

SENATE BILL REPORT

SHB 2754

AS PASSED SENATE, FEBRUARY 26, 1994

**Brief Description:** Authorizing use of closed circuit television in court procedural hearings.

**SPONSORS:** House Committee on Judiciary (originally sponsored by Representatives McMorris, Appelwick, Padden, Campbell, Schoesler, Johanson, Foreman, Mielke, Finkbeiner, Fuhrman, Mastin, Wineberry, Sheahan, L. Thomas, Cooke, Brough and Springer)

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON LAW & JUSTICE**

**Majority Report:** Do pass as amended.

Signed by Senators A. Smith, Chairman; Ludwig, Vice Chairman; Hargrove, Nelson, Quigley, Roach, Schow and Spanel.

**Staff:** Susan Mahoney (786-7717)

**Hearing Dates:** February 18, 1994

**BACKGROUND:**

In recent years, some courts have used closed circuit television or other electronic equipment to conduct procedural hearings. For example, a defendant who is in custody can "appear" before a judge for a procedural hearing without having to transport the defendant from jail to the courtroom. Use of this technology ensures procedural hearings can be conducted in a secure and timely manner. Courts using this technology have found it to be a valuable time and money saving tool.

Current law does not expressly provide for the use of closed circuit television or other electronic equipment in conducting procedural hearings.

**SUMMARY:**

Courts may use closed circuit television or other electronic equipment to conduct procedural hearings, unless inconsistent with court rule.

**SUMMARY OF SENATE AMENDMENT:**

The use of closed circuit television and other electronic equipment in judicial proceedings is authorized. The Administrator for the Courts is directed to promulgate necessary standards and procedures for the use of such technology and is to provide technical assistance when needed.

**Appropriation:** none

**Revenue:** none

**Fiscal Note:** none requested

**TESTIMONY FOR:**

Use of closed circuit television will improve security by reducing chance of escape or accidents. It saves time and money by reducing travel and need for law enforcement officer escorts. Particularly helpful in counties where holding facilities are far away.

**TESTIMONY AGAINST:** None

**TESTIFIED:** Representative McMorris, original prime sponsor (pro);  
Chuck Foster, Office of Administrator for the Courts (pro)