

# CARDOZO

BENJAMIN N. CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW • YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

MARCI A. HAMILTON  
Paul R. Verkuil Chair in Public Law

E-MAIL [hamilton02@aol.com](mailto:hamilton02@aol.com)  
PHONE 215-353-8984

07

March 14, 2011

## SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL

Representative John M. Mizuno  
Chair  
Representative Jo Jordan  
Vice Chair  
Human Service Committee  
State Capitol  
415 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813-2425  
[HUStestimony@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:HUStestimony@capitol.hawaii.gov)

RE: Hearing Before Committee on Human Service on SB217.SD2, Relative to the Statute of Limitations for Civil Actions Involving Childhood Sexual Abuse (March 14, 2011, 9:00 a.m.)

Dear Representatives Mizuno and Jordan:

I commend you and the Committee for taking up SB217.SD2, which would eliminate the statute of limitations for civil actions brought by minor victims of sexual offenses and revive for two (2) years some actions for which the statute of limitations had previously lapsed.

There are untold numbers of hidden child predators who are preying on one child after another, because the statutes of limitations have been configured to give them that opportunity. This bill redresses that injustice and reduces the present danger to Hawaii's children. **If passed, it will put Hawaii in the forefront of child protection.**

**This is a sunshine law for children.** There is an epidemic of child sex abuse around the world. At least one in four girls is sexually abused and at least one in five boys. Sadly, 90% never go to the authorities and the vast majority of claims expire before the victims are capable of getting to court. Most victims are abused by family or family acquaintances. This bill would protect the children of Hawaii by making it possible for victims to come forward and identify their perpetrators in a court of law. It would also bring delayed, but still welcome, justice to these victims.

By way of introduction, I hold the Paul R. Verkuil Chair in Public Law at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University, where I specialize in

church/state relations and constitutional law. My most recent book, *Justice Denied: What America Must Do to Protect Its Children* (Cambridge University Press 2008), makes the case for statute of limitations reform in the child sex abuse arena. I am the leading expert on the history and constitutionality of retroactive statutes of limitations with respect to child sex abuse and have advised many child sex abuse victims on constitutional issues.

**There are three compelling public purposes served by window legislation:**

- (1) the identification of previously unknown child predators to the public so children will not be abused in the future;**
- (2) giving child sex abuse survivors a day in court; and**
- (3) remedying the wrong done to child sex abuse survivors caused by an overly short statute of limitations that placed predators and their enablers in a preferred position to the victims.**

I have been involved in statute of limitations reform in numerous states. This is the only means of identifying child predators. As Professor Timothy Lytton has documented, civil tort claims have been the only means by which survivors of clergy abuse have been able to obtain any justice. Timothy Lytton, *Holding Bishops Accountable: How Lawsuits Helped the Catholic Church Confront Sexual Abuse* (Harvard University Press, 2008).

Legislative reform for statutes of limitations for child sex abuse victims is on the rise. Guam's bill removing the statute of limitations and creating a two-year window was signed into law by Governor Calvo on March 10, 2011.<sup>1</sup> Bills that would eliminate, extend, or create windows for the statutes of limitations covering child sex abuse are pending or have passed in Massachusetts,<sup>2</sup> Connecticut,<sup>3</sup> Virginia,<sup>4</sup> Florida,<sup>5</sup> New Jersey,<sup>6</sup> New York,<sup>7</sup> and Oregon.<sup>8</sup> A bill has also just been introduced in both houses of the Pennsylvania legislature as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bills No. B033 & B034-31(COR), Acts To Amend § 11306 Of Article 3, Chapter 11, Title 7 Of The Guam Code Annotated; Relative To The Statute Of Limitations For Civil Actions Involving Child Sexual Abuse, removing the statute of limitations and establishing a two-year window of opportunity for child sex abuse victims whose claims have expired under the Guam statute of limitations to bring their civil claims, now Public Laws No. 31-06 & 31-07 (2011); Erin Thompson, *Sex Abuse Bills Now Public Law*, PACIFIC DAILY NEWS (Mar. 10, 2011), available at <http://www.guampdn.com/article/20110310/NEWS01/103100301/Sex-abuse-bills-now-public-law>.

<sup>2</sup> H.R. 689, 187th Gen. Ct., Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2011) (pending) (statute of limitations for child sex abuse runs for three years from when claimant discovers connection between sex abuse and harm suffered).

<sup>3</sup> S.B. No. 784, 2011 Gen. Assemb., 2011 Reg. Sess. (Conn. 2011) (pending) (eliminating limitation of time for bringing a civil action with respect to a new occurrence of sexual abuse, sexual exploitation or sexual assault in order to recognize the severity of such occurrences and give victims increased access to the civil court system.)

<sup>4</sup> H.B. 1476, 2011 Gen. Assemb., 2011 Reg. Sess. (Va. 2011) (pending) (extending the limitations period for actions for sexual abuse committed during the infancy or incapacity of the abused person from two years to 25 years from the time of the removal of the infancy or incapacity or from the time the cause of action otherwise accrues).

<sup>5</sup> Fla. Stat. Ann. § 95.11(7) (2010) (enacted) (eliminating statute of limitations for sexual battery if victim was under 16 years old, for claims not barred as of July 2010).

<sup>6</sup> S.B. No. A1164, 2009 (pending) (eliminating statute of limitations for sexual assault when the victim reaches majority).

Information on the statutes of limitations for child sex abuse can be found on my website, [www.sol-reform.com](http://www.sol-reform.com).

Statute of limitations reform is the one tried and true means that will identify the many hidden child predators, who are grooming other children right now. The “window” in California led to the public identification of over 300 perpetrators previously unidentified. Delaware also enacted a window, which has led to the public identification of dozens of perpetrators previously hidden. Given that most child perpetrators abuse many children over the course of their lives,<sup>9</sup> window legislation does far more than create justice for victims in the past. It also forestalls future abuse of today’s children.

The Catholic bishops often argue that window legislation is unconstitutional on the theory that it “targets” the Church. This bill and all window bills introduced in any other state do not target any particular perpetrator or organization. A federal trial court in the Ninth Circuit has upheld the California window against such an argument. See Melanie H. v. Defendant Doe, No. 04-1596-WQH-(WMc), slip op. (S.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2005).

Some have argued that retroactive legislation is unconstitutional. While such an implication was true in the nineteenth century, it is no longer true under the federal Constitution, as the United States Supreme Court has explained: “The presumption against statutory retroactivity had special force in the era in which courts tended to view legislative interference with property and contract rights circumspectly. In this century, legislation has come to supply the dominant means of legal ordering, and circumspection has given way to greater deference to legislative judgments.” Landgraf v. USI Film Prods., 511 U.S. 244, 272 (1994); see also Republic of Austria v. Altmann, 541 U.S. 677 (2004).

In a case decided last month, the Delaware Supreme Court, sitting en banc, upheld a two-year window against a due process challenge. Sheehan v. Oblates of St. Francis de Sales, No. 730 2009, 2011 Del. LEXIS 115 (Del. Feb. 22, 2011). The California one-year

---

<sup>7</sup> Assembly: A. 5488, 234th Sess. (N.Y. 2011) (pending) (extending the statute of limitations in criminal and civil actions for certain sex offenses committed against a child less than eighteen years of age).

<sup>8</sup> H.B. 3057, 76<sup>th</sup> Gen. Assemb., 2011 Reg. Sess. (Or. 2011) (pending) (eliminating criminal statute of limitations for sexual abuse crimes committed against minors). Oregon extended its civil limitations period regarding injuries arising out of child sex abuse in 2009. O.R.S. §12.117 (2009).

<sup>9</sup> KENNETH V. LANNING, CHILD MOLESTERS: A BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS 5, 37 (4<sup>th</sup> ed. 2001) available at [http://www.cybertipline.com/en\\_US/publications/NC70.pdf](http://www.cybertipline.com/en_US/publications/NC70.pdf). (“Except for child prostitution, most sexual-exploitation-of-children cases in the United States involve acquaintance molesters who rarely use physical force on their victims. . . . Although a variety of individuals sexually abuse children, preferential-type sex offenders, and especially pedophiles, are the primary acquaintance sexual exploiters of children. A preferential-acquaintance child molester might molest 10, 50, hundreds, or even thousands of children in a lifetime, depending on the offender and how broadly or narrowly child molestation is defined. Although pedophiles vary greatly, their sexual behavior is repetitive and highly predictable.”).

window also was held to be constitutional. See Deutsch v. Masonic Homes of California, Inc., 164 Cal. App. 4th 748, 760, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 368, 378 (Cal. Ct. App. 2008).

The majority of states has not found retroactive statutes of limitations unconstitutional. See Catholic Bishop of N. Alaska v. Does, 141 P.3d 719 (Alaska 2006); San Carlos Apache Tribe v. Superior Court ex rel. County of Maricopa, 972 P.2d 179 (Ariz. 1999), superseded by statute, Arizona Rev. Stat. § 12-505 (2010); Deutsch v. Masonic Homes of California, Inc., 164 Cal. App. 4th 748, 760, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 368, 378 (Cal. Ct. App. 2008); Liebig v. Superior Court, 257 Cal. Rptr. 574 (Cal. Ct. App. 3d 1989); Mudd v. McColgan, 183 P.2d 10 (Cal. 1947); Shell Western E&P, Inc. v. Dolores County Bd. of Comm'rs, 948 P.2d 1002 (Colo. 1997); Rossi v. Osage Highland Dev., LLC, 219 P.3d 319 (Col. App. 2009) (citing In re Estate of Randall, 441 P.2d 153, 155 (Col. 1968)); Roberts v. Caton, 619 A.2d 844 (Conn. 1993); Whitwell v. Archmere Acad., Inc., C.A. No: 07C-08-006 (RBY), 2008 Del. Super. LEXIS 141 (Del. Super. Ct. April 16, 2008); Riggs Nat'l Bank v. District of Columbia, 581 A.2d 1229 (D.C. 1990); Vaughn v. Vulcan Materials Co., 465 S.E.2d 661 (Ga. 1996); Gov't Employees Ins. Co. v. Hyman, 975 P.2d 211 (Haw. 1999); Roe v. Doe, 581 P.2d 310 (Haw. 1978); Henderson v. Smith, 915 P.2d 6 (Idaho 1996); Hecla Mining Co. v. Idaho State Tax Comm'n, 697 P.2d 1161 (Idaho 1985); Metro Holding Co. v. Mitchell, 589 N.E.2d 217 (Ind. 1992); Ripley v. Tolbert, 921 P.2d 1210 (Kan. 1996); Shirley v. Reif, 920 P.2d 405 (Kan. 1996); Kienzler v. Dalkon Shield Claimants Trust, 686 N.E.2d 447 (Mass. 1997); Rookledge v. Garwood, 340 Mich. 444 (Mich. 1954); Gomon v. Northland Family Physicians, Ltd., 645 N.W.2d 413 (Minn. 2002); Cosgriffe v. Cosgriffe, 864 P.2d 776 (Mont. 1993); Panzinov. Continental Can Co., 364 A.2d 1043 (N.J. 1976); Alsenz v. Twin Lakes Village, 843 P.2d 834 (Nev. 1992); Bunton v. Abernathy, 73 P.2d 810 (N.M. 1937); Hymowitz v. Eli Lilly & Co., 539 N.E.2d 1069 (N.Y. 1989); In Interest of W.M.V., 268 N.W.2d 781 (N.D. 1978); Pratte v. Stewart, 929 N.E.2d 415 (Ohio 2010); McFadden v. Dryvit Systems, Inc., 112 P.3d 1191, 1195 (Or. 2005); McDonald v. Redevelopment Auth., 952 A.2d 713, 718 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2008); Bible v. Dep't of Labor and Indus., 696 A.2d 1149 (Pa. 1997); Stratmeyer v. Stratmeyer, 567 N.W.2d 220 (S.D. 1997); Ballard Square Condo. Owners Ass'n v. Dynasty Constr. Co., 146 P.3d 914 (Wash. 2006) superseded by statute, Wash. Rev. Code 25.15.303, as recognized in Chadwick Farms Owners Ass'n v. FHC, LLC, 160 P.3d 1061 (Wash. 2007); Neiman v. Am. Nat'l Prop. & Cas. Co., 613 N.W.2d 160 (Wis. 2000) (open question); RM v. State Dept. of Family Servs., Div. of Public Servs., 891 P.2d 791, 792 (Wyo. 1995).

The Hawaii Supreme Court has upheld retroactive application of a newly extended statute of limitation to revive claims that previously expired. Roe v. Doe, 581 P.2d 310, 316 (Haw. 1978) (holding that “[t]he right to defeat an action by the statute of limitations has never been regarded as a fundamental or vested right. . . . [W]here lapse of time has not invested a party with title to real or personal property, it does not violate due process to extend the period of limitations even after the right of action has been theretofore barred by the former statute of limitations.”); Gov't Employees Ins. Co. v. Hyman, 975 P.2d 211 (Haw. 1999).

Hawaii does provide for a two-year (2) statute of limitations for repressed memory cases, but victims typically have a difficult time dealing with such memories. Two years is a very short period of time within which to process the information, obtain the needed counseling to be ready to go to court, and then to find an attorney and proceed to the judicial process. The window would help them as well as the vast majority of victims, who do not have repressed memories and simply could not get to court before the statute of limitations expired.

Once again, I applaud you for introducing this legislation and the Committee for taking up the cause of child sex abuse victims in this way. Hawaii's children deserve the passage of SB217.SD2, which eliminates the statute of limitations for all future cases, and creates a two-year (2) window of opportunity for Hawaii's child sex abuse victims who were locked out of the courthouse by unfairly short limitations periods.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions regarding window legislation or if I can be of assistance in any other way.

Sincerely,

Marci A. Hamilton  
[hamilton02@aol.com](mailto:hamilton02@aol.com)  
212-790-0215 (office)  
215-493-1094 (facsimile)

JACOB BURNS INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED LEGAL STUDIES

BROOKDALE CENTER • 55 FIFTH AVENUE • NEW YORK, NY 10003-4391