

HOUSE BILL REPORT

HB 2377

As Passed Legislature

Title: An act relating to optical imaging.

Brief Description: Including optical imaging reproductions as business record copies admissible as evidence.

Sponsors: Representatives Appelwick, Johanson, Padden, H. Myers, Ballasiotes, Tate, Scott and Anderson.

Brief History:

Reported by House Committee on:
Judiciary, January 26, 1994, DP;
Passed House, February 4, 1994, 91-0;
Passed Legislature.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Majority Report: Do pass. Signed by 14 members:
Representatives Appelwick, Chair; Johanson, Vice Chair;
Padden, Ranking Minority Member; Ballasiotes, Assistant
Ranking Minority Member; Campbell; Chappell; Eide; Forner;
J. Kohl; Long; H. Myers; Schmidt; Tate and Wineberry.

Staff: Bill Perry (786-7123).

Background: Washington has adopted the "Uniform Photographic Copies of Business and Public Records as Evidence Act." This law was last amended in 1959. It provides that certain copies of business or government records are admissible as evidence in a court proceeding to the same extent as are the original records. The act requires that a copy be accurate and durable. Copies that are allowed under this act include "photographic, photostatic, microfilm, microcard, miniature photographic" and other accurate and durable copies.

Copying technology has made significant changes since 1959. Although the current law generally allows any accurate and durable copy to be used as evidence, the law does not explicitly include more modern technologies such as optical imaging.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has recently specifically authorized brokers to maintain records on optical disk storage.

Summary of Bill: The Uniform Photographic Copies of Business and Public Records as Evidence Act is amended to explicitly allow the use of optical imaging as a way of producing copies admissible as evidence.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Testimony For: The bill reflects changes in copying technology and will save a great deal of paper and money in the storage of records.

Testimony Against: None.

Witnesses: Lew McMurrin, Household International (pro).