

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Farino, Amber](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Changes to CrR 4.1(a) and CrRLJ 4.1(a)
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 11:38:31 AM

From: Raz, Don <Don.Raz@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Sunday, April 20, 2025 5:54 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>
Cc: Raz, Don <Don.Raz@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Proposed Changes to CrR 4.1(a) and CrRLJ 4.1(a)

You don't often get email from don.raz@kingcounty.gov. [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 Supreme Court

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the adoption of the proposed change to above-noted Criminal Court Rules for Washington State Superior Courts and Courts of Limited Jurisdiction. I am a senior deputy prosecutor with the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office and have 36 years' experience working with and observing the effects of Washington's criminal rules.

The proposed change to CrR 4.1(a) and CrRLJ 4.1(a), cutting the time for arraignment from 14 days to 3 days, appears to have been drafted by individuals with little appreciation for how courts manage their schedules and calendars, or whom, besides in-custody defendants, have interest in receiving timely notice of and attending arraignments/bond hearings. The proposed amendment leaves insufficient time for victim notification, let alone time for said victims to make necessary arrangements to attend. Most prosecutors rely on the postal system to inform victims and out of custody defendants of the arraignment dates. If a letter even reaches a victim in three days, the victim will have no time to make work, childcare, or transportation arrangements to attend the arraignment/potential bond motion or provide input to an advocate or prosecutor to relay to the court. Furthermore, the proposed three-day timeline is not trauma-informed for victims on serious and violent cases. Similarly, the three-day timeline does not provide sufficient time to inform out of custody defendants subject to conditions of release of when they need to appear for arraignment. Unlike absent victims whose voices is taken from them by this proposed rule change, absent defendants risk arrest on warrants issued for their failures to appear. Finally, the proposed amendment does not

allow courts to effectively manage their schedule, calendars, or caseloads. The courts and State require flexibility to manage the volume of cases set for arraignment on given days. The proposed change further ignores the added burden that smaller counties with single or shared judges would endure to schedule and staff daily arraignment calendars.

Had the proposed change suggested an eight (8) days time from filing to arraignment, I would not be writing this email. Eight (3) days would have been reasonable, warranted, and doable. Three (3) is not.

Since the proposal is for 3 days, I strongly urge this Court to reject this proposed change to CrR 4.1 (a) and CrRLJ 4.1 (a).

Thank you for time and your consideration.

Sincerely

Donald J. Raz, WSBA #17287
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office