

Protect the Rights and Safety of Victims and Witnesses of Crime: Reject Criminal Rule 4.11 as currently proposed.

The Washington State Constitution recognizes that the cooperation of victims and witnesses is crucial to the functioning of the criminal justice system. As such, the Washington State Constitution guarantees victims certain rights and proposes to ensure victims a meaningful role in the criminal justice system and to accord them due dignity and respect. Proposed Criminal Rule 4.11 would force recording on witnesses who, *while agreeing to talk about the case and cooperate with pre-trial interviews*, do not wish the interview to be recorded. If adopted, the proposed rule would hinder - not improve - the ability and willingness of victims and witnesses to play their critical role in maintaining law, order, and justice in Washington State.

We, the undersigned, believe the proposed rule would be a significant step backwards in the state's treatment of victims and witnesses and erode the integrity and credibility of criminal justice in Washington. We strongly oppose the adoption of proposed Criminal Rule 4.11 and affirm the following:

1. **Current practices are already sufficient to memorialize witness interviews.**
2. **The rule would hinder the participation of witnesses in the criminal justice system.**
3. **Dissemination of recordings would be dangerous for witnesses.**
4. **The proposed language will not prevent dissemination.**
5. **Witnesses should not have to opt out of recording by obtaining approval of the**

court.

6. **Recording is not a protection of the witness.**
7. **Cooperative witnesses should not be subjected to depositions.**
8. **No standards are established.**
9. **No requirement exists to notify the witness of the right to refuse recording.**
10. **The decision to record lies with the witness, not an attorney or the court.**
11. **A rule that explicitly recognizes a witness' right to refuse recording would address the interests of all parties.**

Current practices are already sufficient to memorialize witness interviews

Proponents suggest that this is a crucial change to the court rules. However, there has been no evidence presented that when a witness agrees to be interviewed, but declines to have the statement recorded, that justice is somehow being impeded. Attorneys already utilize private investigators, ask thorough questions, take accurate notes, review witness statements, and cross-examine the witnesses. These practices are already sufficient to protect the rights of the accused and compelled recording of witness interviews does nothing to enhance this.

The rule would hinder the participation of witnesses in the criminal justice system

Instead, compelled interviews would hinder the ability and willingness of witnesses to participate in the criminal justice system. If this rule were put into practice, the public would soon discover that in order to seek justice through our system, they must not only testify in front of the accused at trial, but that they must submit to recorded pre-trial interviews, which the defendant will likely hear, with only the hope that it will not be disclosed to others. This is a terrifying thought for many witnesses, especially victims of sexual assault or child abuse, and would likely prevent victims from coming forward and allow damaging criminal behavior to flourish.

Dissemination of recordings would be dangerous for witnesses

The fear of who may obtain a copy of a recorded interview which captures his or her voice often revealing very raw and real emotions and describes extremely sensitive and private information cannot be underestimated. Most if not all of the proposed compulsory recordings would be done electronically. In this digital age the potential for this information to fall into the wrong hands and in a matter of minutes be circulated all over the Internet is terrifying and could result in devastating to deadly results for the witness. Suppose a witness agrees to an interview in a gang violence case. Were this recording to become public somehow, the exposure to the witness could result in anything from harassment from family, friends, and fellow gang members of the defendant to attacks on the witness' life.

The proposed language will not prevent dissemination

The restriction on dissemination of the audio recordings as proposed in the rule is an insufficient protection and in itself recognizes one of the primary reasons that witnesses do not wish to submit to a recorded interview. The proponents of the rule suggest the current draft language on dissemination in order to prohibit the distribution of recordings beyond the parties involved in the criminal case. However, when the bar subcommittee did an informal poll to determine if counties would in fact disseminate the recording when considering the proposed language if they received a public information request, the result came back approximately 50/50 on who would disclose versus who would not. A 50% chance that a recorded interview would not be disclosed to the public is laughable as a protection to witnesses. When this was pointed out to the sub-committee, the response was "that's the best we can do." It very likely in fact *is* the best that can be done to prevent disclosure to non-party participants in a criminal case, which is a compelling reason **NOT** to enact a rule that compels the audio or video recording of witness interviews.

Witnesses should not have to opt out of recording by obtaining approval of the court

Victims and witnesses should also not be compelled to opt out of recorded interviews by presenting their case/reasons to the court, especially as they are unrepresented parties in criminal actions. The current policies already allow for the better practice of witnesses opting in by agreeing to submit to a recording if they choose. This is sufficient. Witnesses should not have to go before the court to explain why they don't want an interview recorded, especially when proponents of compulsory recording of pre-trial interviews have not provided sufficient evidence that recording is a necessary element of justice. Once again, this result of such a rule would be to further intimidate witnesses and inhibit their right to a meaningful role in the criminal justice system. It would also make the system more cumbersome for all involved.

Recording is not a protection of the witness

While it has been said that one of the reasons for needing the forced recording of witness interviews is that witnesses lie or change their stories (we believe this is sufficiently addressed by current interview practices,) it has also been suggested that recording of interviews will actually protect the witness. As the rules currently stand, any witness wishing to protect themselves through the recording of their pre-trial interview already has the choice to do so if they believe that a recording is in their best interest. However, one should not force this circumstance on any witness in the criminal justice system; the choice should remain in the hands of the witness.

Cooperative witnesses should not be subjected to depositions

As the rule is proposed, refusing to submit to a recorded interview would result in the ability of an attorney to seek a deposition of the witness. As some witnesses will still refuse to be recorded during their interview, this will likely increase the number of depositions that are sought and be cost- and time-consuming for the court. This is an unnecessary expense and waste of time when witnesses are willing to answer questions without a recording.

No standards are established

Furthermore, no basic standards have been listed to ensure the accuracy and fairness of any such recordings. The proposed rule reflects a lack of awareness or disregard for the extensive protocols and procedures that have been implemented throughout the state to ensure that electronic and/or near verbatim recordings are accurate and complete. Policy makers have consistently emphasized the importance of accurate documentation, particularly in cases involving child victims, and have established standards such as the Child Sexual Abuse Investigation Protocols, of which this rule makes no mention. If recorded interviews are to be compelled, then guidelines and standards must be established.

No requirement exists to notify the witness of the right to refuse recording

Victims and witnesses must also be informed of their right to object to the recording of an interview. They are not familiar with the criminal justice system and are usually unrepresented participants. The impact of the crime on a witness' life can make many witnesses particularly susceptible to intimidation and less capable of asserting their rights. At the very least, a required formalized process of informing a witness of his/her rights should be required. And if the courts are going to infringe upon the rights of non-party private citizens, the court should provide attorneys to represent the interests of those unrepresented private citizens.

The decision to record lies with the witness, not an attorney or the court

There has also been discussion that both defense and prosecuting attorneys like to have audio recordings and that this somehow justifies the recordings. But the fact that many witnesses submit to interviews or that it is convenient for the attorneys is not a basis to strip a witness of the choice not to be recorded. The few who elect not to be recorded have legitimate reasons for doing so and the decision should continue to rest with them - not with a judge or an attorney (either prosecution or defense) who does not have the best interests of the witness as their primary goal.

This rule has been presented many times for consideration with little to no change. We strongly urge you to reject the rule as currently proposed and we urge you to acknowledge at last that the choice to record an interview lies with only one person: the witness.

	Name	From	Comments
1.	Karla Krautscheid	Tumwater, WA	Washington Coalition of Crime Victim Advocates
2.	Leah Godfrey	Ephrata, WA	Victim/Witness Coordinator, Grant County Prosecutor's Office.
3.	Jacinta Carson	Kelso, WA	Emergency Support Shelter Advocate
4.	Kameon Quillen	Everett, WA	Families & Friends of Missing Persons and Violent Crime Victims
5.	Anna Diamond	Goldendale, WA	
6.	Tina Carmona	Pasco, WA	
7.	ELLEN HANEGAN-CRUSE	Olympia, WA	Indeterminate Sentence Review Board
8.	Yessica Rosas	kennewick, WA	
9.	Peggie Arnold	Kennewick, WA	
10.	NormaJean Rios	Granger, WA	Consejo Counseling & Referral Services Crime Victims Advocate
11.	Cydne Cochran	Entiat, WA	Crime Victim Services Advocate, Crime Victim & Trauma Assistance Center at the DSV Crisis Center of Chelan & Douglas Counties
12.	Sherina James	Tacoma, WA	DOC Victim Services
13.	Sheila Lewallen	Tumwater, WA	
14.	Stanley Phillips	Tumwater, WA	Thurston County Prosecutor's Office
15.	Nora J. Sizemore	Kingston, WA	Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Kitsap County, Victim Advocate
20.	Jeralita "Jeri" Costa	Marysville, WA	Victim involvement in the criminal justice process should be encouraged for the health and safety of all; their participation is voluntary and as citizens and victims they have constitutional rights that include the right to privacy. Infringing on their rights solely because they were unfortunate enough to be victimized is abhorrent. I urge the WSBA BOG to oppose this proposal. Thank you!
21.	Andrea Piper	Olympia, WA	For Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs
27.	Michael Golden	Chehalis, WA	As the Lewis County Prosecuting Attorney, I am most troubled by this court rule. First, it ignores the existence of Washington's electronic eavesdropping statute, which specifically prohibits the recording of private conversations without the consent of all parties. Many of the cases we handle involve issues which are not only private, they are intimate in nature. To the extent the victim or witness must submit to a video or audio recording at the hands of a criminal defense lawyer, that loss of privacy should take place before a tribunal with the authority to prevent harassing, irrelevant and unnecessarily intrusive questions. Many defense lawyers in this jurisdiction believe their only obligation is to get their clients off, and they treat victims <i>(continues on next page)</i>

	Name	From	Comments
27.	Michael Golden	Chehalis, WA	<i>(continued from previous page)</i> and witnesses accordingly. This rule change will be used as a tool to further victimize and harass victims and witnesses and should not be adopted in any form. If my live testimony would be of any assistance in making the decision not to adopt this rule change, I will gladly appear at any time and place necessary. Michael Golden Lewis County Prosecuting Attorney
28.	Dianna Hanson	Kennewick, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
29.	Sondra Dixon	Pasco, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center/Crime Victim Service Center
31.	Melody Bazzel	Goldendale, WA	
32.	Julie Karl	Dayton, WA	
33.	Tamra Ingwaldson	Port Orchard, WA	
34.	James A. McMurray	University Place, WA	Victim Advocate, My Service Mind of Northwest, Lakewood, WA 98466
35.	Karl Sloan	Okanogan, WA	
36.	Shamra Coy	Colville, WA	
37.	Renee Mahaney	Colville, WA	
38.	Laurie Cole	Kettle Falls, WA	Once again there are more rights to the courts and the criminal...we need to uphold the rights for the victims and the witnesses.
39.	Stephanie Sanders	Colville, WA	
40.	Nancy Foll	Colville, WA	Victims and witnesses should have the right to decide this.
41.	Laura Wilson	Kettle Falls, WA	
42.	Lyni Smith	Chewelah, WA	Completely opposed...this totally victimizes the victims and witnesses.
43.	michael johnson	Bremerton, WA	
44.	Cristina Peterson	Bellingham, WA	
45.	Erin Carden	SPOKANE, WA	Lutheran Community Services NW, SAFeT Advocacy
46.	Kelly Pelland	Port Orchard, WA	Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office Victim/Witness Coordinator
47.	Jenny Wieland Ward	Everett, WA	Families and Friends of Missing Persons and Violent Crime Victims
48.	Cathy Williams	Federal Way, WA	Federal Way Prosecutor's Office DV Liaison
49.	Leslie Morrison	Port Orchard, WA	Legal Assistant Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office
50.	Layla Carosa	Port Orchard, WA	Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office

	Name	From	Comments
51.	Kathy Hayes	Goldendale, WA	Klickitat County PA's Office
52.	Michelle Shaffer	Kelso, WA	Chief Criminal Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Cowlitz County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
53.	Julile DeSpain	Longview, WA	
54.	Tanis Costa	Marysville, WA	
55.	Eric Bentson	Kelso, WA	Cowlitz County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
56.	Mark Roe	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney Board member Families and Friends of Violent Crime Victims, Vice President Dawson Place Child Advocacy Center board I cannot imagine a worse idea than this rule change. Crime victims and witnesses generally did not choose their status. To essentially strip them of privacy rights because of the choice of someone to victimize them is an offensive notion. To dismiss the privacy rights of someone who merely happens to witness a crime is equally wrong. Victims and witnesses deserve more rights, and to have prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges respect those rights; not eradicate them.
57.	Shelly David	Auburn, WA	DV Legal Advocate. It is hard enough for survivors of domestic violence to go through all of the 'hoops' that the system has set up without adding one more, taking away her freedom to voice her/his choice to be recorded or not. Would you want your statement to be recorded and then used against you at trial?
58.	Jody Newby	Kelso, WA	Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Cowlitz County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
59.	Nancy Westlund	Longview, WA	Cowlitz County Prosecutor's Office
60.	Lynette Hedges	Renton, WA	
61.	Carol Opalinski	Port Orchard, WA	
62.	Allison Sands	Seattle, WA	I am a state employee working as a crime victim advocate
63.	winona latta	Meridian, ID	I am a mother of murdered child and grandchild, the courts were difficult enough to go through. Now they want to re-victimize the victims again and again. Make the murderers happy. I cannot tell you how sad this is.
64.	Holly Diaz	Mount Vernon, WA	
65.	Richard Hollister	Tucson, AZ	
66.	Marilynn LaBerge	Port Orchard, WA	Victim Advocate for Mothers Against Drunk Driving
67.	Patricia Hernandez	Gilroy, CA	
68.	Kamal Ranganathan	Bangalore, India	
69.	STEVE KLEIN	Herndon, VA	

	Name	From	Comments
70.	Julianne Schick	Concord, CA	Families and Friends of Missing Persons and Violent Crime Victims
71.	Karen Himes	Mount Vernon, WA	Victim/Witness Advocate Skagit County
72.	Kaia Scott	Arlington, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutors Office
73.	Shannon Harwood	Ellensburg, WA	Kittitas County Prosecutor's Office Victim / Witness Unit
74.	Brandi Ralston	richland, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
75.	Anne Marie Tennison	Kent, WA	I am the DV & Crime Victim Program Coordinator for the City of Kent Prosecutor's Office. It is often the most vulnerable victims that defense attorney's wish to record and this should remain a choice on the part of the victim. Victims do not choose to become victims of crime and they should have some control over how they participate in the criminal justice system. Victims have no way of communicating with the Washington State Bar Association and influencing court rules, we as advocates are speaking for those that have no voice....please listen.
76.	choi Hannah	Federal Way, United States Minor Outlying Islands	
77.	Heidi Wehde	Spokane, WA	Spokane County Victim/Witness Unit
78.	Rebecca McFann	Wenatchee, WA	DSV Crisis Center
79.	Miriam Cuevas	Kelso, WA	
80.	Beth Hislop	Olympia, WA	Victim Assistance Coordinator with City of Olympia Legal Department
81.	Pauline Rose-Reynolds	Bellingham, WA	Whatcom County Prosecuting Attorney's Office Victim/Witness Unit Domestic Violence Specialist I have many victims of violence and stalking who do NOT want their abuser to hear their voice- Victims of crime need to be able to make an informed choice- they should have the RIGHT TO CHOOSE.
82.	Kirby Orr	Richland, WA	
83.	Lisa Larrabee	Ellensburg, WA	
84.	Nikki Watkins	Kelso, WA	
85.	Deborah Lee	sEATTLE, WA	
86.	Angela Wolski	Kennewick, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
87.	Kelly Whitman	Salem, OR	
88.	Scott Peterson	Seattle, WA	Superior Courts do not have personal jurisdiction over witnesses. They have personal jurisdiction over the parties. The court's authority over witnesses extends only to (continues on next page)

	Name	From	Comments
88.	Scott Peterson	Seattle, WA	<i>(continued from previous page)</i> enforcing a subpoena to appear in court and ordering a witness to answer questions in court or face contempt sanctions. A court's power to hold a witness in contempt extends only to the four walls of the courtroom. A superior court does not have the power to order a witness to submit to being tape recorded during a defense witness interview outside of court.
89.	Colleen Ingalls	Bellingham, WA	Families and Friends of Violent Crime Victims
90.	Jennifer Ullrich	Marysville, WA	Member of Friends and Families of Missing Persons and Violent Crimes Victims So many crime victims get put through the trauma of their offence over and over again during the process of bringing their violators to justice. This seems another thing to detour them from wanting to prosecute!
91.	Tammie Elliott	Ocean Park, WA	Human Response Network & Crime Victims Advocacy Network
92.	Michelle Hull	Bellingham, WA	Lummi Victims of Crime Staff Attorney
93.	Corie Dow	Longview, WA	
94.	Denise Martin Washington	Pasco, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
95.	David Dunkleberger	Doylestown, PA	
96.	Zac Shileika	Everett, WA	
97.	Leslie Myette	Port Orchard, WA	Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office
98.	Brent Bartholomew	San Francisco, CA	
99.	Tina Harris	Seattle, WA	DV Victim Advocate with Renton Police Department
100.	Cynthia Neuhoff	Marysville, WA	
101.	RIC CASTELLANOS	vancouver, WA	As a victim of a serious crime and a witness to a serious crime both in Washington State I had all my rights taken away because they don't care about us as victims or witnesses that is why I am put on trial by the Crime Victims Program here in Washington State. They have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to deny me as a victim/witness what is written in both the State and Federal Constitution.
102.	Kirsten Hammer	Bellingham, WA	
103.	Anna Badgley	Davenport, WA	
104.	becca korbey	port angeles, WA	I am executive director of a domestic violence/sexual assault/child abuse prevention agency. Our services are victim centered and that includes the right of any victim to choose when and how they testify/disclose/tell their story. Victimization carries a heavy weight of oppression with it <i>(continues on next page)</i>

	Name	From	Comments
104.	becca korby	port angeles, WA	<i>(continued from previous page)</i> and that need not be compounded by the criminal justice system that is in place to hold perpetrators accountable rather than add burden to victims.
105.	Gretchen Olsen	Goldendale, WA	
106.	Gloria Callaghan	Hoquiam, WA	Domestic Violence Center of Grays Harbor
107.	Megan Fowler	West Richland, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
108.	ciara murphy	Seattle, WA	the salvation army domestic violence programs
109.	Emily O'Connor	Mount Vernon, WA	
110.	kirsten poole	bingen, WA	
111.	Amanda Coleman	Port Angeles, WA	
112.	Lianne Perron-Kossow	Port Townsend, WA	
113.	Lindsay Gilmore	Federal Way, WA	Domestic Violence Advocate
114.	Rea Culwell	Dayton, WA	Columbia County Prosecuting Attorney
115.	Diana Martinez	Wenatchee, WA	
116.	ann emineth	port angeles, WA	
117.	Amy Plummer	Kennewick, WA	
118.	ellen jensen	stevenson, WA	
119.	Rachel bryan	Stevenson, WA	Skamania Co. Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
120.	Lena Rehberger	Grebenhain, Germany	
121.	Amy Lyddon	North Bonneville, WA	
122.	Anna Rosentrater	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office
123.	Amber Louviere	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutor's office
124.	John Juhl	Everett, WA	Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Snohomish County
125.	Amber De Long	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorneys Office
126.	Scott Halloran	Shoreline, WA	
127.	christopher leyda	marysville, WA	Snohomish County Sheriff's Office As noted in the petition, this would violate the victim all over again, forcing them to go on tape and talk about the incident again, and again, and again... we all know how the system works and things that are looked for in a statement. Specifically, any inconsistencies, whether real or imagined, are often prime targets by defense attorneys attempting to minimize or negate the impact of said witness / victim testimony. The proper place for that is in the courtroom, in my opinion, not in a defense interview.
128.	Thomas Bonnington	Moses Lake, WA	

	Name	From	Comments
129.	Travis Johnson	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office
130.	Kathleen Webber	Everett, WA	
131.	Laurie Johnson	MARYSVILLE, WA	Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney Office
132.	Thomas Curtis	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office
133.	Kathy Jo Blake	Shoreline, WA	Snohomish County Pros. Attorney
134.	Teresa Kranz	Snohomish, WA	Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
135.	Shawn Siers	Lynnwood, WA	
136.	Susie Landdsiedel	Davenport, WA	Family Resource Center of Lincoln County
137.	heidi potter	everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutors Office
138.	Cynthia Owens	Lynnwood, WA	
139.	Angelita Kramer	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
140.	Tanya Bunting	Omak, WA	The Support Center
142.	Denise Branch	Omak, WA	OkanoganCo. Prosecutors, Colville Tribal Prosecutors, NWJP/CLEAR, WASPC, OCVA, CVSC's
143.	Catey Hansen	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Sheriff's Office
144.	Karen Titus	Longview, WA	
145.	Lonnie Johns-Brown	Seattle, WA	lobbyist, Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs
146.	Gail Johnston	Pasco, WA	Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney's Office We deal daily with frightened witnesses/victims. They have already been violated once, we need to protect them from being violated again by the legal system. Forcing people to be recorded at interviews will only make them even more reluctant to participate in the legal process. We need to preserve witness/victims rights to refuse to be recorded.
147.	Mary Brady	Spokane, WA	
148.	Juelanne Dalzell	Port Townsend, WA	
149.	Julie Mohr	Everett, WA	Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office
150.	JoDee Garretson	Kennewick, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center/Crime Victim Service Center Benton/Franklin Counties
152.	Lona Fritts	Riverside, WA	
153.	Renee Blackman	Kennewick, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
154.	Stephen Garvin	Spokane, WA	Spokane County Prosecuting Attorney Many victims are very unhappy with the idea of their words being recorded.
155.	Laurie Dunkerton	Port Townsend, WA	
156.	Leticia Garcia	Kennewick, WA	Sexual Assault Response Center
157.	carmen grodzki	Bingen, WA	PFPL

	Name	From	Comments
158.	Kim Kremer	Pasco, WA	Franklin County Prosecutor's Office I fear that compelling recordings would make victim less cooperative.
159.	Steve Eckstrom	Olympia, WA	The proposed rule is unnecessary and counter to the interests of justice.
160.	Wayne Graham	Olympia, WA	Thurston County Deputy Prosecutor Blatant attempt to intimidate witnesses by the defense bar
161.	dan soukup	Seattle, WA	
162.	Greg Banks	Coupeville, WA	Island County Prosecuting Attorney
164.	Erin Lewis	Coupeville, WA	Island County Prosecutor's Office
165.	Eric Ohme	Coupeville, WA	Island County Prosecutor
168.	Ian Goodhew	Seattle, WA	
169.	Warren Page	Bellingham, WA	
170.	Kristin Richardson	Seattle, WA	
171.	Chong Yi	Lakewood, WA	
172.	Derin Gibson	Vancouver, WA	Ladies & Gentlemen, Please reject Criminal Rule 4.11. If enacted, this rule will surely cause unnecessary distress to victims. If a victim is cooperating with defense, why should they be forced to participate in a taped interview? There is not a good or reasonable answer to this question and should therefore be rejected. Thank you.
173.	Mandy Ma	Lakewood, WA	My Service Mind of Northwest
174.	Cecilia Barajas	Yakima, WA	Yakima County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Victim-Witness Assistance Unit Please reject Criminal Rule 4.11. We wouldn't want someone subjecting us to a recorded conversation without our authorization. Much less if we were victims of a sexual assault or if we are child victims. In my experience most witnesses agree to a recording, but few do not because of fear or other good reason. And in those cases, they make themselves available for an interview anyway. Therefore, a deposition should not be ordered. The decision to be recorded should always be for the witness or the victim to make. They didn't choose to be victims of a crime. They didn't choose to witness something tragic. Let us not take their right to CHOOSE to be recorded or to choose NOT to be recorded. It's the least we can do to help empower them after being victimized. Let's uphold their legal rights. Thank you.
175.	Jennifer Kelly	Des Moines, WA	I believe that the current way that victims are questioned during discovery should leave the victim of a crime with the ability to choose whether or not a recording can be used (continues on next page)

	Name	From	Comments
175.	Jennifer Kelly	Des Moines, WA	<i>(continued from previous page)</i> and have the right not to have the recording if they should choose not to.
176.	tim collins	Olympia, WA	
177.	TAMARA VAUGHN	Cheney, WA	
178.	NOEMY RIVAS	Okanogan, WA	
179.	Josanne Nordyke	Puyallup, WA	
180.	Krasimira Buyuklieva-Darzeva	Stara Zagora, Bulgaria	
181.	alexandra lotsch	Southampton, NY	
182.	Galen Dietz	Renton, WA	
183.	David Duchesneau	Puyallup, WA	I completely agree with the Letter of Opposition to Criminal Rule 4.11 as currently proposed.
184.	Tracy Hocter	Goldendale, WA	Relationship Abuse Prevention Program
185.	Chrys Potuzak	Seattle, WA	
186.	Stanley Phillips	Olympia, WA	Crime Victim Advocacy Network
187.	Patricia Hebert	Leavenworth, WA	Wenatchee DSV and Crisis Center The added pressure on witnesses proposed in this law will revictimize persons struggling to find safety.
188.	Candy Joachims	Yakima, WA	
189.	colleen michael	Rainier, WA	
190.	Catherine O'Byrne	Everett, WA	