

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Martinez, Jacquelynn](#)
Subject: FW: comment to proposed changes to CrR and CrRLJ 4.7
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 2:57:45 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Ramic, Anela <ARAMIC@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 2:51 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: comment to proposed changes to CrR and CrRLJ 4.7

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.

Hello,

I am writing to provide input regarding the proposed changes to CrR 4.7(h) and CrRLJ 4.7(h).

The proposed amendments allow defense counsel to provide discovery to the defendant after redacting pursuant to local rules. The rule does not establish a procedure that applies before each local court adopts redaction rules. Under the proposed rule, the defense attorney does not provide a copy of the redacted discovery to the court or the prosecutor. As a result, no errors in the redaction can be identified and no disagreement with how the redaction rules are being applied can be identified. The existence of unique local redaction rules increases the probability that there will be errors in compliance with the local rules. This is absolutely negligent and a public safety risk to multitudes of victims, but especially those in special assault and domestic violence cases. I have personally prosecuted individuals, who, even with redacted discovery have utilized information provided through their attorney to terrorize their former intimate partners and their children. It is a serious, daily safety risk and there are many persons held in custody on serious offenses who are willing to risk interfering with the justice system through means such as this. There is no legitimate reason that a person who is represented by an attorney who is often assisted by a paralegal *and* investigator also needs the personal identification details of witnesses in discovery.

While the proponent of the rule refers to the thorough redaction guidelines provided in the King County Prosecutor's Office redaction guidelines, there is no reason to believe that rules adopted by *each* local court will be as thorough. If such a rule is adopted, the thorough redaction guidelines referenced in the proposal should be included in the state-wide rule. In the alternative, the rule could require compliance with the redaction guidelines of the

prosecuting authority in that jurisdiction. Finally, the prosecutor should be provided a copy of the redacted discovery that is provided to the defendant, in order to assure that all appropriate redactions have been made. Keeping a copy of the redacted discovery in defense counsel's file is inadequate, as any errors in redaction that reveal the location or contact information of victims/ witnesses will be discovered only after the victims/ witnesses have been contacted by the defendant or their associates.

Thank you for your consideration.



Anela Ramić (she/her)

Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Domestic
Violence Unit - Seattle
King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office