From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
To: Linford, Tera
Subject: FW: proposed change to IRLJ 2.5
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 2:22:30 PM
Attachments: image001.png

From: Greene, Richard <Richard.Greene@seattle.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 2:13 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: proposed change to IRLJ 2.5

The text of what purports to be existing IRLJ 2.5 appears to be wrong. The word "traffic" is not found currently in the 1st line. Proposed IRLJ 2.5(b) should have the word "traffic" in the 1st sentence.

The requirement of notifying a defendant that they have not responded to a notice of traffic infraction before a default judgment can be entered simply adds more work and more expense to a court of limited jurisdiction without any showing that defendants routinely, or even often, contact the court after failing to respond to a notice of traffic infraction to explain that they inadvertently or negligently missed the clearly stated deadline for responding. The requirement for an itemized assessment does not serve any useful purpose, other than, again, to create more work for the court. Will informing a defendant that $5 of his traffic infraction penalty is for the emergency medical services and trauma care system somehow encourage them to pay the penalty?

Setting the payment at $10/month, regardless of a defendant's financial circumstances, for a defendant insufficiently interested or diligent enough to even bother to respond to a notice of traffic infraction finds no basis in the statutes and will only create more work for the court in processing payments. If a defendant can somehow afford gasoline (especially at today's prices) they would seem to be able to pay more than $10/month for their traffic violations.

Richard Greene
Assistant City Prosecutor
Seattle City Attorney's Office
Criminal Division

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2050
Seattle, WA 98104-7097
Phone: 206-684-8538
FAX: 206-684-4648
richard.greene@seattle.gov