

METHODOLOGY

SCOPE OF THE 2017 FEDERAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORT

The Federal Human Trafficking Report provides an exhaustive overview of human trafficking cases that United States federal courts handled in 2017. In recognition that most cases do not begin and end within a calendar year, the Report additionally captures human trafficking cases filed prior to 2017, so long as the case was active during 2017. The Report also captures the same scope of material for all human trafficking cases that federal courts handled in 2016 to provide the ability to compare 2016 and 2017 data.

The Report includes all federal cases that involved a human trafficking offense under Chapter 77. In addition, the Report captures criminal human trafficking cases where the government charged a defendant under statutes outside of Chapter 77, if there is substantial evidence of compelled or coerced labor, services, or commercial sex. The Report recognizes that many human trafficking cases present legal and evidentiary challenges that preclude proving the elements of Chapter 77 crimes beyond a reasonable doubt and includes cases resolved by charges outside of Chapter 77 to accurately capture all federal efforts to hold traffickers accountable for associated criminal conduct.

The Report does not represent the total number of human trafficking cases in the United States, but only those initiated in federal courts. Human trafficking cases handled in state courts are not included.

NOT A PREVALENCE ESTIMATE

The Report is not a prevalence estimate and is not intended to reflect the scope of human trafficking within the United States. Instead, the Report represents what is currently being done to hold traffickers accountable at the federal level. The Report's ability to determine the total number of victims involved in federal human trafficking cases is limited. The Report only captures victims that public court documents identified by name, initials, or pseudonym. The government often does not identify all the victims exploited by trafficking in public court documents. Therefore, this Report should not be used for the purpose of determining the total number of trafficking victims during the 2016 and 2017 reporting period.

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVE HUMAN TRAFFICKING CASES

DEVELOPING AN EXHAUSTIVE CASE LIST

The Human Trafficking Institute (Institute) compiled this Report through a comprehensive examination of public court documents in human trafficking cases, as well as a detailed review of news stories and agency press releases. The

Institute conducted an extensive search of the Federal Government’s Public Access to Court Electronic Records (Pacer), Google, Westlaw, and Press Releases from the Justice Department, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Homeland Security Investigations, and United States Attorney’s Offices to identify human trafficking cases that were active in 2016 or 2017.³⁶ Each of these platforms was reviewed at least twice to ensure the exhaustive inclusion of all federal human trafficking cases in this time period.

PACER

Utilizing the Federal Government’s Public Access to Court Electronic Records (“Pacer”), the Institute searched the individual pages of the 94 federal districts to identify cases involving the following Chapter 77 offenses³⁷ related to human trafficking:

- 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (Peonage);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1582 (Vessels in the Slave Trade);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1583 (Enticement into Slavery);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Involuntary Servitude);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1585 (Seizure, Detention of Slaves);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1586 (Service on Vessels for Slave Trade);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1587 (Possession of Slaves aboard a Vessel);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1588 (Transportation of Slaves from the United States);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (Forced Labor);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1590 (Trafficking for Peonage, Slavery, Involuntary Servitude, or Forced Labor);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1591 (Sex Trafficking);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1592 (Documents);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1593A (Benefitting Financially);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1594 (Attempt or Conspiracy to Commit Human Trafficking); and
- 18 U.S.C. § 1597 (Immigration Documents).

REVIEW OF PRESS RELEASES

The Institute carefully reviewed the press releases of the 94 federal districts to identify all articles discussing the indictment, arrest, trial, sentencing, or appeal of a human trafficking defendant in 2016 or 2017. In addition to including cases where the government expressly labeled the case as a human trafficking case in the press release, the Report captures cases where the press release indicated substantial evidence of compelled or coerced labor, services, or commercial sex or where the government charged the defendant with the transportation of a child for prostitution. The Report includes 13 additional human trafficking cases that were active in 2016 and 2017 as a result of this process. The Report also includes one case where the government charged the defendant with a non-human trafficking charge in federal court, while a companion state case charged the same defendant with a state human trafficking charge arising out of the same circumstances.

³⁶ For a definition of “active,” see the Report’s Methodology Section on Human Trafficking “Cases.”

³⁷ Each district provides a different list of searchable statutes. Not every district allows each section of Chapter 77 to be searched. In those districts, we searched every Chapter 77 offense that was available to be searched on the District’s Pacer site.

LETTERS TO UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICES

To confirm the accuracy of the identified case list, the Institute mailed physical letters to all 94 United States Attorney's Offices in the country, with a list of all the 2016 and 2017 active human trafficking cases that the Institute identified in their district. In addition, the Institute emailed the same letters to the 30 Assistant United States Attorneys who handled the largest number of trafficking cases in 2016 and 2017. Approximately one-third (28) of the United States Attorney's Offices responded, providing 17 additional human trafficking cases for inclusion in the Report. Four of the 17 cases were cases where the government charged the defendant with a Chapter 77 offense that the Institute team had not identified in its search of PACER, Westlaw, or Press Releases. The other 13 cases were cases with an identified human trafficking victim, where the government charged and resolved the defendant with a non-chapter 77 offense.

REVIEW OF CASE LISTS BY MAIN JUSTICE COMPONENTS

The Institute provided a list of the 2016 and 2017 active cases to the United States Department of Justice's Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit in the Civil Rights Division (HTPU) and Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section in the Criminal Division (CEOS). The HTPU provided an additional 12 human trafficking cases that met the standard for inclusion in the Report. Two of the cases involved defendants that the government had charged with Chapter 77 offenses; the remaining ten cases involved defendants that the government charged outside of Chapter 77. CEOS did not identify any additional cases for inclusion in the Report.

IDENTIFICATION OF CIVIL HUMAN TRAFFICKING CASES

In addition to the 877 active criminal cases in 2016 and/or 2017, the Report captures 114 civil human trafficking cases that were active in 2016 and/or 2017. The Institute identified the civil cases through an exhaustive search of Pacer, WestLaw, and Bloomberg. The Institute cross-checked this list of civil cases with the Human Trafficking Legal Center's publically available Civil Case Database. The Institute also provided a list of all the active civil cases in 2016 and 2017 to the Human Trafficking Legal Center to confirm that the Report did not omit any civil suits. The Human Trafficking Legal Center confirmed that the list was complete and noted that some of the civil cases identified by the Institute were summarily dismissed or could be categorized as frivolous. The Report includes all civil human trafficking suits handled during 2016 and/or 2017 regardless of their merits.

COLLECTION & REVIEW OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING CASE DATA

Upon the identification of a human trafficking case, the Institute reviewed the underlying pleadings and other related documents to capture essential information about the case, defendant(s), charge(s), victim(s), attorney(s), and any related direct appeal(s). The Institute team specifically focused on complaints and charging instruments, key motions and briefs, plea agreements, verdict forms, sentencing memoranda, judgments, and appeal information. After the relevant information was collected and reviewed, the Institute added the case to a Salesforce database ("Database") designed expressly for the publication of the Report. At least two trained attorneys separately reviewed the data in each case to ensure accuracy and completeness.

The Institute added all identified human trafficking cases that were active in 2016 or 2017 to the Database for inclusion in

the Report. A human trafficking “case” within the Report may include a single defendant or multiple related defendants who have been charged with trafficking one or more victims. Where multiple defendants are included under one “case,” the defendants must have been related by a common victim(s) and facts. The Report captures related defendants under one case even where the defendants are charged in separate charging instruments or where charges are initiated in separate case numbers, so long as the facts indicate that the defendants were related through a commonly exploited victim or a common plan or scheme.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING “CASES”

ACTIVE & INACTIVE CASES

To qualify for inclusion in the Report, the human trafficking case – whether criminal or civil – must have been “active” in 2017. The Report considers a criminal case to be “active” where the Government has initiated charges in federal court and one or more defendants is still pending trial, sentencing, or direct appeal. Similarly, the Report considers a civil case to be “active” where a plaintiff has filed a complaint in federal court and one or more defendants is still pending final judgment or where any party is pending direct appeal.

The Report classifies a case as “inactive” where there are no charges or claims against any defendant left to be resolved and when the time for all defendants to directly appeal the final judgment or order of the court has expired. To put it differently, a case becomes “inactive” when the last defendant’s time for filing a notice of direct appeal has expired. The Report relies on Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (“FRAP”) to calculate the date that the defendant’s time for filing a notice of direct appeal has expired.

In a criminal case, under FRAP 4(b), “a defendant’s notice of appeal must be filed in the district court within 14 days after the later of: (i) the entry of either the judgment or the order being appealed; or (ii) the filing of the government’s notice of appeal.” For a criminal case where the defendant did not appeal the District Court’s final judgment and did not file any subsequent motions upon which the District Court must rule, the inactive date is 14 days beyond the “Judgment Date.”

In a civil case, under FRAP 4(a), a defendant’s notice of appeal generally “must be filed with the district court within 30 days after entry of the judgment or order appealed from.” A number of timing extensions are provided in civil cases where the United States is a party to the case³⁸, where one of several motions has been filed³⁹, or where the appeal is filed by an inmate confined in an institute.⁴⁰ These timing exemptions are taken into consideration when calculating a case’s inactive date for the purposes of the report. For a civil case where the defendant did not appeal the District Court’s final judgment and did not file any subsequent motions upon which the District Court must rule, the inactive date is 30 days beyond the “Judgment Date.”

For a criminal or civil case where one or more defendants has appealed the district court’s judgment, and the Appellate Court has issued its decision on appeal, the case becomes inactive when the defendant’s time to appeal the Appellate Court’s decision to the Supreme Court has expired. Rule 13 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States provides that “a petition for a writ of certiorari to review a judgment in any case, civil or criminal, entered by . . . a United States court of appeals . . . is timely when it is filed with the Clerk of [the Supreme] Court within 90 days after entry of judgment.” The Supreme Court may extend a party’s time for filing a writ of certiorari, upon showing of good

³⁸ See FRAP 4(a)(1)(B).

³⁹ See FRAP 4(a)(4).

⁴⁰ See FRAP 4(c).

cause, for a period not exceeding 60 days, provided the extension is requested at least ten full days before the petition is otherwise due. For a civil or criminal case where 90 days have passed since the Appellate Court rendered its decision and no additional entries have been added to the appellate docket, the case is deemed inactive upon the date that the time to file the petition of certiorari has expired.

The Report relies on FRAP 26 when calculating dates for the defendant's time to file a notice of appeal.

In a criminal or civil human trafficking case, once there are no pending charges or claims against any defendant to be resolved and after the time for all defendants to appeal the final judgment or order of the court has expired, the case becomes inactive. Subsequent motions for post-conviction relief, such as a motion challenging the defendant's conviction or sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 or the filing of a habeas corpus petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, do not render the case active. Furthermore, clerical activity on the docket following the expiration of the defendant's time to file a direct appeal, including the payment of a fine or restitution or a request for modification of a supervised term of release, does not re-activate an inactive case. Thus, the Report does not capture human trafficking cases where the only activity in the case in 2016 or 2017 includes a defendant's motion for post-conviction relief or payment of a fine or restitution to a victim in the case.

CIVIL & CRIMINAL CASE

The Report classifies every case as "criminal" or "civil." Cases are "criminal" if the government charged a defendant with a federal crime through the filing of a complaint, information or indictment. Cases are "civil" if a plaintiff filed a complaint in federal court against a defendant.

CASE TYPE: SEX TRAFFICKING & LABOR TRAFFICKING

The Report classifies every case as a "sex trafficking" case or "labor trafficking" case. If the facts included in public court documents, news stories, and press releases indicate that the defendant(s) compelled or coerced the victim(s) to provide labor or services, the case is classified as "labor trafficking." Conversely, if the facts included in public court documents, news stories, and press releases indicate that the defendant(s) compelled or coerced the victim(s) to engage in a commercial sex act, the case is classified as "sex trafficking." Cases of attempt and conspiracy are included in both categories.

Generally, the case type classification is consistent with the charges or counts included in the complaint, information, or indictment. However, where the facts in the case indicate that the case type is different than the statute asserted against the defendant, the Report weighs the facts of the case more heavily than the statute when determining the case type. For example, where the government charged the defendant with labor trafficking under 18 U.S.C § 1589, but the facts indicate that the defendant compelled the victim to engage in commercial sex, the case is classified as "sex trafficking," not "labor trafficking."

In the majority of human trafficking cases in the Report, the binary classification is clear and sufficient, as the facts or charges involved a defendant(s) compelling or coercing a victim(s) to perform either labor/services, or sex, not both. However, 18 criminal cases involved both sex trafficking and labor trafficking charges. For these cases, the Institute conducted a thorough review of the court docket and related materials to determine if the trafficking operation was primarily a sex trafficking or labor trafficking enterprise. The Report concludes that 14 of the 18 cases were primarily sex trafficking with associated labor trafficking charges, and 4 of the cases were primarily labor trafficking with corresponding sex trafficking charges.

PRIMARY BUSINESS MODELS

Where there is sufficient information in public court documents, agency press releases, and news sources, the Report seeks to categorize the “business model” of the trafficking enterprise in the case. In a labor trafficking case, the Report identifies the business model as the business or industry where traffickers compel the victims to work or provide labor or services. In a sex trafficking case, the Report identifies the business model by the physical location or online presence where traffickers solicit purchasers. The business model in a sex trafficking case is not categorized by the location where the commercial sex act took place but instead asks where traffickers seek purchasers. Where public documents identify more than one business model in a case, the Report looks to the business model that was most frequently used.

The individual business models for sex trafficking and labor trafficking cases are defined below in the Terminology section of the Report.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING “DEFENDANTS”

CRIMINAL CASES

In general, the Report captures every defendant in a federal criminal human trafficking case, regardless of whether the government charged each defendant in the case with a human trafficking crime. By including all defendants in the case, the Report aims to capture the most accurate picture of human trafficking cases that are prosecuted in federal courts.

IMPORTANT DATES

For each defendant, the Report tracks important dates in the criminal justice process, such as the date the government filed the initial charging instrument, the date that the defendant pled guilty or went to trial, and the date that the district court entered the final judgment. When determining dates, the Report generally relies on the file stamp date in the court docket, unless the court docket indicated that the event occurred on a different date. When the docket revealed that an event occurred on a date different than the file stamp date, the Report relies on the date that the event in fact occurred.

MANNER RESOLVED, PUNISHMENT, & RESTITUTION

The Report also captures the manner in which the district court resolved the charges against each defendant: by dismissal, plea agreement, or trial. If the defendant was convicted, the Report tracks each defendant’s sentence, including term of imprisonment, if any; amount of fine, if imposed; information about special assessments, if ordered; and amount of restitution to the victim(s), if ordered.

DEFENDANT’S PROFILE

Where known, the Report includes general information about the defendant’s profile, such as the gender of the defendant and the age of the defendant at the time of arrest. Where identified in public documents, the Report also identifies the type of relationship that existed between the defendant and one or more of the victims.

“ANCILLARY” HUMAN TRAFFICKING CASES

In cases where human trafficking is an ancillary matter in the federal criminal case, the Report captures only defendants whom the government charged with a human trafficking crime. The Report categorizes human trafficking as an “ancillary” matter where it is clear that the primary purpose of the criminal enterprise was not human trafficking.

For example, if a federal case is primarily about health care fraud, and the government charged only one of ten defendants with a human trafficking crime and the remaining nine defendants with non-human-trafficking-related offenses, the Report would consider human trafficking to be an “ancillary” matter in the case. The Report would capture information about the defendant that the government charged with a human trafficking crime, but would not include the other defendants who were unrelated to the trafficking crime(s).

Alternatively, if a federal case charged only one of ten defendants with a human trafficking crime and the remaining nine defendants with non-human trafficking offenses related to the human trafficking scheme, revealing that the case was primarily about human trafficking, the Report would not consider it an “ancillary” matter. The Report would capture information about all the defendants the government charged.

Of the active criminal cases in 2017, the Report found that human trafficking was an ancillary matter in seven cases. For the remaining 688 active criminal cases in 2017, the Report includes all of the defendants and charges named in the charging instrument, not only those defendants charged with a human trafficking crime. It is important to note that in cases where trafficking is an ancillary matter, the case becomes “inactive” when the charges against the defendant charged with a trafficking crime are resolved, even where charges may still be pending against the other defendants.

CIVIL CASES

For civil human trafficking cases, the Report includes only defendants against whom plaintiffs have initiated Chapter 77 offenses. For each of these defendants, the Report tracks important dates in the civil process, such as the date the plaintiff(s) filed the suit, and the date of resolution, whether by dismissal, trial, or settlement. When determining dates, the Report generally relies on the file stamp date in the court docket, unless the court docket indicated that the event occurred on a different date. When the docket revealed that an event occurred on a date different than the file stamp date, the Report relies on the date that the event in fact occurred. For cases where the district court entered a judgment or default judgment, the Report discloses the amount of the judgment.

Where known, the Report also includes general information about the defendant’s profile, such as the gender of the defendant, the age of the defendant when the plaintiff filed the suit, and the type of relationship that existed between the defendant and victim(s), if any.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING & NON-HUMAN TRAFFICKING “CHARGES”

CRIMINAL CASES

The Report captures each charge that the government filed against each defendant, including both human trafficking charges and non-human trafficking charges. The Report relies on the final charging instrument against the defendant when determining the appropriate charges to include.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING CHARGE

The Report categorizes any charge filed against a defendant under the following criminal statutes as a “human trafficking charge”:

- 18 U.S.C. § 2 (Attempt to Commit Human Trafficking);
- 18 U.S.C. § 371 (Conspiracy to Commit Human Trafficking);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (Peonage);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1582 (Vessels in the Slave Trade);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1583 (Enticement into Slavery);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Involuntary Servitude);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1585 (Seizure, Detention of Slaves);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1586 (Service on Vessels for Slave Trade);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1587 (Possession of Slaves aboard a Vessel);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1588 (Transportation of Slaves from the United States);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (Forced Labor);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1590 (Trafficking for Peonage, Slavery, Involuntary Servitude, or Forced Labor);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1591 (Sex Trafficking);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1592 (Documents);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1593A (Benefitting Financially);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1594 (Attempt or Conspiracy to Commit Human Trafficking);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1597 (Immigration Documents);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (ITAR to Human Trafficking);
- 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (RICO to Human Trafficking)

This list encompasses all the Chapter 77 offenses and attempt, conspiracy, ITAR, and RICO where the object is clearly defined as a Chapter 77 offense.

NON-HUMAN TRAFFICKING CHARGES

All criminal charges other than those listed above as “Human Trafficking Charges” are “Non-Human Trafficking Charges.” Non-human trafficking charges include: alien harboring (8 U.S.C. § 1324); Mann Act (18 U.S.C. §§ 2421 – 2423); child pornography (18 U.S.C. § 2251 – 2252); conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 371); ITAR (18 U.S.C. § 1952); and RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962) to a crime unrelated to the human trafficking enterprise.

NUMBER OF CHARGES

In general, the number of “charges” that the Report captures for a defendant equals the total number of charges included in the final charging instrument against that defendant. Where the government files a superseding information that includes additional charges for the sole purpose of a plea agreement, the Report also captures charges from the charging instrument immediately preceding the superseding information. In doing so, the Report aims to capture the most serious charge(s) that the government brought against the defendant, as well as the ultimate charge(s) included in the defendant’s plea agreement.

Where human trafficking is considered an “ancillary matter,”⁴¹ the Report includes all charges that the government brought against the defendant involved in the trafficking enterprise. This includes both human trafficking and non-human trafficking charges.

⁴¹ See definition of “ancillary matter” under the “Human Trafficking ‘Defendants’” section above.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING “VICTIMS”

CRIMINAL CASES

The Report’s ability to determine the total number of victims involved in federal human trafficking cases is limited. The Report captures only publically-available information about victims that the government identified by name, initials, or pseudonym in the charging instrument(s). The actual number of victims in a case may be more than the government identifies in public filings. The “victim” related findings in this Report should not be used as an estimate of the number of victims identified or assisted by the government or civil society organizations. This Report does not provide a prevalence estimate for the number of victims whom traffickers exploited during 2017.

Where identified in court documents, agency press releases, and news sources, the Report includes information about the identified victim’s gender and age.

The Institute initially sought to capture additional information about identified victims, including the gender, age at exploitation, national origin/citizenship, and whether the victim identified as LGBTQ. However, public documents did not provide sufficient information to distill any meaningful data; thus, the information was excluded from the Report.

CIVIL CASES

The Report relies on public court documents about the plaintiffs who filed a complaint to track victim information in civil human trafficking cases. For civil suits involving less than ten plaintiffs, the Report captures information about each plaintiff-victim, including the gender and age of the victim, where known. For civil suits involving ten or more plaintiffs, the Report captures information about the lead plaintiff in the case.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING “APPEALS”

Where a defendant has filed a notice of appeal in a criminal case, or a party has filed a notice of appeal in a civil suit, the Report tracks the timing and result of the appeal. The Report tracks only direct appeals that follow a final judgment in the case and that are filed within the timeline set out in Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The Report captures information about direct appeals to an appellate court, as well as direct appeals to the United States Supreme Court.

The Report does not track interlocutory appeals. Furthermore, the Report does not capture appeals based on collateral attacks on the district court’s judgment, such as motions to challenge a conviction or sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 or the filing of a habeas corpus petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

REVIEW PROCESS FOR IDENTIFIED CASES & PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

In efforts to provide an exhaustive review of federal human trafficking cases that were active in 2016 and/or 2017, the Institute engaged in a thorough review process. Once an Institute attorney entered information about a case into the Database, a different Institute attorney was tasked with reviewing each field using the primary source to confirm each entry was correct. The reviewing attorneys raised questions and anomalies to the Report’s Primary Authors for

decisions. In addition, the Institute attorneys reviewed the Database through various topical reviews of reports to detect blank fields or unusual entries.

In addition to corresponding with government attorneys and non-profit organizations about the comprehensive identification of human trafficking cases during the reporting period, the Institute conducted in-person meetings with Polaris and the Department of Justice's Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit and Child Exploitation & Obscenity Section to present the Report's preliminary findings. Each of these groups provided verbal feedback, asked clarifying questions, and made recommendations. The Institute incorporated terminology revisions and additional findings as a result of these meetings. In addition, the Institute shared its preliminary findings of the \$5,000 special assessments and purchaser defendants with Shared Hope International.

Furthermore, the Institute hosted a group of six survivors, including several current and former members of the United States Advisory Council on Trafficking in Persons, for a presentation on the Report's preliminary findings and a conversation about terms, searches, and context. The Institute incorporated recommendations and additional findings as a result of this meeting.

In anticipation of the Institute's subsequent publication of annual reports on federal human trafficking cases, the Institute openly welcomes dialogue with interested parties about the substance or methodology of the 2017 Federal Human Trafficking Report, as well as proposed additions for the Report in future years.

REPORT TERMINOLOGY

ADULT: Any person who is 18 years of age or older.

AGRICULTURE/FARMS: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to provide labor for a farming business that is primarily engaged in growing crops, cultivating soil, or rearing animals for their byproducts.

BAR/CLUB: This business model was selected in a sex trafficking case where purchasers sought commercial sex at an establishment which serves alcohol or drinks as their primary business purpose. This business model is selected in a labor trafficking case where a victim was compelled to provide labor or services at an establishment which serves alcohol or drinks as their primary business purpose.

BARTERING RELATIONSHIP: This business model was selected where a defendant offers the victim's sexual services to a "purchaser" in exchange for other goods or services, such as illicit substances, housing, or welfare benefits.

CHILD: Any person who is under the age of 18.

CONSTRUCTION: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to provide labor at a commercial business focused on the process of building or repairing infrastructure, facilities, or residences.

DISTRICT COURT: The District Court is categorized by the district of the trial court that acquitted, convicted, or otherwise resolved the defendant(s) in the district court case.

DOMESTIC WORK: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to work for a household/family providing personal household tasks or child care, often living on-site with the family.

EROTIC SERVICES: This business model was selected where a purchaser solicited commercial sex through an escort service, at a host bar, or at a strip club. An "escort service" is a formal business whose primary purpose is to supply buyers with commercial sex or a romantic companionship. This includes any time a potential victim primarily provides commercial sex on an "out-call" basis. The victim may meet potential buyers at various types of locations (hotels, private residences, etc.). A "strip club" is an establishment whose main business purpose is exotic dancing/stripping performances. This venue should not be confused with a "bar or club," whose primary business purpose is the selling of alcohol.

FINE: Money that a court orders the defendant to pay as punishment for the crime committed. This does not include fees or special assessments ordered by the court.

HOTEL: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to work at a hotel or in hospitality services. This term is a broad industry category that focuses on lodging and tourism.

ILLEGAL BROTHELS: This business model was selected where a defendant's primary method of soliciting purchasers of sexual services was through an illegal establishment where in-house commercial sex was offered to customers.

INTERNET-BASED COMMERCIAL SEX: This business model was selected where a defendant's primary method of soliciting customers for sexual services was through an online website or social media platform. Websites disclosed by the public court documents in the active 2017 criminal cases included: A Plus Bunnies, Adult Friend Finder, Adult Hookups, AlltheLovers, Backpage, Body Rub Lists, Call Escort, CityVibe, Craigslist, Date Hookup, Eccie, Eros, Erotic Mugshots, Erotic Review, Escorts Click 2 Call, Escorts Forever, Escorts Jiji, Escorts Meet, Escort Profile, Escorts Xport, Evil Empire, Executive Companion, Explicit Chicago, Facebook, Friends 4 Rent, Grindr, Independent Girls, Instagram, Kendra of Atlanta, KiK Messenger, MeetMe, Miss Scarlet White, MocoSpace, MyRedBook, MyProvider, Pinger, Platinum

Companions, Plenty of Fish, Seeking Arrangement, A Sexy Service, Skip the Games, Tagged, TNA Board, Whats App, Whisper, Yahoo. Traffickers may have used additional websites that were not mentioned in the public court documents.

JANITORIAL SERVICES: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to provide janitorial or cleaning duties for a cleaning company or for commercial or public properties. This includes employees of maid services, commercial janitors, etc.

LIFE IMPRISONMENT: A sentence of imprisonment for the defendant to remain in prison for the rest of their natural life. The Report captures life sentences that a court imposed against a defendant in a human trafficking case, even where the defendant was also convicted of other serious crimes, including murder.

MESSAGE PARLOR: This business model was selected where a defendant's primary method of soliciting purchasers for commercial sex was at a business that offered, or claimed to offer, legitimate spa services. This includes legal massage parlors, as well as illicit massage parlors that claim to offer legitimate spa services but whose true purpose is to offer commercial sex to customers.

MANUFACTURING: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to work in any industry focused on the production or packaging of food or other merchandise to be sold, or any other type of industrial factory-type job.

PRIMARY INVESTIGATING AGENCY: The primary investigating agency in any federal case must be a federal law enforcement agency. In determining the primary agency, the Report considered press releases, affidavits, and charging instruments related to the case. Where there are multiple investigating agencies, and it is difficult to ascertain which agency played the primary role, the primary agency is classified as the agency that initiated the investigation, if known.

PURCHASER CASE: In a sex trafficking case, if the facts indicate that one or more of the defendants in the case purchased or attempted to purchase commercial sex, then the case is designated as a "purchaser case."

RESTAURANT: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to work at a venue whose primary purpose is selling prepared food. This includes fast food, sit-down restaurants, and food or ice-cream trucks.

RETAIL: This business model was selected where a victim was compelled to work at a commercial venue whose primary purpose is to sell merchandise. This includes grocery stores, gas stations, and kiosks.

STING CASE: A "sting case" is a deceptive operation that law enforcement uses to catch a person committing a crime. This includes cases where law enforcement responds to a trafficker's advertisements for commercial sex as a potential purchaser, as well as cases where law enforcement advertises fictitious children for commercial sex to catch those who respond to the advertisement.

STREET-BASED COMMERCIAL SEX: This business model was selected where a victim was expected to solicit or initiate commercial sex by walking a designated section of a street, sometimes known as a "track," "stroll," or "block."

In developing the terminology for the 2017 Federal Human Trafficking Report, the Institute team met with the data team at Polaris, and they provided recommendations and guidance regarding terms in human trafficking cases. Where possible, the Institute conformed its terminology and definitions to Polaris' to be consistent with their work. We are grateful for Polaris' support and guidance in the development of the Institute's database and the publication of the 2017 Federal Human Trafficking Report.

