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Five years ago, when 17 million American teens aged 12 to 17 were online, the Center Against Children Research Center reported that one in five children had been sexually solicited or approached over the Internet in the preceding year.1 By late 2004, 21 million teens were online, an increase of 24%.2 And it may be safe to assume that the proportion of children who are solicited online has increased commensurately.3 Recognizing the threat to America’s children, many states have created new electronic solicitation or luring statutes, or have strengthened existing sexual solicitation statutes to enable aggressive prosecution of these crimes. This article will identify and analyze the major trends and models that states have developed in combating these crimes against children.

Charging Attempt or Solicitation of Sexual Offenses

The first approach is to charge attempt or solicitation of preexisting sexual offenses against children, including but not limited to statutory rape, sexual assault and/or battery of a minor, and other relevant traditional child sex abuse offenses. Most states that have not developed electronic luring statutes have relied on this approach to prosecute Internet predators. Generally, this crime is defined to require (1) an intent to engage in crime, and (2) conduct constituting a substantial step towards commission of the crime.4 States have not come to a general consensus as to what constitutes a “substantial step.” One court articulated that liability for attempt attaches if the defendant’s actions have proceeded to the point at which, if not interrupted, they would culminate in the commission of the underlying crime.5 Others have defined a “substantial step” more restrictively, stating that the act must come very near to accomplishment of the resulting crime.6 This places the burden on the prosecutor to show that the defendant was close to committing the attempted crime, which is particularly difficult since electronic crimes are classified primarily as misdemeanors or low-level felonies.7 To compensate for this disadvantage, some states have combined the two crimes of electronic luring and dissemination of obscene materials to minors.8 The act of transmitting obscene materials to minors is a separate and usually lesser offense from luring, ranging from the lowest level felony9 to the highest-level felony,10 with many states falling somewhere in between. Only two states, however,11 treat this crime as a misdemeanor.

The disadvantage to charging these crimes is that they are classified primarily as misdemeanors or low-level felonies. To compensate for this disadvantage, some states have combined the two crimes of electronic luring and dissemination of obscene materials to a minor, resulting in a harsher dissemination statute and/or a more lenient luring statute. For example, California’s statute reads “knowingly distributes...any harmful matter...to a minor with the intent of arousing...a minor, and with the intent, or for the purpose of seducing a minor.”12 In other words, the sexually explicit communications are coupled with the intent of arousing and/or seducing the child to add more teeth to the statute. The end result is the desired harsher penalty without having to prove additional elements, such as requiring the offender to travel to a specified place at a specified time.13 Most states have not followed California’s lead and have opted, instead,
to include both approaches in their statutes as two separate crimes: the crime of electronic enticement or luring of a minor and the crime of dissemination of obscene material to a minor. The third and final trend is perhaps the lesser known of the three. This trend involves coupling one or both of the other two approaches with a third type of statute that prohibits the electronic compilation of any identifying information belonging to a minor. This includes a minor’s name, phone number, address, physical characteristics, or other descriptive information that has been compiled or transmitted by means of a computer for the purpose of soliciting a minor to engage in a prohibited sexual act. This crime has been given different names and different classifications by different states. For example, Florida includes the crime in its “computer pornography” statute and classifies it as a felony of the third degree, whereas South Dakota names this crime “seduction of a minor” and classifies it as a Class 6 felony. Interestingly, regardless of the lack of consensus over what to call it and how to classify this crime, the seven states that have included it in their statutes have all used almost identical language to define it.

One additional noteworthy development in electronic luring statutes has been the tendency by states to anticipate and preclude certain defenses. In particular, 11 states have included language in their statutes to preclude the viability of the defense of impossibility where a defendant is prosecuted as a result of communications with an undercover officer. These statutes state specifically that it is not a defense to a prosecution that an undercover officer posed as a minor for the purposes of detecting and investigating an offense. Therefore, the defendant cannot argue that it was impossible to commit the offense of electronic luring of a child. It is likely that as more of these cases go to trial and more defenses are put forth, state legislatures will continue to review and amend their statutes accordingly.

Conclusion

Although each state has taken its own unique statutory approach in combating electronic luring of children, this article addresses some of the major trends and significant variations. As more states enact electronic luring statutes, more unified, identifiable trends may emerge. For a complete list of electronic luring statutes, including the text of the statutes, please see: http://www.ndaa-apri.org/apri/programs/nccpa/statutes.html.
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