

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Linford, Tera](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comment re: Proposed CR 71 Changes  
**Date:** Friday, April 16, 2021 10:58:34 AM

---

---

**From:** Sophia M. Palmer [mailto:[Sophia@sophiampalmerlaw.com](mailto:Sophia@sophiampalmerlaw.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 16, 2021 10:56 AM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <[SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV](mailto:SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV)>  
**Subject:** Comment re: Proposed CR 71 Changes

**External Email Warning!** This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, **DO NOT DO SO!** Instead, report the incident.

It has come to my attention that there is a proposal currently pending before the Supreme Court to amend Civil Rule 71. The proposed Amendment would allow Judges to prevent attorneys from withdrawing within 90 days of trial (among other things) in civil cases. As stated in the disclosure statement, "this proposal is supported by the Superior Court Judges Association (SCJA) with the stated purpose of: (a) reducing judicial inconvenience, (b) avoiding disordered dockets, and (c) protecting pro se litigants from undue prejudice.

While the stated purposes above are valid, these concerns must be balanced against the interests of the attorneys that will be forced to remain on a case they no longer than they wish. There are some attorneys who would not be able to pay their rent if the Supreme Court were to adopt such a rule and would have a particularly disparate impact on new attorneys.

In addition, this proposed rule will have significant impact to attorneys who practice family law, where the judges are most likely to see pro se litigants at trial. This will have the unintended affect of attorneys withdrawing well before the 90-day mark so as not to be subject to this rule, causing cases that could settle during that time period, instead to go to trial, causing more docket congestion and more of the "disordered dockets" the court is trying to protect against. As such this rule will not solve the problem, it will simply make pro se parties, pro se sooner in the process.

I respectfully encourage the Court to reject this proposed rule change.

Respectfully,

Sophia M. Palmer

**Sophia M. Palmer** | Attorney at Law PH 253.777.4165 |  
FX 253.777.4168 | [sophia@sophiampalmerlaw.com](mailto:sophia@sophiampalmerlaw.com)  
615 Commerce St. Ste 101 | Tacoma, WA 98402  
[SOPHIAMPALMERLAW.COM](http://SOPHIAMPALMERLAW.COM)



**NOTICE:** The information contained in this transmission is **CONFIDENTIAL** and may also be protected by **ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGE**. This e-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. secs. 2510-2521, and is legally privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, the reader is hereby notified that any unauthorized review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail or call the sender at (253) 777-4165, and destroy all copies of the original message.