Advocates have long pointed to links between domestic violence and human trafficking. The federal government also has acknowledged the link between these two crimes, recognizing that cases that initially appear to be domestic violence may mask sex or labor trafficking. Understanding the connections between human trafficking and domestic violence is key to identifying appropriate criminal, civil, and immigration remedies. This Fact Sheet provides examples in each context, highlighting cases in which courts and administrative bodies recognized the nexus between human trafficking and domestic violence.

The Department of Justice’s Human Trafficking Task Force eGuide express lists domestic violence as a crime that may overlap with human trafficking. A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) publication revealed that 12 of 27 tribal law enforcement agencies reported identifying domestic violence in their human trafficking investigations. Decisions by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) of the Department of Homeland Security on T-visas similarly reflect this linkage. In a 2011 AAO decision, an applicant for a T-visa alleged that her husband forced her into prostitution in the United States, threatening to tell her children if she did not engage in forced commercial sex. And a recent AAO decision stated, “[t]he Applicant correctly notes on appeal that a personal relationship involving domestic violence may qualify as human trafficking in some cases, and that forced sex may qualify as a type of involuntary servitude.”

It is not uncommon in federal trafficking prosecutions for the trafficker to be the husband, boyfriend, or romantic partner of the victim. The fact that a trafficker is married to – or in an intimate relationship with – his victim does not vitiate the trafficking crime. And while the most widely understood domestic violence-human trafficking scenario involves perpetrators holding their domestic partners in forced prostitution, advocates also should look for forced labor in intimate-partner cases. Forced non-commercial sex may qualify as involuntary servitude, even in the context of an intimate-partner relationship. And intimate partners also may hold wives and girlfriends in forced labor.
Domestic Violence and Sex Trafficking

In some instances, a marriage or intimate relationship may be a fraud instigated by the trafficker from the start. This fact pattern is particularly common in sex trafficking cases, in which young victims are lured into marriages or romantic relationships only to be exploited by their partners through forced prostitution.

For example, a series of successful federal prosecutions revealed that traffickers from the town of Tenancingo, Mexico routinely recruited women and girls by pretending to fall in love with them. The Tenancingo defendants transported their victims, who often hailed from poor, rural parts of Mexico, up and down the East Coast of the United States. Traffickers then forced the women and girls into commercial sex with threats of force and physical and sexual violence. In some cases, traffickers purposefully impregnated their victims and held their children hostage in Mexico in order to coerce their victims into prostitution. The Tenancingo trafficking enterprises spanned New York, Georgia, Florida, and Texas. Since 2009, federal authorities have prosecuted more than 50 Tenancingo defendants for trafficking.

This practice is not limited to Tenancingo. In United States v. Martinez, the defendant forced his girlfriend, a young woman from the State of Puebla, Mexico, into prostitution in the United States. The victim’s children remained under the care of the defendant’s relatives in Mexico. The defendant used physical force to coerce the victim into prostitution. He also instructed his relatives to hold her children hostage. After a violent physical assault, law enforcement authorities arrested the defendant, who was convicted of assault and harassment. Although prosecutors initially viewed this as a domestic violence case, subsequent law enforcement interviews revealed that the defendant had forced the victim into commercial sex. The defendant pled guilty to sex trafficking charges and was sentenced to time served.

Domestically, traffickers use the same tactics on U.S. citizen victims. Boyfriends, husbands, and romantic partners have forced their U.S. citizen victims into commercial sex:

- In United States v. Lee, the defendant was sentenced to 15 years in prison after he pled guilty to sex trafficking of a child. Lee had forced multiple minor victims into commercial sex, including one victim to whom he was married and with whom he had a child.

- In United States v. McKinney, the defendant pled guilty to production of child pornography and sex trafficking of a child. McKinney, the victim’s legal guardian, secretly filmed her having sex with another man. In an effort to mitigate his sentence, the defendant claimed that he and the minor victim were married and that any prior sexual contact between them was consensual. McKinney was sentenced to life in prison.

- In United States v. Vianez, the victim agreed to engage in commercial sex for the defendant in the hopes that he would “love her.” She worked for Vianez for four years. Though she repeatedly tried
to leave, Vianez physically abused her and forced her to continue working. Vianez beat the victim so severely that she had to undergo emergency surgery for her injuries. Hospital staff called the police, who arrested Vianez and initially charged him with domestic assault. He was later convicted of sex trafficking and related crimes, sentenced to 20 years in prison, and ordered to pay the victim restitution in the amount of $1,354,500.15

• In *United States v. Yarbrough et al.*, Yarbrough repeatedly used false promises of romantic relationships and family to target and lure vulnerable victims into forced prostitution. He targeted victims as young as 15 years old. One victim testified that she and other victims were “in love” with Yarbrough. If victims refused to engage in commercial sex, Yarbrough used extreme physical violence to coerce them. Yarbrough was convicted of 10 counts of sex trafficking and sentenced to serve 536 months in prison.16

• In *United States v. Saddler*, the defendant and his 15-year-old victim began dating. Shortly thereafter, Saddler forced the victim to engage in commercial sex in migrant worker camps, physically abusing and threatening her if she refused. Saddler was convicted of conspiracy to commit sex trafficking and sex trafficking of a minor. He awaits sentencing.17

• In *United States v. Knight*, authorities arrested the defendant for aggravated domestic assault after his girlfriend alleged that he had hit, choked, and threatened to kill her. The subsequent medical report and police investigation identified markers of possible human trafficking. The defendant forced the victim and other women into prostitution, using violence and threats of serious harm to coerce them. Knight pled guilty to lesser charges.18

**Domestic Violence and Forced Labor**

Traffickers also have used the promise of a relationship or marriage to obtain forced labor. In *Doe v. Faraghala*, a Moroccan citizen alleged that the defendant married her in Egypt and brought her to the United States. Upon arrival, the victim learned that the defendant was already married with two children. The defendant and his wife allegedly forced her to work as a domestic servant in their home and as a janitor in their limousine business, using physical violence, sexual assault, emotional abuse, and threats against the victim’s family as means of coercion.

In *Pichardo v. Francisco*, the victim alleged that the defendant lured her to the United States from the Dominican Republic with false promises of marriage and forced her to work in his parking garage without compensation. A federal court awarded the victim a default judgment in the amount of $148,863.21

It is not always the case that the relationship between a trafficking victim and trafficker is a fraud at its inception. Trafficking victims often have complex relationships with their traffickers. A bona fide marriage or relationship may devolve into a situation of human trafficking.22
For example, in *Shuvalova v. Cunningham*, the plaintiff, a Russian national, and the defendant met online. After “wooing” the plaintiff for approximately two years, the defendant married her, promising to care for her and her 16-year-old daughter. The plaintiff and her daughter moved to the U.S. The defendant and his son then allegedly forced the plaintiff and her daughter to perform heavy manual labor. The complaint alleged that the men also sexually abused the daughter. In response to the defendants’ argument that the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act did not apply to married parties, the court noted, “there is no basis for the proposition that marriage eliminates a tort claim, including one under the TVPRA.” The case was voluntarily dismissed with prejudice (usually an indication of settlement).

**Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking Involving Other Family Members**

Human trafficking can occur alongside domestic violence, particularly when other family members direct the forced labor. Traffickers may use the victim’s fear of retaliation by her community or extended family as a form of coercion. In *Stein v. World-Wide Plumbing*, the plaintiff alleged that her husband, his parents, and additional relatives held her in forced labor in their illegal fencing operation in New York. According to the complaint, the husband frequently raped her, physically abused her, held her children hostage, seized her wages, and forced her to work at a pizza restaurant owned by the family. The court refused to dismiss the forced labor allegations against several family members.

Similarly, in *Mistry v. Udwadia*, the plaintiff alleged that her parents-in-law forced her to perform domestic work by confining her, controlling her diet, and “leverag[ing]...cultural practices to coerce [her] into providing domestic labor.” The defendants allegedly threatened to have their son divorce the plaintiff and send her back to India.

Family-controlled human trafficking may also include identity theft, tax fraud, and the filing of false tax returns. These fraudulent tax returns can result in IRS enforcement actions against the trafficking victims even years after they escape. Trafficker-perpetrated tax fraud is a risk for all trafficking victims, but the risk is particularly pronounced in situations of domestic violence and family-controlled trafficking.

**Conclusion**

As these cases illustrate, victims of domestic violence may also be victims of sex trafficking and/or labor trafficking. Growing recognition of the connection between domestic violence and human trafficking will enable survivors to achieve justice and immigration relief.

**Additional Resources on Domestic Violence and Human Trafficking**
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