

# Links to Materials for Washington's General Rule 37: Reducing Racism in Jury Selection and Beyond

NAWJ July 2023

Contact Lila Silverstein, [lila@washapp.org](mailto:lila@washapp.org), with questions.

## **General Rule 37**

- Link to the Rule: [General Rule 37](#)
- Full text of the rule is also on pages 2-3 of this document

## **Cases leading up to the adoption of GR 37**

- [State v. Saintcalle](#), 309 P.3d 326 (Wash. 2013)
- [Seattle v. Erickson](#), 398 P.3d 1124 (Wash. 2017)

## **Other materials leading up to the adoption of GR 37**

- Equal Justice Initiative Report. [Illegal Racial Discrimination in Jury Selection: A continuing Legacy \(2010\)](#)
- [Preliminary Report on Race and Washington's Criminal Justice System](#)
- [Testimony of Excluded Juror](#) at symposium hosted by Washington Supreme Court. (This link jumps to the juror's testimony, but you can watch the entire symposium, which mainly addresses fair cross-section issues, by rewinding to zero).
- [Amicus brief](#) in *Seattle v. Erickson*
- General Rule 37 Working Group [Report to the Court](#).

## **Selected Cases Applying GR 37 to Jury Selection**

- [State v. Tesfasilasye](#), 518 P.3d 193 (Wash. 2022)
- [State v. Jefferson](#), 429 P.3d 467 (Wash. 2018)
- [State v. Orozco](#), 496 P.3d 1215 (Wash. Ct. App. 2021)
- [State v. Lahman](#), 488 P.3d 881 (Wash. Ct. App. 2021)
- [State v. Listoe](#), 475 P.3d 534 (Wash. Ct. App. 2020)

## **Selected Cases Extending GR 37 Standard to Other Contexts**

- [State v. Berhe](#), 444 P.3d 1172 (Wash. 2019) (juror misconduct)
- [State v. Sum](#), 511 P.3d 92 (Wash. 2022) (search and seizure)
- [State v. Zamora](#), 512 P.3d 512 (Wash. 2022) (prosecutorial misconduct)
- [Henderson v. Thompson](#), 518 P.3d 1011 (Wash. 2022) (civil personal injury cases)

**Rule 37. JURY SELECTION**

**(a) Policy and Purpose.** The purpose of this rule is to eliminate the unfair exclusion of potential jurors based on race or ethnicity.

**(b) Scope.** This rule applies in all jury trials.

**(c) Objection.** A party may object to the use of a peremptory challenge to raise the issue of improper bias. The court may also raise this objection on its own. The objection shall be made by simple citation to this rule, and any further discussion shall be conducted outside the presence of the panel. The objection must be made before the potential juror is excused, unless new information is discovered.

**(d) Response.** Upon objection to the exercise of a peremptory challenge pursuant to this rule, the party exercising the peremptory challenge shall articulate the reasons that the peremptory challenge has been exercised.

**(e) Determination.** The court shall then evaluate the reasons given to justify the peremptory challenge in light of the totality of circumstances. If the court determines that an objective observer could view race or ethnicity as a factor in the use of the peremptory challenge, then the peremptory challenge shall be denied. The court need not find purposeful discrimination to deny the peremptory challenge. The court should explain its ruling on the record.

**(f) Nature of Observer.** For purposes of this rule, an objective observer is aware that implicit, institutional, and unconscious biases, in addition to purposeful discrimination, have resulted in the unfair exclusion of potential jurors in Washington State.

**(g) Circumstances Considered.** In making its determination, the circumstances the court should consider include, but are not limited to, the following:

(i) the number and types of Questions posed to the prospective juror, which may include consideration of whether the party exercising the peremptory challenge failed to Question the prospective juror about the alleged concern or the types of Questions asked about it;

(ii) whether the party exercising the peremptory challenge asked significantly more Questions or different Questions of the potential juror against whom the peremptory challenge was used in contrast to other jurors;

(iii) whether other prospective jurors provided similar answers but were not the subject of a peremptory challenge by that party;

(iv) whether a reason might be disproportionately associated with a race or ethnicity; and

(v) whether the party has used peremptory challenges disproportionately against a given race or ethnicity, in the present case or in past cases.

**(h) Reasons Presumptively Invalid.** Because historically the following reasons for peremptory challenges have been associated with improper discrimination in jury selection in Washington State, the following are presumptively invalid reasons for a peremptory challenge;

(i) having prior contact with law enforcement officers;

(ii) expressing a distrust of law enforcement or a belief that law enforcement officers engage in racial profiling;

- (iii) having a close relationship with people who have been stopped, arrested, or convicted of a crime;
- (iv) living in a high-crime neighborhood;
- (v) having a child outside of marriage;
- (vi) receiving state benefits; and
- (vii) not being a native English speaker.

**(i) Reliance on Conduct.** The following reasons for peremptory challenges also have historically been associated with improper discrimination in jury selection in Washington State: allegations that the prospective juror was sleeping, inattentive, or staring or failing to make eye contact; exhibited a problematic attitude, body language, or demeanor; or provided unintelligent or confused answers. If any party intends to offer one of these reasons or a similar reason as the justification for a peremptory challenge, that party must provide reasonable notice to the court and the other parties so the behavior can be verified and addressed in a timely manner. A lack of corroboration by the judge or opposing counsel verifying the behavior shall invalidate the given reason for the peremptory challenge.

[Adopted effective April 24, 2018.]