

Tracy, Mary

From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 3:56 PM
To: Tracy, Mary
Subject: FW: Proposed Rule Changes

Forwarding.

From: Connie Church [mailto:churchhouse@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 3:51 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Proposed Rule Changes

Dear Members of the Supreme Court:

As a certified court reporter in Washington State, I am writing to urge you to adopt CR 28(d), (e), and CR 30(b)(1) for all of the reasons outlined in the GR 9 cover pages.

I believe the adoption of CR 28(d) will provide quick remedies for violations of equal terms outlined in CR 28(c) that are regularly being engaged in by nationwide firms here in the state of Washington.

I believe the passage of CR 28(e) will prevent court reporting firms from making changes to transcripts after the original transcript has been completed. It will prevent unethical and unscrupulous "stretching" of transcripts by reducing the characters per line established in RAP 9.2 and WAC 308-14-135 guidelines in order to create a longer transcript and charge higher fees for same to the consumers of our product.

I think the adoption of CR 30(b)(1) requiring transparency and notification within the deposition notice to disclose the existence of any known contractual relationships between the noticing party, its counselor, a third party paying to record the noticed deposition and the person, court reporting firm, consortium, or other organization providing a court reporter for the noticed deposition is necessary to ensure all parties are aware of what could be considered a violation of CR 28(c), in that a court reporting firm that has a long-term contract with one of the parties is not a disinterested person under CR 28(c).

Thank you for publishing these proposed rules, I very much hope they will be adopted.

Sincerely yours,

Connie Church, CCR, RPR, CRR, CRC
Washington Certified Court Reporter #2555