1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY				
7					
8	STATE OF WASHINGTON,)				
9	Plaintiff)) MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER				
10	v.) FOR EXPERT WITNESS AND) SERVICES FUNDING REQUEST AND				
11)				
12	Defendant)				
13					
14	MOTION				
15	The defendant, requests a protective order limiting the disclosure of the following				
16	documents and the information contained in these documents:				
17	Motion and Certification for Appointment of Expert, dated				
18	Order Authorizing Expert Services at Public Expense, dated				
19	3				
20	dated				
21	4				
22	dated				
23					
	Protective Order for Expert Witness Firm Name: and Services Funding Request Address: Address: Page 1 of 3 Pages Phone:				

These documents were provided to the Office of Public Defense (OPD) and the records and information concerning these documents will be provided to various agencies in the future to conduct financial business.

This request is made pursuant to the recent Washington Supreme Court decision in *Yakima County v. Yakima Herald-Republic* 170 Wn. 2d 775 (2011). The Supreme Court ruled that documents prepared by court personnel in connection with court cases and maintained by the court are judicial documents governed by the court rules for disclosure and not the Public Records Act (PRA). In addition, such documents when transferred to non-judicial county entities, are governed by the PRA unless they are subject to a protective order.

The documents listed above, contain information that is work product and confidential under CrR 3.1(f). They outline the defense theory of its case and identify potential experts. Thus, pursuant to the most recent Supreme Court decision, the defense requests that a protective order be issued limiting the disclosure of the documents listed above. The protective order should place restrictions on various agencies from releasing any of these materials or any information contained in these materials. Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDER

1	prosecution of the above-listed defendant, until further order of the court. Defense counsel is				
2	responsible for effecting service.				
3	☐ ORDERED that defendant's motion for a protective order is denied.				
4	DONE this day of, 20				
5	DOILE this tay or	, 20	 ;		
6		JUDGE			
7	Presented by:	JODGE			
8	Tresented by				
9	Attorney for the Defendant				
10	Bar #				
11	Dai #				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
	Protective Order for Expert Witness and Services Funding Request 10/2011	Page 3 of 3 Pages	Firm Name: Address: Phone:		