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## Link to: ALL DATA TABLES

## INTRODUCTION

Homicide in California, 2002 contains information about the crime of homicide and its victims, demographic data on persons arrested for homicide, and information about the response of the criminal justice system. Information about the death penalty, the number of peace officers killed in the line of duty, and justifiable homicide is also included.

Information displayed in this publication comes from several databases maintained by the California Department of Justice (DOJ). The primary source of information is the Homicide File, which captures willful and justifiable homicide crime data. Other databases capture information about persons arrested for homicide, death penalty sentences, and peace officers killed in the line of duty. The reader should consider that the type of data collected, and the methods used to collect these data, differ for each data set. Unless otherwise indicated, all calculations are based on the number of known incidents.

To provide the most valid data possible, the disposition section of this report has been removed. In 2001, Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) staff determined that a number of homicide arrests submitted to the DOJ's Automated Criminal History System (from which adult felony arrest disposition data are extracted) from 1997 to 2001 should have been submitted as arrests for attempted homicide. In addition, some correctly submitted attempted homicide arrests were programmatically treated as homicide arrests. As a result, more homicide arrests were counted during these years than occurred. This caused the percentage of homicide convictions to be too low and the percentage of assault convictions to be too high. (Both percentages were based on the number of adult felony arrests for homicide for which dispositions were received.) Based on CJSC staff findings, the reader is advised against using previously published disposition data for 1997 to 1999. It should be noted that the DOJ has addressed this issue and that the exclusion of disposition data does not affect crime, arrest, death penalty, or other data included in this or past reports. When homicide disposition data are once again determined to be accurate, they will be included in this publication.

CJSC publications available in either printed or electronic format (via the Attorney General's website) are listed on the inside of the back cover. Customized statistical reports or additional statistical information may be requested by contacting the CJSC at the numbers or addresses provided there.

# HIGHLIGHTS * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * 

## HOMICIDE CRIMES (see pages 2-23)

- From 1993 to 2002, the homicide crime rate decreased 47.3 percent ( 12.9 to 6.8 ). However, from 2001 to 2002, homicide crimes increased 7.9 percent in rate per 100,000 population ( 6.3 to 6.8 ). (Source: Table 1.)
- From 2001 to 2002, homicide rates increased for males, Hispanics, and blacks. Blacks experienced the highest increase in rate (up 17.0 percent). (Sources: Tables 2 and 3 .)
- In 2002, the percentage of white homicide victims who were female was almost 3 times the percentage of Hispanic or black female victims. White victims also tended to be older, Hispanic and black victims younger. (Sources: Tables 8 and 9.)
- From 2001 to 2002, the number of homicide victims killed by friends or acquaintances increased 11.2 percent. The number of victims killed by strangers also increased, but by less (8.7 percent). (Source: Table 11.)
- In 2002, approximately 24 percent of all female homicide victims were killed by their spouses. In contrast, less than 2 percent of male victims were killed by theirs. (Source: Table 12.)

Of the 35 counties for which 2002 homicide rates were calculated, Los Angeles County experienced the highest rate per 100,000 population (11.7); Placer County experienced the lowest (0.0). (Source: Table 14.)

From 1993 to 2002, the average number of homicides committed during the summer exceeded the average number committed during any other season. (Source: Table 15.)

On average, 72.5 percent of homicides committed from 1993 to 2002 were committed with firearms. Additionally, the proportionality of firearm and non-firearm weapons usage in homicide crimes during this period remained relatively stable. (Source: Table 21.)

- In 2002, over 36 percent of homicides were gang-related, a historically high percentage. (Source:Table 24.)

On average, 56.5 percent of homicides were cleared by an arrest or by "exceptional means" from 1993 to 2002. (Source: Table 28.)

HOMICIDE ARRESTS (see pages 26-29)

- From 1993 to 2002, the homicide arrest rate decreased 49.6 percent ( 13.5 to 6.8 ). However, from 2001 to 2002, homicide arrests increased 3.0 percent in rate per 100,000 population at risk ( 6.6 to 6.8 ). (Source: Table 29.)
- From 1993 to 2002, the overwhelming majority of homicide arrestees and victims were male. (Sources: Tables 5 and 30 .)
- From 1993 to 2002, the largest percentage of homicide arrestees and victims were Hispanic. (Sources: Tables 6 and 31.)
- From 1993 to 2002, the largest percentage of homicide arrestees and victims were aged 18-29. (Sources: Tables 7 and 32.)

DEATH PENALTY SENTENCES (see pages 32-33)

- By the end of 2002, there were 618 persons under sentence of death in California. Of these, 17 were sentenced in 2002. (Source: Table 35.)


## PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY (see pages 36-37)

Since 1993, there have been 62 peace officers feloniously killed in the line of duty. Four were killed in 2002. (Source: Table N-2.)

- Between 1993 and 2002, the homicide rate for peace officers killed in the line of duty varied from 2.9 to 16.1 per 100,000 sworn law enforcement personnel. (Source: Table 37.)

Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide in California, 2002
Homicide Hopiche Homicide Homicide QPMM Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicide Hore Homicide Homicide Homicide Homicice

Links to:
Preface Crimes Arrests Death Penalties Peace Officers Killed Justifiable Homicides Data Tables Appendix

CJSC Home Page CJSC Publications AG Home Page

## HOMICIDE CRIMES

Homicide is defined by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program as the "willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another." The homicide category comprises murder and nonnegligent manslaughter. Attempted murder, justifiable homicide, manslaughter by negligence, and suicide are excluded. Data depicting homicide in California have been collected and published for 51 years.

From 2001 to 2002:

- The homicide rate per 100,000 population increased 7.9 percent ( 6.3 to 6.8 ).
- The number of homicides increased 8.7 percent (from 2,201 to 2,392).

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- The homicide rate per 100,000 population decreased 47.3 percent (12.9 to 6.8).
- The number of homicides decreased 41.6 percent (from 4,095 to 2,392).

Comparing 1952 to 2002 :

- The homicide rate per 100,000 population increased 183.3 percent (2.4 to 6.8).
- The number of homicides increased 757.3 percent (from 279 to 2,392).

Table N-1
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1952-2002
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Year(s) | Number | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002 | 2,392 | 6.8 |
| 2001 .............. | 2,201 | 6.3 |
| 2000 ............... | 2,074 | 6.0 |
| 1999 ............... | 2,006 | 5.9 |
| 1998 | 2,170 | 6.5 |
| 1997 ............... | 2,579 | 7.8 |
| 1996 ............... | 2,910 | 9.0 |
| 1995 | 3,530 | 11.0 |
| 1994 ............... | 3,699 | 11.5 |
| 1993 | 4,095 | 12.9 |
| 1992 | 3,920 | 12.5 |
| 1991 ............... | 3,876 | 12.6 |
| 1990 | 3,562 | 12.1 |
| 1989 ............... | 3,159 | 11.0 |
| 1988 | 2,947 | 10.5 |
| 1987 | 2,929 | 10.7 |
| 1986 | 3,030 | 11.3 |
| 1985 ............... | 2,781 | 10.7 |
| 1984 .............. | 2,724 | 10.6 |
| 1983 | 2,640 | 10.5 |
| 1982 ............... | 2,778 | 11.3 |
| 1981 ............... | 3,140 | 13.1 |
| 1980 ............... | 3,405 | 14.4 |
| 1979 ............... | 2,941 | 12.6 |
| 1978 ............... | 2,601 | 11.4 |
| 1977 | 2,481 | 11.1 |
| 1976 | 2,214 | 10.1 |
| 1975 | 2,196 | 10.2 |
| 1974 | 1,970 | 9.3 |
| 1973 | 1,862 | 8.9 |
| 1972 ............... | 1,789 | 8.7 |
| 1971 .............. | 1,633 | 8.0 |
| 1970 ............... | 1,355 | 6.8 |
| 1969 ............... | 1,376 | 6.9 |
| 1968 | 1,171 | 6.0 |
| 1967 | 1,051 | 5.4 |
| 1966 ............ | 897 | 4.7 |
| 1965 | 892 | 4.8 |
| 1964 ............... | 758 | 4.2 |
| 1963 ............... | 656 | 3.7 |
| 1962 ............... | 671 | 3.9 |
| 1961 ............... | 609 | 3.7 |
| 1960 ............... | 620 | 3.9 |
| 1959 .................. | 515 | 3.4 |
| 1958 ............... | 547 | 3.7 |
| 1957 ............... | 497 | 3.5 |
| 1956 ............... | 474 | 3.5 |
| 1955 ............... | 417 | 3.2 |
| 1954 ............... | 419 | 3.3 |
| 1953 ............... | 276 | 2.3 |
| 1952 ............... | 279 | 2.4 |

Chart 1
VIOLENT CRIMES, 1993-2002
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 1.

There are four offenses classified as violent crimes by the FBI: homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. For comparison, changes in the rates of the four offenses follow:

From 2001 to 2002:

- Homicide increased 7.9 percent (6.3 to 6.8).
- Forcible rape increased 1.4 percent (28.4 to 28.8).
- Robbery increased 0.8 percent (182.1 to 183.6).
- Aggravated assault decreased 4.8 percent (388.8 to 370.0).

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- Homicide decreased 47.3 percent (12.9 to 6.8).
- Forcible rape decreased 22.2 percent ( 37.0 to 28.8).
- Robbery decreased 53.9 percent (398.0 to 183.6).
- Aggravated assault decreased 39.4 percent (610.9 to 370.0).

[^0]Charts 2, 3, and 4 display homicide rates per 100,000 population for victims classified by gender, race/ethnic group, and age.

In 2002,

- The total homicide rate was 6.8 per 100,000 population.
- The male homicide rate was over 4 times that of the female homicide rate ( 10.8 vs .2 .5 ).
- The black homicide rate was almost 13 times that of whites and over 3 times that of Hispanics (30.9 vs. 2.4 and 9.4 , respectively).

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- The male homicide rate decreased 48.8 percent and the female homicide rate decreased 47.9 percent.
- The white homicide rate decreased 56.4 percent, the Hispanic homicide rate decreased 48.6 percent, and the black homicide rate decreased 46.1 percent.

From 2001 to 2002, homicide rates increased for males, Hispanics, and blacks. Blacks experienced the highest increase in rate (up 17.0 percent). For the same period, females experienced no change in rate and whites experienced a decrease in rate (down 4.0 percent).

Chart 2
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Gender of Victim
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 2.

Chart 3
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 3.

Chart 4
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Age of Victim
Rate per 100,000 Population


Source: Table 4.

In 2002,

- Persons aged 18-29 had the highest homicide victimization rate (17.9 per 100,000 population).

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- The homicide rate decreased 59.3 percent for victims under age $18,40.5$ percent for victims aged 18-29, 44.4 percent for victims aged $30-39$, and 45.9 percent for victims aged 40 and over.

The homicide rate for victims aged 30-39 increased 16.9
percent from 2001 to 2002. A third consecutive-year increase for this age category follows a yearly decline since 1993.

In 2002,

- Males represented 81.0 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 50.2 percent of the population.
- Females represented 19.0 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 49.8 percent of the population.

Chart 5
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Gender of Victim


Source: Table 5.

Chart 6
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender of Victim by Percent of Total Victims and Percent of Population


Sources: Tables 2 and 5 .

*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         *                             *                                 *                                     *                                         *                                             *                                                 *                                                     *                                                         *                                                             * In 2002, the ratio of male to female population was approximately 1:1. The ratio of male to female homicide victimization was approximately 4:1. These ratios represent a consistent historical trend (see Tables 2 and 5).

Chart 7
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim


Source: Table 6.

Chart 8
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Percent of Total Victims and Percent of Population


Sources: Tables 3 and 6.

In 2002,

- Whites represented 17.5 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 49.1 percent of the population.
- Hispanics represented 44.7 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 31.7 percent of the population.
- Blacks represented 30.8 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 6.6 percent of the population.
- The "other" race/ethnic group category represented 7.0 percent of total homicide victims; they comprised 12.6 percent of the population.

In 2002, the percentage of homicide victims who were black was over $41 / 2$ times larger than their percentage of the population (30.8 percent vs. 6.6 percent). This difference far exceeds the disparities between homicide victims belonging to the other race/ethnic groups shown and their percentages of the population.

In 2002,

- 10.4 percent of total homicide victims were under age 18; this age group comprised 28.2 percent of the population.

■ 46.3 percent of total homicide victims were aged 18-29; this age group comprised 17.1 percent of the population.

■ 18.9 percent of total homicide victims were aged $30-39$; this age group comprised 14.0 percent of the population.

- 24.4 percent of total homicide victims were aged 40 and over; this age group comprised 40.7 percent of the population.
*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         *                             *                                 *                                     *                                         *                                             *                                                 *                                                     *                                                         *                                                             * 

In 2002, the percentage of homicide victims aged 18-29 was over 2 1/2 times larger than the percentage of the
population aged 18-29 (46.3 percent vs. 17.1 percent).

Chart9
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Age of Victim


Source: Table 7.

Chart 10
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Percent of Total Victims and Percent of Population




Sources: Tables 4 and 7.

Chart 11
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Gender of Victim


Source: Table 8.

Chart 12
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Age of Victim


Source: Table 9.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

In 2002,

- A greater percentage of white victims were female than were either Hispanic or black victims (37.9 vs. 13.1 and 13.8 percent, respectively).
- A greater percentage of Hispanic and black victims were aged 18-29 than were white victims (54.9 and 48.1 vs. 24.0 percent, respectively).
- A greater percentage of white victims were aged 40 and over than were either Hispanic or black victims ( 50.8 vs. 15.5 and 19.8 percent, respectively).

In 2002, the percentage of white homicide victims who were female was almost 3 times the percentage of Hispanic or black female victims. White victims also tended to be older, Hispanic and black victims younger.

When homicides were examined by the relationship of the victim to the offender, it was found that:

In 2002,

- 46.6 percent of victims were friends or acquaintances of offenders.
- 6.8 percent of victims were spouses of offenders.
- 7.5 percent of victims were parents or children of offenders.
- 3.0 percent of the relationships of victim to offender fell into the "other relative" category.
- 36.1 percent of victims were strangers to offenders.

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- The proportion of homicides in which victims were friends or acquaintances of offenders decreased from 58.2 percent to 46.6 percent.
- The proportion of homicides in which victims were strangers to offenders increased from 29.6 percent to 36.1 percent.


## ****

From 2001 to 2002, the number of homicide victims killed by friends or acquaintances increased 11.2 percent. The number of victims killed by strangers also increased, but by less (8.7 percent).

Chart 13
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 11.

Chart 14
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Selected Relationships of Victims to Offenders


Source: Table 11.

Chart 15
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 12.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 16
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 12.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

In 2002,

- A greater percentage of female victims were spouses of offenders ( 23.5 percent) than were male victims ( 1.5 percent).

A greater percentage of white victims were friends or acquaintances of offenders than were either Hispanic or black victims ( 50.3 vs. 46.0 and 45.8 percent, respectively).

In 2002, approximately 24
percent of all female homicide victims were killed by their spouses. In contrast, less
than 2 percent of male victims were killed by theirs.

In 2002,

The largest percentage of homicide victims under age 18 were parents or children of offenders (34.5 percent).

- The largest percentage of homicide victims aged 18-29, 30-39, and 40 and over were friends or aquaintances of offenders (51.2, 47.6, and 45.3 percent, respectively).
- A greater percentage of victims aged 40 and over were spouses of offenders ( 12.5 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.

In 2002, twice as many
homicide victims aged 40 and over were killed by their spouses than were victims in the 18-29 or 30-39 age categories. No victims under age 18 were killed by their spouses in 2002. (See Table 13.)

Chart 17
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender


Source: Table 13.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 18
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
County by Rate per 100,000 Population
$\square$
10.0 and over
5.0-9.9
0.0-4.9

In 2002, 10 of California's 58 counties exceeded the statewide homicide rate of 6.8 per 100,000 population. When grouped:

■ One county had a homicide rate of 10.0 and over per 100,000 population.
■ Twelve counties had homicide rates between 5.0 and 9.9 per 100,000 population.

- Twenty-two counties had homicide rates between 0.0 and 4.9 per 100,000 population.
- Homicide rates were not calculated for the remaining 23 counties with populations of less than 100,000.

Of the 35 counties for which 2002 homicide rates were calculated, Los Angeles County experienced the highest rate per 100,000 population
(11.7); Placer County experienced the lowest (0.0) .

Inyo
$\qquad$ Rates not calculated (see Appendix I)

## CRIMES

*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         *                             * 

When homicides were examined by season of incident, it was found that:

In 2002, the incidents that led to death occurred more often in the fall than in any other season (26.7 percent).

From 1993 to 2002, the average number of homicides committed during the summer exceeded the average number committed during any other season. Fall experienced the next highest average, with spring and winter following. (See Table 15.)

Chart 19
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Season of Incident


Source: Table 15.

Chart 20
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Season of Incident


Source: Table 15.

Chart21
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Average Daily Number of Incidents on Weekdays and Weekends


Source: Table 16.
Note: Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.

Chart 22
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Average Daily Number of Incidents on Weekdays and Weekends


[^1]In 2002,

- An average of 6.0 homicide victims were killed each weekday and 8.1 homicide victims were killed each weekend day.
- Hispanic victims had the highest average daily number of incidents on both weekdays and weekends (2.6 and 3.8, respectively) of any race/ ethnic group shown.
- Victims aged 18-29 had the highest average daily number of incidents on both weekdays and weekends (2.6 and 4.0, respectively) of any age group shown.

In 2002, Hispanic victims and victims aged 18-29 exhibited the highest average daily number of homicide incidents on both weekdays and weekends.

## CRIMES

When homicides were examined by location of incident, it was found that:

In 2002,

- 27.4 percent of victims were killed at their places of residence.
- 40.6 percent of homicides occurred on streets or sidewalks.
- 32.0 percent of homicides occurred in "all other" locations.
- A greater percentage of males (45.9 percent) were killed on streets or sidewalks than were females(17.8 percent).
- A greater percentage of females (55.9 percent) were killed at their places of residence than were males (20.7 percent).

Of the locations shown, males were more likely to be killed on streets or sidewalks and less likely to be killed in their residences. The inverse was true for females, who were more likely to be killed in their residences and less likely to be killed on streets or sidewalks.

Chart 23
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Location of Homicide


Source: Table 19

Chart 24
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender of Victim by Location of Homicide


[^2]Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 25
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Location of Homicide


Source: Table 19.

In 2002,

- A greater percentage of whites than Hispanics or blacks were killed at their places of residence ( 48.9 vs .22 .3 and 19.1 percent, respectively).
- A greater percentage of Hispanics and blacks were killed on streets or sidewalks than were whites ( 43.8 and 51.8 vs. 20.4 percent, respectively).
- A greater percentage of victims aged 18-29 were killed on streets or sidewalks (48.9 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
- A greater percentage of victims aged 40 and over were killed at their places of residence (46.7 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.

Chart 26
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Location of Homicide


Source: Table 20.

Of the locations shown, white victims and victims aged 40 and over were most likely to be killed in their residences. Hispanic and black victims and victims under the age of 40 were most likely to be killed on streets or sidewalks.

## CRIMES*

When homicides were examined by type of weapon used, it was found that:

In 2002,

- 73.4 percent resulted from the use of firearms.
- 65.8 percent resulted from the use of handguns.
- 7.6 percent resulted from the use of all other types of firearms.
- 11.6 percent resulted from the use of knives.
- 5.0 percent resulted from the use of personal weapons (hands, feet, etc.).
- 4.9 percent resulted from the use of blunt objects (clubs, etc.).
- 5.1 percent resulted from the use of weapons grouped in the "all other" category.

Comparing 1993 to 2002 :

- The proportion of homicides that resulted from the use of firearms decreased slightly (from 74.0 percent to 73.4 percent).
- The proportion of homicides that resulted from the use of non-firearms increased slightly (from 26.0 percent to 26.6 percent).

On average, 72.5 percent of homicides committed from 1993 to 2002 were committed with firearms. Additionally, the proportionality of firearm and non-firearm weapons usage in homicide crimes during this period remained relatively stable.

Chart27
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 21

Chart 28
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Selected Types of Weapons Used


Source: Table 21

Chart 29
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender of Victim by Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 22.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 30
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 22.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

In 2002,

- A greater percentage of males (78.2 percent) were killed with firearms than were females ( 52.3 percent).
- A greater percentage of females (34.1 percent) were killed with knives, personal weapons, or blunt objects than were males ( 18.6 percent).
- A greater percentage of Hispanics and blacks were killed with firearms than were whites (76.3 and 84.5 vs. 51.2 percent, respectively).

In 2002, the percentage of whites killed with firearms was far less than the percentage of Hispanics or blacks killed with firearms.

## 

In 2002,

- A greater percentage of victims aged 18-29 were killed with firearms (86.7 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
- A lower percentage of victims aged 40 and over were killed with firearms ( 52.9 percent) than were victims in any other age group shown.
*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         *                             *                                 *                                     *                                         *                                             *                                                 *                                                     *                                                         *                                                             * 

In 2002, over 86 percent of homicide victims aged 18-29 were killed with firearms. This age group represents the largest killed with firearms; victims aged 40 and over represent the smallest group killed with firearms (52.9 percent).

Chart31
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Type of Weapon Used


Source: Table 23.

Chart 32
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
By Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 24.
Note: Percentages do not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 33
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Selected Contributing Circumstances


Source: Table 24.

When homicides were examined by contributing circumstance, it was found that:

In 2002,

- 8.9 percent occurred as a result of a rape, robbery, or burglary.
- 38.5 percent occurred as a result of an argument.

■ 36.1 percentwere gang-related.

- 4.3 percent were drug-related.

■ 12.3 percent occurred as a result of "all other" contributing circumstances.

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- The percentage of homicides in which the contributing circumstance was gang-related increased from 24.3 percent to 36.1 percent.
- The percentage of homicides in which the contributing circumstance was drug-related decreased from 7.9 percent to 4.3 percent.

In 2002,

- A greater percentage of males (42.7 percent) were victims of gang-related homicides than were females (8.7 percent).
- A greater percentage of whites than Hispanics or blacks were victims of homicides which occurred as a result of an argument ( 56.5 vs .32 .4 and 36.0 percent, respectively).
- A greater percentage of Hispanics and blacks were victims of gang-related homicides than were whites ( 45.8 and 43.1 vs. 6.3 percent, respectively).

In 2002, the percentage of males killed in gang-related homicides was about 5 times that of females (42.7 vs. 8.7 percent). The percentages of Hispanics or blacks killed in gang-related homicides were approximately 7 times the percentage of whites killed in gang-related incidents (45.8 and 43.1 vs. 6.3 percent, respectively).

Chart 34
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender of Victim by Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 25.
Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Charts 32, 35, and 36 include rape with robbery and burglary. However, for a more relevant comparison between male and female victims, rape is included in the "all other" category in Chart 34. In 2002, 1.8 percent of homicide crimes involving females were rape-related and 0.1 percent of homicide crimes involving males were rape-related.

Chart 35
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Contributing
Circumstance


Source: Table 25.

Chart 36
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 26.
Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 37
HOMICIDE CRIMES CLEARED, 1993-2002
Clearance Rate


Source: Table 28.
Note: A clearance rate is the percentage of crimes (homicides) reported that have been cleared. It is calculated by dividing the number of homicides cleared by the number of homicides reported. The result is multiplied by 100. Please see "Appendix II - Criminal Justice Glossary" for a detailed explanation of clearances.

In 2002,

- Most homicide victims under age 5 were killed as a result of child abuse ( 77.4 percent).
- The majority of homicide victims aged 5-17 and aged 18-29 were killed as a result of gang- or drug-related activities ( 62.1 and 58.0 percent, respectively).
- The majority of homicide victims aged 40 and over were killed as a result of an argument (53.9 percent).
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## HOMICIDE ARRESTS

Unlike crimes, which are classified by nationwide Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) standards, arrests are reported by California statute definition of the offense. ${ }^{1}$ This may cause some differences in the definitions of certain crimes and the reporting of the arrests for those crimes. For instance, the California definition of a homicide arrest includes murder and nonvehicular manslaughter. The federal definition of a homicide crime includes murder and nonnegligent(nonaccidental) manslaughter.

All California law enforcement agencies report arrest and citation information to the California Department of Justice on the "Monthly Arrest and Citation Register," which lists each arrestee; includes information about age, gender, and race/ethnic group; and specifies the "most serious" arrest offense and law enforcement disposition.

In 2002, of 1,864 arrests for homicide:

- 88.8 percent $(1,655)$ of arrestees were male.
- 11.2 percent (209) were female.

Chart 38
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002
By Gender of Arrestee


Source: Table 30.

[^3]In 2002, nearly 9 out of 10 homicide arrestees were male (88.8 percent).

Chart 39
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee


Source: Table 31.
Note: Percentages do not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart40
POPULATION INCALIFORNIA, 2002
By Race/Ethnic Group


Source: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit.

In 2002, of 1,864 arrests for homicide:
18.7 percent (349) of arrestees were white.

- 48.1 percent (897) were Hispanic.
- 24.4 percent (455) were black.
- 8.7 percent (163) fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.

The subjectivity of the classification and labeling process must be considered in the analysis of race/ethnic group data. As commonly used, race refers to large populations which share certain similar physical characteristics such as skin color. Because these physical characteristics can vary greatly within groups as well as between groups, determination of race is frequently, by necessity, subjective. Ethnicity refers to cultural heritage and can cross racial lines. For example, the ethnic designation "Hispanic" includes persons of any race. Most commonly, selfidentification of race/ethnicity is used in the classification and labeling process.

```
In 2002, the largest percentage
of homicide arrestees were
Hispanic (48.1 percent).
```


## ARRESTS * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In 2002, of 1,864 arrests for homicide:
■ 11.5 percent (215) of arrestees were under age 18.

■ 58.9 percent $(1,097)$ were aged 18-29.
■ 15.7 percent (293) were aged 30-39.

- 13.9 percent (259) were aged 40 and over.

Chart41
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002

## 

The majority of homicide arrestees were aged 18-29 (58.9 percent).

By Age of Arrestee


Source: Table 32.


Chart 42
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Gender of Arrestee


[^4]Chart 43
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Age of Arrestee


[^5]In 2002,
Homicide arrestees for all three race/ethnic groups shown were predominately male.

And,
A greater percentage of white arrestees were aged 40 and over than were Hispanic or black arrestees ( 33.5 vs. 6.7 and 12.3 percent, respectively).

- Regardless of race/ethnic group, the largest percentage of homicide arrestees fell into the " $18-29$ " age category.

More
(To Death Penalties)

# Homicide in California, 2002 
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## DEATH PENALTIES * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

## DEATH PENALTY SENTENCES

This section contains information about persons sentenced to death in California courts in 2002. Death penalty data were extracted from the 2002 Offender-Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) system. For detailed information regarding the death penalty and the criteria by which a person can be sentenced to death, refer to California Penal Code sections 190 through 190.9.

Chart44
PERSONS UNDER CALIFORNIA SENTENCE OF DEATH, 1978-2002


Source: Table 35.

During 2002, there were 17 persons convicted of firstdegree murder and sentenced to death. These were initial death sentences only and do not include persons who were resentenced to death after their death sentences were reversed on appeal. By the end of 2002, there were 618 persons under sentence of death in California.

Of the 17 persons newly sentenced to death in 2002:
Fifteen were male; 2 were female.

- Eight were white; 1 was Hispanic; 4 were black; 4 fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.
- The average (mean) age at arrest was 31.
- Riverside County sentenced the largest number (4).

Additional information can be found in Tables 35 and 36.

More (To Peace Officers Killed in the Line of Duty)

# Homicide in California, 2002 PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY 
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## PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Information about peace officers killed in the line of duty was obtained from the Homicide File. Only sworn officers feloniously killed in the line of duty are included. (Sworn officers accidentally killed in the line of duty and nonsworn officers, such as security guards, are excluded.)

Data in Tables N-2 and N-3 show that:
■ From 1993 to 2002, there were 62 peace officers killed in the line of duty. The average number of peace officers killed annually was 6.2 . In 2002, 4 were killed.

- In 2002, all 4 officers killed in the line of duty were killed with handguns belonging to the offenders.

Table N-2
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED
IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 1993-2002

| Year(s) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total ........................... | 62 |
| 2002 | 4 |
| 2001 ..................... | 6 |
| 2000 | 2 |
| 1999 | 4 |
| 1998 | 7 |
| 1997 ...................... | 7 |
| 1996 ...................... | 5 |
| 1995 | 10 |
| 1994 ...................... | 9 |
| 1993 ...................... | 8 |

Table N-3
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED
IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 2002
By Type of Weapon Used

| Type of <br> weapon used | Total | Offender's | Officer's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total ..................... | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Handgun .......... | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Other firearms .. | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table N-4
PEACE OFFICERS KILLED
IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Officer by Gender of Officer

| Race/ethnic group | Total | Gender |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |
| Total ........................ | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| White ................. | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Hispanic .............. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black ................... | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other ................... | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Chart 45
HOMICIDE CRIMES AND PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 1993-2002
Homicide Rate per 100,000 Respective Population


Source: Table 37.

Data in Table N-4 show that:

- In 2002, all 4 peace officers killed in the line of duty were male; all 4 were white.

When homicide rates for the general population were compared to homicide rates for peace officers killed in the line of duty, it was found that:

In 2002,

- The general population homicide rate was 6.8 per 100,000 respective population. The homicide rate for peace officers killed in the line of duty was 5.3 per 100,000 respective population.

Comparing 1993 to 2002:

- The general population homicide rate decreased 47.3 percent ( 12.9 to 6.8 ). The homicide rate for peace officers killed in the line of duty decreased 61.0 percent ( 13.6 to 5.3 ).


## More

## JUSTIFIABLE

## HOMICIDES

## Links to:

Preface Crimes Arrests Death Penalties Peace Officers Killed Justifiable Homicides Data Tables Appendix

CJSC Home Page CJSC Publications AG Home Page

## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES

A justifiable homicide is defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program as the killing of a felon by a private citizen or peace officer during the commission of a felony. Justifiable homicides are sometimes referred to as excusable or noncriminal homicides.

When justifiable homicides were examined, it was found that:

In 2002,

- 96.0 percent of felons (97) killed by peace officers were male; 4.0 percent were female (4).
- 88.6 percent of felons (31) killed by private citizens were male; 11.4 percent were female (4).

Chart 46
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Gender of Deceased


Source: Table 39

Chart47
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Deceased


[^6]Chart 48
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Age of Deceased


[^7]In 2002,
30.7 percent (31) of felons killed by peace officers were white, 40.6 percent (41) were Hispanic, 16.8 percent (17) were black, 10.9 percent (11) fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category, and 1.0 percent (1) fell into the "unknown" race/ethnic group category.

- 22.9 percent (8) of felons killed by private citizens were white, 37.1 percent (13) were Hispanic, 37.1 percent (13) were black, and 2.9 percent (1) fell into the "other" race/ethnic group category.
- 2.0 percent (2) of felons killed by peace officers were under age $18,45.5$ percent (46) were aged 18-29, 33.7 percent (34) were aged 30-39, and 18.8 percent (19) were aged 40 and over.
- No felons killed by private citizens were under age 18, 45.7 percent (16) were aged 18-29, 20.0 percent ( 7 ) were aged $30-39$, and 34.3 percent (12) were aged 40 and over.


## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

When justifiable homicides were examined by location, it was found that:

In 2002,

- Most felons killed by peace officers were killed on a street or sidewalk (69.3 percent).
- The largest percentage of felons killed by private citizens fell into the "commercial establishment" category ( 28.6 percent).

Chart 49
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS, 2002
By Location of Justifiable Homicide


Source: Table 40
Note: Percentages do not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Chart 50
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Location of Justifiable Homicide


Source: Table 40.

Chart51
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS, 2002 By Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 41.
Note: Percentages do not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

When justifiable homicides were examined by contributing circumstance, it was found that:

In 2002,
Most felons killed by peace officers were killed while attacking a peace officer ( 76.2 percent).

- Most felons killed by private citizens were killed during the commission of a crime ( 54.3 percent).

Chart52
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002 By Contributing Circumstance


Source: Table 41.
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## CRIMES DATA TABLES (1-28)

Violent crimes, 1993-2002, number, rate per 100,000 population, and percent change

## Homicide crimes

Gender of victim, 1993-2002, number, percent, and rate per 100,000 population
Race/ethnic group of victim, 1993-2002, number, percent, and rate per 100,000 population
Age of victim, 1993-2002, number, percent, and rate per 100,000 population Gender of victim, 1993-2002
Race/ethnic group of victim, 1993-2002
Age of victim, 1993-2002
Race/ethnic group of victim by gender of victim, 2002
Race/ethnic group of victim by age of victim, 2002
Race/ethnic group of victim by gender and age of victim, 2002
Relationship of victim to offender, 1993-2002
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by relationship of victim to offender, 2002
Age of victim by relationship of victim to offender, 2002
County, number and rate per 100,000 population, 1993-2002
Season and month of incident, 1993-2002
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by day of incident, 2002
Age of victim by day of incident, 2002
Location of homicide, 1993-2002
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by location of homicide, 2002
Age of victim by location of homicide, 2002
Type of weapon used, 1993-2002
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by type of weapon used, 2002
Age of victim by type of weapon used, 2002
Contributing circumstance, 1993-2002
Gender and race/ethnic group of victim by contributing circumstance, 2002
Age of victim by contributing circumstance, 2002
Contributing circumstance by relationship of victim to offender, 2002
Clearances, 1993-2002, number reported, number cleared, and clearance rate

Table 1
VIOLENT CRIMES, 1993-2002
Number, Rate per 100,000 Population, and Percent Change

| Year(s) | Total | Homicide | Forcible rape | Robbery | Aggravated assault |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002. | 207,988 | 2,392 | 10,176 | 64,805 | 130,615 |
| 2001.... | 210,510 | 2,201 | 9,882 | 63,299 | 135,128 |
| 2000............... | 210,492 | 2,074 | 9,785 | 60,243 | 138,390 |
| 1999............... | 207,874 | 2,006 | 9,443 | 60,027 | 136,398 |
| 1998............... | 229,766 | 2,170 | 9,777 | 68,752 | 149,067 |
| 1997............... | 257,409 | 2,579 | 10,182 | 81,413 | 163,235 |
| 1996............... | 274,675 | 2,910 | 10,238 | 94,137 | 167,390 |
| 1995............ | 304,998 | 3,530 | 10,550 | 104,581 | 186,337 |
| 1994............... | 318,946 | 3,699 | 10,960 | 112,149 | 192,138 |
| 1993............... | 336,100 | 4,095 | 11,754 | 126,347 | 193,904 |
| Percent change in number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001-2002....... | -1.2 | 8.7 | 3.0 | 2.4 | -3.3 |
| 2000-2001....... | 0.0 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 5.1 | -2.4 |
| 1999-2000........ | 1.3 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 1.5 |
| 1998-1999........ | -9.5 | -7.6 | -3.4 | -12.7 | -8.5 |
| 1997-1998........ | -10.7 | -15.9 | -4.0 | -15.6 | -8.7 |
| 1996-1997... | -6.3 | -11.4 | -0.5 | -13.5 | -2.5 |
| 1995-1996........ | -9.9 | -17.6 | -3.0 | -10.0 | -10.2 |
| 1994-1995........ | -4.4 | -4.6 | -3.7 | -6.7 | -3.0 |
| 1993-1994........ | -5.1 | -9.7 | -6.8 | -11.2 | -0.9 |
| 1993-2002... | -38.1 | -41.6 | -13.4 | -48.7 | -32.6 |
| Rate per 100,000 population ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002. | 589.2 | 6.8 | 28.8 | 183.6 | 370.0 |
| 2001............... | 605.6 | 6.3 | 28.4 | 182.1 | 388.8 |
| 2000............... | 610.5 | 6.0 | 28.4 | 174.7 | 401.4 |
| 1999............... | 610.7 | 5.9 | 27.7 | 176.4 | 400.7 |
| 1998............. | 686.0 | 6.5 | 29.2 | 205.3 | 445.1 |
| 1997............... | 781.0 | 7.8 | 30.9 | 247.0 | 495.3 |
| 1996............... | 848.2 | 9.0 | 31.6 | 290.7 | 516.9 |
| 1995............... | 951.2 | 11.0 | 32.9 | 326.2 | 581.2 |
| 1994............... | 992.4 | 11.5 | 34.1 | 348.9 | 597.8 |
| 1993... | 1,058.8 | 12.9 | 37.0 | 398.0 | 610.9 |


|  | Percent change in rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2001-2002 \ldots \ldots .$. | -2.7 | 7.9 | 1.4 | 0.8 | -4.8 |  |  |
| $2000-2001 \ldots \ldots .$. | -0.8 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | -3.1 |  |  |
| $1999-2000 \ldots \ldots .$. | 0.0 | 1.7 | 2.5 | -1.0 | 0.2 |  |  |
| $1998-1999 \ldots . . .$. | -11.0 | -9.2 | -5.1 | -14.1 | -10.0 |  |  |
| $1997-1998 \ldots . .$. | -12.2 | -16.7 | -5.5 | -16.9 | -10.1 |  |  |
| $1996-1997 \ldots \ldots .$. | -7.9 | -13.3 | -2.2 | -15.0 | -4.2 |  |  |
| $1995-1996 \ldots \ldots .$. | -10.8 | -18.2 | -4.0 | -10.9 | -11.1 |  |  |
| $1994-1995 \ldots \ldots .$. | -4.2 | -4.3 | -3.5 | -6.5 | -2.8 |  |  |
| $1993-1994 \ldots \ldots .$. | -6.3 | -10.9 | -7.8 | -12.3 | -2.1 |  |  |
| $1993-2002 \ldots \ldots \ldots$. | -44.4 | -47.3 | -22.2 | -53.9 | -39.4 |  |  |

Note: Rates may not add to total because of rounding.
${ }^{1}$ Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.

Table 2
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Gender of Victim
Number, Percent, and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Gender of victim | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1993- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2001- \\ 2002 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims.......... | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | 2,201 | 2,392 | -41.6 | 8.7 |
| Percent of victims.......... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Population.................... | 31,742,000 | 32,140,000 | 32,063,000 | 32,383,000 | 32,957,000 | 33,494,000 | 34,036,000 | 34,480,000 | 34,758,000 | 35,301,000 | 11.2 | 1.6 |
| Percent of population...... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Rate............................ | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.8 | -47.3 | 7.9 |
| Male ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 3,338 | 3,090 | 2,901 | 2,368 | 2,097 | 1,727 | 1,568 | 1,666 | 1,756 | 1,938 | -41.9 | 10.4 |
| Percent of total victims. | 81.5\% | 83.5\% | 82.2\% | 81.4\% | 81.3\% | 79.6\% | 78.2\% | 80.3\% | 79.8\% | 81.0\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 15,826,148 | 16,302,037 | 16,643,729 | 16,979,256 | 17,135,207 | 16,810,163 | 17,099,812 | 17,398,995 | 17,694,411 | 17,984,195 | 13.6 | 1.6 |
| Percent of population... | 49.9\% | 50.1\% | 50.1\% | 50.1\% | 50.0\% | 50.2\% | 50.2\% | 50.2\% | 50.2\% | 50.2\% |  |  |
| Rate......................... | 21.1 | 19.0 | 17.4 | 13.9 | 12.2 | 10.3 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 10.8 | -48.8 | 9.1 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims....... | 757 | 609 | 629 | 542 | 482 | 443 | 438 | 408 | 445 | 454 | -40.0 | 2.0 |
| Percent of total victims. | 18.5\% | 16.5\% | 17.8\% | 18.6\% | 18.7\% | 20.4\% | 21.8\% | 19.7\% | 20.2\% | 19.0\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 15,868,588 | 16,218,103 | 16,545,201 | 16,884,383 | 17,159,994 | 16,696,243 | 16,972,666 | 17,254,400 | 17,538,924 | 17,818,043 | 12.3 | 1.6 |
| Percent of population... | 50.1\% | 49.9\% | 49.9\% | 49.9\% | 50.0\% | 49.8\% | 49.8\% | 49.8\% | 49.8\% | 49.8\% |  |  |
| Rate........................... | 4.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | -47.9 | 0.0 |

Notes: Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.
Population breakdowns by gender will not add to total because of variations in population source data
The "percent of population" category for male and female was calculated using the sum of the male and female populations.
The "male" category includes homicide victims whose gender could not be determined: 1993 includes two, 1994 includes seven, 1995 includes six, 1997 includes five, 2000 includes two, 2001 includes one, and 2002 includes one.

Table 3
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim
Number, Percent, and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Race/ethnic group of victim | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1993- } \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2001- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........... | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | 2,201 | 2,392 | -41.6 | 8.7 |
| Percent of victims............ | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Population..................... | 31,742,000 | 32,140,000 | 32,063,000 | 32,383,000 | 32,957,000 | 33,494,000 | 34,036,000 | 34,480,000 | 34,758,000 | 35,301,000 | 11.2 | 1.6 |
| Percent of population....... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Rate............................. | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.8 | -47.3 | 7.9 |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 952 | 771 | 726 | 617 | 547 | 523 | 446 | 421 | 442 | 417 | -56.2 | -5.7 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 23.2\% | 20.8\% | 20.6\% | 21.2\% | 21.2\% | 24.1\% | 22.2\% | 20.3\% | 20.1\% | 17.4\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 17,324,679 | 17,511,489 | 17,593,222 | 17,787,715 | 17,849,510 | 17,258,003 | 17,339,690 | 17,421,511 | 17,503,225 | 17,573,850 | 1.4 | 0.4 |
| Percent of population.... | 54.7\% | 53.8\% | 53.0\% | 52.5\% | 52.0\% | 51.5\% | 50.9\% | 50.3\% | 49.7\% | 49.1\% |  |  |
| Rate. | 5.5 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 | -56.4 | -4.0 |
| Hispanic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 1,631 | 1,572 | 1,615 | 1,291 | 1,154 | 964 | 909 | 933 | 985 | 1,066 | -34.6 | 8.2 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 39.8\% | 42.5\% | 45.8\% | 44.4\% | 44.7\% | 44.4\% | 45.3\% | 45.0\% | 44.8\% | 44.6\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 8,906,439 | 9,340,495 | 9,764,691 | 10,114,228 | 10,421,039 | 10,022,551 | 10,352,763 | 10,688,752 | 11,020,710 | 11,352,852 | 27.5 | 3.0 |
| Percent of population.... | 28.1\% | 28.7\% | 29.4\% | 29.9\% | 30.4\% | 29.9\% | 30.4\% | 30.8\% | 31.3\% | 31.7\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 18.3 | 16.8 | 16.5 | 12.8 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.4 | -48.6 | 5.6 |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 1,249 | 1,111 | 922 | 794 | 682 | 523 | 488 | 589 | 622 | 734 | -41.2 | 18.0 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 30.5\% | 30.0\% | 26.1\% | 27.3\% | 26.4\% | 24.1\% | 24.3\% | 28.4\% | 28.3\% | 30.7\% |  |  |
| Population................... | 2,179,651 | 2,255,738 | 2,293,634 | 2,330,391 | 2,314,836 | 2,309,152 | 2,320,916 | 2,337,935 | 2,355,812 | 2,373,399 | 8.9 | 0.7 |
| Percent of population.... | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 6.7\% | 6.9\% | 6.8\% | 6.7\% | 6.7\% | 6.6\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 57.3 | 49.3 | 40.2 | 34.1 | 29.5 | 22.6 | 21.0 | 25.2 | 26.4 | 30.9 | -46.1 | 17.0 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 247 | 226 | 254 | 198 | 177 | 147 | 157 | 121 | 145 | 166 | -32.8 | 14.5 |
| Percent of total victims.. | 6.0\% | 6.1\% | 7.2\% | 6.8\% | 6.9\% | 6.8\% | 7.8\% | 5.8\% | 6.6\% | 6.9\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | 3,283,967 | 3,412,418 | 3,537,383 | 3,631,305 | 3,709,816 | 3,916,700 | 4,059,109 | 4,205,197 | 4,353,588 | 4,502,137 | 37.1 | 3.4 |
| Percent of population..... | 10.4\% | 10.5\% | 10.7\% | 10.7\% | 10.8\% | 11.7\% | 11.9\% | 12.1\% | 12.4\% | 12.6\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 7.5 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.7 | -50.7 | 12.1 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims......... | 16 | 19 | 13 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 9 | - | - |
| Percent of total victims.. | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% |  |  |
| Population.................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Percent of population.... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Rate........................... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.
Population breakdowns by race/ethnic group will not add to total because of variations in population source data
Dash indicates that the percent of population and rate for the "unknown" category cannot be calculated because there are no unknown race/ethnic group population data
The "percent of population" category for race/ethnic group was calculated using the sum of the race/ethnic group populations.

Table 4
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Age of Victim
Number, Percent, and Rate per 100,000 Population

| Age of victim | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1993- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2001- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims.......... | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | 2,201 | 2,392 | -41.6 | 8.7 |
| Percent of victims........... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Population................... | 31,742,000 | 32,140,000 | 32,063,000 | 32,383,000 | 32,957,000 | 33,494,000 | 34,036,000 | 34,480,000 | 34,758,000 | 35,301,000 | 11.2 | 1.6 |
| Percent of population..... | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |
| Rate.......................... | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.8 | -47.3 | 7.9 |
| Under 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 512 | 470 | 519 | 421 | 361 | 306 | 276 | 246 | 252 | 247 | -51.8 | -2.0 |
| Percent of total victims. | 12.5\% | 12.7\% | 14.7\% | 14.5\% | 14.0\% | 14.1\% | 13.8\% | 11.9\% | 11.4\% | 10.3\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 8,651,941 | 8,917,191 | 9,191,662 | 9,456,115 | 9,701,218 | 9,426,168 | 9,587,332 | 9,770,687 | 9,932,913 | 10,095,903 | 16.7 | 1.6 |
| Percent of population... | 27.3\% | 27.4\% | 27.7\% | 27.9\% | 28.3\% | 28.1\% | 28.1\% | 28.2\% | 28.2\% | 28.2\% |  |  |
| Rate........................ | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 | -59.3 | -4.0 |
| 18-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 1,763 | 1,603 | 1,510 | 1,183 | 1,068 | 933 | 840 | 888 | 992 | 1,098 | -37.7 | 10.7 |
| Percent of total victims. | 43.1\% | 43.3\% | 42.8\% | 40.7\% | 41.4\% | 43.0\% | 41.9\% | 42.8\% | 45.1\% | 45.9\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 5,863,383 | 5,934,537 | 5,854,943 | 5,770,311 | 5,537,727 | 5,474,990 | 5,511,604 | 5,523,472 | 5,555,926 | 6,123,037 | 4.4 | 10.2 |
| Percent of population... | 18.5\% | 18.2\% | 17.6\% | 17.0\% | 16.1\% | 16.3\% | 16.2\% | 15.9\% | 15.8\% | 17.1\% |  |  |
| Rate........................ | 30.1 | 27.0 | 25.8 | 20.5 | 19.3 | 17.0 | 15.2 | 16.1 | 17.9 | 17.9 | -40.5 | 0.0 |
| 30-39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 934 | 861 | 737 | 630 | 534 | 428 | 364 | 377 | 426 | 449 | -51.9 | 5.4 |
| Percent of total victims. | 22.8\% | 23.3\% | 20.9\% | 21.6\% | 20.7\% | 19.7\% | 18.1\% | 18.2\% | 19.4\% | 18.8\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 5,747,693 | 5,874,969 | 5,942,572 | 5,968,805 | 5,942,241 | 5,654,098 | 5,629,424 | 5,597,411 | 5,535,620 | 4,994,720 | -13.1 | -9.8 |
| Percent of population... | 18.1\% | 18.1\% | 17.9\% | 17.6\% | 17.3\% | 16.9\% | 16.5\% | 16.2\% | 15.7\% | 14.0\% |  |  |
| Rate....................... | 16.2 | 14.7 | 12.4 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 7.7 | 9.0 | -44.4 | 16.9 |
| 40 and over |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 842 | 698 | 719 | 636 | 580 | 480 | 505 | 534 | 519 | 579 | -31.2 | 11.6 |
| Percent of total victims. | 20.6\% | 18.9\% | 20.4\% | 21.9\% | 22.5\% | 22.1\% | 25.2\% | 25.7\% | 23.6\% | 24.2\% |  |  |
| Population................. | 11,431,719 | 11,793,443 | 12,199,753 | 12,668,408 | 13,114,015 | 12,951,150 | 13,344,118 | 13,761,825 | 14,208,876 | 14,588,578 | 27.6 | 2.7 |
| Percent of population... | 36.1\% | 36.3\% | 36.8\% | 37.4\% | 38.2\% | 38.7\% | 39.2\% | 39.7\% | 40.3\% | 40.7\% |  |  |
| Rate........................ | 7.4 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.0 | -45.9 | 8.1 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of victims........ | 44 | 67 | 45 | 40 | 36 | 23 | 21 | 29 | 12 | 19 | - | - |
| Percent of total victims. | 1.1\% | 1.8\% | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.1\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.8\% |  |  |
| Population................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Percent of population... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Rate..................... | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.
Population breakdowns by age will not add to total because of variations in population source data
Dash indicates that the percent of population and rate for the "unknown" category cannot be calculated because there are no unknown age population data.
The "percent of population" category for age group was calculated using the sum of the age populations.

Table 5
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Gender of Victim

| Year(s) | Total |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2002.......... | 2,392 | 100.0 | 1,938 | 81.0 | 454 | 19.0 |
| 2001............ | 2,201 | 100.0 | 1,756 | 79.8 | 445 | 20.2 |
| 2000............. | 2,074 | 100.0 | 1,666 | 80.3 | 408 | 19.7 |
| 1999............. | 2,006 | 100.0 | 1,568 | 78.2 | 438 | 21.8 |
| 1998........... | 2,170 | 100.0 | 1,727 | 79.6 | 443 | 20.4 |
| 1997............. | 2,579 | 100.0 | 2,097 | 81.3 | 482 | 18.7 |
| 1996............ | 2,910 | 100.0 | 2,368 | 81.4 | 542 | 18.6 |
| 1995............. | 3,530 | 100.0 | 2,901 | 82.2 | 629 | 17.8 |
| 1994............. | 3,699 | 100.0 | 3,090 | 83.5 | 609 | 16.5 |
| 1993. | 4,095 | 100.0 | 3,338 | 81.5 | 757 | 18.5 |

${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes homicide victims whose gender could not be determined: 1993 includes two, 1994 includes seven, 1995 includes six, 1997 includes five, 2000 includes two, 2001 includes one, and 2002 includes one.

Table 6
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Victim

| Year(s) | Total including unknown | Unknown | Known race/ethnic group of victim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2002. | 2,392 | 9 | 2,383 | 100.0 | 417 | 17.5 | 1,066 | 44.7 | 734 | 30.8 | 166 | 7.0 |
| 2001............. | 2,201 | 7 | 2,194 | 100.0 | 442 | 20.1 | 985 | 44.9 | 622 | 28.4 | 145 | 6.6 |
| 2000.............. | 2,074 | 10 | 2,064 | 100.0 | 421 | 20.4 | 933 | 45.2 | 589 | 28.5 | 121 | 5.9 |
| 1999............. | 2,006 | 6 | 2,000 | 100.0 | 446 | 22.3 | 909 | 45.5 | 488 | 24.4 | 157 | 7.9 |
| 1998.............. | 2,170 | 13 | 2,157 | 100.0 | 523 | 24.2 | 964 | 44.7 | 523 | 24.2 | 147 | 6.8 |
| 1997.............. | 2,579 | 19 | 2,560 | 100.0 | 547 | 21.4 | 1,154 | 45.1 | 682 | 26.6 | 177 | 6.9 |
| 1996............. | 2,910 | 10 | 2,900 | 100.0 | 617 | 21.3 | 1,291 | 44.5 | 794 | 27.4 | 198 | 6.8 |
| 1995............. | 3,530 | 13 | 3,517 | 100.0 | 726 | 20.6 | 1,615 | 45.9 | 922 | 26.2 | 254 | 7.2 |
| 1994............. | 3,699 | 19 | 3,680 | 100.0 | 771 | 21.0 | 1,572 | 42.7 | 1,111 | 30.2 | 226 | 6.1 |
| 1993. | 4,095 | 16 | 4,079 | 100.0 | 952 | 23.3 | 1,631 | 40.0 | 1,249 | 30.6 | 247 | 6.1 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 7
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Age of Victim

| Year(s) | Total including unknown | Unknown | Known age of victim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total |  | Under 18 |  | 18-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40 and over |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2002. | 2,392 | 19 | 2,373 | 100.0 | 247 | 10.4 | 1,098 | 46.3 | 449 | 18.9 | 579 | 24.4 |
| 2001............ | 2,201 | 12 | 2,189 | 100.0 | 252 | 11.5 | 992 | 45.3 | 426 | 19.5 | 519 | 23.7 |
| 2000............. | 2,074 | 29 | 2,045 | 100.0 | 246 | 12.0 | 888 | 43.4 | 377 | 18.4 | 534 | 26.1 |
| 1999............. | 2,006 | 21 | 1,985 | 100.0 | 276 | 13.9 | 840 | 42.3 | 364 | 18.3 | 505 | 25.4 |
| 1998............. | 2,170 | 23 | 2,147 | 100.0 | 306 | 14.3 | 933 | 43.5 | 428 | 19.9 | 480 | 22.4 |
| 1997............. | 2,579 | 36 | 2,543 | 100.0 | 361 | 14.2 | 1,068 | 42.0 | 534 | 21.0 | 580 | 22.8 |
| 1996............. | 2,910 | 40 | 2,870 | 100.0 | 421 | 14.7 | 1,183 | 41.2 | 630 | 22.0 | 636 | 22.2 |
| 1995............. | 3,530 | 45 | 3,485 | 100.0 | 519 | 14.9 | 1,510 | 43.3 | 737 | 21.1 | 719 | 20.6 |
| 1994............. | 3,699 | 67 | 3,632 | 100.0 | 470 | 12.9 | 1,603 | 44.1 | 861 | 23.7 | 698 | 19.2 |
| 1993............. | 4,095 | 44 | 4,051 | 100.0 | 512 | 12.6 | 1,763 | 43.5 | 934 | 23.1 | 842 | 20.8 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 8
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Gender of Victim

| Gender of victim | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total............ | 2,392 | 100.0 | 417 | 100.0 | 1,066 | 100.0 | 734 | 100.0 | 166 | 100.0 | 9 | 100.0 |
| Male ${ }^{1} . . . . . . . .$. | 1,938 | 81.0 | 259 | 62.1 | 926 | 86.9 | 633 | 86.2 | 115 | 69.3 | 5 | - |
| Female...... | 454 | 19.0 | 158 | 37.9 | 140 | 13.1 | 101 | 13.8 | 51 | 30.7 | 4 | - |

[^8]The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.

Table 9

## HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002

Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Age of Victim

| Age of victim | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown.. | 2,392 |  | 417 |  | 1,066 |  | 734 |  | 166 |  | 9 |  |
| Unknown................... | 19 |  | 0 |  | 9 |  | 5 |  | 1 |  | 4 |  |
| Total known. | 2,373 | 100.0 | 417 | 100.0 | 1,057 | 100.0 | 729 | 100.0 | 165 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 |
| Under 18................. | 247 | 10.4 | 31 | 7.4 | 137 | 13.0 | 60 | 8.2 | 17 | 10.3 | 2 | - |
| 18-29..................... | 1,098 | 46.3 | 100 | 24.0 | 580 | 54.9 | 351 | 48.1 | 66 | 40.0 | 1 | - |
| 30-39..................... | 449 | 18.9 | 74 | 17.7 | 176 | 16.7 | 174 | 23.9 | 23 | 13.9 | 2 | - |
| 40 and over............. | 579 | 24.4 | 212 | 50.8 | 164 | 15.5 | 144 | 19.8 | 59 | 35.8 | 0 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 10
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Gender and Age of Victim

| Gender and age of victim | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  | Unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total................. | 2,392 | 100.0 | 417 | 100.0 | 1,066 | 100.0 | 734 | 100.0 | 166 | 100.0 | 9 | 100.0 |
| Under 18........ | 247 | 10.3 | 31 | 7.4 | 137 | 12.9 | 60 | 8.2 | 17 | 10.2 | 2 | - |
| 18-19............. | 203 | 8.5 | 19 | 4.6 | 118 | 11.1 | 52 | 7.1 | 14 | 8.4 | 0 | - |
| 20-24............. | 530 | 22.2 | 48 | 11.5 | 271 | 25.4 | 185 | 25.2 | 26 | 15.7 | 0 | - |
| 25-29............ | 365 | 15.3 | 33 | 7.9 | 191 | 17.9 | 114 | 15.5 | 26 | 15.7 | 1 | - |
| 30-34............ | 254 | 10.6 | 36 | 8.6 | 101 | 9.5 | 100 | 13.6 | 15 | 9.0 | 2 | - |
| 35-39............ | 195 | 8.2 | 38 | 9.1 | 75 | 7.0 | 74 | 10.1 | 8 | 4.8 | 0 | - |
| 40-44............. | 186 | 7.8 | 47 | 11.3 | 62 | 5.8 | 58 | 7.9 | 19 | 11.4 | 0 | - |
| 45-49............ | 129 | 5.4 | 41 | 9.8 | 36 | 3.4 | 42 | 5.7 | 10 | 6.0 | 0 | - |
| 50-54............. | 80 | 3.3 | 25 | 6.0 | 23 | 2.2 | 25 | 3.4 | 7 | 4.2 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over..... | 184 | 7.7 | 99 | 23.7 | 43 | 4.0 | 19 | 2.6 | 23 | 13.9 | 0 | - |
| Unknown......... | 19 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 0.8 | 5 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.6 | 4 | - |
| Male ${ }^{1} . . . . . . . . . . . .$. | 1,938 | 100.0 | 259 | 100.0 | 926 | 100.0 | 633 | 100.0 | 115 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 |
| Under 18...... | 181 | 9.3 | 13 | 5.0 | 105 | 11.3 | 50 | 7.9 | 13 | 11.3 | 0 | - |
| 18-19.......... | 176 | 9.1 | 11 | 4.2 | 109 | 11.8 | 47 | 7.4 | 9 | 7.8 | 0 | - |
| 20-24.......... | 482 | 24.9 | 36 | 13.9 | 254 | 27.4 | 171 | 27.0 | 21 | 18.3 | 0 | - |
| 25-29.......... | 315 | 16.3 | 21 | 8.1 | 174 | 18.8 | 105 | 16.6 | 15 | 13.0 | 0 | - |
| 30-34.......... | 206 | 10.6 | 23 | 8.9 | 88 | 9.5 | 85 | 13.4 | 8 | 7.0 | 2 | - |
| 35-39.......... | 151 | 7.8 | 27 | 10.4 | 62 | 6.7 | 58 | 9.2 | 4 | 3.5 | 0 | - |
| 40-44.......... | 145 | 7.5 | 33 | 12.7 | 49 | 5.3 | 49 | 7.7 | 14 | 12.2 | 0 | - |
| 45-49.......... | 93 | 4.8 | 22 | 8.5 | 29 | 3.1 | 35 | 5.5 | 7 | 6.1 | 0 | - |
| 50-54.......... | 60 | 3.1 | 19 | 7.3 | 18 | 1.9 | 17 | 2.7 | 6 | 5.2 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over.. | 114 | 5.9 | 54 | 20.8 | 30 | 3.2 | 12 | 1.9 | 18 | 15.7 | 0 | - |
| Unknown...... | 15 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 0.9 | 4 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | - |
| Female.......... | 454 | 100.0 | 158 | 100.0 | 140 | 100.0 | 101 | 100.0 | 51 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Under 18...... | 66 | 14.5 | 18 | 11.4 | 32 | 22.9 | 10 | 9.9 | 4 | 7.8 | 2 | - |
| 18-19.......... | 27 | 5.9 | 8 | 5.1 | 9 | 6.4 | 5 | 5.0 | 5 | 9.8 | 0 | - |
| 20-24.......... | 48 | 10.6 | 12 | 7.6 | 17 | 12.1 | 14 | 13.9 | 5 | 9.8 | 0 | - |
| 25-29.......... | 50 | 11.0 | 12 | 7.6 | 17 | 12.1 | 9 | 8.9 | 11 | 21.6 | 1 | - |
| 30-34.......... | 48 | 10.6 | 13 | 8.2 | 13 | 9.3 | 15 | 14.9 | 7 | 13.7 | 0 | - |
| 35-39.......... | 44 | 9.7 | 11 | 7.0 | 13 | 9.3 | 16 | 15.8 | 4 | 7.8 | 0 | - |
| 40-44.......... | 41 | 9.0 | 14 | 8.9 | 13 | 9.3 | 9 | 8.9 | 5 | 9.8 | 0 | - |
| 45-49.......... | 36 | 7.9 | 19 | 12.0 | 7 | 5.0 | 7 | 6.9 | 3 | 5.9 | 0 | - |
| 50-54.......... | 20 | 4.4 | 6 | 3.8 | 5 | 3.6 | 8 | 7.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over.. | 70 | 15.4 | 45 | 28.5 | 13 | 9.3 | 7 | 6.9 | 5 | 9.8 | 0 | - |
| Unknown...... | 4 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.

Table 11
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Relationship of Victim to Offender

| Relationship of victim to offender | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown........ | 4,095 |  | 3,699 |  | 3,530 |  | 2,910 |  | 2,579 |  |
| Unknown....................... | 1,166 |  | 994 |  | 947 |  | 728 |  | 859 |  |
| Total known..... | 2,929 | 100.0 | 2,705 | 100.0 | 2,583 | 100.0 | 2,182 | 100.0 | 1,720 | 100.0 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{1}$. | 1,706 | 58.2 | 1,680 | 62.1 | 1,359 | 52.6 | 1,075 | 49.3 | 869 | 50.5 |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 270 | 9.2 | 239 | 8.8 | 260 | 10.1 | 261 | 12.0 | 203 | 11.8 |
|  | 130 | 4.4 | 113 | 4.2 | 123 | 4.8 | 115 | 5.3 | 89 | 5.2 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3}$............... | 140 | 4.8 | 126 | 4.7 | 137 | 5.3 | 146 | 6.7 | 114 | 6.6 |
| All other relatives............. | 87 | 3.0 | 77 | 2.8 | 77 | 3.0 | 43 | 2.0 | 46 | 2.7 |
| Stranger.. | 866 | 29.6 | 709 | 26.2 | 887 | 34.3 | 803 | 36.8 | 602 | 35.0 |


| Relationship of victim to offender (cont.) | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | 2001 |  | 2002 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1993- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2001- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total including unknown........ | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  | 2,201 |  | 2,392 |  |  |  |
| Unknown.......................... | 625 |  | 761 |  | 796 |  | 900 |  | 969 |  |  |  |
| Total known...... | 1,545 | 100.0 | 1,245 | 100.0 | 1,278 | 100.0 | 1,301 | 100.0 | 1,423 | 100.0 | -51.4 | 9.4 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{1}$. | 766 | 49.6 | 632 | 50.8 | 601 | 47.0 | 596 | 45.8 | 663 | 46.6 | -61.1 | 11.2 |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 192 | 12.4 | 202 | 16.2 | 207 | 16.2 | 183 | 14.1 | 204 | 14.3 | -24.4 | 11.5 |
| Spouse ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 83 | 5.4 | 85 | 6.8 | 115 | 9.0 | 87 | 6.7 | 97 | 6.8 | -25.4 | 11.5 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3}$................ | 109 | 7.1 | 117 | 9.4 | 92 | 7.2 | 96 | 7.4 | 107 | 7.5 | -23.6 | 11.5 |
| All other relatives............. | 41 | 2.7 | 49 | 3.9 | 40 | 3.1 | 49 | 3.8 | 42 | 3.0 | -51.7 | - |
| Stranger......................... | 546 | 35.3 | 362 | 29.1 | 430 | 33.6 | 473 | 36.4 | 514 | 36.1 | -40.6 | 8.7 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
${ }^{2}$ Includes "common-law" marriage partner.
${ }^{3}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Table 12
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender

| Relationship of victim to offender | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown......... | 2,392 | 1,938 | 454 | 417 | 1,066 | 734 | 166 | 9 |
| Unknown.......................... | 969 | 860 | 109 | 89 | 436 | 378 | 59 | 7 |
| Total known...................... | 1,423 | 1,078 | 345 | 328 | 630 | 356 | 107 | 2 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{2} . . . . .$. | 663 | 520 | 143 | 165 | 290 | 163 | 45 | 0 |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 204 | 67 | 137 | 68 | 80 | 28 | 26 | 2 |
| Spouse ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 97 | 16 | 81 | 34 | 35 | 16 | 12 | 0 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4}$............... | 107 | 51 | 56 | 34 | 45 | 12 | 14 | 2 |
| All other relatives............ | 42 | 35 | 7 | 9 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| Stranger......................... | 514 | 456 | 58 | 86 | 237 | 158 | 33 | 0 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known....................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{2} . . . .$. | 46.6 | 48.2 | 41.4 | 50.3 | 46.0 | 45.8 | 42.1 | - |
| Spouse, parent, child....... | 14.3 | 6.2 | 39.7 | 20.7 | 12.7 | 7.9 | 24.3 | - |
|  | 6.8 | 1.5 | 23.5 | 10.4 | 5.6 | 4.5 | 11.2 | - |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4}$............... | 7.5 | 4.7 | 16.2 | 10.4 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 13.1 | - |
| All other relatives............ | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 2.8 | - |
| Stranger......................... | 36.1 | 42.3 | 16.8 | 26.2 | 37.6 | 44.4 | 30.8 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{2}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Includes "common-law" marriage partner.
${ }^{4}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Table 13
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Relationship of Victim to Offender

| Relationship of victim to offender | Total | Under 18 | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown....... | 2,392 | 247 | 1,098 | 449 | 579 | 19 |
| Unknown........................ | 969 | 70 | 508 | 197 | 179 | 15 |
| Total known............... | 1,423 | 177 | 590 | 252 | 400 | 4 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{1}$.. | 663 | 60 | 302 | 120 | 181 | 0 |
| Spouse, parent, child..... | 204 | 61 | 28 | 26 | 89 | 0 |
| Spouse ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .$. | 97 | 0 | 23 | 24 | 50 | 0 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3}$............. | 107 | 61 | 5 | 2 | 39 | 0 |
| All other relatives.......... | 42 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 19 | 0 |
| Stranger.. | 514 | 50 | 247 | 102 | 111 | 4 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{1}$. | 46.6 | 33.9 | 51.2 | 47.6 | 45.3 | - |
| Spouse, parent, child..... | 14.3 | 34.5 | 4.7 | 10.3 | 22.3 | - |
| Spouse ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 6.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 9.5 | 12.5 | - |
| Parent, child ${ }^{3}$............. | 7.5 | 34.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 9.8 | - |
| All other relatives.......... | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 4.8 | - |
| Stranger........................ | 36.1 | 28.2 | 41.9 | 40.5 | 27.8 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
${ }^{2}$ Includes "common-law" marriage partner.
${ }^{3}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Table 14
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By County
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| County | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statewide total....... | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | 2,201 | 2,392 |
| Alameda............ | 199 | 187 | 196 | 142 | 142 | 107 | 85 | 110 | 108 | 144 |
| Alpine............... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Amador.............. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Butte................ | 6 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 5 |
| Calaveras......... | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Colusa............... | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Contra Costa...... | 113 | 120 | 80 | 71 | 63 | 54 | 57 | 56 | 49 | 48 |
| Del Norte........... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| El Dorado........... | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| Fresno............... | 127 | 122 | 105 | 93 | 84 | 57 | 43 | 38 | 61 | 62 |
| Glenn................ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Humboldt........... | 10 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 12 |
| Imperial.............. | 5 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Inyo.................. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Kern................. | 73 | 92 | 71 | 52 | 55 | 55 | 52 | 37 | 39 | 51 |
| Kings................ | 9 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Lake................. | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| Lassen.............. | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles....... | 1,944 | 1,669 | 1,682 | 1,398 | 1,176 | 959 | 891 | 1,000 | 1,070 | 1,162 |
| Madera.............. | 10 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 6 |
| Marin................. | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| Mariposa............ | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mendocino......... | 9 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Merced.............. | 21 | 16 | 11 | 8 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 6 | 5 | 18 |
| Modoc............... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mono................. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Monterey............ | 32 | 40 | 26 | 23 | 33 | 27 | 29 | 25 | 26 | 28 |
| Napa................. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Nevada.............. | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| Orange.............. | 196 | 171 | 166 | 111 | 102 | 85 | 92 | 56 | 63 | 77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ntinued) |

Table 14 - continued
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By County
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| County | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Placer................ | 9 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Plumas.............. | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Riverside........... | 159 | 166 | 133 | 111 | 110 | 104 | 89 | 79 | 93 | 111 |
| Sacramento........ | 145 | 126 | 103 | 93 | 87 | 73 | 82 | 75 | 78 | 83 |
| San Benito.......... | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 |
| San Bernardino... | 256 | 243 | 225 | 185 | 146 | 147 | 110 | 145 | 125 | 141 |
| San Diego........... | 245 | 206 | 198 | 166 | 125 | 87 | 106 | 97 | 92 | 87 |
| San Francisco...... | 129 | 92 | 99 | 82 | 59 | 58 | 64 | 59 | 62 | 68 |
| San Joaquin........ | 65 | 64 | 62 | 66 | 73 | 42 | 39 | 39 | 50 | 59 |
| San Luis Obispo.. | 0 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| San Mateo.......... | 33 | 26 | 35 | 11 | 28 | 23 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 21 |
| Santa Barbara..... | 12 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 8 |
| Santa Clara......... | 61 | 56 | 56 | 48 | 62 | 44 | 37 | 34 | 34 | 37 |
| Santa Cruz.......... | 9 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 6 |
| Shasta............... | 12 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Sierra................. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Siskiyou.............. | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Solano............... | 27 | 44 | 27 | 22 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 21 | 10 | 16 |
| Sonoma............. | 24 | 18 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 16 |
| Stanislaus........... | 23 | 27 | 32 | 28 | 29 | 25 | 25 | 16 | 34 | 15 |
| Sutter................ | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| Tehama............. | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Trinity................ | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Tulare................ | 28 | 42 | 39 | 22 | 29 | 22 | 24 | 17 | 26 | 29 |
| Tuolumne.......... | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Ventura.............. | 42 | 28 | 26 | 33 | 25 | 24 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 21 |
| Yolo................... | 10 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| Yuba.................. | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ntinued) |

Table 14 - continued
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By County
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| County | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate per 100,000 population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statewide total....... | 12.9 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.8 |
| Alameda............ | 14.9 | 13.8 | 14.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 9.7 |
| Alpine................ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte................. | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 2.4 |
| Calaveras......... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa............... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa...... | 13.1 | 13.7 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 7.0 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 4.9 |
| Del Norte........... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado........... | 3.5 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 2.4 |
| Fresno............... | 17.1 | 16.1 | 13.9 | 12.1 | 10.8 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| Glenn................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Humboldt........... | 7.9 | 5.5 | 6.4 | 2.4 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 9.5 | 3.1 | 5.5 | 9.4 |
| Imperial.............. | 3.8 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 9.2 | 3.5 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| Inyo................... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kern.................. | 11.9 | 14.8 | 11.5 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 8.0 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 7.3 |
| Kings................. | 8.0 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 8.6 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 3.0 |
| Lake.................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lassen............... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Los Angeles....... | 21.1 | 18.1 | 18.0 | 14.9 | 12.3 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 11.0 | 11.7 |
| Madera.............. | 9.6 | 13.9 | 11.3 | 10.0 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 5.1 | 7.8 | 11.5 | 4.6 |
| Marin................. | 1.7 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| Mariposa............ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino......... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Merced.............. | 10.7 | 8.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 8.1 |
| Modoc............... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mono................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey............ | 8.5 | 10.8 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 8.7 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.8 |
| Napa................. | 3.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 1.6 |
| Nevada.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange.............. | 7.6 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 2.2 | $\begin{gathered} 2.6 \\ \text { intinued) } \end{gathered}$ |

Table 14 - continued
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By County
Number and Rate per 100,000 Population

| County | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate per 100,000 population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Placer............... | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| Plumas.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside............ | 11.9 | 12.0 | 9.7 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 5.7 | 6.6 |
| Sacramento........ | 12.9 | 11.1 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.4 |
| San Benito.......... |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| San Bernardino... | 16.2 | 15.1 | 14.2 | 11.6 | 9.0 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 7.8 |
| San Diego........... | 9.2 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| San Francisco...... | 17.2 | 12.2 | 13.2 | 10.7 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 8.6 |
| San Joaquin........ | 12.5 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 13.5 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 8.5 | 9.7 |
| San Luis Obispo.. | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 1.2 |
| San Mateo........... | 4.8 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 1.6 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| Santa Barbara..... | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| Santa Clara......... | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| Santa Cruz.......... | 3.8 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 1.6 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 2.3 |
| Shasta............... | 7.4 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Sierra................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou.............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano............... | 7.2 | 11.7 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 2.5 | 3.9 |
| Sonoma............. | 5.7 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 3.4 |
| Stanislaus.......... | 5.6 | 6.5 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 3.5 | 7.3 | 3.1 |
| Sutter................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tehama............. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trinity................ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare................ | 8.1 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 6.2 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 4.5 | 6.9 | 7.6 |
| Tuolumne.......... | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventura.............. | 6.0 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Yolo................... | 6.7 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 2.8 |
| Yuba.................. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Notes: Dash indicates that a rate is not computed when a county's population is less than 100,000 in a given year.
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.

Table 15
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Season and Month of Incident

| Season and month of incident | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown... | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | 2,201 | 2,392 |
| Unknown...................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known................. | 4,095 | 3,699 | 3,530 | 2,910 | 2,579 | 2,170 | 2,006 | 2,074 | 2,201 | 2,392 |
| Spring....................... | 1,002 | 925 | 806 | 682 | 651 | 517 | 451 | 464 | 528 | 582 |
| March..................... | 328 | 316 | 272 | 201 | 226 | 197 | 142 | 126 | 159 | 189 |
| April....................... | 315 | 307 | 255 | 225 | 217 | 156 | 147 | 162 | 176 | 188 |
| May....................... | 359 | 302 | 279 | 256 | 208 | 164 | 162 | 176 | 193 | 205 |
| Summer.................... | 1,134 | 942 | 978 | 745 | 678 | 568 | 562 | 597 | 581 | 623 |
| June.. | 391 | 307 | 270 | 254 | 212 | 177 | 157 | 205 | 165 | 183 |
| July........................ | 383 | 305 | 333 | 272 | 232 | 171 | 199 | 185 | 208 | 230 |
| August.................... | 360 | 330 | 375 | 219 | 234 | 220 | 206 | 207 | 208 | 210 |
| Fall.......................... | 1,033 | 930 | 956 | 699 | 662 | 522 | 516 | 497 | 613 | 638 |
| September.............. | 337 | 310 | 326 | 256 | 228 | 159 | 171 | 173 | 221 | 253 |
| October................... | 369 | 345 | 345 | 212 | 240 | 178 | 174 | 174 | 213 | 181 |
| November............... | 327 | 275 | 285 | 231 | 194 | 185 | 171 | 150 | 179 | 204 |
| Winter....................... | 926 | 902 | 790 | 784 | 588 | 563 | 477 | 516 | 479 | 549 |
| December............... | 332 | 293 | 281 | 238 | 194 | 207 | 166 | 210 | 168 | 175 |
| January................... | 304 | 315 | 279 | 296 | 203 | 199 | 183 | 175 | 171 | 214 |
| February................. | 290 | 294 | 230 | 250 | 191 | 157 | 128 | 131 | 140 | 160 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known................. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spring....................... | 24.5 | 25.0 | 22.8 | 23.4 | 25.2 | 23.8 | 22.5 | 22.4 | 24.0 | 24.3 |
| March..................... | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 7.1 | 6.1 | 7.2 | 7.9 |
| April....................... | 7.7 | 8.3 | 7.2 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 7.9 |
| May....................... | 8.8 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.8 | 8.1 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.6 |
| Summer.................... | 27.7 | 25.5 | 27.7 | 25.6 | 26.3 | 26.2 | 28.0 | 28.8 | 26.4 | 26.0 |
| June........................ | 9.5 | 8.3 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 9.9 | 7.5 | 7.7 |
| July........................ | 9.4 | 8.2 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 8.9 | 9.5 | 9.6 |
| August.................... | 8.8 | 8.9 | 10.6 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 8.8 |
| Fall.......................... | 25.2 | 25.1 | 27.1 | 24.0 | 25.7 | 24.1 | 25.7 | 24.0 | 27.9 | 26.7 |
| September.............. | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 10.0 | 10.6 |
| October................... | 9.0 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.7 | 7.6 |
| November............... | 8.0 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 8.5 |
| Winter....................... | 22.6 | 24.4 | 22.4 | 26.9 | 22.8 | 25.9 | 23.8 | 24.9 | 21.8 | 23.0 |
| December............... | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 10.1 | 7.6 | 7.3 |
| January................... | 7.4 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 10.2 | 7.9 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 8.4 | 7.8 | 8.9 |
| February.................. | 7.1 | 7.9 | 6.5 | 8.6 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.7 |

Note: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 16
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Day of Incident

| Day of incident | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown.... | 2,392 | 1,938 | 454 | 417 | 1,066 | 734 | 166 | 9 |
| Unknown....................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known................... | 2,392 | 1,938 | 454 | 417 | 1,066 | 734 | 166 | 9 |
| Weekday.................... | 1,553 | 1,225 | 328 | 284 | 666 | 493 | 102 | 8 |
| Monday................... | 316 | 232 | 84 | 60 | 146 | 95 | 14 | 1 |
| Tuesday.................. | 298 | 224 | 74 | 69 | 112 | 98 | 16 | 3 |
| Wednesday............. | 294 | 245 | 49 | 56 | 123 | 93 | 22 | 0 |
| Thursday................. | 286 | 230 | 56 | 49 | 119 | 94 | 22 | 2 |
| Friday...................... | 359 | 294 | 65 | 50 | 166 | 113 | 28 | 2 |
| Weekend... | 839 | 713 | 126 | 133 | 400 | 241 | 64 | 1 |
| Saturday.................. | 403 | 333 | 70 | 66 | 185 | 124 | 28 | 0 |
| Sunday.................... | 436 | 380 | 56 | 67 | 215 | 117 | 36 | 1 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.. | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weekday.................. | 64.9 | 63.2 | 72.2 | 68.1 | 62.5 | 67.2 | 61.4 | - |
| Monday................... | 13.2 | 12.0 | 18.5 | 14.4 | 13.7 | 12.9 | 8.4 | - |
| Tuesday.................. | 12.5 | 11.6 | 16.3 | 16.5 | 10.5 | 13.4 | 9.6 | - |
| Wednesday............. | 12.3 | 12.6 | 10.8 | 13.4 | 11.5 | 12.7 | 13.3 | - |
| Thursday................. | 12.0 | 11.9 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 12.8 | 13.3 | - |
| Friday...................... | 15.0 | 15.2 | 14.3 | 12.0 | 15.6 | 15.4 | 16.9 | - |
| Weekend... | 35.1 | 36.8 | 27.8 | 31.9 | 37.5 | 32.8 | 38.6 | - |
| Saturday................. | 16.8 | 17.2 | 15.4 | 15.8 | 17.4 | 16.9 | 16.9 | - |
| Sunday... | 18.2 | 19.6 | 12.3 | 16.1 | 20.2 | 15.9 | 21.7 | - |
| Average daily number of incidents ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday.................... | 6.0 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Weekend. | 8.1 | 6.9 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{2}$ There were 365 days in 2002; 261 weekdays and 104 weekend days. The average daily number of incidents for weekdays was calculated by dividing weekday totals by 261 . The average daily number of incidents for weekends was calculated by dividing weekend totals by 104 .

Table 17
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Day of Incident

| Day of incident | Total | Under 18 | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown..... | 2,392 | 247 | 1,098 | 449 | 579 | 19 |
| Unknown....................... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known.................. | 2,392 | 247 | 1,098 | 449 | 579 | 19 |
| Weekday.................... | 1,553 | 171 | 678 | 294 | 395 | 15 |
| Monday................... | 316 | 40 | 132 | 66 | 74 | 4 |
| Tuesday.................. | 298 | 36 | 115 | 56 | 89 | 2 |
| Wednesday.............. | 294 | 31 | 126 | 55 | 80 | 2 |
| Thursday................. | 286 | 35 | 126 | 46 | 75 | 4 |
| Friday..................... | 359 | 29 | 179 | 71 | 77 | 3 |
| Weekend.................... | 839 | 76 | 420 | 155 | 184 | 4 |
| Saturday.................. | 403 | 43 | 200 | 67 | 91 | 2 |
| Sunday.. | 436 | 33 | 220 | 88 | 93 | 2 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Weekday.................... | 64.9 | 69.2 | 61.7 | 65.5 | 68.2 | - |
| Monday................... | 13.2 | 16.2 | 12.0 | 14.7 | 12.8 | - |
| Tuesday.................. | 12.5 | 14.6 | 10.5 | 12.5 | 15.4 | - |
| Wednesday.............. | 12.3 | 12.6 | 11.5 | 12.2 | 13.8 | - |
| Thursday................. | 12.0 | 14.2 | 11.5 | 10.2 | 13.0 | - |
| Friday..................... | 15.0 | 11.7 | 16.3 | 15.8 | 13.3 | - |
| Weekend.................... | 35.1 | 30.8 | 38.3 | 34.5 | 31.8 | - |
| Saturday.................. | 16.8 | 17.4 | 18.2 | 14.9 | 15.7 | - |
| Sunday.................... | 18.2 | 13.4 | 20.0 | 19.6 | 16.1 | - |
| Average daily number of incidents ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday.................... | 6.0 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.1 |
| Weekend. | 8.1 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 0.0 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
Average daily number of incidents may not add to totals because of rounding.
${ }^{1}$ There were 365 days in 2002; 261 weekdays and 104 weekend days. The average daily number of incidents for weekdays was calculated by dividing weekday totals by 261 . The average daily number of incidents for weekends was calculated by dividing weekend totals by 104 .

Table 18
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Location of Homicide

| Location of homicide | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown $\qquad$ Unknown $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,095 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,699 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,530 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 2,910 \\ 2 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,579 \\ 1 \end{array}$ |  |
| Total known........................ | 4,095 | 100.0 | 3,699 | 100.0 | 3,530 | 100.0 | 2,908 | 100.0 | 2,578 | 100.0 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 1,076 | 26.3 | 944 | 25.5 | 943 | 26.7 | 807 | 27.8 | 746 | 28.9 |
| Victim's residence............ | 742 | 18.1 | 636 | 17.2 | 626 | 17.7 | 545 | 18.7 | 487 | 18.9 |
| Shared residence............. | 334 | 8.2 | 308 | 8.3 | 317 | 9.0 | 262 | 9.0 | 259 | 10.0 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 1,526 | 37.3 | 1,429 | 38.6 | 1,466 | 41.5 | 1,165 | 40.1 | 994 | 38.6 |
| All other........................... | 1,493 | 36.5 | 1,326 | 35.8 | 1,121 | 31.8 | 936 | 32.2 | 838 | 32.5 |
| Hotel, motel................... | 55 | 1.3 | 38 | 1.0 | 27 | 0.8 | 35 | 1.2 | 17 | 0.7 |
| Other residence............... | 228 | 5.6 | 256 | 6.9 | 206 | 5.8 | 204 | 7.0 | 175 | 6.8 |
| Liquor store.................... | 14 | 0.3 | 10 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.1 | 5 | 0.2 |
| Bar............................... | 85 | 2.1 | 61 | 1.6 | 57 | 1.6 | 39 | 1.3 | 29 | 1.1 |
| Other business................ | 161 | 3.9 | 140 | 3.8 | 110 | 3.1 | 104 | 3.6 | 90 | 3.5 |
| Parking lot..................... | 190 | 4.6 | 163 | 4.4 | 164 | 4.6 | 101 | 3.5 | 77 | 3.0 |
| Vehicle.......................... | 434 | 10.6 | 373 | 10.1 | 295 | 8.4 | 242 | 8.3 | 226 | 8.8 |
| Field, park..................... | 293 | 7.2 | 247 | 6.7 | 224 | 6.3 | 178 | 6.1 | 191 | 7.4 |
| School .......................... | 9 | 0.2 | 7 | 0.2 | 6 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 |
| Other. | 24 | 0.6 | 31 | 0.8 | 25 | 0.7 | 24 | 0.8 | 23 | 0.9 |


| Location of homicide (cont.) | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | 2001 |  | 2002 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1993 \\ & 2002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2001- \\ 2002 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total including unknown............ | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  | 2,201 |  | 2,392 |  |  |  |
| Unknown............................ | 2 |  | 4 |  | 4 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total known......................... | 2,168 | 100.0 | 2,002 | 100.0 | 2,070 | 100.0 | 2,201 | 100.0 | 2,390 | 100.0 | -41.6 | 8.6 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 629 | 29.0 | 686 | 34.3 | 612 | 29.6 | 573 | 26.0 | 655 | 27.4 | -39.1 | 14.3 |
| Victim's residence.. | 404 | 18.6 | 520 | 26.0 | 439 | 21.2 | 417 | 18.9 | 465 | 19.5 | -37.3 | 11.5 |
| Shared residence.. | 225 | 10.4 | 166 | 8.3 | 173 | 8.4 | 156 | 7.1 | 190 | 7.9 | -43.1 | 21.8 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 823 | 38.0 | 710 | 35.5 | 779 | 37.6 | 845 | 38.4 | 970 | 40.6 | -36.4 | 14.8 |
| All other.... | 716 | 33.0 | 606 | 30.3 | 679 | 32.8 | 783 | 35.6 | 765 | 32.0 | -48.8 | -2.3 |
| Hotel, motel.................. | 26 | 1.2 | 28 | 1.4 | 23 | 1.1 | 28 | 1.3 | 26 | 1.1 | -52.7 | - |
| Other residence............... | 132 | 6.1 | 119 | 5.9 | 162 | 7.8 | 173 | 7.9 | 147 | 6.2 | -35.5 | -15.0 |
| Liquor store.................... | 4 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.2 | 7 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Bar.. | 32 | 1.5 | 35 | 1.7 | 37 | 1.8 | 44 | 2.0 | 40 | 1.7 | -52.9 | - |
| Other business......... | 84 | 3.9 | 54 | 2.7 | 76 | 3.7 | 61 | 2.8 | 61 | 2.6 | -62.1 | 0.0 |
| Parking lot...................... | 68 | 3.1 | 59 | 2.9 | 72 | 3.5 | 75 | 3.4 | 87 | 3.6 | -54.2 | 16.0 |
| Vehicle......................... | 182 | 8.4 | 139 | 6.9 | 156 | 7.5 | 196 | 8.9 | 228 | 9.5 | -47.5 | 16.3 |
| Field, park. | 157 | 7.2 | 129 | 6.4 | 120 | 5.8 | 167 | 7.6 | 134 | 5.6 | -54.3 | -19.8 |
| School ........................... | 9 | 0.4 | 5 | 0.2 | 2 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Other.............................. | 22 | 1.0 | 33 | 1.6 | 27 | 1.3 | 29 | 1.3 | 37 | 1.5 | - | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 19
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Location of Homicide

| Location of homicide | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown........... | 2,392 | 1,938 | 454 | 417 | 1,066 | 734 | 166 | 9 |
| Unknown.............................. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total known......................... | 2,390 | 1,936 | 454 | 417 | 1,065 | 733 | 166 | 9 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 655 | 401 | 254 | 204 | 237 | 140 | 71 | 3 |
| Victim's residence........... | 465 | 332 | 133 | 137 | 167 | 104 | 54 | 3 |
| Shared residence............ | 190 | 69 | 121 | 67 | 70 | 36 | 17 | 0 |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 970 | 889 | 81 | 85 | 467 | 380 | 35 | 3 |
| All other............................. | 765 | 646 | 119 | 128 | 361 | 213 | 60 | 3 |
| Hotel, motel................... | 26 | 18 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Other residence............... | 147 | 128 | 19 | 25 | 76 | 39 | 7 | 0 |
| Liquor store..................... | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Bar................................ | 40 | 38 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 0 |
| Other business................ | 61 | 43 | 18 | 9 | 26 | 12 | 14 | 0 |
| Parking lot...................... | 87 | 82 | 5 | 5 | 49 | 29 | 4 | 0 |
| Vehicle........................... | 228 | 210 | 18 | 23 | 113 | 78 | 14 | 0 |
| Field, park...................... | 134 | 95 | 39 | 37 | 58 | 28 | 8 | 3 |
| School | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Other.............................. | 37 | 27 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Victim's, shared residence... | 27.4 | 20.7 | 55.9 | 48.9 | 22.3 | 19.1 | 42.8 | - |
| Victim's residence. | 19.5 | 17.1 | 29.3 | 32.9 | 15.7 | 14.2 | 32.5 | - |
| Shared residence............ | 7.9 | 3.6 | 26.7 | 16.1 | 6.6 | 4.9 | 10.2 | - |
| Street, sidewalk................. | 40.6 | 45.9 | 17.8 | 20.4 | 43.8 | 51.8 | 21.1 | - |
| All other............................. | 32.0 | 33.4 | 26.2 | 30.7 | 33.9 | 29.1 | 36.1 | - |
| Hotel, motel................... | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | - |
| Other residence............... | 6.2 | 6.6 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 4.2 | - |
| Liquor store.................... | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.6 | - |
| Bar................................ | 1.7 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 3.0 | - |
| Other business................ | 2.6 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 8.4 | - |
| Parking lot...................... | 3.6 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 2.4 | - |
| Vehicle........................... | 9.5 | 10.8 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 8.4 | - |
| Field, park...................... | 5.6 | 4.9 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 4.8 | - |
| School........................... | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - |
| Other.............................. | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 3.6 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.

Table 20
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Location of Homicide

| Location of homicide | Total | Under 18 | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40 and over | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown........... | 2,392 | 247 | 1,098 | 449 | 579 | 19 |
| Unknown............................... | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Total known........................... | 2,390 | 247 | 1,098 | 448 | 578 | 19 |
| Victim's, shared residence.... | 655 | 87 | 176 | 121 | 270 | 1 |
| Victim's residence............. | 465 | 51 | 143 | 85 | 185 | 1 |
| Shared residence.............. | 190 | 36 | 33 | 36 | 85 | 0 |
| Street, sidewalk................... | 970 | 98 | 537 | 175 | 149 | 11 |
| All other............................... | 765 | 62 | 385 | 152 | 159 | 7 |
| Hotel, motel...................... | 26 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 0 |
| Other residence............... | 147 | 24 | 68 | 27 | 27 | 1 |
| Liquor store...................... | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Bar.................................. | 40 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 10 | 0 |
| Other business................. | 61 | 4 | 16 | 11 | 30 | 0 |
| Parking lot....................... | 87 | 4 | 52 | 18 | 13 | 0 |
| Vehicle............................. | 228 | 11 | 153 | 36 | 26 | 2 |
| Field, park........................ | 134 | 14 | 63 | 28 | 25 | 4 |
| School.............................. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other............................... | 37 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 20 | 0 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Victim's, shared residence.... | 27.4 | 35.2 | 16.0 | 27.0 | 46.7 | - |
| Victim's residence............. | 19.5 | 20.6 | 13.0 | 19.0 | 32.0 | - |
| Shared residence.............. | 7.9 | 14.6 | 3.0 | 8.0 | 14.7 | - |
| Street, sidewalk................... | 40.6 | 39.7 | 48.9 | 39.1 | 25.8 | - |
| All other.............................. | 32.0 | 25.1 | 35.1 | 33.9 | 27.5 | - |
| Hotel, motel...................... | 1.1 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 1.2 | - |
| Other residence................ | 6.2 | 9.7 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 4.7 | - |
| Liquor store...................... | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | - |
| Bar.................................. | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 1.7 | - |
| Other business................. | 2.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 5.2 | - |
| Parking lot....................... | 3.6 | 1.6 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 2.2 | - |
| Vehicle............................ | 9.5 | 4.5 | 13.9 | 8.0 | 4.5 | - |
| Field, park....................... | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 6.3 | 4.3 | - |
| School.............................. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |
| Other............................... | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 3.5 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

Table 21
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Type of Weapon Used

| Type of weapon used | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown........... | 4,095 |  | 3,699 |  | 3,530 |  | 2,910 |  | 2,579 |  |
| Unknown............................. | 34 |  | 33 |  | 29 |  | 45 |  | 40 |  |
| Total known......................... | 4,061 | 100.0 | 3,666 | 100.0 | 3,501 | 100.0 | 2,865 | 100.0 | 2,539 | 100.0 |
| Firearm............................. | 3,007 | 74.0 | 2,778 | 75.8 | 2,590 | 74.0 | 2,055 | 71.7 | 1,835 | 72.3 |
| Handgun........................ | 2,609 | 64.2 | 2,441 | 66.6 | 2,288 | 65.4 | 1,866 | 65.1 | 1,633 | 64.3 |
| All other firearms.............. | 398 | 9.8 | 337 | 9.2 | 302 | 8.6 | 189 | 6.6 | 202 | 8.0 |
| Rifle............................ | 154 | 3.8 | 141 | 3.8 | 140 | 4.0 | 95 | 3.3 | 115 | 4.5 |
| Shotgun....................... | 167 | 4.1 | 165 | 4.5 | 123 | 3.5 | 86 | 3.0 | 72 | 2.8 |
| Other firearm............... | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 77 | 1.9 | 31 | 0.8 | 39 | 1.1 | 8 | 0.3 | 15 | 0.6 |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 1,054 | 26.0 | 888 | 24.2 | 911 | 26.0 | 810 | 28.3 | 704 | 27.7 |
|  | 470 | 11.6 | 427 | 11.6 | 405 | 11.6 | 341 | 11.9 | 307 | 12.1 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 204 | 5.0 | 157 | 4.3 | 156 | 4.5 | 147 | 5.1 | 108 | 4.3 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . .$. | 139 | 3.4 | 156 | 4.3 | 165 | 4.7 | 156 | 5.4 | 148 | 5.8 |
| All other.......................... | 241 | 5.9 | 148 | 4.0 | 185 | 5.3 | 166 | 5.8 | 141 | 5.6 |
|  | 114 | 2.8 | 81 | 2.2 | 75 | 2.1 | 61 | 2.1 | 56 | 2.2 |
| Drugs.......................... | 5 | 0.1 | 4 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 | 8 | 0.3 | 6 | 0.2 |
| Other........................... | 122 | 3.0 | 63 | 1.7 | 108 | 3.1 | 97 | 3.4 | 79 | 3.1 |


| Typeof weapon used (cont.) | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | 2001 |  | 2002 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1993- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2001- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total including unknown........... | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  | 2,201 |  | 2,392 |  |  |  |
| Unknown............................. | 36 |  | 29 |  | 28 |  | 28 |  | 28 |  |  |  |
| Total known......................... | 2,134 | 100.0 | 1,977 | 100.0 | 2,046 | 100.0 | 2,173 | 100.0 | 2,364 | 100.0 | -41.8 | 8.8 |
| Firearm.. | 1,469 | 68.8 | 1,334 | 67.5 | 1,440 | 70.4 | 1,568 | 72.2 | 1,735 | 73.4 | -42.3 | 10.7 |
| Handgun......................... | 1,315 | 61.6 | 1,152 | 58.3 | 1,242 | 60.7 | 1,341 | 61.7 | 1,555 | 65.8 | -40.4 | 16.0 |
| All other firearms.............. | 154 | 7.2 | 182 | 9.2 | 198 | 9.7 | 227 | 10.4 | 180 | 7.6 | -54.8 | -20.7 |
| Rifle............................ | 89 | 4.2 | 62 | 3.1 | 66 | 3.2 | 67 | 3.1 | 80 | 3.4 | -48.1 | 19.4 |
| Shotgun....................... | 57 | 2.7 | 63 | 3.2 | 55 | 2.7 | 68 | 3.1 | 60 | 2.5 | -64.1 | -11.8 |
| Other firearm............... | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.1 | - | - |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 8 | 0.4 | 57 | 2.9 | 76 | 3.7 | 90 | 4.1 | 38 | 1.6 | -50.6 | -57.8 |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 665 | 31.2 | 643 | 32.5 | 606 | 29.6 | 605 | 27.8 | 629 | 26.6 | -40.3 | 4.0 |
| Knife ${ }^{1}$. | 289 | 13.5 | 254 | 12.8 | 285 | 13.9 | 298 | 13.7 | 274 | 11.6 | -41.7 | -8.1 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2}$.................... | 117 | 5.5 | 134 | 6.8 | 98 | 4.8 | 95 | 4.4 | 116 | 4.9 | -43.1 | 22.1 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3}$............ | 112 | 5.2 | 106 | 5.4 | 111 | 5.4 | 103 | 4.7 | 118 | 5.0 | -15.1 | 14.6 |
| All other.......................... | 147 | 6.9 | 149 | 7.5 | 112 | 5.5 | 109 | 5.0 | 121 | 5.1 | -49.8 | 11.0 |
|  | 63 | 3.0 | 60 | 3.0 | 40 | 2.0 | 37 | 1.7 | 41 | 1.7 | -64.0 | - |
| Drugs.......................... | 2 | 0.1 | 8 | 0.4 | 3 | 0.1 | 4 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Other........................... | 82 | 3.8 | 81 | 4.1 | 69 | 3.4 | 68 | 3.1 | 75 | 3.2 | -38.5 | 10.3 |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab.
${ }^{2}$ Club, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Hands, feet, etc.
${ }^{4}$ Any instrument used to hang or strangle.

Table 22
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Type of Weapon Used

| Type of weapon used | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown............ | 2,392 | 1,938 | 454 | 417 | 1,066 | 734 | 166 | 9 |
| Unknown.............................. | 28 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Total known.......................... | 2,364 | 1,924 | 440 | 408 | 1,059 | 724 | 165 | 8 |
| Firearm. | 1,735 | 1,505 | 230 | 209 | 808 | 612 | 102 | 4 |
| Handgun......................... | 1,555 | 1,360 | 195 | 174 | 735 | 553 | 91 | 2 |
| All other firearms.............. | 180 | 145 | 35 | 35 | 73 | 59 | 11 | 2 |
| Rifle............................ | 80 | 63 | 17 | 14 | 30 | 34 | 2 | 0 |
| Shotgun........................ | 60 | 49 | 11 | 15 | 25 | 16 | 4 | 0 |
| Other firearm................ | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 38 | 31 | 7 | 4 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 2 |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 629 | 419 | 210 | 199 | 251 | 112 | 63 | 4 |
|  | 274 | 196 | 78 | 67 | 128 | 52 | 27 | 0 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{3}$.................... | 116 | 82 | 34 | 41 | 47 | 16 | 11 | 1 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{4} . . . . . . . . . .$. | 118 | 80 | 38 | 49 | 38 | 25 | 6 | 0 |
| All other.......................... | 121 | 61 | 60 | 42 | 38 | 19 | 19 | 3 |
| Rope ${ }^{5} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 41 | 18 | 23 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Drugs.......................... | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other............................ | 75 | 40 | 35 | 23 | 26 | 14 | 9 | 3 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Firearm.............................. | 73.4 | 78.2 | 52.3 | 51.2 | 76.3 | 84.5 | 61.8 | - |
| Handgun......................... | 65.8 | 70.7 | 44.3 | 42.6 | 69.4 | 76.4 | 55.2 | - |
| All other firearms.............. | 7.6 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 6.9 | 8.1 | 6.7 | - |
| Rifle............................ | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 1.2 | - |
| Shotgun........................ | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | - |
| Other firearm................ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 3.0 | - |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 26.6 | 21.8 | 47.7 | 48.8 | 23.7 | 15.5 | 38.2 | - |
| Knife ${ }^{2}$.......... | 11.6 | 10.2 | 17.7 | 16.4 | 12.1 | 7.2 | 16.4 | - |
| Blunt object ${ }^{3}$................... | 4.9 | 4.3 | 7.7 | 10.0 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 6.7 | - |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{4} . . . . . . . . .$. | 5.0 | 4.2 | 8.6 | 12.0 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | - |
| All other......................... | 5.1 | 3.2 | 13.6 | 10.3 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 11.5 | - |
| Rope ${ }^{5} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 1.7 | 0.9 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 6.1 | - |
| Drugs.......................... | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |
| Other............................ | 3.2 | 2.1 | 8.0 | 5.6 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 5.5 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.
${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{2}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab.
${ }^{3}$ Club, etc.
${ }^{4}$ Hands, feet, etc.
${ }^{5}$ Any instrument used to hang or strangle.

Table 23
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Type of Weapon Used

| Type <br> of weapon used | Total | Under 18 | 18-29 | 30-39 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown............ | 2,392 | 247 | 1,098 | 449 | 579 | 19 |
| Unknown....... | 28 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 3 |
| Total known.......................... | 2,364 | 242 | 1,090 | 445 | 571 | 16 |
| Firearm.............................. | 1,735 | 158 | 945 | 322 | 302 | 8 |
| Handgun.......................... | 1,555 | 133 | 868 | 287 | 263 | 4 |
| All other firearms.............. | 180 | 25 | 77 | 35 | 39 | 4 |
| Rifle........................... | 80 | 12 | 38 | 14 | 16 | 0 |
| Shotgun....................... | 60 | 10 | 22 | 14 | 14 | 0 |
| Other firearm................ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 38 | 3 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 4 |
| Nonfirearm......................... | 629 | 84 | 145 | 123 | 269 | 8 |
|  | 274 | 13 | 92 | 61 | 105 | 3 |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2}$.................. | 116 | 10 | 17 | 23 | 63 | 3 |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3} \ldots \ldots . . . .$. | 118 | 34 | 16 | 17 | 51 | 0 |
| All other.......................... | 121 | 27 | 20 | 22 | 50 | 2 |
|  | 41 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 21 | 1 |
| Drugs.......................... | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Other............................ | 75 | 23 | 10 | 15 | 26 | 1 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known.......................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Firearm.............................. | 73.4 | 65.3 | 86.7 | 72.4 | 52.9 | - |
| Handgun......................... | 65.8 | 55.0 | 79.6 | 64.5 | 46.1 | - |
| All other firearms.............. | 7.6 | 10.3 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 6.8 | - |
| Rifle............................ | 3.4 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.8 | - |
| Shotgun....................... | 2.5 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 2.5 | - |
| Other firearm................ | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | - |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.2 | - |
| Nonfirearm........................ | 26.6 | 34.7 | 13.3 | 27.6 | 47.1 | - |
| Knife ${ }^{1}$........................... | 11.6 | 5.4 | 8.4 | 13.7 | 18.4 | - |
| Blunt object ${ }^{2}$.................. | 4.9 | 4.1 | 1.6 | 5.2 | 11.0 | - |
| Personal weapon ${ }^{3} \ldots \ldots \ldots .$. | 5.0 | 14.0 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 8.9 | - |
| All other......................... | 5.1 | 11.2 | 1.8 | 4.9 | 8.8 | - |
| Rope ${ }^{4} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 3.7 | - |
| Drugs.......................... | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | - |
| Other............................ | 3.2 | 9.5 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 4.6 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding. Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab.
${ }^{2}$ Club, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Hands, feet, etc.
${ }^{4}$ Any instrument used to hang or strangle.

Table 24
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 1993-2002
By Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | 1993 |  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total including unknown. $\qquad$ Unknown $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,095 \\ 643 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,699 \\ 527 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,530 \\ 595 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,910 \\ 389 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,579 \\ 424 \end{array}$ |  |
| Total known..................... | 3,452 | 100.0 | 3,172 | 100.0 | 2,935 | 100.0 | 2,521 | 100.0 | 2,155 | 100.0 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary. | 515 | 14.9 | 409 | 12.9 | 385 | 13.1 | 320 | 12.7 | 240 | 11.1 |
| Rape........................ | 21 | 0.6 | 19 | 0.6 | 14 | 0.5 | 11 | 0.4 | 12 | 0.6 |
| Robbery..................... | 476 | 13.8 | 366 | 11.5 | 342 | 11.7 | 294 | 11.7 | 219 | 10.2 |
| Burglary.................... | 18 | 0.5 | 24 | 0.8 | 29 | 1.0 | 15 | 0.6 | 9 | 0.4 |
| Argument...................... | 1,532 | 44.4 | 1,374 | 43.3 | 1,207 | 41.1 | 1,070 | 42.4 | 928 | 43.1 |
| Domestic violence ${ }^{1} . .$. | 329 | 9.5 | 224 | 7.1 | 179 | 6.1 | 130 | 5.2 | 128 | 5.9 |
| All other argument...... | 1,203 | 34.8 | 1,150 | 36.3 | 1,028 | 35.0 | 940 | 37.3 | 800 | 37.1 |
| Gang-, drug-related....... | 1,113 | 32.2 | 1,137 | 35.8 | 1,059 | 36.1 | 784 | 31.1 | 704 | 32.7 |
| Gang-related............... | 840 | 24.3 | 880 | 27.7 | 867 | 29.5 | 620 | 24.6 | 544 | 25.2 |
| Drug-related............... | 273 | 7.9 | 257 | 8.1 | 192 | 6.5 | 164 | 6.5 | 160 | 7.4 |
| All other........................ | 292 | 8.5 | 252 | 7.9 | 284 | 9.7 | 347 | 13.8 | 283 | 13.1 |


| Contributing circumstance (cont.) | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | 2001 |  | 2002 |  | Percent change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1993- \\ & 2002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2001- \\ 2002 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total including unknown...... | 2,170 |  | 2,006 |  | 2,074 |  | 2,201 |  | 2,392 |  |  |  |
| Unknown........................ | 336 |  | 304 |  | 314 |  | 317 |  | 370 |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 1,834 | 100.0 | 1,702 | 100.0 | 1,760 | 100.0 | 1,884 | 100.0 | 2,022 | 100.0 | -41.4 | 7.3 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary. | 206 | 11.2 | 157 | 9.2 | 206 | 11.7 | 149 | 7.9 | 179 | 8.9 | -65.2 | 20.1 |
| Rape......................... | 9 | 0.5 | 16 | 0.9 | 8 | 0.5 | 12 | 0.6 | 8 | 0.4 | - | - |
| Robbery..................... | 183 | 10.0 | 127 | 7.5 | 186 | 10.6 | 133 | 7.1 | 163 | 8.1 | -65.8 | 22.6 |
| Burglary.................... | 14 | 0.8 | 14 | 0.8 | 12 | 0.7 | 4 | 0.2 | 8 | 0.4 | - | - |
| Argument................. | 857 | 46.7 | 710 | 41.7 | 726 | 41.3 | 793 | 42.1 | 779 | 38.5 | -49.2 | -1.8 |
| Domestic violence ${ }^{1}$.... | 120 | 6.5 | 128 | 7.5 | 147 | 8.4 | 176 | 9.3 | 181 | 9.0 | -45.0 | 2.8 |
| All other argument...... | 737 | 40.2 | 582 | 34.2 | 579 | 32.9 | 617 | 32.7 | 598 | 29.6 | -50.3 | -3.1 |
| Gang-, drug-related....... | 512 | 27.9 | 487 | 28.6 | 581 | 33.0 | 726 | 38.5 | 816 | 40.4 | -26.7 | 12.4 |
| Gang-related............... | 404 | 22.0 | 402 | 23.6 | 506 | 28.8 | 647 | 34.3 | 730 | 36.1 | -13.1 | 12.8 |
| Drug-related... | 108 | 5.9 | 85 | 5.0 | 75 | 4.3 | 79 | 4.2 | 86 | 4.3 | -68.5 | 8.9 |
| All other.. | 259 | 14.1 | 348 | 20.4 | 247 | 14.0 | 216 | 11.5 | 248 | 12.3 | -15.1 | 14.8 |

[^9]Dash indicates that a percent change is not calculated when the base number is less than 50
Data reflect 1) homicides submitted to the CJSC from law enforcement agencies as domestic violence-related, and 2) homicides interpreted by the CJSC as domestic violence-related based on available information, including victim/offender relationship. Recent examination of homicide data indicate that ambiguity in the interpretation of what constitutes a domestic violence-related incident may have resulted in an undercount in this category. Further examination of these data by the CJSC will determine if an undercount has occurred and the extent to which it has occurred.

Table 25
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Gender and Race/Ethnic Group of Victim by Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male ${ }^{1}$ | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Unknown |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown...... | 2,392 | 1,938 | 454 | 417 | 1,066 | 734 | 166 | 9 |
| Unknown.......................... | 370 | 308 | 62 | 54 | 153 | 140 | 18 | 5 |
| Total known..................... | 2,022 | 1,630 | 392 | 363 | 913 | 594 | 148 | 4 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary.. | 179 | 146 | 33 | 49 | 71 | 33 | 26 | 0 |
| Rape.......................... | 8 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Robbery, burglary........ | 171 | 145 | 26 | 46 | 67 | 32 | 26 | 0 |
| Robbery................... | 163 | 140 | 23 | 43 | 64 | 32 | 24 | 0 |
| Burglary................... | 8 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Argument...................... | 779 | 558 | 221 | 205 | 296 | 214 | 64 | 0 |
| Domestic violence ${ }^{2} . . .$. | 181 | 37 | 144 | 58 | 56 | 39 | 28 | 0 |
| All other argument....... | 598 | 521 | 77 | 147 | 240 | 175 | 36 | 0 |
| Gang-, drug-related........ | 816 | 772 | 44 | 39 | 454 | 287 | 35 | 1 |
| Gang-related............... | 730 | 696 | 34 | 23 | 418 | 256 | 32 | 1 |
| Drug-related................ | 86 | 76 | 10 | 16 | 36 | 31 | 3 | 0 |
| All other......................... | 248 | 154 | 94 | 70 | 92 | 60 | 23 | 3 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary.. | 8.9 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 13.5 | 7.8 | 5.6 | 17.6 | - |
| Rape.......................... | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - |
| Robbery, burglary........ | 8.5 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 12.7 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 17.6 | - |
| Robbery................... | 8.1 | 8.6 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 7.0 | 5.4 | 16.2 | - |
| Burglary................... | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | - |
| Argument...................... | 38.5 | 34.2 | 56.4 | 56.5 | 32.4 | 36.0 | 43.2 | - |
| Domestic violence ${ }^{2} \ldots \ldots$. | 9.0 | 2.3 | 36.7 | 16.0 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 18.9 | - |
| All other argument....... | 29.6 | 32.0 | 19.6 | 40.5 | 26.3 | 29.5 | 24.3 | - |
| Gang-, drug-related........ | 40.4 | 47.4 | 11.2 | 10.7 | 49.7 | 48.3 | 23.6 | - |
| Gang-related............... | 36.1 | 42.7 | 8.7 | 6.3 | 45.8 | 43.1 | 21.6 | - |
| Drug-related................ | 4.3 | 4.7 | 2.6 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 5.2 | 2.0 | - |
| All other......................... | 12.3 | 9.4 | 24.0 | 19.3 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 15.5 | - |

[^10]${ }^{1}$ The "male" category includes one homicide victim whose gender could not be determined.
${ }^{2}$ Data reflect 1) homicides submitted to the CJSC from law enforcement agencies as domestic violence-related, and (2) homicides interpreted by the CJSC as domestic violence-related based on available information, including victim/offender relationship.
Recent examination of homicide data indicate that ambiguity in the interpretation of what constitutes a domestic violence-related incident may have resulted in an undercount in this category. Further examination of these data by the CJSC will determine if an undercount has occurred and the extent to which it has occurred.

Table 26
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Age of Victim by Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Total | Under 5 | 5-17 | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | $70$ and over | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown...... | 2,392 | 64 | 183 | 1,098 | 449 | 315 | 141 | 49 | 74 | 19 |
| Unknown......................... | 370 | 2 | 9 | 177 | 88 | 48 | 28 | 3 | 5 | 10 |
| Total known..................... | 2,022 | 62 | 174 | 921 | 361 | 267 | 113 | 46 | 69 | 9 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary.. | 179 | 0 | 6 | 41 | 45 | 38 | 33 | 6 | 9 | 1 |
| Rape......................... | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Robbery..................... | 163 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 42 | 34 | 31 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| Burglary..................... | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Argument...................... | 779 | 6 | 35 | 297 | 171 | 154 | 60 | 25 | 28 | 3 |
| Domestic violence ${ }^{1} . . .$. | 181 | 5 | 11 | 51 | 46 | 44 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| All other argument....... | 598 | 1 | 24 | 246 | 125 | 110 | 48 | 19 | 22 | 3 |
| Gang-, drug-related........ | 816 | 3 | 108 | 534 | 112 | 43 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Gang-related............... | 730 | 3 | 104 | 496 | 87 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Drug-related............... | 86 | 0 | 4 | 38 | 25 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Child abuse................... | 58 | 48 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All other......................... | 190 | 5 | 15 | 49 | 33 | 32 | 11 | 12 | 31 | 2 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rape, robbery, burglary.. | 8.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 12.5 | 14.2 | 29.2 | - | 13.0 | - |
| Rape......................... | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | - | 1.4 | - |
| Robbery...................... | 8.1 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 11.6 | 12.7 | 27.4 | - | 10.1 | - |
| Burglary..................... | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | - | 1.4 | - |
| Argument...................... | 38.5 | 9.7 | 20.1 | 32.2 | 47.4 | 57.7 | 53.1 | - | 40.6 | - |
| Domestic violence ${ }^{1} . . .$. | 9.0 | 8.1 | 6.3 | 5.5 | 12.7 | 16.5 | 10.6 | - | 8.7 | - |
| All other argument....... | 29.6 | 1.6 | 13.8 | 26.7 | 34.6 | 41.2 | 42.5 | - | 31.9 | - |
| Gang-, drug-related........ | 40.4 | 4.8 | 62.1 | 58.0 | 31.0 | 16.1 | 8.0 | - | 1.4 | - |
| Gang-related.............. | 36.1 | 4.8 | 59.8 | 53.9 | 24.1 | 10.9 | 7.1 | - | 0.0 | - |
| Drug-related............... | 4.3 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.1 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 0.9 | - | 1.4 | - |
| Child abuse................... | 2.9 | 77.4 | 5.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All other......................... | 9.4 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 5.3 | 9.1 | 12.0 | 9.7 | - | 44.9 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding
Dash indicates that data are not applicable or that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
${ }^{1}$ Data reflect 1) homicides submitted to the CJSC from law enforcement agencies as domestic violence-related, and 2) homicides interpreted by the CJSC as domestic violence-related based on available information, including victim/offender relationship. Recent examination of homicide data indicate that ambiguity in the interpretation of what constitutes a domestic violence-related incident may have resulted in an undercount in this category. Further examination of these data by the CJSC will determine if an undercount has occurred and the extent to which it has occurred.

Table 27
HOMICIDE CRIMES, 2002
Contributing Circumstance by Relationship of Victim to Offender

| Relationship of victim to offender | Total | Rape | Robbery, burglary | Argument ${ }^{1}$ | Gang-, drugrelated | Child abuse | All other | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total including unknown........ | 2,392 | 8 | 171 | 779 | 816 | 58 | 190 | 370 |
| Unknown.......................... | 969 | 2 | 54 | 110 | 392 | 8 | 62 | 341 |
| Total known..................... | 1,423 | 6 | 117 | 669 | 424 | 50 | 128 | 29 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{2} \ldots$. | 663 | 2 | 31 | 332 | 232 | 8 | 55 | 3 |
|  | 97 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4}$................ | 107 | 0 | 1 | 41 | 0 | 40 | 25 | 0 |
| All other relatives........... | 42 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| Stranger........................ | 514 | 3 | 84 | 177 | 191 | 0 | 33 | 26 |
| Percent based on total known |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total known..................... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Friend, acquaintance ${ }^{2} . .$. | 46.6 | - | 26.5 | 49.6 | 54.7 | 16.0 | 43.0 | - |
| Spouse ${ }^{3} . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~$ | 6.8 | - | 0.0 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 | - |
| Parent, child ${ }^{4} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . . .$. | 7.5 | - | 0.9 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 19.5 | - |
| All other relatives............ | 3.0 | - | 0.9 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 6.3 | - |
| Stranger........................ | 36.1 | - | 71.8 | 26.5 | 45.0 | 0.0 | 25.8 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .
Includes domestic violence
${ }^{2}$ Includes ex-husband, ex-wife, employer, employee, gang member, etc.
${ }^{3}$ Includes "common-law" marriage partner.
${ }^{4}$ Includes stepmother, stepfather, stepdaughter, and stepson.

Table 28
HOMICIDE CRIMES CLEARED, 1993-2002
Number Reported, Number Cleared, and Clearance Rate

| Year(s) | Number of homicides reported | Number of homicides cleared | Clearance rate ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002............... | 2,392 | 1,362 | 56.9 |
| 2001............... | 2,201 | 1,091 | 49.6 |
| 2000............... | 2,074 | 1,082 | 52.2 |
| 1999............... | 2,006 | 1,200 | 59.8 |
| 1998............... | 2,170 | 1,369 | 63.1 |
| 1997............... | 2,579 | 1,489 | 57.7 |
| 1996............... | 2,910 | 1,743 | 59.9 |
| 1995............... | 3,530 | 1,916 | 54.3 |
| 1994............... | 3,699 | 2,091 | 56.5 |
| 1993. | 4,095 | 2,274 | 55.5 |

${ }^{1}$ A clearance rate is the percentage of crimes (homicides) reported that have been cleared. It is calculated by dividing the number of homicides cleared by the number of homicides reported. The result is multiplied by 100. Please see "Appendix II - Criminal Justice Glossary" for a detailed explanation of clearances.

## ARRESTS DATA TABLES (29-34)

Felony arrests for selected violent offenses, 1993-2002, number, rate per 100,000 population at risk, and percent change

Homicide arrests
Gender of arrestee, 1993-2002
Race/ethnic group of arrestee, 1993-2002
Age of arrestee, 1993-2002
Race/ethnic group of arrestee by gender and age of arrestee, 2002
Race/ethnic group of arrestee by gender and age of arrestee, 2002 (additional age breakdowns)

Table 29
FELONY ARRESTS FOR
SELECTED VIOLENT OFFENSES, 1993-2002

| Year(s) | Total | Homicide | Forcible rape | Robbery | Assault |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002. | 130,295 | 1,864 | 2,549 | 16,957 | 108,925 |
| 2001................. | 134,398 | 1,754 | 2,730 | 17,167 | 112,747 |
| 2000................. | 130,259 | 1,627 | 2,702 | 17,122 | 108,808 |
| 1999................. | 134,319 | 1,770 | 2,887 | 18,753 | 110,909 |
| 1998................. | 142,498 | 2,117 | 3,032 | 21,507 | 115,842 |
| 1997................. | 153,279 | 2,212 | 3,108 | 23,824 | 124,135 |
| 1996. | 149,795 | 2,535 | 3,202 | 26,014 | 118,044 |
| $1995{ }^{\text {a }}$. | 155,053 | 2,821 | 3,199 | 27,641 | 121,392 |
| 1994................. | 151,906 | 2,963 | 3,305 | 27,984 | 117,654 |
| 1993. | 147,603 | 3,276 | 3,572 | 29,567 | 111,188 |
| Percent change in number |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 to 2002....... | -3.1 | 6.3 | -6.6 | -1.2 | -3.4 |
| 2000 to 2001....... | 3.2 | 7.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 3.6 |
| 1999 to 2000....... | -3.0 | -8.1 | -6.4 | -8.7 | -1.9 |
| 1998 to 1999....... | -5.7 | -16.4 | -4.8 | -12.8 | -4.3 |
| 1997 to 1998....... | -7.0 | -4.3 | -2.4 | -9.7 | -6.7 |
| 1996 to 1997.. | 2.3 | -12.7 | -2.9 | -8.4 | 5.2 |
| 1995 to 1996....... | -3.4 | -10.1 | 0.1 | -5.9 | -2.8 |
| 1994 to 1995....... | 2.1 | -4.8 | -3.2 | -1.2 | 3.2 |
| 1993 to 1994....... | 2.9 | -9.6 | -7.5 | -5.4 | 5.8 |
| 1993 to 2002. | -11.7 | -43.1 | -28.6 | -42.6 | -2.0 |
| Rate per 100,000 population at risk ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002................. | 477.2 | 6.8 | 9.3 | 62.1 | 399.0 |
| 2001................. | 502.5 | 6.6 | 10.2 | 64.2 | 421.6 |
| 2000................. | 497.1 | 6.2 | 10.3 | 65.3 | 415.2 |
| 1999................. | 522.4 | 6.9 | 11.2 | 72.9 | 431.4 |
| 1998.................. | 564.1 | 8.4 | 12.0 | 85.1 | 458.5 |
| 1997.................. | 595.0 | 8.6 | 12.1 | 92.5 | 481.9 |
| 1996................. | 586.2 | 9.9 | 12.5 | 101.8 | 461.9 |
| 1995................. | 617.2 | 11.2 | 12.7 | 110.0 | 483.2 |
| 1994................. | 614.9 | 12.0 | 13.4 | 113.3 | 476.3 |
| 1993. | 606.6 | 13.5 | 14.7 | 121.5 | 456.9 |
| Percent change in rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 to 2002....... | -5.0 | 3.0 | -8.8 | -3.3 | -5.4 |
| 2000 to 2001....... | 1.1 | 6.5 | -1.0 | -1.7 | 1.5 |
| 1999 to 2000....... | -4.8 | -10.1 | -8.0 | -10.4 | -3.8 |
| 1998 to 1999....... | -7.4 | -17.9 | -6.7 | -14.3 | -5.9 |
| 1997 to 1998.. | -5.2 | -2.3 | -0.8 | -8.0 | -4.9 |
| 1996 to 1997....... | 1.5 | -13.1 | -3.2 | -9.1 | 4.3 |
| 1995 to 1996....... | -5.0 | -11.6 | -1.6 | -7.5 | -4.4 |
| 1994 to 1995....... | 0.4 | -6.7 | -5.2 | -2.9 | 1.4 |
| 1993 to 1994....... | 1.4 | -11.1 | -8.8 | -6.7 | 4.2 |
| 1993 to 2002. | -21.3 | -49.6 | -36.7 | -48.9 | -12.7 |

Notes: Rates may not add to total because of rounding.
Rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the
Oakland Police Department.
${ }^{1}$ Rates are based on the total population at risk (10-69 years of age).

Table 30
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 1993-2002
By Gender of Arrestee

| Year(s) | Total |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2002. | 1,864 | 100.0 | 1,655 | 88.8 | 209 | 11.2 |
| 2001.. | 1,754 | 100.0 | 1,537 | 87.6 | 217 | 12.4 |
| 2000............ | 1,627 | 100.0 | 1,426 | 87.6 | 201 | 12.4 |
| 1999... | 1,770 | 100.0 | 1,579 | 89.2 | 191 | 10.8 |
| 1998............ | 2,117 | 100.0 | 1,870 | 88.3 | 247 | 11.7 |
| 1997............ | 2,212 | 100.0 | 1,990 | 90.0 | 222 | 10.0 |
| 1996............ | 2,535 | 100.0 | 2,286 | 90.2 | 249 | 9.8 |
| $1995{ }^{\text {a }}$. | 2,821 | 100.0 | 2,564 | 90.9 | 257 | 9.1 |
| 1994........... | 2,963 | 100.0 | 2,709 | 91.4 | 254 | 8.6 |
| 1993............ | 3,276 | 100.0 | 2,975 | 90.8 | 301 | 9.2 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the Oakland Police Department.

Table 31
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 1993-2002
By Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee

| Year(s) | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2002. | 1,864 | 100.0 | 349 | 18.7 | 897 | 48.1 | 455 | 24.4 | 163 | 8.7 |
| 2001............. | 1,754 | 100.0 | 400 | 22.8 | 832 | 47.4 | 406 | 23.1 | 116 | 6.6 |
| 2000.. | 1,627 | 100.0 | 374 | 23.0 | 698 | 42.9 | 397 | 24.4 | 158 | 9.7 |
| 1999............. | 1,770 | 100.0 | 382 | 21.6 | 845 | 47.7 | 417 | 23.6 | 126 | 7.1 |
| 1998... | 2,117 | 100.0 | 484 | 22.9 | 987 | 46.6 | 470 | 22.2 | 176 | 8.3 |
| 1997. | 2,212 | 100.0 | 447 | 20.2 | 1,017 | 46.0 | 586 | 26.5 | 162 | 7.3 |
| 1996............. | 2,535 | 100.0 | 537 | 21.2 | 1,110 | 43.8 | 663 | 26.2 | 225 | 8.9 |
| 1995 ${ }^{\text {a }}$.......... | 2,821 | 100.0 | 580 | 20.6 | 1,284 | 45.5 | 743 | 26.3 | 214 | 7.6 |
| 1994............ | 2,963 | 100.0 | 675 | 22.8 | 1,175 | 39.7 | 850 | 28.7 | 263 | 8.9 |
| 1993............. | 3,276 | 100.0 | 698 | 21.3 | 1,299 | 39.7 | 998 | 30.5 | 281 | 8.6 |

[^11]Table 32
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 1993-2002
By Age of Arrestee

| Year(s) | Total |  | Under 18 |  | 18-29 |  | 30-39 |  | 40 and over |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2002............ | 1,864 | 100.0 | 215 | 11.5 | 1,097 | 58.9 | 293 | 15.7 | 259 | 13.9 |
| 2001............. | 1,754 | 100.0 | 194 | 11.1 | 1,011 | 57.6 | 291 | 16.6 | 258 | 14.7 |
| 2000............ | 1,627 | 100.0 | 160 | 9.8 | 913 | 56.1 | 299 | 18.4 | 255 | 15.7 |
| 1999............. | 1,770 | 100.0 | 182 | 10.3 | 1,037 | 58.6 | 317 | 17.9 | 234 | 13.2 |
| 1998............ | 2,117 | 100.0 | 308 | 14.5 | 1,244 | 58.8 | 302 | 14.3 | 263 | 12.4 |
| 1997............. | 2,212 | 100.0 | 353 | 16.0 | 1,267 | 57.3 | 326 | 14.7 | 266 | 12.0 |
| 1996............ | 2,535 | 100.0 | 389 | 15.3 | 1,430 | 56.4 | 427 | 16.8 | 289 | 11.4 |
| $1995{ }^{\text {a }} \ldots . . . . . . .$. | 2,821 | 100.0 | 521 | 18.5 | 1,570 | 55.7 | 462 | 16.4 | 268 | 9.5 |
| 1994............. | 2,963 | 100.0 | 542 | 18.3 | 1,625 | 54.8 | 483 | 16.3 | 313 | 10.6 |
| 1993............. | 3,276 | 100.0 | 618 | 18.9 | 1,804 | 55.1 | 525 | 16.0 | 329 | 10.0 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the Oakland Police Department.

Table 33
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Gender and Age of Arrestee

| Gender and age of arrestee | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total................... | 1,864 | 100.0 | 349 | 100.0 | 897 | 100.0 | 455 | 100.0 | 163 | 100.0 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male................ | 1,655 | 88.8 | 283 | 81.1 | 827 | 92.2 | 393 | 86.4 | 152 | 93.3 |
| Female............. | 209 | 11.2 | 66 | 18.9 | 70 | 7.8 | 62 | 13.6 | 11 | 6.7 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18.......... | 215 | 11.5 | 16 | 4.6 | 136 | 15.2 | 47 | 10.3 | 16 | 9.8 |
| 18-29............... | 1,097 | 58.9 | 149 | 42.7 | 585 | 65.2 | 271 | 59.6 | 92 | 56.4 |
| 30-39.............. | 293 | 15.7 | 67 | 19.2 | 116 | 12.9 | 81 | 17.8 | 29 | 17.8 |
| 40 and over....... | 259 | 13.9 | 117 | 33.5 | 60 | 6.7 | 56 | 12.3 | 26 | 16.0 |

Table 34
HOMICIDE ARRESTS, 2002
Race/Ethnic Group of Arrestee by Gender and Age of Arrestee

| Gender and age of arrestee | Total |  | White |  | Hispanic |  | Black |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total.................. | 1,864 | 100.0 | 349 | 100.0 | 897 | 100.0 | 455 | 100.0 | 163 | 100.0 |
| Under 18......... | 215 | 11.5 | 16 | 4.6 | 136 | 15.2 | 47 | 10.3 | 16 | 9.8 |
| 18-19............... | 296 | 15.9 | 29 | 8.3 | 156 | 17.4 | 78 | 17.1 | 33 | 20.2 |
| 20-24.............. | 494 | 26.5 | 68 | 19.5 | 271 | 30.2 | 118 | 25.9 | 37 | 22.7 |
| 25-29.............. | 307 | 16.5 | 52 | 14.9 | 158 | 17.6 | 75 | 16.5 | 22 | 13.5 |
| 30-34.............. | 154 | 8.3 | 29 | 8.3 | 64 | 7.1 | 43 | 9.5 | 18 | 11.0 |
| 35-39............... | 139 | 7.5 | 38 | 10.9 | 52 | 5.8 | 38 | 8.4 | 11 | 6.7 |
| 40-44............... | 88 | 4.7 | 29 | 8.3 | 24 | 2.7 | 28 | 6.2 | 7 | 4.3 |
| 45-49..... | 77 | 4.1 | 37 | 10.6 | 15 | 1.7 | 16 | 3.5 | 9 | 5.5 |
| 50-54............... | 37 | 2.0 | 15 | 4.3 | 9 | 1.0 | 8 | 1.8 | 5 | 3.1 |
| 55 and over...... | 57 | 3.1 | 36 | 10.3 | 12 | 1.3 | 4 | 0.9 | 5 | 3.1 |
| Male................ | 1,655 | 100.0 | 283 | 100.0 | 827 | 100.0 | 393 | 100.0 | 152 | 100.0 |
| Under 18....... | 197 | 11.9 | 10 | 3.5 | 130 | 15.7 | 42 | 10.7 | 15 | 9.9 |
| 18-19............ | 277 | 16.7 | 26 | 9.2 | 152 | 18.4 | 68 | 17.3 | 31 | 20.4 |
| 20-24............ | 456 | 27.6 | 59 | 20.8 | 254 | 30.7 | 107 | 27.2 | 36 | 23.7 |
| 25-29............ | 271 | 16.4 | 43 | 15.2 | 140 | 16.9 | 68 | 17.3 | 20 | 13.2 |
| 30-34............ | 129 | 7.8 | 21 | 7.4 | 58 | 7.0 | 33 | 8.4 | 17 | 11.2 |
| 35-39............ | 115 | 6.9 | 31 | 11.0 | 42 | 5.1 | 32 | 8.1 | 10 | 6.6 |
| 40-44............ | 67 | 4.0 | 21 | 7.4 | 21 | 2.5 | 19 | 4.8 | 6 | 3.9 |
| 45-49............ | 65 | 3.9 | 32 | 11.3 | 12 | 1.5 | 14 | 3.6 | 7 | 4.6 |
| 50-54........... | 33 | 2.0 | 14 | 4.9 | 6 | 0.7 | 8 | 2.0 | 5 | 3.3 |
| 55 and over... | 45 | 2.7 | 26 | 9.2 | 12 | 1.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 5 | 3.3 |
| Female............ | 209 | 100.0 | 66 | 100.0 | 70 | 100.0 | 62 | 100.0 | 11 | 100.0 |
| Under 18........ | 18 | 8.6 | 6 | 9.1 | 6 | 8.6 | 5 | 8.1 | 1 | - |
| 18-19............ | 19 | 9.1 | 3 | 4.5 | 4 | 5.7 | 10 | 16.1 | 2 | - |
| 20-24............ | 38 | 18.2 | 9 | 13.6 | 17 | 24.3 | 11 | 17.7 | 1 | - |
| 25-29............ | 36 | 17.2 | 9 | 13.6 | 18 | 25.7 | 7 | 11.3 | 2 | - |
| 30-34............ | 25 | 12.0 | 8 | 12.1 | 6 | 8.6 | 10 | 16.1 | 1 | - |
| 35-39............ | 24 | 11.5 | 7 | 10.6 | 10 | 14.3 | 6 | 9.7 | 1 | - |
| 40-44............ | 21 | 10.0 | 8 | 12.1 | 3 | 4.3 | 9 | 14.5 | 1 | - |
| 45-49............ | 12 | 5.7 | 5 | 7.6 | 3 | 4.3 | 2 | 3.2 | 2 | - |
| 50-54............ | 4 | 1.9 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 4.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - |
| 55 and over... | 12 | 5.7 | 10 | 15.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.2 | 0 | - |

Notes: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

DEATH PENALTY SENTENCES DATA TABLES (35-36)
Persons under California sentence of death, 1978-2002
Sentencing county by gender, race/ethnic group, and age of persons sentenced to death, 2002

PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY DATA TABLES (37-38)
Homicide crimes and peace officers killed in the line of duty, 1993-2002, number and rate per 100,000 respective population
Contributing circumstance, 2002

Table 35
PERSONS UNDER CALIFORNIA SENTENCE OF DEATH, 1978-2002

| Year(s) | Initial sentences | $(+)$ Resentences | (-) <br> Removals ${ }^{1}$ | $(=)$ <br> Persons under sentence of death ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002............... | 17 | 2 | 11 | 618 |
| 2001.............. | 25 | 1 | 5 | 610 |
| 2000............... | 33 | 3 | 5 | 589 |
| 1999............... | 42 | 0 | 2 | 558 |
| 1998............... | 32 | 2 | 9 | 518 |
| 1997.............. | 40 | 0 | 8 | 493 |
| 1996.............. | 40 | 1 | 6 | 461 |
| 1995............... | 38 | 0 | 3 | 426 |
| 1994............... | 21 | 1 | 5 | 391 |
| 1993.............. | 34 | 0 | 5 | 374 |
| 1992 ${ }^{\text {a }}$............ | 40 | 6 | 5 | 345 |
| $1991{ }^{\text {b }}$............ | 26 | 3 | 2 | 305 |
| 1990.............. | 33 | 3 | 4 | 279 |
| $1989^{\text {c }}$............. | 33 | 4 | 11 | 247 |
| $1988{ }^{\text {d }}$............. | 34 | 3 | 15 | 223 |
| $1987^{\text {e }}$............. | 25 | 4 | 6 | 203 |
| 1986.............. | 21 | 5 | 6 | 179 |
| 1985.............. | 16 | 2 | 20 | 159 |
| 1984.............. | 27 | 2 | 11 | 161 |
| 1983 ${ }^{\text {f............. }}$ | 35 | 2 | 5 | 143 |
| 1982............... | 39 | 0 | 6 | 113 |
| 1981.............. | 39 | 1 | 2 | 80 |
| 1980............... | 23 | 1 | 7 | 42 |
| 1979.............. | 20 | 0 | 2 | 25 |
| 1978............... | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Source: California Appellate Project.
${ }^{1}$ Persons no longer under sentence of death because of execution, death by other causes, removal pending retrial, resentenced to a penalty less than death, or freed.
${ }^{2}$ Total persons under sentence of death on December 31 of each year. Persons with multiple California death sentences are counted once.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ In 1992, one person already under sentence of death received an additional death sentence. Forty initial sentences were imposed with 39 new persons being sentenced.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ In 1991, one person already under sentence of death received an additional death sentence.
Twenty-six initial sentences were imposed with 25 new persons being sentenced.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ In 1989, two persons already under sentence of death received additional death sentences. Thirty-three initial sentences were imposed with 31 new persons being sentenced.
${ }^{d}$ In 1988, two persons already under sentence of death received additional death sentences. Thirty-four initial sentences were imposed with 32 new persons being sentenced.
${ }^{e}$ In 1987, although six death sentences were reversed, only five persons were no longer under sentence of death. The sixth person had an additional death sentence from another county.
${ }^{\dagger}$ In 1983, two persons already under sentence of death received additional death sentences. Thirty-five initial sentences were imposed with 33 new persons being sentenced.

Table 36
PERSONS SENTENCED TO DEATH, 2002
Sentencing County by Gender, Race/Ethnic Group, and Age

| Sentencing county | Total | Gender |  | Race/ethnic group |  |  |  | Age at arrest |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | White | Hispanic | Black | Other | Under 20 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40 and over |
| Total.................... | 17 | 15 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Alameda............ | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Contra Costa..... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles....... | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Orange.............. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside........... | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Sacramento....... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Santa Clara....... | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Shasta.............. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tulare.............. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura............ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Note: This table does not include persons resentenced to death after their death sentence was reversed on appeal.

Table 37
HOMICIDE CRIMES AND PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 1993-2002
Number and Rate per 100,000 Respective Population

| Year(s) | California population | Homicides |  | Sworn law enforcement personnel ${ }^{2}$ | Peace officers killed in the line of duty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number ${ }^{1}$ | Rate |  | Number | Rate |
| 2002............. | 35,301,000 | 2,392 | 6.8 | 75,612 | 4 | 5.3 |
| 2001............. | 34,758,000 | 2,201 | 6.3 | 72,119 | 6 | 8.3 |
| 2000............. | 34,480,000 | 2,074 | 6.0 | 69,029 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 1999............. | 34,036,000 | 2,006 | 5.9 | 69,363 | 4 | 5.8 |
| 1998............. | 33,494,000 | 2,170 | 6.5 | 67,035 | 7 | 10.4 |
| 1997............. | 32,957,000 | 2,579 | 7.8 | 65,416 | 7 | 10.7 |
| 1996............. | 32,383,000 | 2,910 | 9.0 | 64,008 | 5 | 7.8 |
| 1995............. | 32,063,000 | 3,530 | 11.0 | 62,150 | 10 | 16.1 |
| 1994............. | 32,140,000 | 3,699 | 11.5 | 59,340 | 9 | 15.2 |
| 1993............. | 31,742,000 | 4,095 | 12.9 | 58,861 | 8 | 13.6 |

Note: Homicide rates are based on annual population estimates provided by the Demographic Research
Unit, California Department of Finance.
${ }^{1}$ Includes peace officers feloniously killed in the line of duty.
${ }^{2}$ Personnel in the Department of Justice and other state regulatory agencies are not included.

## Table 38

PEACE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, 2002
By Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total........................................................ | 4 | 100.0 |
| Ambush. | 1 | - |
| Attempted arrest of gunman................... | 1 | - |
| Investigation (stolen vehicle)................... | 1 | - |
| Routine traffic stop................................ | 1 | - |

Note: Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50 .

## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES DATA TABLES (39-42)

Gender, race/ethnic group, and age of deceased, 2002
Location of justifiable homicide, 2002
Contributing circumstance, 2002
Type of weapon used, 2002

## POPULATION DATA TABLE (43)

Population estimates, 1952-2002

Table 39

## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS

OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Gender, Race/Ethnic Group, and Age of Deceased

| Gender, race/ethnic group, and age of deceased | Total |  | Peace officer justifiable |  | Citizen justifiable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total................... | 136 | 100.0 | 101 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male............... | 128 | 94.1 | 97 | 96.0 | 31 | 88.6 |
| Female............ | 8 | 5.9 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 11.4 |
| Race/ethnic group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White............... | 39 | 28.7 | 31 | 30.7 | 8 | 22.9 |
| Hispanic.......... | 54 | 39.7 | 41 | 40.6 | 13 | 37.1 |
| Black............... | 30 | 22.1 | 17 | 16.8 | 13 | 37.1 |
| Other............... | 12 | 8.8 | 11 | 10.9 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Unknown.......... | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18.......... | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 18-19............... | 5 | 3.7 | 5 | 5.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 20-24.............. | 25 | 18.4 | 17 | 16.8 | 8 | 22.9 |
| 25-29.............. | 32 | 23.5 | 24 | 23.8 | 8 | 22.9 |
| 30-34............... | 18 | 13.2 | 16 | 15.8 | 2 | 5.7 |
| 35-39.............. | 23 | 16.9 | 18 | 17.8 | 5 | 14.3 |
| 40-44............... | 14 | 10.3 | 7 | 6.9 | 7 | 20.0 |
| 45-49............... | 10 | 7.4 | 9 | 8.9 | 1 | 2.9 |
| 50-54............... | 3 | 2.2 | 1 | 1.0 | 2 | 5.7 |
| 55 and over...... | 4 | 2.9 | 2 | 2.0 | 2 | 5.7 |
| Unknown.......... | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 40
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Location of Justifiable Homicide

| Location of justifiable homicide | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |
| Total...................................... | 136 |  |
| Peace officer justifiable |  |  |
| Total.................................. | 101 | 100.0 |
| Felon's residence.............. | 10 | 9.9 |
| Other residence................. | 2 | 2.0 |
| Street, sidewalk................ | 70 | 69.3 |
| Commercial establishment.. | 5 | 5.0 |
| Hotel, motel.................... | 2 | 2.0 |
| Bar............................... | 1 | 1.0 |
| Other business................ | 2 | 2.0 |
| All other............................ | 14 | 13.9 |
| Parking lot...................... | 4 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle.......................... | 6 | 5.9 |
| Field, park...................... | 4 | 4.0 |
| Other.............................. | 0 | 0.0 |
| Citizen justifiable |  |  |
| Total.................................. | 35 | 100.0 |
| Citizen's, shared residence.. | 7 | 20.0 |
| Citizen's residence.......... | 6 | 17.1 |
| Shared residence............. | 1 | 2.9 |
| Other residence................ | 6 | 17.1 |
| Felon's residence............ | 3 | 8.6 |
| Other residence.............. | 3 | 8.6 |
| Street, sidewalk.................. | 7 | 20.0 |
| Commercial establishment.. | 10 | 28.6 |
| Hotel, motel.................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Bar................................ | 3 | 8.6 |
| Other business................ | 7 | 20.0 |
| All other........................... | 5 | 14.3 |
| Parking lot...................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Vehicle.......................... | 3 | 8.6 |
| Field, park...................... | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other.. | 2 | 5.7 |

Note: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 41

## JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS

OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Contributing Circumstance

| Contributing circumstance | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |
| Total.. | 136 |  |
| Peace officer justifiable |  |  |
| Total................................................... | 101 | 100.0 |
| Felon attacked peace officer................. | 77 | 76.2 |
| Felon killed during commission of crime.. | 17 | 16.8 |
| Felon resisted arrest.... | 1 | 1.0 |
| All other.. | 6 | 5.9 |
| Felon attacked another peace officer... | 1 | 1.0 |
| Felon attacked citizen.. | 0 | 0.0 |
| Felon attempted flight...................... | 3 | 3.0 |
| Unknown. | 2 | 2.0 |
| Citizen justifiable |  |  |
| Total.................................................... | 35 | 100.0 |
| Felon attacked citizen.......................... | 14 | 40.0 |
| Felon killed during commission of crime.. | 19 | 54.3 |
| Unknown........................................ | 2 | 5.7 |

Note: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.

Table 42
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES BY PEACE OFFICERS
OR PRIVATE CITIZENS, 2002
By Type of Weapon Used

| Type of weapon used | Total |  | Peace officer justifiable |  | Citizen justifiable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total........................... | 136 | 100.0 | 101 | 100.0 | 35 | 100.0 |
| Firearm.......................... | 130 | 95.6 | 100 | 99.0 | 30 | 85.7 |
| Handgun...................... | 121 | 89.0 | 95 | 94.1 | 26 | 74.3 |
| Rifle............................ | 4 | 2.9 | 3 | 3.0 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Shotgun....................... | 4 | 2.9 | 1 | 1.0 | 3 | 8.6 |
| Firearm - unknown type.. | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 4 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 11.4 |
| Other............................ | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unknown........................ | 1 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.9 |

[^12]Table 43
POPULATION ESTIMATES, 1952-2002

| Year(s) | Total | Population at risk |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | population | Total $^{1}$ |  | Adult $^{2}$ |

[^13]
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## COMPUTATIONAL FORMULAS


#### Abstract

ARREST RATE - An arrest rate describes the number of arrests made by law enforcement agencies per 100,000 total population or per 100,000 population considered to be at risk for arrest. Regardless of the population used, both rates are calculated in the same manner. An arrest rate is calculated by dividing the number of reported arrests by the respective population; the result is multiplied by 100,000. For example, in 2002 there were 1,864 homicide arrests. The total population was $35,301,000$ and the total population at risk (10-69 years of age) was 27,302,433.


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1,864}{35,301,000}=0.000052803 \times 100,000=5.3 \text { per } 100,000 \text { population } \\
& \frac{1,864}{27,302,433}=0.000068272 \times 100,000=6.8 \text { per } 100,000 \text { population at risk }
\end{aligned}
$$

CLEARANCE RATE - A clearance rate is the percentage of crimes reported that have been cleared. A clearance rate is calculated by dividing the number of crimes cleared by the number of crimes reported; the result is multiplied by 100 . For example, in 2002 there were 1,362 homicides cleared and 2,392 homicides reported. This equals a homicide clearance rate of 56.9 percent.

$$
\frac{1,362}{2,392}=0.569397993 \times 100=56.9 \text { percent }
$$

CRIME RATE - A crime rate describes the number of crimes reported to law enforcement agencies per 100,000 total population. A crime rate is calculated by dividing the number of reported crimes by the total population; the result is multiplied by 100,000. For example, in 2002 there were 2,392 homicides in California and the population was $35,301,000$. This equals a homicide crime rate of 6.8 per 100,000 general population.

$$
\frac{2,392}{35,301,000}=0.00006776 \times 100,000=6.8 \text { per 100,000 population }
$$

PERCENT CHANGE - A percent change describes a change in number or rate from one year to another. A percent change is calculated by subtracting base-year data from current-year data; the result is divided by base-year data and multiplied by 100. For example, in 2002 the homicide crime rate was 6.8. In 1993 the homicide crime rate was 12.9. The percent change in rate from 1993 to 2002 is a 47.3 percent decrease.

$$
\frac{6.8-12.9}{12.9}=-0.4728682 \times 100=-47.3 \text { percent }
$$

POPULATION AT RISK - Arrest section data tables include three comparison populations: total (10-69 years of age), adult (18-69 years of age), and juvenile (10-17 years of age).

When a series of rates are calculated using different populations, the rate calculated for the total will not be equal to the sum of the rates calculated for each subtotal. For example, the total arrest rate (calculated using the total at-risk population) will not equal the sum of the adult arrest rate (calculated using the adult at-risk population) and the juvenile arrest rate (calculated using the juvenile at-risk population).

Note: Calculating rates for counties of less than 100,000 will generate an inflated rate when compared to counties with populations of 100,000 or more; therefore, rates are not calculated for counties with populations of less than 100,000.

ACQUITTAL: a judgment of a court, based either on the verdict of a jury or a judicial officer, that the defendant is not guilty of the offense(s) for which he/she was tried.

ADULT: a person 18 years of age or older.
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT: an unlawful attack or attempted attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm (UCR definition).

APPEAL: a petition initiated by a defendant for a rehearing in an appellate court regarding a previous sentence or motion.

ARREST: ". . . taking a person into custody, in a case and in the manner authorized by law. An arrest may be made by a peace officer or by a private person" (834 PC).

ARREST RATE: the number of arrests per 100,000 population. See "Computational Formulas" preceding this glossary for further explanation.

## CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

(CYA): the state agency which has jurisdiction over and maintains institutions as correctional schools for the reception of wards of the juvenile court and other persons committed from trial courts.

CLEARANCE: an offense is "cleared by arrest" or solved, for crime reporting purposes, when at least one person is arrested, charged with the commission of an offense, and turned over to a court for prosecution. Although no physical arrest is made, a clearance by arrest can be claimed when an offender is a person under 18 years of age and is cited to appear in juvenile court or before other juvenile authorities. An offense can also be "cleared exceptionally" for crime reporting purposes when an investigation has definitely established the identity of an offender; there is enough information to support an arrest; and the exact location of an offender is known but, for some reason, law enforcement cannot take the offender into custody.

CLEARANCE RATE: the percentage of crimes reported that have been cleared.

COMBINED CASES: cases rejected by the prosecutor in favor of other counts/cases.

COMPLAINT: a verified written accusation, filed by a prosecuting attorney with a local criminal court, which charges one or more persons with the commission of one or more offenses.

CONVICTION: a judgment, based either on the verdict of a jury or a judicial officer or on the guilty plea of the defendant, that the defendant is guilty.

COURT: an agency of the judicial branch of government, authorized or established by statute or constitution, having one or more judicial officers on its staff. A court has the authority to decide upon controversies in law and disputed matters of fact brought before it. Because of court consolidation we no longer distinguish between lower court and superior court.

CRIME: ". . . an act committed or omitted in violation of a law forbidding or commanding it. . ." (15 PC).

CRIME RATE: the number of reported crimes per 100,000 general population. See "Computational Formulas" preceding this glossary for further explanation.

CYA: see "California Department of the Youth Authority."
DISMISSAL: a decision by a judicial officer to terminate a case without a determination of guilt or innocence.

DISPOSITION - COURT: an action taken as the result of an appearance in court by a defendant. Examples are: adults - dismissed, acquitted, or convicted; juveniles dismissed, transferred, or remanded to adult court.

DISPOSITION -LAW ENFORCEMENT: an action taken as the result of an arrest. Examples of police dispositions are: adults - released by law enforcement, referred to another jurisdiction, or a misdemeanor or felony complaint sought; juveniles - handled within the department, referred to another agency, or referred to the probation department or juvenile court.

DISPOSITION - PROSECUTOR: an action taken as the result of a complaint requested by an arresting agency. Dispositions include granting a misdemeanor or a felony complaint or denying a complaint for reasons such as lack of sufficient evidence or complainant refuses to testify.

DIVERSION: a disposition of a criminal defendant either before adjudication or following adjudication, but prior to sentencing, in which the court directs the defendant to participate in a work, educational, or rehabilitative program.

DIVERSION DISMISSED: the successful completion of a diversion program.

EXCEPTIONAL MEANS: an offense can also be "cleared exceptionally" for crime reporting purposes when an investigation has definitely established the identity of an offender; there is enough information to support an arrest; and the exact location of an offender is known but, for some reason, law enforcement cannot take the offender into custody.

FELON: one who has committed a felony.
FELONY: a crime which is punishable by death or by imprisonment in a state prison (17 \& 18 PC).

FILING: a document filed with the court clerk or county clerk by a prosecuting attorney alleging that a person committed or attempted to commit a crime.

FORCIBLE RAPE: the carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will. Assaults or attempts to commit rape by force or threat of force are included (UCR definition).

HOMICIDE: the willful (nonnegligent) killing of one human being by another. Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter are included (UCR definition).

JAIL: a county or city facility for incarceration of sentenced and unsentenced persons.

JUVENILE: a person under the age of 18.
MISDEMEANOR: a crime punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for up to one year.

## MONTHLY ARREST AND CITATION REGISTER (MACR):

a reporting system used to collect information on adult and juvenile arrests and citations by police and sheriffs' departments. This register contains data on arrest offenses, arrestee characteristics (age, gender, and race/ethnic group), and law enforcement dispositions.

OFFENDER-BASED TRANSACTION STATISTICS (OBTS): a system designed to collect statistical information on the various processes within the criminal justice system that occur between the point of the felony arrest of an adult and the point of final disposition.

OFFENSE: the charged offense is the crime for which the defendant was arrested or filed on by the district attorney. The convicted offense is the offense the defendant was convicted of or pled guilty to in court.

PC (PENAL CODE): the California Penal Code contains statutes that define criminal offenses and specify corresponding punishments. Criminal justice system mandates and procedures are also included.

POPULATION AT RISK: that portion of the total population who, because of like characteristics to the specific study group, are considered "at risk." For example, if one were studying juvenile arrestees, all persons between 10 and 17 years of age would constitute the at-risk population.

PRISON: a state correctional facility where persons are confined following conviction for a felony offense.

PROBATION: a judicial requirement that a person fulfill certain conditions of behavior in lieu of a sentence to confinement. See "Straight Probation."

PROBATION WITH JAIL: a type of disposition given upon conviction which imposes a jail term as a condition of probation.

RATE: a comparison of a number of events to a population.

REMAND: to send back (a case) to another court for further action.

ROBBERY: the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by creating fear in the victim (UCR definition).

SENTENCE: the penalty imposed by a court upon a convicted person.

STRAIGHT PROBATION: probation granted to adults without condition or stipulation that the defendant serve time in jail as a condition of probation.

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING (UCR): a federal reporting system which compiles crime data based on information submitted by law enforcement agencies throughout the nation. In California, the Department of Justice administers and forwards these law enforcement data to the federal program.

VIOLENT CRIMES: crimes committed against people. This category includes homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

YOUTH AUTHORITY: see "California Department of the Youth Authority."

## Links to:

Preface Crimes Arrests Death Penalties
Peace Officers Killed Justifiable Homicides
Data Tables Appendix


[^0]:    * $\boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*} \boldsymbol{*}$

    Homicide crimes account for approximately 1 percent of violent crimes each year. And, of the four offenses classified as violent by the FBI, homicide maintained the lowest rate per 100,000 population for the years shown.

[^1]:    Source: Table 17.

[^2]:    Source: Table 19

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ The following penal codes for homicide arrest offenses were valid at the time of the closeout of the 2002 arrest offense code file: 128, 187(a), 189, 192(a), 192(b), 193(a), 193(b), 273ab, 399, and 12310(a).

[^4]:    Source: Table 33.

[^5]:    Source: Table 33.

[^6]:    Source: Table 39.

[^7]:    Source: Table 39.

[^8]:    Note: Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.

[^9]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding

[^10]:    Notes: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
    Dash indicates that percent distributions are not calculated when the base number is less than 50.

[^11]:    Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 because of rounding.
    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes estimated annual data for the Bakersfield Police Department and the Oakland Police Department.

[^12]:    Note: Percentages may not add to subtotals or 100.0 because of rounding.
    ${ }^{1}$ Any instrument used to cut or stab.

[^13]:    Source: Population estimates were provided by the Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance.
    Note: Population data by age are not available prior to 1960.
    ${ }^{1}$ Total population at risk, 10-69 years of age.
    ${ }^{2}$ Adult population at risk, $18-69$ years of age.
    ${ }^{3}$ Juvenile population at risk, 10-17 years of age.

