

## Tracy, Mary

---

**From:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 16, 2019 4:42 PM  
**To:** Tracy, Mary  
**Subject:** FW: Objections to Proposed rule changes

**From:** Washington, LaKeysha [mailto:[lwashington@kingcounty.gov](mailto:lwashington@kingcounty.gov)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 16, 2019 4:40 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <[SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV](mailto:SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV)>  
**Subject:** Objections to Proposed rule changes

- **Proposed CrR 3.7 will impede effective law enforcement because many individuals are reluctant to be recorded.** Requiring them to be recorded will decrease cooperation with police. It is illogical and a violation of the Washington Privacy Act to record the refusal of a person who refuses to be recorded.
- **Proposed CrR 3.7 will impede effective law enforcement because many individuals are reluctant to be recorded. Requiring them to be recorded will decrease cooperation with police. It is illogical and a violation of the Washington Privacy Act to record the refusal of a person who refuses to be recorded.**
- **Proposed CrR 3.8 will impede effective law enforcement, because many individuals are reluctant to be recorded. With respect to DV victims, human trafficking victims, and any victim of a violent crime or gang-related violence, they will fear retaliation because they will anticipate (accurately) that their assailant will have access to the recording and their image may be circulated to associates of the defendant for purposes of retaliation.**
- The proposed amendment to CrR 4.7 requires the State to disclose evidence known to anyone acting on the State's behalf, which arguably includes any State witness, especially with the concluding clause, "including the police." It could be construed to include witnesses testifying pursuant to a plea agreement. It is unreasonable to require the State to disclose evidence of which it is unaware when that evidence is known only to a witness or another civilian. While the Brady obligation extends to evidence known to law enforcement directly involved in an investigation, it certainly does not extend to civilians who are not State agents. If the proposed amendment is not intended to expand the Brady rule, then it is entirely unnecessary.

**LaKeysha N. Washington**  
**Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney**  
**Domestic Violence Unit-MRJC**  
**[lwashington@kingcounty.gov](mailto:lwashington@kingcounty.gov)**  
**(206) 477-1218-desk**  
**(206) 455-5150-cell**