

Samuel S. Chung President King County Superior Court 516 3rd Ave, Rm C-203 Seattle, WA 98104-2361 206-477-1417

Kristin Ferrera President Elect Chelan County Superior Court 401 Washington St, FI 5 Wenatchee, WA 98807-0880 509-667-2610

Jennifer A. Forbes Immediate Past President Kitsap County Superior Court 614 Division St, MS 24 Port Orchard, WA 98366-4683 360-337-7140

Shelley D. Szambelan Secretary Spokane County Superior Court 1116 W Broadway Ave Spokane, WA 99260-0350 509-477-5792

Ken Schubert Treasurer King County Superior Court 401 4th Ave N, Rm 2D Kent, WA 98032-4429 206-477-1567

Board of Trustees

Raymond F. Clary

Spokane County Superior Court 1116 W Broadway Ave Spokane, WA 99260-0350 509-477-4704

Chris Lanese

Thurston County Superior Court 2000 Lakeridge Dr, SW, Bldg 2 Olympia, WA 98502-1045 360-786-5560

Adrienne Thomas McCoy King County Superior Court 516 3rd Ave, Rm C-203 Seattle, WA 98104-2361 206-477-1933

Susan Adams Pierce County Superior Court 930 Tacoma Ave S, Rm 334 Tacoma, WA 98402-2108 253-798-7571

Laura M. Riguelme

Skagit County Superior Court 205 W Kincaid St, Rm 202 Mount Vernon, WA 98273-4225 360-416-1200

Norma Rodriguez Benton/Franklin Co Superior Courts 7122 W Okanogan PI, Bldg A Kennewick, WA 99336-2359 509-736-3071

Josephine Wiggs

King County Superior Court 516 3rd Ave, Rm C-203 Seattle, WA 98104-2361 206-477-4933

Superior Court Judges' Association

April 25, 2024

Honorable Charles W. Johnson, Chair Honorable Mary I. Yu, Chair Washington State Supreme Court Rules Committee Temple of Justice P.O. Box 40929 Olympia, WA 98504-0929

Dear Justice Johnson and Justice Yu:

Re: Proposed Changes to CrR 3.2

The Superior Court Judges' Association (SCJA) reviewed the proposed changes to Criminal Rule (CrR) 3.2. This proposed change would require courts to offer persons accused of crimes an appearance bond, which is a 10% cash deposit of the bail amount paid directly to the court. This deposit could then be returned to the accused at the end of their case. After much discussion within the SCJA, and appreciation for the underlying rationale of the proposed changes, we must respectfully request the Supreme Court reject this proposal.

The SCJA generally supports limiting the impact of assigned bond on indigent litigants. From a court's perspective, there is little bureaucratic impact as to whether the 10% deposit of a bond goes to a private bail bonds firm or to the county clerk. However, depositing bond with the clerk could make a significant difference to persons accused of crimes and their families, as those funds would be returned to them at the end of the case if they comply with pretrial requirements. Alternatively, when posting through a bond agent, the accused would lose the 10% deposit regardless of pretrial compliance, disproportionately impacting low-income people, which is the majority of people coming through court. Changes to Washington's bail system have the potential to moderate a real economic barrier to pretrial release and should be encouraged. The SCJA has long served as a partner in pretrial reform efforts, including co-sponsoring Washington's Pretrial Reform Task Force several years ago.

The SCJA does not find, however, that the changes offered to CrR 3.2 are the best option for bail system reform. This proposal would eliminate judicial discretion in determining the options under which a person accused of a crime would pay bond. While judges currently have the *option* to offer an appearance bond, they are not *required* to do so. There are some cases where an appearance bond might not be effective, so judicial discretion in making the determination on the type of bond to impose is necessary. For example, the efforts of a bond agent can be instrumental in returning to court individuals with a significant flight risk for which either the full bond amount or collateral for the full amount significantly increases the likelihood of their return to court and the administration of justice.

April 25, 2024 Page 2

For this reason, the SCJA opposes the changes proposed to CrR 3.2. The SCJA would welcome, however, a change to CrR 3.2 that would suppose an appearance bond as the default, but allow judicial discretion to deny or limit an appearance bond when certain conditions are met (e.g., significant flight risk) and specific findings are made. Superior courts value clear and precise criteria to guide judicial decision making as to the appropriate use of bond types.

Finally, many of the judges reviewing this proposed rule change were unfamiliar with the option of an appearance bond, and have never been requested to grant such a bond. To increase the use of appearance bonds in superior courts as an option for certain defendants, the SCJA would welcome tailored judicial education and outreach.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Chung anne Samuel Chung, President

Superior Court Judges' Association

cc: SCJA Board of Trustees Ms. Allison Lee Muller

From:	OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
То:	Martinez, Jacquelynn
Subject:	FW: Court Rule Public Comment Letters
Date:	Thursday, April 25, 2024 2:45:39 PM
Attachments:	SCJA Public Comment CR 59 GR 3.2.pdf
	SCJA Public Comment GR 41.pdf
	SCJA Public Comment CrR 3.2.pdf

From: Valdez, Andrea <Andrea.Valdez@courts.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 2:42 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Cc: 'Chung, Samuel' <Samuel.Chung@kingcounty.gov>; Lee Muller, Allison
<Allison.LeeMuller@courts.wa.gov>; Ireland, Shelley <Shelley.Ireland@courts.wa.gov>; Green, Heidi
<Heidi.Green@courts.wa.gov>
Subject: Court Rule Public Comment Letters

Good afternoon.

Please see the attached comment letters on behalf of the Superior Court Judges' Association. The proposed rules we are commenting on at this time are:

- CR 59 / GR 3.2
- GR 41
- CrR 3.2

Thank you, Andrea Valdez, MPA (she/her/hers) Senior Policy Analyst Superior Court Judges' Association Administrative Office of the Courts <u>Andrea.valdez@courts.wa.gov</u>