



Stefan Sharkansky

---

## Your Complaint

---

**Satterberg, Dan <Dan.Satterberg@kingcounty.gov>****Fri, Oct 12, 2007 at 8:24 AM**

To: theshark

Cc: dparvaz@seattlepi.com

Mr.. Sharkansky,

The King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office has conducted a preliminary review of the facts surrounding the challenge to the voter registration of Dorothy Parvaz and, consistent with its prior policy, has determined that it will not file criminal charges against Ms. Parvaz.

State law requires that an individual register to vote at their residential address. However, it has been the general policy of the Prosecuting Attorney not to criminalize the failure to register at the proper address under certain circumstances. The Prosecuting Attorney will generally not prosecute this violation when: (1) the issue has been raised with the voter, and (2) the voter has corrected the problem before the next election by either changing their voter registration or (as is the case with Ms. Parvaz) cancelling their registration. In this circumstance, the criminal charge is deemed to be moot.

There are certain obvious exceptions to this general rule. If there is evidence of a specific intent to defraud, or to improperly influence the outcome of an election, the matter will be prosecuted. Intentionally voting twice will be prosecuted. Voting under the name of any other individual – even a deceased spouse or family member – will result in a criminal charge. Submitting fraudulent registrations (as in the recent ACORN cases) will always be pursued criminally. Any affirmative act of fraud when registering to vote (such as submitting a fraudulent identification) will be prosecuted. Other circumstances may arise that justify prosecution.

Otherwise, the Prosecuting Attorney has concluded that it is an unnecessary waste of investigative and prosecutorial resources to pursue a case that has been rendered moot by the voter's decision to change their registration to comply with state law. Such prosecutions do not serve the ends of justice.

This is less like the Jane Balough case and more like the voter residency challenges of 2005, where, as you recall, we did not use the criminal law to punish the unsuccessful challenges, despite the call from partisans that we do so. A voter-residency challenge should not be a winner-take-all event, with either the challenger being charged with a crime if the challenge proves to be incorrect, or the challenged voter being charged with a crime if the information supplied on the voter registration did not comply with the strict requirements of the law. I fail to see how raising the stakes in this manner would advance voter confidence in our system.

We arrived at this conclusion last week, but waiting until the PI Editorial Board had offered its opinion on my campaign so as to avoid the appearance that we were trying to influence its decision.

Sincerely,  
Dan Satterberg  
Interim Prosecuting Attorney

---

---