

# A LEGAL CONTENT ANALYSIS THROUGH A HUMAN RIGHTS FRAMEWORK OF THE CONGRESSIONAL STEALTHING ACT

Monideepa B. Becerra, DrPH, MPH

[monideepa.becerra@rosalindfranklin.edu](mailto:monideepa.becerra@rosalindfranklin.edu)

**Abstract:** Legal protections related to stealthing, the non-consensual condom removal, remain uneven in the U.S. This study applies a legal content analysis to the congressional Stealthing Act, evaluating its provisions through the Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality human rights framework. The analysis reveals that the Act advances human rights protections by establishing a federal civil cause of action with clear definitions and broad remedies, enhancing availability of legal recourse nationwide. However, the Act lacks explicit provisions addressing accessibility barriers such as filing fee waivers, trauma-informed procedures, and equity measures, potentially limiting access for marginalized survivors. These findings highlight both the progress represented by the Act and areas requiring further legislative or policy development. By integrating a human rights framework into legal analysis, this study offers an innovative approach to assessing health legislation at the intersection of law, health, and human rights, providing guidance for future policymaking to strengthen survivor-centered justice. The findings further underscore the ethical importance of protecting bodily autonomy, informed consent, and equitable access to justice through federal legislation.

**Keywords:** Bodily autonomy; Public health ethics; Justice; Right to health; Sexual consent; Federal legislation; Health equity.

\*Address correspondence to: Monideepa B. Becerra, DrPH, MPH. Department of Population Health and Administration. Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science.  
Email: [monideepa.becerra@rosalindfranklin.edu](mailto:monideepa.becerra@rosalindfranklin.edu)

+To cite this article: Becerra, M. "A Legal Content Analysis Through a Human Rights Framework of the Congressional Stealthing Act". The Journal of Healthcare Ethics & Administration Vol. 12, no. 3 (Summer 2026): 68-80, <https://doi.org/10.22461/jhea.8.7166>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute of Clinical Bioethics (ICB) at Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA, U.S.A. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Healthcare Ethics & Administration by the editorial board and an authorized administrator of the JHEA. For more information, please contact [support@jheaonline.org](mailto:support@jheaonline.org)

## INTRODUCTION

Stealthing is usually defined as the non-consensual removal of a condom during sexual activity and is increasingly recognized as both a form of sexual violence and a violation of trust, a view reflected in legal scholarship as well as in public perception (Ahmad et al. 2020; Brodsky 2017; Shapiro 2021). Survivors face emotional and psychological harm as well as increased risks of unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections (Latimer et al. 2018; Worsley et al. 2017; Davis 2019; Davis et al. 2019). Despite these serious consequences, legal protections remain limited in the U.S. As of 2025, only four states, California, Washington, Maine, and Vermont, have successfully enacted statutes specifically addressing stealthing by creating a civil cause of action (Cal. Civ. Code § 1708.5 2021; 14 M.R.S. § 8305 2023; 1958 HBR APH 24 2024; 12 V.S.A. § 1043 2024). These laws also vary in definitions, remedies, and scope, illustrating a patchwork approach that leaves many survivors without clear legal recourse.

For example, while California's statute addresses the act of non-consensual condom removal and requires verbal consent to condom use (Cal. Civ. Code § 1708.5 2021), Maine's law goes further by covering both removal and tampering, extending liability to situations where a condom is interfered with even if it is not fully removed. Washington also prohibits non-consensual removal, tampering, or misrepresentation regarding the use of protective devices (1958 HBR APH 24 2024), and Vermont adopts the broadest scope by including removal as well as any concealment or deception about protective device use (12 V.S.A. § 1043 2024).

While these legislative advances mark important progress, the legal landscape remains uneven and fragmented, with protections still determined largely by geographic location. The *Stealthing Act of 2025*, introduced in April 2025 in the U.S. Congress (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025), seeks to address this disparity by creating a consistent nationwide civil remedy for survivors, closing jurisdictional gaps and promoting uniformity in definitions and protections. Given the Act's potential to reshape the legal response to stealthing, it is important to evaluate not only its existence but also its capacity to deliver equitable and effective protections.

As such, to assess such potential impact, this study applies the Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality (AAAQ) human rights framework. The AAAQ framework, originally developed by the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights to operationalize the right to health, has become a widely respected tool for evaluating health policies, systems, and service delivery. Each dimension of the AAAQ framework provides a structured lens for evaluating the Act's provisions. Availability addresses whether legal remedies exist in sufficient scope to meet survivors' needs. Accessibility considers whether these remedies are practically reachable, especially for marginalized groups facing social, economic, or systemic barriers. Acceptability ensures that legal protections respect cultural norms, personal dignity, and the diverse experiences of all individuals affected. Quality assesses the clarity, effectiveness, and trauma-informed nature of the law, ensuring that protections meet ethical and human rights standards (IFHHRO, n.d.; *Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Quality Framework*, n.d.; *Interpreting the International Right to Health in a Human Rights-Based Approach to Health – Health and Human Rights Journal*, n.d.).

Further, the AAAQ framework's emphasis on equitable, dignified, and effective rights protections makes it particularly well suited to analyze legislation at the nexus of health and human rights. In recent years, the framework has been applied to evaluate broader legal instruments and policies (Shrestha-Ranjit et al. 2020; Dubey et al. 2021); however, its application to specific legislative action remains limited. By applying the framework to the Act, this study offers an innovative and rigorous approach to evaluating how legal provisions align with human rights principles, public health imperatives, and survivor-centered justice. This adaptation also fills a methodological gap in legal analysis, illustrating the versatility of the AAAQ framework to inform legislative evaluation and human rights advocacy in emerging areas of sexual and reproductive health law.

Beyond its legal significance, stealthing also raises fundamental ethical questions regarding respect for bodily autonomy, informed consent, dignity, and justice. Although legal protections define rights and remedies,

ethical principles provide the moral and normative foundation for evaluating whether legislation adequately protects individuals from harm and promotes equitable treatment. Accordingly, the AAAQ framework serves not only as a human rights framework but also as an ethical lens through which the Act's provisions can be assessed.

## METHODS

This study employed a legal content analysis to systematically examine the *Stealth Act of 2025* (Act). Legal content analysis is a rigorous qualitative method used to interpret and evaluate legal texts by identifying themes, patterns, and implications within statutory provisions. It allows for a structured and replicable approach to assessing how legislation addresses specific policy and rights-based concerns.

The analytical process began with the selection of the Act as the primary document for analysis. The full text was carefully reviewed to capture all relevant sections pertaining to definitions, remedies, jurisdictional scope, procedural elements, and legislative findings. To provide a focused and principled evaluation, the AAAQ human rights framework was applied as the guiding conceptual tool.

Each section of the Act was systematically coded and analyzed according to the four dimensions of the AAAQ framework: availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality. The analysis was structured around key primary questions (Table 1) corresponding to each dimension. For example, assessing the extent to which the Act establishes clear legal remedies (availability), or whether those remedies are practically reachable by all survivors (accessibility). Complementing these were secondary questions that explored the broader scope and implication considerations of the law.

The coding process involved extracting and categorizing statutory language related to the existence and clarity of remedies, procedural and practical access, respect for dignity and diversity, and the ethical grounding and clarity of legal protections. These key provisions were then thematically analyzed to determine how the Act fulfills or falls short of the AAAQ framework's criteria.

Supporting quotations from the statutory text were incorporated to substantiate interpretations and provide concrete evidence of legislative intent and scope. This textual evidence anchored the analysis firmly in the law's language while allowing for critical interpretation within the broader human rights and public health context.

By situating the Act within legal and social frameworks and focusing on both primary and secondary questions, the analysis offers nuanced recommendations to strengthen legislative effectiveness, ensure equitable justice, and advance human rights protections through statutory reform. This approach further underscores the value of legal content analysis in informing policy development and human rights advocacy.

## RESULTS

### *Availability*

Availability, as defined in the AAAQ framework, requires that effective remedies and protections exist in sufficient quantity and scope for all individuals. The Act establishes a federal civil cause of action for “*non-consensual sexual protection barrier removal* (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025).” According to Section 3(a), “*any person may bring a civil action against any other person* (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025)” who, without consent, removes or attempts to remove a sexual protection barrier such as a condom, internal condom, or dental dam during sexual contact. The Act explicitly defines “*non-consensual sexual protection barrier removal* (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025)” in Section 3(d)(1) and clarifies qualifying “*sexual protection barriers* (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025)” in Section 3(d)(2). Survivors are entitled to remedies including compensatory and punitive damages, as well as injunctive, declaratory, and other relief (Section 3(c)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025). The Act also asserts federal jurisdiction based on several commerce-related factors enumerated in Section 3(b) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025).

## THE JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE ETHICS & ADMINISTRATION

Vol. 12 | No. 3 (Summer 2026)

These include conduct involving travel across state or national borders, use of mail or electronic communication, or the movement of sexual protection barriers through interstate commerce (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025):

*“The defendant knowingly traveled in interstate or foreign commerce, or entered or left Indian country or the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States”* (Section 3(b)(1));

*“The defendant knowingly used the mail or any interactive computer service or facility of interstate or foreign commerce”* (Section 3(b)(2)); and

*“Any sexual protection barrier or any other material involved in the conduct described ... crossed a State line or was transported or received in interstate or foreign commerce”* (Section 3(b)(3)).

These provisions establish federal jurisdiction over conduct involving Indian country and the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States. Furthermore, the statute applies to conduct occurring within U.S. territories and special maritime and territorial jurisdictions, invoking Congress’s authority under the Commerce Clause: *“... Indian country or the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States”* (Section 3(b)(1)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025); enabling broad application of the civil remedy beyond state boundaries.

In addition, Section 2 of the Act (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025) acknowledges the limited state-level protections, highlighting California as the first state to enact stealthing-specific civil remedies in 2021. The Act emphasizes that stealthing constitutes a form of sexual violence violating individual autonomy and exposing survivors to emotional, physical, and reproductive harm. The Act establishes a federal civil cause of action with defined scope and remedies.

### *Accessibility*

Accessibility, as defined in the AAAQ framework, requires that legal remedies be reachable by all individuals without undue barriers such as financial hardship, geographic constraints, or social stigma. The Act (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025) grants survivors the right to file a civil lawsuit in federal court for non-consensual removal of a sexual protection barrier (Section 3(a)) and to seek damages, including compensatory, punitive, injunctive, and declaratory relief (Section 3(c)). These provisions establish clear and meaningful avenues for survivors to pursue civil remedies.

Further, access to federal remedies is conditioned on jurisdictional requirements outlined in Section 3(b) (1) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025), which include factors such as defendants who *“traveled in interstate or foreign commerce”*; use of mail or electronic communication in furtherance of the conduct (Section 3(b)(3)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025); and the movement of sexual protection barriers through interstate commerce (Section 3(b)(2)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025). These criteria define the scope of federal jurisdiction and broaden the availability of federal remedies to a wide range of cases with interstate or commerce-related connections.

However, the Act does not explicitly address several sub-dimensions of accessibility. There are no provisions ensuring non-discrimination to guarantee equitable access regardless of race, gender, disability, or socioeconomic status. The Act also lacks measures to address physical accessibility barriers such as geographic or logistical challenges in reaching courts or legal services. Economic accessibility is unaddressed, with no mention of filing fee waivers, legal aid, or financial support to reduce economic burdens on survivors. Additionally, the Act does not mandate information accessibility strategies to inform survivors of their rights or available remedies. Finally, access to supportive services, such as counseling or trauma-informed legal assistance, is not incorporated within the Act’s provisions.

## *Acceptability*

Acceptability, as defined in the AAAQ framework, requires that legal protections be respectful of cultural norms, uphold personal dignity and autonomy, and be sensitive to the diverse experiences of all populations. The Act (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025) broadly defines “*sexual protection barrier*” to include “condoms, internal condoms, and dental dams” (Section 3(d)(2)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025), thereby recognizing multiple forms of protection used across diverse sexual activities and populations.

The Act (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025) explicitly frames stealthing as a violation of bodily autonomy and sexual consent. Its findings state: “*The non-consensual removal or attempted removal of a sexual protection barrier during sexual contact constitutes sexual violence that violates individual autonomy and exposes survivors to emotional, physical, and reproductive harm*” (Section 2).

The Act identifies non-consensual removal of a sexual protection barrier as the prohibited conduct. Section 2 includes legislative findings describing stealthing as sexual violence and identifying its emotional, physical, and reproductive harms. Furthermore, the Act’s definitions avoid heteronormative or cisnormative language and use broad, neutral terminology that encompasses multiple forms of sexual protection across diverse populations. The Act uses broad, neutral terminology and does not restrict the definition to particular populations. For example, the Act defines “*sexual protection barrier*” broadly as including “*condoms, internal condoms, and dental dams*” (Section 3(d)(2)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025), reflecting recognition of diverse sexual practices without limiting the scope to specific groups.

## *Quality*

Quality, as defined by the AAAQ framework, requires that services and protections be scientifically and medically appropriate and of good quality. This encompasses respectful treatment, safety, cultural appropriateness, and adherence to ethical standards. In the legal context, this means that protections and remedies should be clear, effective, trauma-informed, and uphold the dignity and rights of survivors. The Act (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025) provides clear and explicit definitions for critical terms, including “*non-consensual sexual protection barrier removal*,” defined as “*removing or attempting to remove a sexual protection barrier during sexual contact without consent*” (Section 3(d)(1)), and “*sexual protection barrier*,” which includes “*condoms, internal condoms, and dental dams*” (Section 3(d)(2)) (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025).

The Act’s (Text - H.R.3084 - 119th Congress (2025-2026) 2025) provision for “*other relief as the court considers appropriate*” (Section 3(c)) further allows judicial flexibility to tailor remedies to the circumstances of each case. In addition, while the Act establishes a foundational framework for addressing stealthing, it does not explicitly incorporate trauma-informed procedural safeguards or guidance on how courts should manage the psychological complexities inherent in sexual violence cases.

## DISCUSSION

This legislative content analysis applied the Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality (AAAQ) human rights framework to evaluate the *Stealthing Act of 2025* (Act). The AAAQ framework, widely recognized in health and human rights contexts (Montel et al. 2022; Lodeiro 2021; Williams et al. 2014), offers a structured lens to assess whether legal protections are not only present but also effective, equitable, and respectful of diverse survivor needs. Although originally developed to assess health services, its principles are highly relevant for analyzing legislation at the intersection of sexual health, human rights, and legal remedies.

Content analysis of the proposed Act highlight that it responds to a fragmented legal landscape where few states have successfully enacted stealthing-specific civil remedies. By clearly defining non-consensual sexual protection barrier removal and creating a federal cause of action, the Act establishes a consistent and uniform legal pathway that may promote more consistent judicial interpretation across jurisdictions. Similarly, the Act's broad remedial language, including 'other relief as the court considers appropriate,' affords courts flexibility to tailor remedies to the circumstances of individual cases, an important characteristic of survivor-centered justice. This combination of definitional clarity and judicial flexibility strengthens the Act's capacity to provide consistent legal protections while allowing courts to respond to the unique circumstances of individual survivors. Grounded in the Commerce Clause, the Act extends protections nationwide, including to Indigenous territories and maritime jurisdictions, significantly enhancing the availability of legal remedies for survivors regardless of their geographic location or state of residence.

Further, to ensure accessibility, the Act grants survivors the right to seek a wide range of civil remedies in federal court and broadens eligibility through its interstate commerce jurisdiction. These provisions establish tangible legal avenues for survivors pursuing justice. Additionally, the Act affirms fundamental human rights by recognizing stealthing as a violation of bodily autonomy and consent. Its inclusive and neutral language encompasses a broad spectrum of sexual practices and populations, aligning closely with principles of cultural sensitivity and respect for diversity. By avoiding gendered or heteronormative terminology, the Act promotes equitable legal protections across diverse populations and reflects contemporary human rights principles that emphasize dignity, autonomy, and non-discrimination. The importance of inclusive language has been further highlighted across multiple disciplines (Cavanaugh 2023; American Psychological Association 2023; Andoh, n.d.; Lynn and Lennon-Dearing 2023; Salguero and Morse 2024; Holden and Ziliotto 2023), thus aligning the Act's language with best practices to promote equitable outcomes of vulnerable groups.

On the other hand, while the Act provides clear, precise definitions, and flexible remedial provisions that promote consistent legal interpretation and survivor-centered outcomes; thus, ensuring quality; it does not explicitly address procedural or equity-related barriers that often impede access in practice. Important areas such as legal aid, filing fee waivers, confidentiality protections, and trauma-informed procedural accommodations are not directly incorporated.

Beyond its legal implications, the Act raises broader ethical considerations concerning respect for autonomy, justice, beneficence, and nonmaleficence. Respect for autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice are widely recognized as foundational principles in biomedical and public health ethics (Beauchamp and Childress 2019). At its core, stealthing violates informed sexual consent and bodily autonomy, making respect for autonomy and the prevention of harm central ethical considerations in evaluating the Act. The Act's recognition of stealthing as a violation of consent therefore represents not only a legal remedy but also an ethical acknowledgment of the obligation to respect individual dignity and protect persons from preventable harm. However, the absence of provisions addressing equitable access, trauma-informed procedures, and practical barriers to justice also raises ethical concerns regarding distributive justice, particularly for survivors facing social, financial, or structural disadvantages.

Overcoming the challenges to accessibility identified in the Act necessitates a comprehensive and coordinated approach integrating judicial policies, amendments, community services, among others. For example, Washington State's House Bill 1958, effective July 1, 2024, establishes a civil cause of action for nonconsensual removal or tampering with sexually protective devices, such as condoms, dental dams, and cervical caps. The law allows survivors to seek damages up to \$5,000 per violation, along with attorney's fees and other appropriate relief. Notably, plaintiffs may file under a pseudonym, subject to applicable state law and procedural rules (1958 HBR APH 24 2024), enhancing accessibility and protecting survivor identities during legal proceedings. The *Stealthing Act of 2025* could incorporate similar survivor-centered judicial policies, such as permitting pseudonymous filings, or include amendments to explicitly protect survivor privacy and procedural accessibility. These measures would



complement the Act's broad legal framework, further promoting equitable access to justice and reducing barriers for survivors engaging with the civil justice system.

Reforms within court administration are equally important. Specialized training programs for judges, attorneys, and court staff can improve understanding of the unique needs of survivors, leading to more empathetic and effective case handling. For example, the U.S. Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women offers trauma-informed training and technical assistance to justice system professionals nationwide (United States Department of Justice 2024). Integrating such training requirements in courts handling stealthing cases could significantly enhance survivor-centered justice.

Furthermore, victim support services complement legal reforms by providing survivors with emotional support, advocacy, and practical assistance throughout litigation. Integrated models that combine legal aid with counseling and advocacy have demonstrated improved outcomes for survivors of domestic violence by addressing both legal and psychosocial needs simultaneously. Research indicates that legal aid services can help survivors secure protective orders, maintain housing, and navigate family law issues, thereby enhancing their safety and stability ("How Legal Aid Helps Domestic Violence Survivors | LSC - Legal Services Corporation," n.d.). Additionally, trauma-informed legal advocacy, which incorporates an understanding of the impact of trauma on survivors, has been shown to improve client engagement and satisfaction with legal processes (James 2020).

Moreover, fee waiver programs to reduce or eliminate court filing costs are widely available courts in the U.S. (United States Courts, n.d.). While these programs are not specific to stealthing cases, they are critical mechanisms that improve financial accessibility for survivors pursuing civil remedies. Ensuring that survivors and the broader public are aware of these resources is an important aspect of informational accessibility as well. Policymakers and legislators can in turn strengthen the impact of the Act by partnering with community organizations and advocacy groups to promote outreach and education about support services, such as fee waivers, while also advocating for the passage of related legislation. Together, these multi-level strategies form a supportive ecosystem that highlight the necessity of coordinated action across judicial, administrative, social service, and community domains to ensure equitable and effective access to justice for all survivors.

## ***Limitations and Strengths***

The analysis presented in this study should be interpreted in the context of its limitations. First, the analysis relies on legal content analysis of the statutory text of the Stealthing Act of 2025. Given that the Act is currently assigned to the U.S. House of Representatives and has not progressed beyond that stage, there is a lack of empirical data on the law's practical implementation, enforcement, or survivor experiences. Due to this paucity of data, the study does not assess how judicial interpretation, or administrative practices might influence the application of the Act's provisions.

Notwithstanding such limitations, there are several strengths to this study, including the innovative application of the AAAQ human rights framework to conduct a systematic and comprehensive legal content analysis of emerging sexual health legislation. This approach brings a multidisciplinary lens, integrating principles of health equity, human rights, and legal clarity into legislative evaluation. The use of a structured coding process tied directly to the AAAQ dimensions ensures replicability and transparency in interpreting statutory language and thus a valuable template for evaluating future legislation at the intersection of health, rights, and law.

## **CONCLUSION**

The *Stealthing Act of 2025* plays a vital foundation across all AAAQ dimensions, enhancing protections for survivors of stealthing. To fully realize its potential, coordinated legislative refinements, judicial policy development, and supportive services are needed to bolster accessibility, affirm cultural diversity, and elevate the quality of legal protections. Without congressional action, survivors will continue to face a fragmented and often inadequate legal

# THE JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE ETHICS & ADMINISTRATION

Vol. 12 | No. 3 (Summer 2026)

landscape, where access to justice depends largely on geography. Prompt passage of the Act would establish a consistent national standard, affirming the federal commitment to bodily autonomy and ensuring that all survivors, regardless of state of residence, have access to meaningful legal remedies. Such comprehensive efforts will help ensure that the law not only exists in principle but also helps fulfill the ethical obligation of protecting bodily autonomy, promoting justice, and ensuring equitable legal protections for all survivors.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge the work of all the sexual assault prevention advocates for and the resilience of survivors. The author would also like to thank SEJ for his support during this process.



REFERENCES

- 12 V.S.A. § 1043, 12 V.S.A. § 1043 (2024). <https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2024/H.40>.
- 14 M.R.S. § 8305, 14 M.R.S. § 8305 (2023). <https://legislature.maine.gov/statutes/14/title14sec8305.html>.
- 1958 HBR APH 24, HB 1958, 68th Washington State Legislator 2023–2024 Regular Session (2024). <https://lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2023-24/Htm/Bill%20Reports/House/1958%20HBR%20APH%2024.htm>.
- Ahmad, Marwa, Benjamin Becerra, Dyanna Hernandez, Paulchris Okpala, Amber Olney, and Monideepa Becerra. 2020. “‘You Do It without Their Knowledge.’ Assessing Knowledge and Perception of Stealthing among College Students.” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17 (10): 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17103527>.
- American Psychological Association. 2023. “Inclusive Language Guide.” <https://www.apa.org/about/apa/equity-diversity-inclusion/language-guidelines.pdf>.
- Andoh, Efua. n.d. “Why Inclusive Language Matters.” <https://www.apa.org>. Accessed August 11, 2025. <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/psn/2022/09/inclusive-language>.
- Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Quality Framework: A Tool to Identify Potential Barriers in Accessing Services in Humanitarian Settings - Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action*. n.d. Accessed August 13, 2025. <https://gbvguidelines.org/document/availability-accessibility-acceptability-and-quality-framework-a-tool-to-identify-potential-barriers-in-accessing-services-in-humanitarian-settings/>.
- Beauchamp, Tom, and James Childress. 2019. “Principles of Biomedical Ethics: Marking Its Fortieth Anniversary.” *The American Journal of Bioethics: AJOB* 19 (11): 9–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2019.1665402>.
- Brodsky, Alexandra. 2017. “Rape-Adjacent”: *Imagining Legal Responses to Nonconsensual Condom Removal*. SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 2954726. Social Science Research Network. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2954726>.
- Cal. Civ. Code § 1708.5, AB453, California Civil Code § 1708.5 (2021). [https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=CIV&sectionNum=1708.5](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=CIV&sectionNum=1708.5).
- Cavanaugh, Murphy. 2023. “‘More than a Woman to Me’: The Need for Gender Inclusive Language in Court Opinions and Statutes Relating to Abortion and Reproductive Health.” *Nebraska Law Review* 102: 453.
- Davis, Kelly Cue. 2019. “‘Stealthing’: Factors Associated with Young Men’s Nonconsensual Condom Removal.” *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association* 38 (11): 997–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000779>.
- Davis, Kelly Cue, Cynthia A. Stappenbeck, N. Tatiana Masters, and William H. George. 2019. “Young Women’s Experiences with Coercive and Noncoercive Condom Use Resistance: Examination of an Understudied Sexual Risk Behavior.” *Women’s Health Issues* 29 (3): 231–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2019.01.005>.
- Dubey, Sweta, Jeel Vasa, and Siddhesh Zadey. 2021. “Do Health Policies Address the Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality of Human Resources for Health? Analysis over Three Decades of National Health

# THE JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE ETHICS & ADMINISTRATION

Vol. 12 | No. 3 (Summer 2026)

- Policy of India.” *Human Resources for Health* 19 (November): 139. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-021-00681-1>.
- Holden, Livia, and Anna Ziliotto. 2023. *Guide for an Inclusive Language in Court and Legal Documents*. CULTEXP. <https://hal.science/hal-04108593>.
- “How Legal Aid Helps Domestic Violence Survivors | LSC - Legal Services Corporation: America’s Partner for Equal Justice.” n.d. Accessed August 11, 2025. <https://www.lsc.gov/our-impact/publications/other-publications-and-reports/how-legal-aid-helps-domestic-violence>.
- H.R.3084 - Stealthing Act of 2025, H.R.3084, U.S. House of Representatives, United States Congress 119th Congress, 1st Session, 2025–2026 (2025). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/3084/text>.
- IFHHRO. n.d. *AAAQ Framework*. Accessed August 13, 2025. <https://www.ifhro.org/topics/aaaq-framework/>.
- Interpreting the International Right to Health in a Human Rights-Based Approach to Health – Health and Human Rights Journal*. n.d. Accessed August 13, 2025. <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2016/12/03/interpreting-the-international-right-to-health-in-a-human-rights-based-approach-to-health/>.
- James, Colin. 2020. “Towards Trauma-Informed Legal Practice: A Review.” *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law* 27 (2): 275–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2020.1719377>.
- Latimer, Rosie L., Lenka A. Vodstrcil, Christopher K. Fairley, et al. 2018. “Non-Consensual Condom Removal, Reported by Patients at a Sexual Health Clinic in Melbourne, Australia.” *PLOS ONE* 13 (12): e0209779. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209779>.
- Lodeiro, Carolina. 2021. *Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality of SRHR Related Health Care for Unaccompanied Minor Girls in VGR: A Qualitative Study Based on the Perceptions of Health Care Professionals*. June 23. <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/68724>.
- Lynn, Vickie A., and Robin Lennon-Dearing. 2023. “Putting People First: The Power of Inclusive Language.” *Journal of HIV/AIDS & Social Services* 22 (4): 186–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15381501.2024.2390923>.
- Montel, Lisa, Naomi Ssenyonga, Michel P. Coleman, and Claudia Allemani. 2022. “How Should Implementation of the Human Right to Health Be Assessed? A Scoping Review of the Public Health Literature from 2000 to 2021.” *International Journal for Equity in Health* 21 (September): 139. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-022-01742-0>.
- Salguero, Rachael, and Brenna L. Morse. 2024. “Fostering Belonging Beyond the Health Office Through Inclusive Language.” *NASN School Nurse* 39 (2): 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1942602X231206345>.
- Shapiro, Mikaela. 2021. “Yes, ‘Stealthing’ Is Sexual Assault... And We Need to Address It.” *Touro Law Review* 37 (3). <https://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/lawreview/vol37/iss3/16>.
- Shrestha-Ranjit, Jagamaya, Deborah Payne, Jane Koziol-McLain, Ineke Crezee, and Elizabeth Manias. 2020. “Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability, and Quality of Interpreting Services to Refugee Women in New Zealand.” *Qualitative Health Research* 30 (11): 1697–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732320924360>.
- United States Courts. n.d. “Fee Waiver Application Forms.” Accessed August 11, 2025. <https://www.uscourts.gov/forms-rules/forms/fee-waiver-application-forms>.
- United States Department of Justice. 2024. “Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) | Training and Technical Assistance.” December 18. <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/training-and-technical-assistance>.

## THE JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE ETHICS & ADMINISTRATION

Vol. 12 | No. 3 (Summer 2026)

Williams, Carmel, Toni Ashton, and Chris Bullen. 2014. "Using Health Rights to Design Aid-Funded Health Programs so They First Do No Harm." *Human Rights Quarterly* 36 (2): 428–46.

Worsley, Joanne D., Jacqueline M. Wheatcroft, Emma Short, and Rhiannon Corcoran. 2017. "Victims' Voices: Understanding the Emotional Impact of Cyberstalking and Individuals' Coping Responses." *Sage Open* 7 (2): 2158244017710292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017710292>.

| <b>Table 1. Analytical questions, <i>The Stealthing Act of 2025</i>.</b> |                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>AAAQ Dimension</b>                                                    | <b>Main Guiding Question</b>                                                                                                                     | <b>Secondary Question</b>                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Availability</b>                                                      | To what extent does the <i>Stealthing Act of 2025</i> establish a clear and consistent legal remedy for survivors across jurisdictions?          | Does the Act help address variation in state laws and offer a foundational level of legal protection nationwide?                           |
| <b>Accessibility</b>                                                     | Are the remedies under the Act accessible to survivors in practice, particularly those facing legal, financial, or social barriers?              | What considerations are included to support equitable access for marginalized survivors, such as those lacking resources or facing stigma? |
| <b>Acceptability</b>                                                     | Does the Act respect and uphold the dignity, autonomy, and diverse experiences of individuals affected by stealthing?                            | Is the language of the bill inclusive and affirming of diverse sexual orientations, gender identities, and relationship structures?        |
| <b>Quality</b>                                                           | Are the legal definitions and remedies proposed in the Act clear, survivor-centered, and grounded in evidence-informed, trauma-aware principles? | Do the forms of relief (e.g., compensatory/punitive damages, injunctive relief) promote meaningful outcomes and accountability?            |

| <b>Table 2.</b> Key findings for legal content analysis, <i>The Stealthing Act of 2025</i> . |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>AAAQ dimension</b>                                                                        | <b>Key findings</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Availability</b>                                                                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establishes a federal civil cause of action for non-consensual sexual protection barrier removal (Section 3(a)).</li> <li>- Clear definitions of key terms (Section 3(d)(1), (2)).</li> <li>- Remedies include compensatory, punitive damages, injunctive, declaratory, and other relief (Section 3(c)).</li> <li>- Federal jurisdiction grounded in Commerce Clause with broad reach (Section 3(b)).</li> <li>- Addresses patchwork of state laws, offering uniform remedy nationwide.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Accessibility</b>                                                                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Survivors may file civil lawsuits with broad remedies available (Section 3(a), (c)).</li> <li>- No explicit procedural supports (filing fee waivers, confidentiality, trauma-informed accommodations).</li> <li>- Jurisdictional requirements could complicate filing, especially for intrastate cases (Section 3(b)).</li> <li>- Equity provisions for marginalized groups not explicitly included.</li> </ul>                                                                                    |
| <b>Acceptability</b>                                                                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frames stealthing as violation of bodily autonomy and sexual consent (Section 2).</li> <li>- Broad definitions promote inclusivity across sexual practices (Section 3(d)(2)).</li> <li>- Recognizes harm and dignity through damages and injunctive relief (Section 2, 3(c)).</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Quality</b>                                                                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear statutory definitions support consistent legal interpretation (Section 3(d)(1), (2)).</li> <li>- Lack of guidance on assessing consent in complex cases.</li> <li>- No explicit trauma-informed procedural safeguards.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |