

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Farino, Amber](#)  
**Cc:** [Ward, David](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on Proposed Amendment to CrR 4.1/CrRLJ 4.1/CrRLJ 3.2.1  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 29, 2025 4:00:28 PM

---

---

**From:** Dolly Hunt <DHunt@pendoreille.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 29, 2025 3:55 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** Comments on Proposed Amendment to CrR 4.1/CrRLJ 4.1/CrRLJ 3.2.1

You don't often get email from [dhunt@pendoreille.org](mailto:dhunt@pendoreille.org). [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.

Dear Justices,

I am writing to encourage the committee to reject the proposed changes to CrR 4.1/CrRLJ 4.1/CrRLJ 3.2.1 related to arraignment. Pursuant to chapters 7.69, 7.69A., and 7.69B RCW, prosecutors are required to give crime victims notice of a defendant's arraignment date and time. In many cases, especially in rural counties, the only way to provide such information to victims is through the postal service or word of mouth. Many disadvantaged victims do not have cell phones or even stable residences.

The proposed 3-day window between filing and arraignment is insufficient to generate the required notice, submit it to the postal service, and have it delivered and received prior to the arraignment date. At best, the notice will arrive the day before arraignment, providing crime victims with insufficient time to make work, childcare, or transportation arrangements to attend the arraignment. This thwarts the intent of chapters 7.69, 7.69A., and 7.69B RCW because it prevents victims from providing advocates and prosecutors with input on bond and other pretrial release conditions to share with the court. As a result, the proposed 3-day timeline is not trauma-informed for victims in serious cases.

Small county court systems, such as ours in Pend Oreille County, do not have a daily Superior Court docket on criminal matters. Pend Oreille County shares Superior Court judges with Stevens and Ferry Counties. Our Superior court docket is held once a week. This rule change would create an additional burden on the Superior Courts in this state to hold additional unplanned dockets on unpredictable days of the week. The courts and State require flexibility to manage the volume of cases set for arraignment on given days. Otherwise, circumstances like heavy arrest days, court holidays, and unexpected closures due to weather will result in unmanageable arraignment calendars.

Additionally, these proposed changes would require short notice to schedule arraignments

with court staff, defense attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, jail staff, victims, and family members of the defendant, to name a few. It is an untenable burden. It would create a situation where Superior Court Judges would constantly need to keep their schedules clear to accommodate unexpected arraignments. Under this proposed change, it would place these judges in a situation where they would need to be in two different counties at the same time to arraign two individuals or more.

Furthermore, Pend Oreille County, like most small counties, does not have an office of public defense, but instead contracts with private defense attorneys. This change would create an additional burden on these private attorneys, as it would prevent them from taking other work. They would need to be available to appear at an arraignment within three days of being appointed on a case. This change would make it more difficult to retain qualified defense attorneys in rural counties.

While I understand the position of the proponent, the basis for their position lacks support. Defendants have a right to be represented by an attorney at their first appearance on a felony arrest, during which appearance the attorney can argue for the defendant's release. In our county, most defendants are released on their personal recognizance. There is nothing in the court rules preventing a defendant from moving a court prior to arraignment for reconsideration of release conditions. Proponents ignore the importance of the fourteen-day period in allowing defense attorneys to meet with their clients, review initial discovery, and properly advise their client to enter a plea of guilty or not guilty. This shortened timeframe could easily lead to a flood of appeals from defendants claiming their attorney was ineffective for not properly advising them of the consequences of entering a not-guilty plea at arraignment and then getting convicted of more serious charges.

Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Dolly Hunt



Dolly N. Hunt  
Prosecuting Attorney  
Pend Oreille County  
Hall of Justice  
PO Box 5070  
Newport, WA 99156-5070

Phone (509) 447-4414  
Fax (509) 447-0235  
Website [www.pendoreilleco.org](http://www.pendoreilleco.org)

The contents of this e-mail message, including any attachments, are intended solely for the use

of the person or entity to whom the e-mail is addressed. It contains information that may be protected by attorney-client privilege, work-product, or other privileges, and may be restricted from disclosure by applicable state and federal law. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, be advised that any dissemination, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail. Please also permanently delete all copies of the original e-mail and any attached documentation. Please be advised that any reply to this e-mail may be considered a public record and be subject to disclosure upon request. Thank you.