Blakely, TL, Baker WL & Vigilante D (1995). Childhood trauma, the neurobiology of adaptation, and use-dependent development of the brain: How states become traits. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 16(4), 271-291.
- ²³ Heim, C., Newport, J., Heit, S., Graham, Y., Wilcox, M., Bonsall, R., Miller, A., & Nemeroff, C.B.. (2008) *Biol Psychiatry* ;398-405.
- ²⁴ Abram, K.M., Teplin, L.A., Charles, D.R., Longworth S.L., McClelland G.M. & Dulcan, M.K. (2004). Posttraumatic stress disorder and trauma in youth in juvenile detention. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 61(4); 403-410.
- ²⁵ Igelman , R.S., Ryan, B.E., Gilbert, A.M., Bashant, C. & Nor, K. (2008). Best practices for serving traumatized children and families. *Juvenile and Family Court journal*, 59(4), and 35-4.7
- ²⁶ American Psychiatric Association (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, (5th ed.) Washington DC.
- ²⁷ Howard, M.L. & Tiner, R.R. (2008). Children who have been traumatized: One Court's response. *Juvenile and Family court Journal*, 59(4); 21-34
- ²⁸ Goodman, G.S., Taub, E., Jones ,D., England ,P., Port, L., Rudy, L., et al. (1992). Testifying in criminal court. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*.57 (5).
- ²⁹ *Maryland v. Craig*, 497 U.S. 836,853 (1990) (discussing the state's interest in protecting the welfare of children and noting the 'growing body of academic literature (that) document the psychological trauma suffered by child abuse victims who must testify in court'
- ³⁰ Schore, A. (2009). Relational trauma and the developing right brain: An interface with psychoanalytic, self -psychology and neuroscience. *Self and Systems. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1159; 189-203.
- ³¹ Crenshaw, D., Clinical Children's Home of Poughkeepsie, Faculty Associate, Johns Hopkins University. *Recognizing and Responding to Trauma Reactions of children testifying in court*. www.childtherapytechniques.com
- ³² Lyon, T.D., et al. (2012). "How did you feel?": Increasing child sexual abuse witnesses' production of evaluative information. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(5), 448-457. Doi: 10.1037/h0093986

-
- ³³ Herman, J. (2003). The Mental Health of Crime Victims: Impact of legal intervention. *J of Traumatic Stress*, 16(2); 159-166.
- ³⁴ Marsil, D., *et al.* (2002). Children as Victims and Witnesses in the Criminal Trial Process: Child witness Policy: Law Interfacing with Social Science, 65 *Law & Contemp. Prob.* 209; 213.
- ³⁵ H.R. 667, 2023 Leg., 148th Sess. (Fla. 2023).
- ³⁶ Florida Statute § 92.55(6)(c) (2023).
- ³⁷ Florida Statute § 92.55(6)(d) (2023).
- ³⁸ Florida Statute § 92.55(6)(e) (2023).
- ³⁹ Fed. R. Crim. P. 15.
- ⁴⁰ Mo. Sup. Ct. R. 25.12.
- ⁴¹ Vt. R. Crim. P. 15.
- ⁴² N.D. R. Crim. P. 16.
- ⁴³ Iowa R. Crim. P. 2.14.
- ⁴⁴ Ind. Code Ann. § 35-40-5-11.5.
- ⁴⁵ N.D. R. Crim. P. 15.
- ⁴⁶ Vt. R. Crim. P. 15.
- ⁴⁷ V.A.M.R. Rule 25.12.
- ⁴⁸ Ariz. Const. Art. II, § 2.1.
- ⁴⁹ Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 2930.04.
- ⁵⁰ Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 29-1917.
- ⁵¹ Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 7.69A.030 (West).
- ⁵² N.H. Crim. R. 13.
- ⁵³ American Bar Association Standards for Criminal Justice Administration, ABA Standard 11-5.2.
- ⁵⁴ Fla. R. Crim. P. Rule 3.220.
- ⁵⁵ Iowa R. Crim. P. 2.14.
- ⁵⁶ Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 29-1912.
- ⁵⁷ *Minges v. State*, 192 N.E.3d 893 (Ind. 2022).
- ⁵⁸ N.D. R. Crim. P. 16.
- ⁵⁹ Mont. Code Ann. § 46-15-322.
- ⁶⁰ Decade of the Brain Home Page (Library of Congress). (2022). Decade of the Brain. Retrieved from <https://www.loc.gov//oc/brain/proclaim.html>.
- ⁶¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). About the CDC-Kaiser ACE Study. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/aces/about.html>.
- ⁶² American Bar Association Child Law Practice. (2014). Understanding Trauma and its Impact on Child Clients. Retrieved from https://www.flcourts.gov/content/download/215860/file/09_TraumaSeries_understanding.pdf.
- ⁶³ Schore, A. (2009). Relational trauma and the developing right brain: An interface with psychoanalytic, self-psychology and neuroscience. *Self and Systems. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1159; 189-203.
- ⁶⁴ Crenshaw, D., Clinical Children's Home of Poughkeepsie, Faculty Associate, John Hopkins University. Recognizing and Responding to Trauma Reactions of children testifying in court. www.childtherapytechniques.com.
- ⁶⁵ Tobey, A.E., Goodman, G.S., Batternab-Faunce, J.M., Orcutt, H.K.& Sachsenmaier, T. (1995) *Balancing the rights of children and defendants: Effects of closed-circuit television on children's*

accuracy and juror's perceptions. In MS Zaragoza, JR Graham, GCN Hall, R Hirschman & YS Ben Porath (Eds.), *Memory and testimony in the child witness* (pp 214-239). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

⁶⁶ Brannon, L.C. (Spring, 1994). The Trauma of Testifying in court for Child victims of Sexual Assault vs the Accused's right to Confrontation. 18 *Law & Psychol. Rev.* 439.

⁶⁷ FL ST § 92.55.

⁶⁸ FL ST § 92.55(2)(a).

⁶⁹ FL ST RCRP Rule 3.220(h)(7).

⁷⁰ *In re AMENDMENT TO FLORIDA RULE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 3.220 (Discovery)*, 550 So.2d 1097 (Fla. 1989).