

*Original Paper*

# Difficulties in the Enforcement of Personal Safety Protection Orders and Research on the Path of Multi-Party Coordinated Resolution

Siyu Bao

Chengdu University of Technology, Chengdu Sichuan 610059, China

Received: March 3, 2026

Accepted: April 2, 2026

Online Published: April 7, 2026

doi:10.22158/sss.v7n2p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sss.v7n2p1>

## **Abstract**

*As the core system established by the Anti-Domestic Violence Law, personal safety protection orders are a key legal tool for preventing and curbing domestic violence and safeguarding the personal safety of victims. With the advancement of judicial practice, while the number of issued orders has steadily increased, problems such as empty execution, poor coordination, weak punishment, and lack of supervision have become increasingly prominent. A large number of protection orders have become "paper orders," failing to achieve the original legislative intent. Based on the current situation of judicial practice, this paper sorts out the practical difficulties in the enforcement of personal safety protection orders in terms of enforcement subjects, assistance mechanisms, punitive measures, and social support, analyzes the in-depth causes such as system design, inter-departmental coordination, resource guarantee, and public awareness. Based on the concept of multi-governance, it proposes resolution paths from five dimensions: clarifying enforcement responsibilities, improving coordination mechanisms, strengthening punitive deterrence, improving supervision systems, and optimizing social support. It aims to promote the transformation of personal safety protection orders from "ruling issuance" to "effective implementation," effectively build a judicial barrier against domestic violence, and maintain family harmony and social stability.*

## **Keywords**

*Personal Safety Protection Orders, Enforcement Difficulties, Domestic Violence, Multi-Party Coordination, Domestic Violence Governance*

## **1. Introduction**

Domestic violence is a persistent problem that infringes on citizens' personal rights, undermines family

ethics and social order, and has long plagued social governance practices. In 2016, the Anti-Domestic Violence Law of the People's Republic of China was officially implemented, establishing the personal safety protection order system in the form of special legislation. This system broke the traditional perception that "domestic violence is a family matter" and provided a clear basis for public power to intervene in the private field of families and protect victims in a timely manner. Data from the Supreme People's Court shows that in recent years, the number of applications for and issuance of personal safety protection orders by courts across the country has been increasing year by year. The scope of application of the system has gradually expanded to new forms of domestic violence such as mental violence and economic control, covering various vulnerable groups including women, minors, the elderly, and the disabled.

However, compared with the progress in the issuance link, the shortcomings in the enforcement link have become more prominent. In practice, problems such as insufficient court enforcement forces, vague boundaries of public security assistance, perfunctory participation of grass-roots organizations, and low violation costs are widespread. Some respondents ignore the ruling and continue to commit violence, leaving victims with no way to seek help, which greatly reduces the deterrence and effectiveness of protection orders. The root cause lies in the fact that the current system only makes principled provisions on enforcement procedures, departmental responsibilities, coordination models, and supervision and accountability, lacking operable detailed rules, and failing to form a governance pattern in which judicial organs, administrative departments, social organizations, and grass-roots forces work together.

At present, the work of combating domestic violence has been included in the important content of building a safe China. Improving the enforcement mechanism of personal safety protection orders is the core link to enhance the efficiency of domestic violence governance. Combining judicial precedents and practical investigations, this paper systematically analyzes the multiple difficulties in enforcement, explores the underlying institutional and practical causes, and constructs a multi-party resolution path with clear powers and responsibilities, efficient coordination, and strong guarantees. It aims to provide theoretical reference and practical ideas for solving enforcement difficulties and giving full play to the function of the protection order system.

## **2. Legislative Norms and Practical Status of the Enforcement of Personal Safety Protection Orders**

### *2.1 Sorting out Core Legislative Norms*

The rules for the enforcement of personal safety protection orders in China are mainly scattered in the Anti-Domestic Violence Law, the Civil Procedure Law, and relevant judicial interpretations of the Supreme People's Court. Article 32 of the Anti-Domestic Violence Law clearly stipulates that people's courts are the enforcement subjects, and public security organs, villagers' committees, and residents' committees are the assisting enforcement subjects; Article 34 sets out the legal liability for violating

protection orders, stipulating that those who constitute a crime shall be held criminally responsible, and those who do not constitute a crime shall be admonished, fined, or detained. Relevant opinions of the Supreme People's Court further refine the application procedures, protection measures, and requirements for assisting enforcement to promote the implementation of the system (Hou, Y., 2025). From the perspective of the normative system, the current legislation has established an enforcement framework of "court-led and multi-party assistance," clarifying the basic powers and responsibilities and the bottom line of punishment. However, it lacks supporting rules such as detailed enforcement procedures, operational norms for assistance, supervision and accountability mechanisms, and inter-departmental coordination processes, leading to inconsistent enforcement standards and low coordination efficiency in practice.

## *2.2 Current Status of Judicial Practice Operation*

### *2.2.1 Steady Growth in the Number of Issuances, but Low Enforcement Rate*

Courts in various regions have continuously smoothed the application channels and simplified the application procedures, leading to a year-by-year increase in the number of personal safety protection orders issued. The application scenarios have expanded from traditional physical violence to mental intimidation, stalking and harassment, economic control, and other fields. However, most cases only complete the document delivery and notification procedures, and the actual enforcement of behavioral injunctions such as eviction from residences, prohibition of contact, and stay away from specific places is not in place, leaving victims still facing the threat of violence (Li, H., 2025).

### *2.2.2 Single Enforcement Method and Lack of Dynamic Supervision*

Court enforcement mainly relies on written notification and post-event punishment, lacking real-time supervision and dynamic intervention means. Domestic violence is characterized by concealment and suddenness, making it difficult for enforcement subjects to follow up 24 hours a day. Violations of injunctions by respondents are difficult to detect and stop in a timely manner, and post-event accountability is lagging.

### *2.2.3 Perfunctory Assisted Enforcement and Insufficient Coordination Efficiency*

Assisting subjects such as public security organs, villagers' committees, residents' committees, and women's federations lack clear operational guidelines, resulting in unclear boundaries of responsibilities, delayed responses, and mutual shirking. Some grass-roots organizations have no special personnel in charge or funding guarantee, and assisted enforcement only stays at the level of registration and filing, failing to form a joint force (Zhu, K., Liu, B., & Hu, Z., 2021).

### *2.2.4 Weak Punitive Deterrence and Low Violation Costs*

In practice, most violations of protection orders are punished by admonition and small fines, with a low proportion of detention and even fewer criminal prosecutions, which is difficult to form an effective deterrent. Some respondents repeatedly violate the rules, and the coercive power of protection orders cannot be reflected.

### **3. Practical Difficulties in the Enforcement of Personal Safety Protection Orders**

#### *3.1 Vague Powers and Responsibilities of Enforcement Subjects and Insufficient Supply of Judicial Resources*

##### 3.1.1 Unclear Positioning of Court Enforcement Functions

The law only stipulates that people's courts are the enforcement subjects, but does not clarify the specific internal undertaking departments. The division of responsibilities between family courts and executive bureaus is unclear, leading to the problem of "separation of trial and enforcement." Courts are facing the prominent contradiction of more cases and fewer personnel, lacking special anti-domestic violence enforcement teams and supporting resources, making it difficult to deal with a large number of behavioral enforcement cases (Covalciuc, A. S., 2019).

##### 3.1.2 Behavioral Enforcement Is Much More Difficult Than Property Enforcement

Most protection orders are prohibitive or affirmative behavioral rulings, such as eviction from residences, prohibition of contact, and stay away from specific areas. Such behaviors are characterized by continuity and personal nature, and cannot be realized through traditional enforcement methods such as seizure and detention. Courts lack professional enforcement methods and personnel, resulting in greatly reduced enforcement effects.

#### *3.2 Empty Assisted Enforcement Mechanism and Prominent Inter-Departmental Coordination Barriers*

##### 3.2.1 Lack of Detailed Rules for the Responsibilities of Assisting Subjects

The Anti-Domestic Violence Law does not stipulate the specific assistance procedures, response time limits, and performance standards for assisting subjects such as public security organs, villagers' committees, residents' committees, and women's federations, leading to unregulated assisted enforcement in practice. Public security organs have unclear procedures for responding to police calls, collecting evidence, and handling violations of protection orders, and grass-roots organizations fail to fully implement their daily inspection and reporting obligations (Wang Shuyu, 2023).

##### 3.2.2 Difficulties in Breaking Inter-Departmental Information Barriers

Courts, public security organs, civil affairs departments, health departments, women's federations, and other departments have not established a shared information platform, resulting in poor transmission of information such as protection order delivery, reporting of violation clues, and victim assistance, making it difficult to achieve rapid response and closed-loop management. Some departments refuse to share information for fear of privacy leakage, leading to low efficiency of coordinated governance.

##### 3.2.3 Lack of Guarantee for Grass-Roots Assisted Enforcement

Grass-roots forces such as villagers' committees and community grid workers have no special funds or professional training, and lack the ability to handle domestic violence disputes. Some grass-roots staff are concerned about human relationships and are unwilling to take the initiative to intervene in family conflicts, resulting in low enthusiasm for assisted enforcement (Wang Dan, 2022).

### *3.3 Weak Rigidity of Punitive Measures and Difficulties in Manifesting Deterrent Effect*

#### 3.3.1 Light Application of Administrative Penalties

For violations of protection orders, judicial practice mainly relies on admonition, with a low proportion of fines and detention. The upper limit of fines is relatively low, making it difficult to effectively restrict respondents. Some regions have a tendency of "valuing education over punishment," which weakens judicial authority.

#### 3.3.2 Unsmooth Connection of Criminal Accountability

Serious violations of protection orders may constitute crimes such as abuse and intentional injury. However, in practice, victims face difficulties in providing evidence, public security organs have strict filing standards, and procuratorial supervision is not timely, leading to an extremely low application rate of criminal accountability, which is difficult to play the deterrent role of criminal punishment.

#### 3.3.3 Lack of Joint Credit Punishment Mechanism

Violations of personal safety protection orders have not been included in the list of persons subject to enforcement for breach of trust or the social credit system. Respondents do not need to bear credit punishment consequences after violating the injunctions, resulting in an imbalance between illegal costs and potential benefits (Xiao Jianguo & Ding Jinyu, 2022).

### *3.4 Absence of Supervision and Accountability System and Lack of Guarantee for Enforcement Effect*

#### 3.4.1 Imperfect Internal Supervision Mechanism

Courts lack a special assessment and follow-up supervision mechanism for the enforcement of protection orders. There are no clear evaluation standards for enforcement progress and performance, leading to the tendency of "valuing issuance over enforcement."

#### 3.4.2 Unsmooth External Supervision Channels

Procuratorial supervision and social supervision lack institutionalized paths. The scope and methods of legal supervision by procuratorial organs over enforcement activities are unclear. Victims and social organizations cannot effectively supervise the enforcement process, and there is no effective remedy channel after discovering ineffective enforcement.

#### 3.4.3 Blank Dereliction of Duty Accountability Mechanism

There are no clear accountability clauses or procedures for dereliction of duty and shirking of responsibilities by enforcement subjects and assisting subjects, leading to passive performance of duties by some staff and failure to implement enforcement responsibilities.

### *3.5 Weak Social Support and Fragile Foundation for System Operation*

#### 3.5.1 Insufficient Protection for Victims

There is a lack of supporting services such as temporary shelters, psychological counseling, legal aid, and living assistance. Victims still face dual pressures of survival and safety during the enforcement of protection orders. Some victims give up applying for or supervising enforcement for fear of retaliation (Nongjiang, 2020).

### 3.5.2 Insufficient Public Awareness and Evidence Collection Capacity

Some members of the public have a low awareness of the personal safety protection order system and are unclear about the application procedures and enforcement effects. Affected by domestic violence, victims are physically and mentally fragile and lack the ability to fix evidence, making it difficult to prove that respondents have violated the injunctions, which affects enforcement and accountability.

### 3.5.3 Insufficient Participation of Professional Social Forces

Social forces such as social work organizations, psychological counseling institutions, and anti-domestic violence public welfare organizations have a low participation rate. A supporting system linking judicial, administrative, and social services has not been formed. Enforcement work relies only on public power organs, making it difficult to meet diverse needs.

## 4. Analysis of the Causes of Difficulties in the Enforcement of Personal Safety Protection Orders

### 4.1 Institutional Design Level: Overly Principled Rules and Lack of Operability

The current legislation only makes principled provisions on enforcement procedures, assistance mechanisms, supervision and accountability, and does not design targeted enforcement rules in combination with the concealment and suddenness of domestic violence. The particularity of behavioral enforcement has not been fully considered, and the traditional civil enforcement model is difficult to adapt to the needs of protection order enforcement, leading to lack of laws to follow in practice.

### 4.2 Subject Coordination Level: Unclear Division of Powers and Responsibilities and Lack of Linkage Consensus

Various departments have different understandings of the importance of anti-domestic violence work and have not established the concept of coordinated governance. The boundaries of responsibilities between enforcement subjects and assisting subjects are vague, and there is a lack of regular communication and coordination mechanisms, resulting in the phenomenon of "acting independently." Grass-roots organizations have limited resources and insufficient capabilities, making it difficult to assume the responsibility of assisted enforcement.

### 4.3 Resource Guarantee Level: Insufficient Manpower and Material Resources and Lack of Professional Capabilities

Courts, public security organs, and other departments have not equipped special anti-domestic violence enforcement forces, and staff lack professional training in domestic violence disposal and psychological intervention. Grass-roots assisted enforcement has no funds, venues, or equipment, and both hardware and software guarantees are not in place, affecting enforcement quality and efficiency.

### 4.4 Legal Concept Level: Traditional Cognitive Biases and Weak Awareness of Rights Protection

Some members of the public still hold the traditional concept that "domestic violence is a family matter" and have resistance to the intervention of public power in the family field. Respondents have weak legal awareness and ignore the authority of judicial rulings. Restricted by traditional concepts,

victims are worried about damage to their reputation and retaliation, and dare not take the initiative to protect their rights and supervise enforcement.

#### *4.5 Governance System Level: Single Governance Model and Failure to Form Multi-Party Co-Governance*

At present, the enforcement of protection orders is still led by judicial organs, and a governance pattern in which judicial, administrative, social, and grass-roots forces work together has not been constructed. The channels for social forces to participate are not smooth, and supporting mechanisms such as assistance, services, and supervision are not perfect, making it difficult to form a full-chain, closed-loop enforcement guarantee system.

### **5. Multi-Party Coordinated Resolution Paths for Difficulties in the Enforcement of Personal Safety Protection Orders**

#### *5.1 Clarify Enforcement Responsibilities and Optimize the Court-Led Enforcement Mechanism*

##### 5.1.1 Clarify the Internal Division of Enforcement Responsibilities in Courts

Establish a working model in which family courts take the lead in the enforcement of protection orders, set up special anti-domestic violence enforcement teams to achieve "connection between trial and enforcement." Incorporate the enforcement of protection orders into special assessments, establish enforcement ledgers and follow-up supervision systems, and eliminate the tendency of "valuing issuance over enforcement."

##### 5.1.2 Innovate Behavioral Enforcement Methods

For behavioral injunctions such as eviction from residences and prohibition of contact, adopt on-site compulsory enforcement, regular return visits and inspections, electronic positioning supervision, and other methods. For respondents who refuse to perform their obligations, promptly take compulsory measures such as fines and detention in accordance with the law to enhance enforcement rigidity (Liu Jie, 2016).

##### 5.1.3 Simplify the Enforcement Application Process

Open a green channel for the enforcement of protection orders. Victims do not need to pay fees when applying for compulsory enforcement, and the filing and review procedures are simplified. Promote online applications and online supervision to facilitate victims to protect their rights in a timely manner.

#### *5.2 Improve Coordination Mechanisms and Break Inter-Departmental Coordination Barriers*

##### 5.2.1 Refine the Performance Standards for Assisting Subjects

Issue detailed implementation rules for the assisted enforcement of personal safety protection orders, clarify the responsibilities of public security organs to respond quickly to police calls, collect evidence, and handle violations in a timely manner when receiving clues of violations of injunctions. Stipulate the daily inspection, regular return visit, and clue reporting obligations of villagerss' committees, residents' committees, and grid workers. Clarify the assistance and support responsibilities of women's federations, civil affairs departments, and other departments.

### 5.2.2 Establish an Inter-Departmental Linkage Platform

Taking the Politics and Law Commission as the lead, establish an anti-domestic violence linkage mechanism involving courts, public security organs, civil affairs departments, health departments, women's federations, disabled persons' federations, and other departments, and hold regular joint meetings. Build an encrypted information sharing platform to realize the interconnection of data such as protection order information, domestic violence clues, and assistance services, forming a rapid response closed loop.

### 5.2.3 Strengthen Grass-Roots Enforcement Support

Equip grass-roots organizations with special funds and necessary equipment for assisted enforcement, and carry out professional training on anti-domestic violence laws and regulations, disposal procedures, psychological counseling, and other aspects. Incorporate the situation of assisted enforcement into the assessment of grass-roots governance to improve the enthusiasm of grass-roots staff in performing their duties.

## 5.3 Strengthen Punitive Deterrence and Enhance the Rigid Constraints of the System

### 5.3.1 Increase the Intensity of Application of Administrative Penalties

For violations of protection orders, strictly apply compulsory measures such as fines and detention in accordance with the law to increase illegal costs. Eliminate the tendency of "replacing punishment with admonition" and highlight judicial authority.

### 5.3.2 Smooth the Connection Channel of Criminal Accountability

Establish a joint accountability mechanism involving courts, public security organs, and procuratorial organs. For those who violate protection orders and constitute crimes, promptly file cases, investigate, and prosecute in accordance with the law. Lower the threshold for victims to provide evidence, implement the inclination of evidence rules in domestic violence cases, and ensure the implementation of criminal accountability.

### 5.3.3 Incorporate into the Joint Credit Punishment System

Include respondents who refuse to perform personal safety protection orders into the list of persons subject to enforcement for breach of trust, and implement credit punishment such as restricting high consumption and industry access. Publicize typical cases through the media to form social deterrence.

## 5.4 Improve the Supervision System and Consolidate the Responsibilities of Enforcement Subjects

### 5.4.1 Strengthen Internal Supervision of Courts

Establish a special supervision mechanism for the enforcement of protection orders. The Case Management Office regularly inspects the progress and effect of enforcement, and urges the rectification of handling personnel who are ineffective in enforcement. Implement the enforcement disclosure system and take the initiative to inform victims of the progress of enforcement.

### 5.4.2 Strengthen Procuratorial Legal Supervision

Clarify the supervisory responsibility of procuratorial organs for the enforcement of protection orders. For acts such as dereliction of duty in enforcement, illegal enforcement, and dereliction of duty by

assisting subjects, issue procuratorial suggestions in accordance with the law. For those suspected of dereliction of duty crimes, investigate criminal responsibility in accordance with the law.

#### 5.4.3 Expand Social Supervision Channels

Protect the supervisory rights of victims, social organizations, and the media, and set up a hotline and online supervision platform. Expose typical cases of ineffective enforcement and poor coordination to force the implementation of responsibilities.

### 5.5 Consolidate the Social Foundation and Build a Full-Chain Support System

#### 5.5.1 Improve the Protection for Victims

Civil affairs departments set up temporary shelters to provide free accommodation and food for victims. Judicial administrative organs provide full-coverage legal aid. Health departments open a green channel for domestic violence victims to provide injury identification and psychological counseling services.

#### 5.5.2 Enhance Public Legal Awareness

Carry out anti-domestic violence publicity and education activities in communities, families, and campuses to popularize the personal safety protection order system. Through the publicity of typical cases, break the misunderstanding of "domestic violence is a family matter" and improve the awareness of victims' rights protection and evidence collection capacity.

#### 5.5.3 Guide the Participation of Social Forces

Cultivate professional anti-domestic violence social work organizations and public welfare institutions to provide social service support for enforcement work. Establish volunteer teams to assist in return visits, comfort, supervision, and other work, forming a coordinated governance pattern between public power and social forces.

## 6. Conclusion

Personal safety protection orders are the core system of the domestic violence governance system, and their enforcement effect is directly related to the vital interests of victims and social fairness and justice. The current difficulty in enforcement is the result of the interweaving of multiple factors such as system design, subject coordination, resource guarantee, legal concepts, and governance models. A single governance method is difficult to solve the problem, so it is necessary to build a systematic and closed-loop resolution path based on the concept of multi-party coordination.

By clarifying the enforcement responsibilities of courts, improving the inter-departmental coordination mechanism, strengthening the intensity of punitive deterrence, improving the supervision and accountability system, and consolidating social support, we can effectively solve the difficulties such as empty execution, poor coordination, and weak punishment, and promote the transformation of personal safety protection orders from "paper rulings" to "real shields." In the future, we should continue to deepen the reform of domestic violence governance, improve system details, integrate various resources, gather the joint efforts of justice, administration, society, and grass-roots levels, and continuously improve the enforcement efficiency of personal safety protection orders, providing a solid

legal guarantee for preventing and curbing domestic violence, safeguarding citizens' personal rights, and building a safe and harmonious society.

## References

- Covalciuc, A. S. (2019). PERSONAL SAFETY. PROTECTION OF THE VICTIMS OF CRIME. *Agora International Journal of Juridical Sciences*, 13(2), 25-32. <https://doi.org/10.15837/aijjs.v13i2.3797>
- Hou, Y. (2025). Challenges in Enforcing Personal Safety Protection Orders and Establishing Collaborative Governance Mechanisms. *Scientific Innovation in Asia*, 3(4).
- Li, H. (2025). Research on the Application of Personal Safety Protection Order System. *Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science*, 9(5). <https://doi.org/10.26855/jhass.2025.05.006>
- Liu Jie. (2016). Opposition to the Improvement of Legal Systems Against Domestic Violence: An Interpretation of the Personal Safety Protection Order System in the Anti-Domestic Violence Law of the People's Republic of China. *Legal System Review*, 2016(13), 16-17.
- Nongjiang. (2020). Exploration of the Dilemma in the Personal Safety Protection Order System. *Law and Society*, 2020(26), 5-6.
- Wang Dan. (2022). Analysis of Several Practical Issues in the Personal Safety Protection Order System. *Legal Application*, 2022(07), 11-21.
- Wang Shuyu. (2023). *Implementation Challenges and Countermeasures of Personal Safety Protection Orders*. Huazhong University of Science and Technology.
- Xiao Jianguo, & Ding Jinyu. (2022). Research on Evidence Issues in Personal Safety Protection Orders. *Legal Application*, 2022(07), 22-33.
- Zhu, K., Liu, B., & Hu, Z. (2021). Impact of the Implementation of the Anti-domestic Violence Law of the People's Republic of China on Domestic Violence Behavior by Married Couples in Urban Areas. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 4.0(12.0). <https://doi.org/10.25236/AJHSS.2021.041217>