

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Tracy, Mary](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Changes to CrR 3.4  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 16, 2020 8:03:25 AM

---

---

**From:** Bradlow, Rebecca [mailto:Rebecca.Bradlow@kingcounty.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 15, 2020 8:19 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** Proposed Changes to CrR 3.4

Hello,

I am emailing to express my support for the proposed changes to CrR 3.4. I am a practicing Public Defender in Washington and I firmly believe that these changes take a needed step towards creating a 'just' system where members of our community are not denied access to justice because of their socioeconomic status.

Fewer required physical appearances for clients will have the simple result of fewer missed work shifts, less stress on already strained childcare systems, less gas money, less bus money, and fewer lengthy days waiting in court simply to be told "your case has been continued, come back next time and we'll do this again."

The assertion by many prosecutors and judges, based on my review of the public comments, seems to be that the proposed change to this rule is problematic because it will result in a strain to the system and that the hearings are necessary. I fundamentally disagree with both assertions.

- First, the system is strained for a myriad of reasons, there is no denying that, but placing the blame on the backs of our, primarily indigent, clients is cruel, ignorant, and unhelpful. I urge the court to look to the record on this, the number of court continuances, trial continuances, and court delays that are based on missing or late discovery from the State, ongoing investigation, ongoing negotiations, State or Defense unavailability, or pending witness interviews will, I'm sure, vastly outweigh any other supposed system strain. Perhaps the Court and State should look inward rather than outward if delay is the concern.
- Second, the majority of the hearings at issue are not necessary for anyone other than the attorneys. To be sure, arraignment, trial, and some limited other hearings cannot take place without the defendant present. However, the majority of other court hearings are primarily 'scheduling' hearings that last approximately 2-10 minutes, are for the purpose of notifying the Court of a case's trajectory, and client presence seems to be for the sole purpose of giving prosecutors a basis to issue warrants. If clients wish to save themselves the time and hassle of showing up for a hearing that they will have little to no voice in, there should be no debate that attendance is optional.

I ask this reviewing body to carefully consider the motivations behind the those persons who support this amendment and those persons who oppose it. I ask this reviewing body to carefully consider whether those persons who oppose the amendment have ever had meaningful interactions with those people who are directly affected by the proposed changes. I ask this reviewing body to consider the comments of parents and loved ones of clients with mental illnesses, physical

disabilities, and financial limitations that result in their effective denial of access to justice.  
Thank you,

Rebecca Bradlow  
She/Her  
TDA Staff Attorney  
Kent Felonies  
206-477-8714  
420 W. Harrison St., STE 202, Kent 98032