



**Department of
PUBLIC DEFENSE**

Matthew Sanders

Interim Director

710 Second Avenue, Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98104

matthew.sanders@kingcounty.gov

April 30, 2025

Clerk of the Supreme Court

P.O. Box 40929

Olympia, WA 98504-0929

Dear Justices of the Washington State Supreme Court,

The proposed amendments to CrR 8.3 and CrRLJ 8.3, Dismissal, aim to ensure that Washington judges are empowered to dismiss cases following arbitrary action or governmental misconduct, without the current rule's overburdensome constraints that unnecessarily limit judicial discretion.

To be clear, increased discretion is not unfettered discretion. We trust our judges to make some of the most consequential decisions in society: deprivation of human liberty, termination of parental rights, involuntary commitment of the mentally ill. Certainly, judges can be entrusted with the power to dismiss a criminal charge upon a particular showing.

Further, the proposed rule contains four important guardrails to guide judicial discretion.

First, the proposed rule does not permit judges to simply substitute their judgment for that of the prosecuting authority. Nearly fifty years ago this Court explained that a case may not be "dismissed on equitable grounds absent a showing of arbitrary action or governmental misconduct." *State v. Starrish*, 86 Wn.2d 200, 205 (1975). The text of CrR 8.3(b) was subsequently amended to incorporate this prerequisite and that text is unchanged in the proposed amendments.

Second, this Court has long held that "dismissal under CrR 8.3 is an extraordinary remedy," and that courts must explore "intermediate remedial steps" when analyzing a claim under CrR 8.3(b). *State v. Wilson*, 149 Wn.2d 1, 12 (2003). Clearly not every act of government misconduct or mismanagement will require dismissal, and the State will have the opportunity to identify and argue for intermediate remedies.

Third, even once government misconduct or mismanagement has been established and intermediate remedial steps are shown inadequate, the court still may dismiss only when such action is "in the furtherance of justice."

Fourth, the proposed amendments would provide judges with specific direction on the factors to consider when deciding whether to dismiss a case: (1) the seriousness and circumstances of the offense, (2) the impact of a dismissal on the safety or welfare of the community (including the defendant as a member of the community), (3) the impact of a dismissal or lack of dismissal upon the confidence of the public in the criminal justice system, and (4) the degree and impact of the arbitrary action or governmental misconduct.

This Court can and should authorize courts to use CrR/CrRLJ 8.3(b) as it was intended and as the demands of justice require. In its June 4, 2020, Open Letter on Racial Injustice, the Court instructed the legal community to address “racialized policing and the overrepresentation of black Americans in every stage of our criminal and juvenile justice systems.”

Allowing judges greater discretion to dismiss in cases of government misconduct or mismanagement is a critical step to making the legal system more just. For example, in the following examples of government misconduct, the judge may have dismissed in the furtherance of justice if the current bar was not set unreasonably high:

- In a Municipal Court case, the police destroyed exculpatory evidence – video of the accused acting in self-defense after being threatened. In that case, the trial court did not find sufficient prejudice to the accused’s right to a fair trial to warrant dismissal.
- In another Municipal Court case, the police officer witnesses and prosecutor deliberately failed to disclose impeaching information. The judge did not dismiss because the case was pretrial and insufficient prejudice to the accused’s right to a fair trial existed.
- In another Municipal Court case, police wrongly destroyed an officer’s body-worn camera footage documenting an arrest. The accused was a non-English speaker and asserted that their interactions with police were not as written in the officer’s report narrative. The judge denied the dismissal motion, citing insufficient prejudice to the accused’s right to a fair trial.

In each of the cases, under the proposed rule, the trial court would have been able to look beyond the individual prejudice to the accused’s right to a fair trial in the case to consider how the public’s confidence in the legal system is undermined when police destroy evidence, the importance of preventing this kind of misconduct, and whether it was intentional misconduct that should be sanctioned so that it will not continue.

As the Court has recognized, judges and the entire legal community bear responsibility for the ongoing injustices in our criminal legal system. Replacing the broad limitation on dismissals “when there has been prejudice to the rights of the accused which materially affect the accused’s right to a fair trial” with specific guidance on other factors that promote the integrity and fairness of our legal system will help judges take long-overdue steps to better address governmental mismanagement and misconduct.

Sincerely,

Matthew Sanders
Interim Director
King County Department of Public Defense

Providence Kamana
CEO
Cocreative Culture

Shannon Perez-Darby
Founder
Accountable Communities Consortium

Roxana Gomez
Director of Policy & Systemic Advocacy
Legal Counsel for Youth and Children

Charles Smith
Public Policy and Advocacy Director
The Mockingbird Society

Lisa Dugaard
Co-Executive Director
Purpose Dignity Action (PDA)

Arthur Longworth
Policy Manager
TeamChild

Jessica Levin & Melissa Lee
Co-Directors
Center for Civil Rights and Critical Justice

Magda Baker
Director of Legal Services
Washington Defender Association

Dena Alo-Colbeck
Attorney
Law Offices of Dena Alo-Colbeck

Aaron Faletogo
Referral Administrator
Restorative Community Pathways

Rachel Sottile
President & CEO
Center for Children & Youth Justice (CCYJ)

Laurie Lippold
Sr. Policy Advisor
Partners for Our Children

Larry Jefferson
Director
Washington State Office of Public Defense

Stephan Blanford
Executive Director
Children's Alliance

Bryanna Jenkins
Policy Director
Lavender Rights Project

Izzy E
Community Organizer
I Did The Time

Chanel Rhymes
Director of Advocacy
Northwest Community Bail Fund

Martina Kartman
Co-Founder
Collective Justice

Emily Gause
Partner
Gause Law Offices

Kathleen Kyle
Executive Director
Snohomish County Public Defender Association

Laura Martin

Eugene Youngblood

Brian D. Johnston, MD MPH

Mark B. Middaugh

Michael P Brodsky

Benjamin Danielson

John A. Marlow

Blake Wessinger

Taylor A. Severns

Aleksandrea Johnson

Jared J. Gannon

Jennifer McIntyre

Dr. Esther Matthews

Makayla Dilg

George Yeannakis

Christopher Carney

Srikanth K. Naidu

Amy L. Jones

Katrina Cymerman

Kimberly S. Sloan

Piper Salvator

Rachel Stine-Sheridan

Jeffrey Julian Wolfenbarger, WSBA #45319

Caroline Mann

John Chase, WSBA #58313

Chelaina Crews

Rachel Forde

Dr. Kendrick Glover

Allison Hunter

Dustin D. Drenguis

Aaron Faletogo

Hannah Long

John Phet

Jasmine M. Vail

Deborah Carstens

Ali Burton

Kathryn Fraser

Tori Sullivan Lavoie

Christopher M. Sanders

Jacqueline McMurtrie

Heather Kelly

Emily Hiskes

Amy Muth

From: [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)
To: [Farino, Amber](#)
Cc: [Ward, David](#)
Subject: FW: Comments Regarding Proposed Amendments to CrR/CrRLJ 8.3 3.2 and 4.1/3.2.1
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 3:11:41 PM
Attachments: [FINAL Comment on Proposed CrR and CrRLJ 3.2 \(Release of Accused\) Amendments 4.30.25.docx](#)
[FINAL Comment on Proposed CrR 4.1 and CrRLJ 3.2.1 \(Arraignment and Preliminary Appearance\) Amendments 4.30.25.docx](#)
[FINAL Comment on Proposed CrR and CrRLJ 8.3 \(Dismissal\) Amendments 4-30-25.docx](#)

From: Sanders, Matthew <Matthew.Sanders@kingcounty.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 2:26 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>; Ward, David <David.Ward@courts.wa.gov>
Cc: Hurley, Katherine <Katherine.Hurley@kingcounty.gov>; Van Arcken, Julie <jvanarcken@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Comments Regarding Proposed Amendments to CrR/CrRLJ 8.3 3.2 and 4.1/3.2.1

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.

Hello,

Attached please find comments regarding proposed rule changes regarding:

- CrR/CrRLJ 8.3b;
- CrR/CrRLJ 4.1 and CrRLJ 3.2.1;
- CrR/CrRLJ 3.2.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thank you,

Matt Sanders (he/him/his) | Interim Director
King County Department of Public Defense
710 Second Avenue, Suite 200, Seattle, WA 98104
Matthew.Sanders@kingcounty.gov | office: 206.477-9025