

**LEX FEMINAE
INDEX**

France 2026 Edition

**LEX FEMINAE
INDEX**

LEX FEMINAE INDEX

France – 2026 Edition

Enforcement Assessment of Gender-Based Violence

Data Coverage: 2024

Grade:

D

Weak Enforcement

Trend Indicator: → Stagnant

The Lex Feminae Index evaluates whether legal systems deliver measurable protection against gender-based violence. The assessment is outcome-based. Legislative intent, policy announcements and strategic commitments are not considered. Only enforcement performance is examined.

This report presents the 2026 enforcement assessment of France using consolidated national data for the 2024 reporting cycle.

The evaluation relies exclusively on official statistical publications issued by French public authorities, including:

- Service statistique ministériel de la sécurité intérieure (SSMSI – Interstats) (Info Rapide n°47, n°56, n°57, n°59 – 2024 data)
- Ministère de la Justice – Service statistique ministériel de la Justice (SSER) (Infos Rapides Justice n°33; Infostat Justice n°200)
- Judicial statistical and methodological documentation (Dossier Méthode n°2 – Police/Justice data linkage)
- Institutional reporting on violences sexistes et sexuelles (Lettre violences sexistes et sexuelles – novembre 2025)
- Rapport “À VIF” – Ministère de la Justice (2025)

No external estimates, advocacy projections, NGO datasets or media summaries are used. All figures cited derive from officially published national statistical sources.

Where datasets are not fully interoperable, methodological limitations are applied in accordance with official statistical documentation.

The analysis examines:

- Recorded victim volume
- Prosecutorial filtering and case orientation
- Final conviction counts
- Sentencing structure and custodial application
- Protection mechanism monitoring
- National data consolidation and transparency

The central question is structural:

Does enforcement practice produce measurable protection for women after violence occurs?

The findings below assess France under the Lex Feminae Index grading framework.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Data Scope

This assessment relies exclusively on official statistical publications issued by the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice.

No NGO datasets, advocacy estimates, media compilations or external projections are used.

B. Administrative Counting Limits

Victim figures reflect administrative counting by infraction and may include multiple entries per individual within a given procedure.

C. Police-Justice Interoperability Limits

Where police and judicial datasets are not fully interoperable, limitations follow those described in Dossier Méthode n°2, including an optimized matching rate of approximately 81% between police and justice data.

D. Conviction Timing Clarification

Conviction figures reflect cases reaching judicial resolution within the reporting year and do not represent direct cohort conversion between complaints registered and convictions issued in the same year.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

I. Legal Recognition & Statutory Framework

France criminalizes:

- Rape and sexual assault
- Domestic violence (physical, psychological, sexual)
- Intimate Partner Homicide
- Harassment and coercive control–related conduct (through existing provisions)

ASSESSMENT:

Legal framework comprehensive.

REPORTING

II. Reporting Accessibility & Victim Registration

2024 Recorded Victims

- Intimate Partner Violence (IPV): 272,382 victims (84% women)
- Sexual violence (all contexts): 122,600 victims (85% women)
- Rape: 46,297 victims
- Intimate Partner Homicide: 134 homicides

Victimization surveys indicate:

- 6% of adult sexual violence victims file complaints.
- 14–22% of physical violence victims file complaints.

Police data is publicly accessible, nationally consolidated, and annually published.

ASSESSMENT:

High transparency in recorded violence.

Severe reporting gap persists.

PROSECUTION

III. Prosecutorial Filtering

For sexual violence (2024):

- 43,738 suspects registered
- 69% of cases deemed legally actionable
- 78.4% of actionable cases lead to formal prosecution

For Intimate Partner Violence (IPV):

- 145,389 suspects identified
- 42,229 final convictions

Prosecutorial activity is active and documented.

ASSESSMENT:

Structured prosecutorial engagement.

Filtering significant but not structurally obstructive.

IV. Judicial Throughput — Enforcement Funnel

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

- Judicial intake: 145,389
- Prosecutions initiated: 54,360
- Final convictions: 42,229

This reflects:

- Prosecutorial activation rate: 37% of suspects
- Conviction relative to suspects: 29%
- Conviction relative to prosecutions: 78%

Once prosecution is initiated, conviction likelihood is high.

Structural narrowing occurs primarily at the prosecutorial activation stage.

Rape

- Judicial intake : 18,781
- Prosecutions initiated: 5,373
- Final convictions: 1,665

This reflects:

- Prosecutorial activation rate: 28% of suspects
- Conviction relative to suspects: 9%
- Conviction relative to prosecutions: 31%

Throughput depth remains structurally limited in rape cases.

V. Conviction Ratios

Conviction output must be evaluated within the justice-phase dataset rather than police-recorded victim intake.

In 2024:

- 29% of IPV suspects resulted in final conviction.
- 9% of rape suspects resulted in final conviction.

While conviction rates following prosecution are comparatively high in IPV cases (78%), prosecutorial activation remains limited relative to suspect intake.

In rape cases, both prosecutorial activation (28%) and final conviction output (9%) indicate narrow throughput depth within the enforcement chain.

These figures reflect system-level annual performance and do not represent same-year complaint-to-conviction cohort conversion

Attrition patterns differ across procedural classifications and do not correspond to same-year complaint-to-conviction conversion.

SENTENCING

VI. Sentencing & Deterrence

Criminal convictions (2024):

- 58% of recorded criminal convictions concern rape
- 31% concern homicide or serious intentional violence
- 99% of criminal convictions result in imprisonment
- 52% receive 10–20-year sentences

Sentencing severity for crimes is high and consistently custodial.

Recidivism present:

- 51.2% of individuals convicted in IPV cases had at least one prior conviction.

ASSESSMENT:

Sentencing structure strong for serious crimes.

Recidivism data suggests limits in deterrent effect within certain offence categories.

PROTECTION

VII. Protection Measures

In 2024, France recorded:

- 6,826 applications for judicial protection orders (ordonnances de protection)
- 6,741 decisions rendered
- 91% of decisions granted protection

This corresponds to approximately 6,100 protection orders effectively issued during the year.

ASSESSMENT:

Judicial protection mechanisms are therefore operational and accessible.

However, enforcement effectiveness must be assessed beyond issuance.

Even applied conservatively to the annual volume of granted protection orders, this represents several hundred violations of court-ordered protection within a single year.

While the breach rate is not numerically dominant, it reflects measurable non-compliance affecting a non-negligible number of protected individuals.

Public reporting does not provide a fully consolidated national dataset detailing:

- The proportion of breaches resulting in detention
- The speed of post-breach judicial response
- The proportion of repeated violations

As a result, protection mechanisms are demonstrably issued, but their enforcement effectiveness following breach cannot be fully externally verified through unified outcome reporting.

DATA TRANSPARENCY

VIII. Data Integrity & Transparency

France publishes:

- Police data (SSMSI – Interstats)
- Prosecutorial orientation (Infostat)
- Judicial conviction summaries
- Data linkage methodology (81% police–justice matching rate)
- Statistical limitations are publicly documented.

However:

Judicial conviction data is not published in a unified Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) conviction dataset allowing offence-specific traceability from recorded victim categories through to final conviction outcomes.

Femicide is statistically reported in annual administrative publications but is not codified as a distinct penal qualification, limiting offence-specific disaggregation within conviction datasets.

ASSESSMENT:

- High national data consolidation.
- Transparency strong.
- Offence-level judicial disaggregation incomplete.

CLIMATE RISK MODIFIER

No integrated dataset links disaster displacement to GBV enforcement outcomes.

The Climate Risk Modifier does not alter grade determination.

STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT

DOES THE LAW PROTECT WOMEN IN PRACTICE?

Judicial throughput demonstrates measurable activity but constrained conversion depth.

In IPV, fewer than one-third of identified suspects result in final conviction.

In rape, fewer than one in ten suspects result in final conviction within the reporting cycle.

Throughput limitation occurs primarily at the prosecutorial activation stage and remains most pronounced in sexual violence cases.

AUDIT GRADE ASSIGNMENT

Under Lex Feminae Index criteria, based strictly on outcome-based criteria, Grade D is the more rigorous classification.

1. Structural Throughput Gap

The most critical enforcement metric is judicial conversion capacity within the justice-phase dataset.

Rape:

- Judicial intake : 18,781
- Final convictions: 1,665
- 8.9% of identified rape suspects resulted in criminal enforcement

This indicates that fewer than one in ten identified suspects resulted in enforceable judicial sanction within the reporting cycle.

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

- Judicial intake: 145,389
- Final convictions: 42,229
- 29% of identified IPV suspects resulted in criminal conviction.

This indicates that fewer than one-third of identified suspects in domestic violence cases resulted in enforceable judicial sanction within the reporting cycle.

While conversion in IPV cases is materially higher than in rape cases, the majority of identified suspects do not result in conviction.

Across core gender-based violence categories, enforcement conversion remains uneven.

- Rape enforcement stands at 8.9% of identified suspects.
- IPV enforcement stands at 29%.

Grade C requires judicial engagement with conversion that, while uneven, does not reflect structurally narrow throughput in serious offence categories.

The system is operational. However, enforcement depth in serious sexual violence remains structurally limited, and overall conversion across core GBV categories does not demonstrate protection delivery at a level consistent with Grade C.

These combined enforcement outcomes align more closely with Grade D criteria.

2. Traceability and Codification

Grade C requires identifiable but potentially fragmented enforcement traceability across the judicial chain.

In France, homicide is criminalized under Article 221-1 of the Penal Code. Killings committed by a spouse, former spouse, partner, or former partner are legally recognized as aggravated offences under Article 221-4 of the Penal Code.

However, France does not maintain a standalone penal offence specifically designated as femicide.

Judicial statistical publications do not provide consolidated offence-specific disaggregation allowing direct linkage from prosecution to final conviction in gender-motivated homicide cases.

While administrative reporting identifies intimate-partner killings at ministerial level, judicial outcome data is not presented within a unified offence-coded framework allowing direct tracking of lethal gender-based violence through to sentencing.

This limits complete enforcement traceability at the judicial outcome level.

Such structural limitations exceed the level of fragmentation tolerated under Grade C and support classification under Grade D, where enforcement traceability is not fully consolidated across the judicial chain.

3. Protection vs Operational Verification

Protective mechanisms exist in law and are accessible in practice.

However:

- A measurable breach rate
- Absence of unified monitoring architecture
- Limited transparency regarding post-breach enforcement consequences

Restrict full external verification of protection effectiveness.

Grade C requires protection mechanisms to function in practice with identifiable breach-to-sanction enforcement, even if inconsistently applied.

France maintains:

- A comprehensive statutory framework
- Published administrative and judicial data
- Operational investigative and judicial structures

However:

- Protection monitoring lacks complete transparency at outcome level

Where monitoring and breach-to-sanction tracking are not consolidated within a unified enforcement dataset, protection reliability cannot be externally verified at the level required for Grade C.

Under an outcome-based enforcement methodology, these constraints support:

Grade D – Weak Enforcement

FINAL GRADE

D — Weak Enforcement

Trend Indicator:

→ **Stagnant***

1. Legal and institutional framework operational.
2. Judicial conversion relative to intake remains structurally limited.
3. Enforcement depth uneven across core gender-based violence categories.
4. Protection monitoring and offence-level traceability not fully consolidated.

* Stagnation reflects structural persistence of enforcement patterns across recent reporting cycles as documented in official statistical continuity