

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 01, 2014 8:03 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Against massive revisions to General Rule 15--keep transparency within the court system

Please note that any pleading filed as an attachment to e-mail will be treated as the original. Therefore, if a filing is by e-mail attachment, it is not necessary to mail to the court the original of the document.

**From:** Catherine Ross [mailto:catherineross33@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 30, 2014 8:21 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK  
**Cc:** Harold Ross  
**Subject:** Against massive revisions to General Rule 15--keep transparency within the court system

Attn: Clerk of the Supreme Court

I, as a citizen of Washington state, oppose massive revisions to General Rule 15.

**Reasons for opposition:**

\*Since fairly good changes were made in 2006, ones that allowed, for instance, the unsealing of records involving safety concerns, etc., why go backwards and now allow parties (including government agencies) to again get broad rights to seal court records? *A moral imperative (read: transparency in government) would seem to impel the Court against sealing court records.*

**\* I recall reading about the many sealed cases that were closed to public view in Grant County, WA. Lawyers were making deals, some shady settlements were being reached--and all the while court records were sealed and the general public denied access.** (The Seattle Times did a expose regarding this and won a national Pulitzer Prize for its efforts.) To me this exposure by the Seattle Times was a shocking disclosure of some shady justice deals that actually ended up harming the public good in this state. I then would urge the Supreme Court to deny most of the recommended changes to General Rule 15. History will assuredly repeat itself if the good judges at the Supreme Court level don't allow more transparency within the court system. .

\*If the general public is once again denied access to court records because the parties reaching settlements request this, how is justice being served by allowing this? Obviously, it isn't. Think of child- safety issues, i.e., : abuse of kids , where maybe the government was negligent --do you want to allow changes that again directly or indirectly facilitates government cover-up?

While there may be, in some cases, legitimate privacy concerns of parties involved in the justice system, drastically revamping General Rule 15 isn't the answer. The current rules already appear to protect privacy matters.

A judicial system functions best when it is transparent.

Catherine Ross

--

This message is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended addressee, nor authorized to receive for the intended addressee, you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose, or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message and any attachment. Every reasonable precaution has been made to insure there are no viruses in this message. We are not liable for damage or loss that may arise from the use of this email or attachment. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by Reply email and delete the message and any attachment. Thank you.