From: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

To: <u>Linford, Tera</u>

Subject: FW: Support for proposed changes to IRLJs 1.2, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, and 5.1, proposed new

rules

Date: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 9:35:52 AM

From: Bruce Adsero [mailto:badsero@feldmanlee.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 9:34 AM

To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK < SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>

Subject: Support for proposed changes to IRLJs 1.2, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, and 5.1,

proposed new rules

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.

My name is Bruce Adsero. I am a criminal defense attorney, and 95 percent of my case load is devoted to indigent defense. DWLS3, DWLS2, and DWLS1 are very common offenses that I provide representation on.

In addition to the persuasive reasoning provided in comments by other proponents, I would ask the court to consider the important safeguards this rule would provide for individuals before they are trapped in the cycle of endless suspensions.

Currently, a DWLS 3 charge, which is often a crime of poverty, not only carries a risk of jail or fine, but is a predicate charge for purposes of a DWLS 2 suspension pursuant to RCW 46.20.291(3) and WAC 308-104-025. Preventing unnecessary DWSL 3 suspensions will help protect indigent defendants from the greater jeopardy of more serious suspensions. As it stands, very few procedural safeguards exist for indigent individuals before they are locked into this cycle.

Bruce Adsero WSBA #53986 Attorney Feldman & Lee PS (425) 775-7258