

February 12, 2015

As I read H.105, it appears to assume without stating that the person depicted in the image is the “first party;” that the offender is the “second party;” and that the recipient of the illegal disclosure is the “third party.” Following this logic, I don’t think the statute criminalizes further dissemination of the image by the third party to a fourth party. This is probably how it should be – because the third party doesn’t necessarily know that the image is revenge porn (versus, I suppose, regular porn). If this is the intent of the statute, we might want to make it clearer.

Dave

---

David J. Cahill  
Executive Director  
Department of State’s Attorneys & Sheriffs  
12 Baldwin Street  
Montpelier, VT 05633  
(802)-828-2888