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AN ACT Relating to the well-being of children; and amending RCW 9.68A.110.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

Sec. 1. RCW 9.68A.110 and 1989 c 32 s 9 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.040, it is not a defense that the defendant was involved in activities of law enforcement and prosecution agencies in the investigation and prosecution of criminal offenses. Law enforcement and prosecution agencies shall not employ minors to aid in the investigation of a violation of RCW 9.68A.090 or 9.68A.100. This chapter does not apply to (individual case treatment in a recognized medical facility or individual case treatment by a psychiatrist or psychologist licensed under Title 18 RCW, or to) lawful conduct between spouses.
(2) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, 9.68A.070, or 9.68A.080, it is not a defense that the defendant did not know the age of the child depicted in the visual or printed matter: PROVIDED, That it is a defense, which the defendant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence, that at the time of the offense the defendant was not in possession of any facts on the basis of which he or she should reasonably have known that the person depicted was a minor.

(3) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.040, 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, or 9.68A.090, it is not a defense that the defendant did not know the alleged victim's age: PROVIDED, That it is a defense, which the defendant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence, that at the time of the offense, the defendant reasonably believed the alleged victim to be at least eighteen years of age based on declarations by the alleged victim made a reasonable bona fide attempt to ascertain the true age of the minor by requiring production of a driver's license, marriage license, birth certificate, or other governmental or educational identification card or paper and did not rely solely on the oral allegations or apparent age of the minor.

(4) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, or 9.68A.070, it shall be an affirmative defense that the defendant was a law enforcement officer in the process of conducting an official investigation of a sex-related crime against a minor, or that the defendant was providing individual case treatment as a recognized medical facility or as a psychiatrist or psychologist licensed under Title 18 RCW.

(5) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, or 9.68A.070, the state is not required to establish the identity of the alleged victim.
NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.
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