Tracy, Mary

From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 12:28 PM
To: Tracy, Mary
Subject: FW: Objecting to changes in CrR 3.7 - 4.11

From: Odegard, Ryan [mailto:rodegard@kingcounty.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2019 12:25 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Objecting to changes in CrR 3.7 - 4.11

Hello,

I am a Prosecutor with King County, writing on behalf of my own personal opinions regarding proposed CrR 3.7 – 4.11. I don't believe they will benefit the people of Washington as a whole and have included some reasons below:

Regarding 3.7:

- **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.
- **At the beginning of an investigation, almost everyone is under investigation and requiring audio-visual recording of the questioning of everyone at the scene of a violent crime will obstruct justice, as many will be reluctant to speak when video recorded.** The rule does not take into account that a person may first appear to be only a witness but later become a suspect.
- **The rule encompasses every encounter with a potential suspect, no matter how casual or innocuous, on the scene, on the street, at their home, in a vehicle, or at any other location.** It imposes an unreasonable burden on law enforcement.
- **Proposed CrR 3.7 appears to be predicated on a belief that police are inherently untrustworthy and cannot be taken at their word.** The credibility of witnesses is a matter for the judge or jury to decide after hearing all of the evidence.
- **The rule is impractical – most police agencies in Washington lack the resources to record and preserve the broad range of interactions that would fall within the rule.** The additional burden of preserving detailed maintenance records of every recording device used also is unwarranted.
- Proposed CrR 3.7 would require sweeping changes to police procedure in the investigation of every incident that may constitute a crime. Not only would it obstruct these investigations, it is an unrealistic mandate and unless it is funded by the court, impossible due to lack of equipment that would be required.
- The rule presumes that any statement not taken in compliance with the rule is untrustworthy. It codifies a presumption that officers who have taken an oath to uphold the law are presumed to be unreliable witnesses. It shifts the normal burden away from the person trying to suppress the evidence onto the State, with no reason.
- Proposed CrR 3.7 is not limited to interrogations by law enforcement. Does it apply to retail security? Child/ Adult Protective Service employees? Any state employee or agent? Private citizens? Judges?

- The rule does not define "interrogation." Subsection (b) suggests any question is an interrogation. It could be broadly interpreted to include actions likely to provoke a response.
- Proposed CrR 3.7 imposes an impossible burden. It would require universal recording of everyone with whom an investigator speaks/ interacts to avoid errors, violating the privacy rights of citizens and producing a massive amount of recordings that will be subject to public disclosure.
- This is an unwarranted burden on police investigations.
- The rule does not limit applicability to events that occur after enactment of the rule. Even if it did, most law enforcement agencies will be unable to immediately acquire video recording equipment for all officers to carry at all times (the financial and practical obstacles would be overwhelming), and to retroactively create maintenance records as to existing equipment.
- The rule will require litigation as to whether the questioner knew the person questioned was "under investigation," when the questioner knew that, and perhaps whether the questioner should have known the person could be implicated in a crime (any crime). Is it a subjective or an objective standard? What if the person becomes a suspect mid-questioning?
- Proposed CrR 3.7 is an improper exercise of the court's authority, forcing specified investigative procedures without legal authority to direct police use of resources and the nature of their interrogations.

Regarding 3.8:

- 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 rule will result in intimidation of victims (and witnesses) of violent crimes when recordings of them making an identification are circulated by the defendant. The recordings will be available under the Public Records Act upon the filing of charges.
- How does it further justice to bar evidence of identification procedures rather than allow the jury to determine the weight of the evidence, which is tested by cross-examination?
- The rule is impractical – most police agencies in Washington lack the resources to record and preserve all identification procedures. The rule would encompass identifications at the scene of traffic accidents as well as ongoing violent crimes.
- Existing constitutional and common law standards adequately address the issue of admissibility of identification procedures.
- **It is unclear that the lack of availability of recording devices would be a legitimate reason not to video record the procedure.** Such an exception must be included.
- **The rule does not make clear that a witness's assertion of their right not to be recorded (under the Privacy Act) would establish that recording was not possible.**
- The rule does not define "when practicable." Who makes that decision?
- What does the reference to "administrators" mean? Supervisors?
- What "is possible" is a standard that is impossible to interpret. Does it allow an exception for exigent circumstances, lack of equipment, or community safety?

Thank you,

Ryan

Ryan Odegard
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Felony Trial Unit
King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
206-263-6823 rodegard@kingcounty.gov