

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Martinez, Jacquelynn](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment re: Caseload Standards
Date: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 4:44:17 PM

From: Park, Aiden <aidpark@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 4:44 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: Public Comment re: Caseload Standards

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.

Justices of the Washington State Supreme Court,

I am writing in support of the proposed court rule amendments to codify the WSBA's recently passed criminal caseload standards for public defenders. The WSBA Board of Governors approved these long-overdue updates to the maximum workload public defenders can reasonably be expected to carry for a simple and obvious reason: They recognized the status quo has required public defenders like me to compromise our ethical obligations to our clients.

This is not an academic matter – as unsustainable workloads drive my experienced colleagues out of public defense, those of us who remain are forced to take on more and more cases carrying potential life-altering consequences for our clients. We do everything we can to vindicate our clients' constitutional right to a speedy trial, but with near-constant trials many clients have no choice but to continue their case – and prolong their pre-trial incarceration – until their latest attorney has capacity to prepare for yet another trial.

There have been many instances in which I have been in trial, or another time-intensive hearing, such that I did not have enough capacity to contact clients whose pre-trial hearings were the next day. I could not talk them through their right to trial meaningfully, despite the fact that the decision to set for trial is weighty. The reality is this often places clients in a position of having to continue their cases to think about what I just advised them of. That is, my caseload often places me in the position of having to impart crucial information about a client's rights and options the very moment they need to make a large decision. This is not what our system was designed to accomplish.

I know you will hear from institutional actors claiming that these standards are impractical or would be prohibitively expensive. These concerns are real, but they cannot justify continuing a status quo that makes a mockery out of most clients' constitutional right to a speedy trial. My colleagues and I are already stretched to our breaking point.

Without the relief that these caseloads would bring, the quality of the representation I can provide to people who do not have the ability to choose their own lawyer will continue to get worse. At some point, I will reach the same conclusion as many of my former colleagues: I can no longer practice in public defense while claiming to honor my ethical obligations to my clients.

The Supreme Court did not condition the right to an attorney on a government's ability to afford one when it decided *Gideon v. Wainwright*. They rightly placed the obligation to find funding to pay for a public defender at public expense on the government seeking to take away an indigent person's liberty.

When deciding whether that right means my clients deserve someone with the time and capacity to zealously represent them, that is the example this Court should follow. I urge you to adopt the proposed court rules that would codify the WSBA's caseload standards for public defenders so the right enshrined in *Gideon* entitles my clients to more than just a warm body with a bar card.

Respectfully,

Aiden Park

Public Defender

Northwest Defenders Division

King County Department of Public Defense

(206) 390-0592

he/him