

March 14, 2018

The Honorable Mary Fairhurst
Chief Justice of the Washington Supreme Court
Washington Supreme Court
PO Box 40929 Olympia, WA 98504-0929

Re: Suggested Changes to Rule of Appeal of Decisions of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction 9.3

Dear Chief Justice Fairhurst:

The Public Defender Association (PDA) is submitting for the Washington Supreme Court's consideration the enclosed suggested changes to RALJ 9.3. As an organization that provides legal advice and representation to people unable to pay Legal Financial Obligations, we see first-hand the practices that keep people in cycles of poverty and with barriers to successful reentry. As the enclosed GR 9 cover sheet explains, the language we propose is very similar to language the Washington Supreme Court adopted when it amended RAP 14.2 effective January 31, 2017. The primary difference is that our suggested changes to RALJ 9.3 discuss costs in civil and criminal appeals separately. This is because members of the WSBA RALJ Subcommittee asked that we make clear that any suggested changes to RALJ 9.3 apply only to indigent criminal defendants. We are available to answer any questions that may arise during the review of this proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lisa Daugaard

Director

Lisa.daugaard@defender.org

Tarra Simmons Skadden Fellow

tarra.simmons@defender.org

Enclosures

cc: The Honorable Charles W. Johnson, Chair of the Supreme Court Rules Committee Shannon Hinchcliffe, AOC

1	GR 9 Cover Sheet	
2		
3	Suggested Changes to RALJ 9.3	
4		
5	(A) Name of Proponent: Washington Defender Association	
6 7	(B) Spokesperson: Magda Baker, Misdemeanor Resource Attorney, Washington Defender Association	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(C) Purpose: The Washington Defender Association suggests changes to RALJ 9.3 that would require a superior court judge who decides a criminal RALJ appeal to consider the defendant's current or likely future ability to pay before imposing costs of appeal. The proposed language is similar to language the Washington Supreme Court added to RAP 14.2 effective January 31, 2017, and would give indigent people convicted of misdemeanors the same ability to appeal their convictions without having to weigh financial considerations that people convicted of felonies currently have. It would also increase uniformity between the RALJs and the RAPs.	
16 17 18 19 20 21	The Washington Supreme Court has recognized problems with legal financial obligations (LFOs) when courts impose them on indigent people. These problems include increased difficulty becoming a productive member of society after a conviction, questionable recoupment of money by the government, and unequal administration of LFOs. See State v. Blazina, 182 Wn.2d 827, 836-37 (2015). These obstacles apply to misdemeanors as well as felonies. Changing RALJ 9.3 to more closely mirror RAP 14.2 would decrease the LFOs courts must impose on indigent misdemeanants.	
23	(D) Hearing: None recommended.	
24	(E) Expedited Consideration: Expedited consideration is not requested.	
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		

[Suggested changes to RALJ 9.3(a) and (g)]

1

RALJ 9.3 COSTS 2 3 (a) Party-Entitled to Costs in Civil and Criminal Appeals. (1) Civil Appeals. The party that substantially prevails on a civil appeal shall be awarded costs 4 on appeal. Costs will be imposed against a party whose appeal is involuntarily dismissed. Costs 5 will be awarded in a case dismissed by reason of a voluntary withdrawal of an appeal only if the 6 superior court so directs at the time the order is entered permitting the voluntary withdrawal of 7 the appeal. 8 (2) Criminal Appeals. The party that substantially prevails on a criminal appeal shall be 9 awarded costs on appeal unless the superior court judge determines the criminal defendant does 10 not have the current or likely future ability to pay such costs. Costs will be imposed against a 11 party whose appeal is involuntarily dismissed unless that party is a criminal defendant and the 12 superior court judge determines the criminal defendant does not have the current or likely future 13 ability to pay such costs. When the trial court has entered an order that a criminal defendant is 14 indigent for purposes of appeal, that finding of indigency remains in effect unless the superior 15 court judge determines by a preponderance of the evidence that the criminal defendant's 16 financial circumstances have significantly improved since the last determination of indigency. 17 The superior court judge may consider any evidence offered to determine the individual's current 18 or future ability to pay. Costs will be awarded in a case dismissed by reason of a voluntary 19 withdrawal of an appeal only if the superior court so directs at the time the order is entered 20 permitting the voluntary withdrawal of the appeal. 21 (b) - (f) [No changes.] 22 (g) Reasonable Attorney Fees. A request for reasonable attorney fees should not be made in the 23 cost bill. The request should be made as provided in rule 11.2. In a criminal case attorney fees 24 are subject to rule 9.3(a)(2). 25 26 27

Tracy, Mary

From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 8:41 AM
To: Tracy, Mary

Subject: FW: Proposed changes to RALJ 9.3

Attachments: 9.3 Comments.pdf

Forwarding.

From: Tarra Simmons [mailto:tarra.simmons@defender.org]

Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2018 10:29 AM

To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK < SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>

Subject: Proposed changes to RALJ 9.3

Dear Supreme Court Clerk,

For your consideration to the proposed changes to RALJ 9.3, please accept the attached comments on behalf of the Public Defender Association.

Sincerely,

Tarra Simmons

Tarra Simmons
Skadden Fellow

110 Prefontaine Place South, Suite 502 Seattle WA 98104 206-392-0050 ext #708 tarra.simmons@defender.org www.defender.org