

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.

So often this job feels like triage. It's a constant decision-making process of who needs my time the most. Even writing a proposed comment is difficult, because it takes away from time I could be spending on my clients. But ultimately I do understand that writing this comment and advocating on behalf of the proposed caseload standards is in fact time spent on my clients. On all of them, present and future. And it's also time spent for myself. To make sure I—and so many others—can continue to do this work sustainably, energetically, and ethically.

I went into this work because I care deeply about those who have—or are about to—lose agency and control over their futures and their freedoms. So to make the type of compromises alluded to above—to triage my work—feels awful, every single day. Codifying the approved caseload standards would ensure (1) that clients won't ever receive disparate outcomes / levels of representation simply because their case was on the wrong end of the "triage" calculation, and (2) that dedicated, compassionate attorneys will continue to choose and remain in this work. Codifying the approved standards is about human beings, plain and simple. Arguments regarding budgets or how to hire enough public defenders should be secondary to that. And for what it's worth, there already is a hiring crisis. The current status quo has caused a pattern of exodus and constant searches for new attorneys, as talented and committed public defenders routinely burn out and leave the practice. Codifying more sustainable caseload standards would alleviate that cycle. Yes, it will require financial commitment and an initial push for hiring. But that will pay-off in the long run: in how the state treats its public service employees and, more importantly, in how it treats its most vulnerable residents.

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. Wainright*. 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.

Rob LaRose

King County Department of Public Defense.

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Martinez, Jacquelynn](#)
Subject: FW: written comment urging the Supreme Court to codify wsba pd caseload standards
Date: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 3:48:01 PM
Attachments: [Rob LaRose written comment.docx](#)

From: LaRose, Robert <rolarose@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 3:46 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Subject: written comment urging the Supreme Court to codify wsba pd 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.

Good afternoon,

Please find attached.

Thanks!

Rob LaRose
Northwest Defenders Division
King County Department of Public Defense
710 Second Ave., Suite 250
Seattle, WA 98104
Office: 206-674-4700 ext. 80517
Cell: 206-512-4028
(he/him)