

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Martinez, Jacquelyn](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Standards for Indigent Defense  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 2, 2024 8:10:16 AM

---

---

**From:** Alan Zarky <azarky@d-z.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 6:36 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** Proposed Standards for Indigent Defense

You don't often get email from [azarky@d-z.com](mailto:azarky@d-z.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**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.

I support the Proposed Standards for Indigent Defense. I have not practiced much in Washington state courts, but I have 45 years of practice doing federal criminal defense, including 15 years (and still counting) as a Federal Public Defender. I am aware of how much better supported our office is than state public defense agencies. I am not proposing that there be parity between them, but thanks to my habeas practice I have some knowledge of how poorly defendants can be represented as a result of understaffing in state public defense agencies. I and my colleagues frequently are called upon to represent prisoners seeking habeas relief based on ineffective assistance of counsel. I have seen significant problems with inadequate investigation, missed meritorious issues, and so forth, many of which rise, in my view, to Sixth Amendment violations. And I know that many, probably most, of these deficiencies are not a result of bad lawyers, but of overworked and under-supported lawyers. (As an aside, I'll note that rarely can the ineffective assistance be remedied, given the difficulty for pro se defendants in developing the record for a state personal restraint petition while imprisoned and given the inability for their federal counsel to develop the record under

the restrictions of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996.) The only solution for this is to reduce caseloads significantly.