

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Farino, Amber](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments regarding proposed rule changes  
**Date:** Friday, April 25, 2025 3:40:34 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

---

**From:** Dec, Paul <pdec@kingcounty.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 25, 2025 3:32 PM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** Comments regarding proposed rule changes

You don't often get email from [pdec@kingcounty.gov](mailto:pdec@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.

Good afternoon,

I would like to share comments about the proposed rule changes this year.

Regarding CrR/CrRLJ 8.3: I am vehemently opposed to this proposed change to the rule given established legal precedent necessitating prejudice to the defendant for such an extreme remedy and because the allowance of dismissals for “arbitrary” actions of the government calls into question the separation of powers between the judiciary and the prosecution. There is a litany of cases that make clear that dismissal is an extraordinary remedy that should not be used lightly and requires a showing of prejudice to the defendant that materially affects their right to a fair trial. The proposed change to this rule flies in the face of established precedent. This overbroad proposal would give a seemingly unlimited power to judges to express their policy disagreements in the form of dismissals that would result in harm to the victims and to the community.

Regarding CrR/CrRLJ 4.1 & CrRLJ 3.2.1: I join my colleagues in voicing my disagreement with the proposed changes to these rules. The proposal does not give the State sufficient time to provide notice, to both victims and defendants, of the arraignment date given the continued reliance on the postal system.

Regarding CrR/CrRLJ 3.2: I am opposed to the proposed change of this rule. The proposal is making an intentionally broad rule too narrow and ignores that a defendant can tamper with witnesses without threatening or intimidating them. The proposed change also invalidates otherwise valid criteria for the administration of justice that don't involve threats or intimidation such as no-contact conditions or prohibiting the commission of new law violations.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my concerns to the Court.

Paul R. Dec (he/him)  
*Deputy Prosecuting Attorney for Identity  
Theft, Economic Crimes Unit*



King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office  
516 3rd Avenue, Seattle, WA, 98104  
O (206) 477-4421  
E [pdec@kingcounty.gov](mailto:pdec@kingcounty.gov)