

**From:** Powers, Emma <[epowers@kingcounty.gov](mailto:epowers@kingcounty.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 29, 2026 3:40 PM  
**To:** LR Comments <[lrcomments@kingcounty.gov](mailto:lrcomments@kingcounty.gov)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Local Rule Changes Comments

Hello,

I am raising some concerns I have regarding the proposed changes to LFLR 12. Since the General Order was issued, we have noticed these issues.

- (e)(1)(A): There is no clear description of what constitutes as “voluminous writings” which would require a party to provide a chart, summary, or calculation. Having a set number of pages or photos at which a party is required to provide a summary would make it more clear to the parties. Additionally, there is no guidance on how to create or format these charts, summaries, or calculations. It would be helpful to have templates for parties to use if they have reached the amount of evidence that requires this extra summarization.
- (e)(1)(B): Clear language would be helpful in explaining if this rule prohibits parties from filing exhibits or documents that are filed into other cases with King County Superior Court or if this is only prohibiting them from filing exhibits that are filed previously in the same case specifically. For example, if a party wants to file a document, such as a parenting plan, that is in their dissolution case into their protection order case.
- (e)(1)(C): The Limitations on written submissions raise concerns.
  - o In the first line of the chart it lists that the petitioner can only provide one written declaration either as part of the petition or in addition to the petition. It is not clear if this is in addition to answering the statement questions of the petition. Additionally, the need to get a temporary protection order is often emergent and petitioners may need to put the bare minimum to explain their need for a protection order in order to get a temporary order in place that same day. It would be helpful to clearly indicate that they are able to provide more statements after they file their petition in order to meet their burden of proof to get a full protection order.

- In the 3<sup>rd</sup> line it discusses reply declarations. Parties who have not been involved in court cases before may not understand the difference between a declaration in support of or opposition to the petition and a reply declaration of moving party. It would be helpful to clearly define each of those so parties know they are able to provide both to the court.
- In the 5<sup>th</sup> line it discusses exhibits to declarations. Clearly explaining the difference between an exhibit and a written declaration is helpful for parties who are pro se and may not understand what is meant by “exhibit”.
- (e)(1)(D): In this section it discusses filing professional assessments and specifically lists that these submissions “must be properly authenticated” without giving any explanation on what that means or how to ensure it is formatted correctly. Providing guidance on that would be helpful to pro se parties.
- (e)(2)(A): It would be helpful to include a template for the summary/chart that is required to be provided for audio/video to ensure it is presented correctly to the court.
- (f) Raises concerns about the barriers pro se parties face and how this impacts the party’s ability to file. It will increase cost and make it more difficult for parties to file, especially with no option for e-filing these documents. There is also not any clarity on whether or not these orders will be filed before each hearing, especially if there are continuances and reissuances of the temporary order.
- (g) and (h) Add increasing barriers for parties that require accommodations or an interpreter. Someone who requires an interpreter faces the barrier of having to get someone to assist with translating and transcribing which makes it very difficult to meet the quick turnaround times for filing replies and responses. Someone who requires special accommodations may need more time to get their replies/responses into the court file as well. Additionally, in hearings, parties who require an interpreter would lose out on part of their 5 minutes for argument by having everything interpreted.
- (i) While this is written to hopefully help with the barriers discussed above, liberally interpreting these rules can also cause more confusion as parties are not able to fully prepare for hearings if different commissioners are interpreting the rule

differently. It would be more helpful to clearly define rules while considering these barriers.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Thank you,

Emma (She/Her)  
Advocate  
Protection Order Advocacy  
Program  
King County Prosecuting Attorney's  
Office  
Office: (206) 477-1103  
[protectionorder@kingcounty.gov](mailto:protectionorder@kingcounty.gov)  
Monday – Friday, 8:00am – 4:30pm

\*Please note that this email may be subject to public disclosure pursuant to RCW ch. 42.56.