

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Linford, Tera](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to changes to CrR 3.4
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 3:46:51 PM

From: Thompson, Darren [mailto:Darren.Thompson@kingcounty.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 3:42 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Opposition to changes to CrR 3.4

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.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed changes to CrR 3.4.

There are so many reasons why this will never work. I encourage you to read all the comments that go into greater detail of the myriad specific examples of why the proposed changes are wrong.

One example I'd like to make: think of every Zoom meeting you've ever been in. There is always something you cannot hear due to connection issues or people talking over each other. Now imagine pivotal stages of the criminal justice system being conducted like that, where the defendant, the person who has a constitutional right to face his accuser is sitting at home on a laptop and nobody knows if he can hear or see what is going on. Everyone is just hoping for the best – that everything makes it to him – that he can hear the judge, the prosecutor, his own attorney, the witness, the interpreter, the jurors during voir dire, etc. And, that when he speaks, he is heard by all of those people. And that a court reporter can hear it all and make a complete record. And that he can see the documents he needs to see (Information, Guilty Plea Statement, etc.). The potential appellate issues are countless just based on a claim by the defendant that he did not hear or see or read something important because of Zoom issues. The appellate courts will be blocked for years on these issues alone.

Yes, a defendant is innocent until proven guilty. But, he is expected to attend hearings after probable cause is found. He is in the courtroom to deal with the consequences of his own actions; and if it turns out he is wrongly accused, then he is in the courtroom to make that clear so that justice can be properly served. He is in the courtroom to make sure the State does its job and meets its burden. He is in the courtroom so that the jury can determine if he is guilty or not. He is in the courtroom so that victims can see who wronged them. Any way you look at it, the defendant needs to be in the

courtroom. Justice for all happens in the courtroom.

Please do not permit these changes.

Thank you,
Darren Thompson