

## Faulk, Camilla

---

**From:** Breck and Mona [dillardjoe@qwest.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 29, 2011 5:58 AM  
**To:** Faulk, Camilla  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 4.11

April 29, 2011

To the Justices of the Washington Supreme Court:

As an adult survivor of childhood sex abuse I wanted to provide my victim's perspective on the documenting witness interview rule, which I support. My nightmare began when I was nine years old and continued for seven years. In addition to subjecting me to repeated instances of rape, my abuser didn't hesitate to threaten harm to my younger siblings and often used physical violence against me in order to accomplish his ends and to ensure I complied with his code of silence. When I had the guts to speak up, I didn't want that process dragged out any longer than necessary. I am aware that some groups which advocate for victim's rights oppose the proposed Rule 4.11, and have asserted that it would be traumatic for victims to be audio-recorded during interviews. They are mistaken. While disclosing a first-hand account of an intimate violation to any person is traumatic, having the interview audio-recorded does not increase the trauma. As a victim of repeated and multiple intrusive serious violent offenses, the most important thing to me is getting the interview over with as quickly as possible...the presence of a recording device making a verbatim record neither increases or decreases the ordeal of having to find the words to describe what happened to outsiders. Despite the passage of more than twenty years since I was victimized, I still find it difficult to revisit the events I suffered with anyone, even a therapist. I would have found an interview much more traumatic had I been required to pause, wait, and repeat the details of my abuse while I waited for an to take notes by hand rather than to simply be audio recorded in real time. For me and other victims, the less time an interview takes, the less time it is we have to relive and confront these distressing memories. Further, I fully support a rule requiring the development of a verbatim record of victim statements as I know I feel more secure in the knowledge that my words are being heard in the context and tone that I intended for them to be, rather than worrying they would be twisted to suit anyone else's agenda, be it prosecution or defense. Additionally, it is my understanding that Rule 4.11 allows any victim who objects to an audio-recording to opt for a verbatim record prepared by court reporter. Such an option alleviates my concern anyone could have regarding audio recordings of a victim recounting the details of the crime against them in their own voice. Further, I understand that Rule 4.11 also implements new controls strictly controlling dissemination of victim and witness statements, a protection not currently afforded to us and which wasn't present at the time I was a child victim. I wish it had been.

As a victim, I strongly encourage the implementation of Rule 4.11 regarding the recording of witness interviews and ask for your support in this matter.

Misty Vichitnand