

*City of Seattle v. May (Robert J.)*

No. 83677-9

STEPHENS, J. (concurring in dissent)—I agree with the dissent’s conclusion that the order here does not satisfy the statutory requirements for a permanent protection order under RCW 26.50.060(2). For this reason, the King County Superior Court properly held that the order could not be the basis for Robert May’s criminal prosecution. I write separately because I cannot endorse the dissent’s gratuitous comments about the misuse of protection orders generally. *See* dissent at 1-2 and accompanying notes. There is no need in this case to question the integrity of protection orders, which undeniably serve to protect individuals in our society. As I see it, this case is about the need for law enforcement and the courts to have clearly written, unambiguous protection orders that satisfy the strict terms of RCW 26.50.060(2). Because the boilerplate “findings” in this protection order were at best vague and inadequate, the Court of Appeals must be reversed and May’s conviction vacated.

AUTHOR:

Justice Debra L. Stephens

---

WE CONCUR:

---

---

---

---

---

