

Faulk, Camilla

From: JohnStine [john@stinelaw.comcastbiz.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 29, 2010 11:38 AM
To: Faulk, Camilla
Subject: Proposed rule 4.11

I am writing in support of the rule allowing recording of witness interviews. If court proceedings are fundamentally about bringing out the truth, what could be more helpful than an actual recording of a statement? I have been an attorney for almost 15 years and cannot count the number of trials where there were disputes about what was said at a prior interview. Defendants dispute what police officers testify to regarding admissions during interrogation, and victims/witnesses dispute assertions that their trial testimony differs from previous interviews. The current system of having a defendant hire an investigator (frequently at public expense) to sit in on interviews and take notes does nothing to resolve the problem. The opposing party simply argues that the investigator is biased because they are being paid by the defendant/other party. By allowing the recording of witness interviews, it assures an accurate recitation of what was said, and does so with significant savings of scarce resources. To me this is one of the most critical rule changes the Court has considered in many years, and the rule should be adopted to allow recording of witness interviews. Thank you for your attention. John Stine, WSBA #26391.