

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Linford, Tera](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment - I am opposing the DMCJA proposal to amend CrRLJ 3.3 and 3.4.
Date: Tuesday, March 1, 2022 8:07:56 AM

From: Christine Olson [mailto:colson@snocopda.org]
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:04 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Public Comment - I am opposing the DMCJA proposal to amend CrRLJ 3.3 and 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 oppose the DMCJA proposal to amend CrRLJ 3.3 and 3.4.

The 2021 changes to CrRLJ 3.4 have greatly lifted the burden of numerous court dates on indigent defendants, enhanced communication between attorneys and clients, have made calendars more efficient and effective, and promoted safety through COVID. Reverting back to the presumption of physical presence will just re-introduce the problems that existed prior to *Gelinas* and the current version of 3.4. Clients having the ability to appear via zoom for most hearings or having the opportunity to appear through counsel has kept cases moving forward in Snohomish County where access to transportation is difficult. It has eased the burden that many indigent clients face while keeping cases moving forward. It has allowed clients to still appear for court when they need to be at work or cannot find childcare or transportation. It has allowed clients to resolve their cases in a more efficient matter. It has also made it so clients with public defenders do not need to sit in crowded courtroom waiting long periods of time while the court takes private attorney matters first (which is the custom tradition in Snohomish County District and Municipal Courts).

Furthermore, the proposal to require defense attorneys to notify their clients of court dates and to report to the court whether they had communication with their clients is very problematic. It puts a further burden on public defenders managing large caseloads. It also violates RPC 1.6. Public defenders in particular work hard to gain the trust of their clients. Requiring public defenders to disclose confidential communication to the court will only hurt the attorney-client relationship.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christine Olson (Preferred Pronouns: She/Her/Hers)

Associate Supervisor

Snohomish County Public Defender Association

2722 Colby Ave, Suite 200, Everett, WA 98201

(425) 339-6300, ext. 270 (Office)

(360) 206-9788 (Cell)

colson@snocopda.org

