

Faulk, Camilla

From: Charlie Phillips [cphillips@gohighspeed.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2008 11:40 AM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Cc: 'Pat'; Ed Ammon
Subject: Proposed Court Rule CrRLJ 4.1

Dear Madam Clerk:

I am the City Attorney for the City of College Place. I'm writing to advise that my client and I both oppose proposed rule CrRLJ 4.1. There is absolutely no good reason why a public defender or a retained attorney should have to be present at all arraignments. The budgets of the courts of our smaller cities are already stretched to the limit. To impose this unfunded mandate will only further limit the resources that can be applied to the running of our court. There is no constitutional right to an attorney at arraignment, no constitutional requirement for the presence of a prosecutor at arraignment, and no funding provided to implement this legislation. Moreover, there is no practical reason that I can think of that would justify the proposed rule. In short, the proposed rule will only waste time and money. Aren't there better ways that the money that will be required by the implementation of this rule might be spent?

Respectfully,

Charles B. Phillips