

WSR 22-21-109
RULES OF COURT
STATE SUPREME COURT
[October 13, 2022]

IN THE MATTER OF THE) ORDER
SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO GR) NO. 25700-A-1470
11.3—REMOTE INTERPRETATION)

The Washington State Supreme Court Interpreter Commission, having recommended the adoption of the suggested amendments to GR 11.3—Remote Interpretation, and the Court having considered the suggested amendments, and having determined that the suggested amendments will aid in the prompt and orderly administration of justice;

Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED:

(a) That the suggested amendments as shown below are adopted.

(b) That pursuant to the emergency provisions of GR 9 (j) (1), the suggested amendments will be expeditiously published in the Washington Reports and will become effective upon publication.

DATED at Olympia, Washington this 13th day of October, 2022.

Johnson, J.
Madsen, J.
Owens, J.
Stephens, J.
Gonzalez, C.J.
Gordon McCloud, J.
Yu, J.
Montoya-Lewis, J.
Whitener, J.

GENERAL RULE 9
RULE AMENDMENT COVER SHEET
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO GENERAL RULE 11.3

- 1. Proponent Organization: Washington State Supreme Court Interpreter Commission
2. Spokesperson & Contact Info: Robert W. Lichtenberg, AOC Interpreter Commission Staff, Robert.Lichtenberg@courts.wa.gov
3. Purpose of Proposed Rule Amendment:

The Commission would like to correct two incorrect provisions that were inadvertently included in the previous proposal to amend GR 11.3:

a. The Rule title should have shown the following strikethrough: "Remote Interpreting Interpretation", rather than the proffered language "Remote Interpretation Interpreting".

b. The 2021 submitted revision to GR 11.3 (h) mistakenly did not have a strikethrough in the first sentence, but instead omitted that sentence altogether. The Code Revisor then reinserted the sentence when the rule was published to ensure conformity. The final rule now contains a sentence that was not intended to be in the current rule. The intention of the Interpreter Commission was to strike the first sentence of the prior rule. The correction is shown in the proposed rule attachment.

This rule order will correct the Rule title and Section (h) to reflect the final Rule content as was intended by the Supreme Court Interpreter Commission. The subject matter of the sentence being removed is addressed by other court rules and does not need to be con-

tained within this rule. Removing the reference here will reduce confusion by the courts.

4. Is Expedited Consideration Requested? Yes, because these are technical corrections that should be included in the original proposal.

5. Is a Public Hearing Recommended? No. This is a correction to the Rule.

GR 11.3

REMOTE INTERPRETING INTERPRETATION

(a) - (g) [Unchanged.]

(h) ~~An audio recording shall be made of all statements made on the record during their interpretation, and the same shall be preserved.~~ Upon the request of a party, the court may make and maintain recording of the spoken language interpretations or a video recording of the signed language interpretations made during a hearing. Any recordings permitted by this subparagraph shall be made and maintained in the same manner as other audio or video recordings of court proceedings.

(i) [Unchanged.]

Comments:

[1] - [6] [Unchanged.]

Reviser's note: The typographical error in the above section occurred in the copy filed by the agency and appears in the Register pursuant to the requirements of RCW 34.08.040.