

# Evidence

**CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS**

***Context and Practice Series***

Michael Hunter Schwartz

Series Editor

**Civil Procedure for All States**

Benjamin V. Madison, III

**Contracts**

Michael Hunter Schwartz and Denise Riebe

**Current Issues in Constitutional Litigation**

Sarah E. Ricks, with contributions by Evelyn M. Tenenbaum

**Employment Discrimination**

Susan Grover, Sandra F. Sperino, and Jarod S. Gonzalez

**Evidence**

Pavel Wonsowicz

**The Lawyer's Practice**

Kris Franklin

**Sales**

Edith R. Warkentine

# Evidence

*A Context and Practice Casebook*

**Pavel Wonsowicz**

UCLA SCHOOL OF LAW

Carolina Academic Press

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2012  
Pavel Wonsowicz  
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 978-1-59460-521-5  
LCCN 2012939242

Carolina Academic Press  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, NC 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

To Joy,  
All the other stars seem dim around you.

To Eva and Charles,  
Deep in their roots, all flowers keep the light.



# Contents

---

Table of Principal Cases	xvii
Series Editor's Preface	xix
Preface and Acknowledgments	xxi
<b>Chapter 1 · An Introduction to Evidence</b>	<b>3</b>
I. Introduction	3
<i>The Staircase</i>	4
<i>State v. Peterson</i>	4
II. The Anatomy of a Trial	7
III. Witnesses	10
A. Competency	11
Problem 1-1	12
Problem 1-2	12
B. Personal Knowledge	13
Problem 1-3	14
C. Oaths and Affirmations	15
Problem 1-4	15
IV. The Role of the Jury	16
Focus Questions: <i>Tanner v. United States</i>	17
<i>Tanner v. United States</i>	17
V. Shortcuts to Proof	24
A. Stipulations	25
B. Judicial Notice	25
Problem 1-5	27
Problem 1-6	28
C. Burden of Proof and Presumptions	28
Problem 1-7	32
Professional Development Questions	33
<b>Chapter 2 · Relevance</b>	<b>35</b>
I. Is It Relevant?	38
Overview Question	38
Defining Relevance	38
The Judge's Role in Determining Relevance	40
Another Way of Examining Relevance: The Evidential Hypothesis	40

Problem 2-1	41
Problem 2-2	42
Case Excerpt: Prosecution Brief in <i>State v. Peterson</i>	42
<i>State v. Peterson</i>	44
Focus Questions: <i>Jones v. Pak-Mor Manufacturing Co.</i>	45
<i>Jones v. Pak-Mor Manufacturing Co.</i>	45
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. James</i>	51
<i>United States v. James</i>	51
Problem 2-3	55
Problem 2-4	56
II. Is There a Conditional Relevance Objection?	57
III. Even If It Is Relevant, Is It Too Prejudicial?	58
Problem 2-5	61
Case Excerpt: Prosecution Brief in <i>State v. Peterson</i>	61
<i>State v. Peterson</i>	63
Problem 2-6	65
Problem 2-7	65
IV. Can the Evidence Be Stipulated?	65
Focus Questions: <i>Old Chief v. United States</i>	66
<i>Old Chief v. United States</i>	66
Professional Development Questions	76
<b>Chapter 3 · The Specialized Relevance Rules</b>	79
Overview: Tilting the Playing Field	79
I. Is It a Subsequent Remedial Remedy?	81
Overview Problem	81
(1) Policy Underpinnings	81
(2) Elements	82
(3) Exceptions	83
Focus Questions: <i>Wood v. Morbark Indus., Inc.</i>	83
<i>Wood v. Morbark Industries, Inc.</i>	84
Problem 3-1	89
Problem 3-2	89
II. Is It Evidence of a Compromise?	89
Overview Problem	90
(1) Policy Underpinnings	90
(2) Elements	90
(3) Exceptions	91
Focus Questions: <i>EEOC v. Gear Petroleum</i>	91
<i>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Gear Petroleum, Inc.</i>	91
Focus Questions: <i>McInnis v. A.M.F. Inc.</i>	93
<i>McInnis v. A.M.F. Inc.</i>	93
Problem 3-3	97
Problem 3-4	97
Problem 3-5	98
III. Is It a Payment of Medical Expenses?	98
Overview Problem	98
(1) Policy Underpinnings	98
(2) Elements	99



(3) Exceptions	99
Problem 3-6	99
IV. Is It a Plea or Plea Discussions?	99
Overview Problem	100
(1) Policy Underpinnings	100
(2) Elements	101
(3) Exceptions	101
Problem 3-7	102
V. Is It Evidence of Insurance?	102
Overview Problem	102
(1) Policy Underpinnings	103
(2) Elements	103
(3) Exceptions	103
Focus Questions: <i>Williams v. McCoy</i>	104
<i>Williams v. McCoy</i>	104
Problem 3-8	107
Professional Development Questions	107
 Chapter 4 · Character Evidence: Propensity Reasoning That Is Not Based on Character	109
I. FRE 404(b)	109
Overview Problem	109
A. Character-Propensity Reasoning	110
B. Evidential Hypotheses that Avoid Character-Propensity Reasoning	113
C. The Introduction of Evidence Pursuant to FRE 404(b)	114
Focus Questions: <i>People v. Zackowitz</i>	116
<i>People v. Zackowitz</i>	116
Problem 4-1	119
Problem 4-2	120
Focus Questions: <i>State v. Peterson</i>	121
<i>State v. Peterson</i>	121
Problem 4-3	128
Problem 4-4	129
Problem 4-5	129
Problem 4-6	130
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Robinson</i>	130
<i>United States v. Robinson</i>	130
Problem 4-7	136
Problem 4-8	137
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Hernandez</i>	138
<i>United States v. Hernandez</i>	138
Problem 4-9	142
Problem 4-10	143
Problem 4-11	143
II. Habit Evidence	144
Focus Questions: <i>Reyes v. Missouri Pacific R.R.</i>	145
<i>Reyes v. Missouri Pacific R.R. Co.</i>	145
Professional Development Questions	147

<b>Chapter 5 · Exceptions to the Character-Propensity Ban</b>	149
I. “Opening the Door” to Character in Criminal Cases	150
Overview Problem	150
A. Proving Character Under FRE 404(a)(1) and 404(a)(2)	151
1. What Type of Evidence?	151
2. Who May Introduce and How May It Be Rebutted?	151
3. What Process Must Be Followed?	152
B. The Role of FRE 405(b)	154
C. Conclusion	155
Focus Questions: <i>Broyles v. Commonwealth</i>	155
<i>Broyles v. Commonwealth</i>	155
Problem 5-1	157
Problem 5-2	158
Problem 5-3	158
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Gilliland</i>	159
<i>United States v. Gilliland</i>	159
Problem 5-4	162
Problem 5-5	162
Problem 5-6	162
II. FRE 413-415: Sexual Assault and Child Molestation	163
Overview Problem	165
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. LeCompte</i>	166
<i>United States v. LeCompte</i>	166
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Guardia</i>	168
<i>United States v. Guardia</i>	168
Problem 5-7	173
Problem 5-8	173
Problem 5-9	174
Problem 5-10	174
Professional Development Questions	174
 <b>Chapter 6 · Impeachment</b>	177
Overview	177
I. Impeachment by Attacking General Trustworthiness	178
A. Bias	178
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Abel</i>	179
<i>United States v. Abel</i>	180
B. Defect in Capacity	183
Focus Questions: <i>Henderson v. DeTella</i>	184
<i>Henderson v. DeTella</i>	184
C. Untruthful General Character	185
1. Calling a Character Witness	185
2. Cross-Examining a Witness Regarding Non-Conviction Misconduct	187
Focus Questions: <i>State v. Morgan</i>	188
<i>State v. Morgan</i>	188
Problem 6-1	191
3. Cross-Examining a Witness Regarding the Witness’s Convictions	192
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Brewer</i>	195
<i>United States v. Brewer</i>	196

Problem 6-2	199
Problem 6-3	200
II. Impeachment to Cast Doubt on Specific Testimony	200
A. Demonstrating Prior Inconsistent Statements	200
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Winchenbach</i>	202
<i>United States v. Winchenbach</i>	202
B. Contradicting a Witness on Cross or Through Extrinsic Evidence	205
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Opager</i>	206
<i>United States v. Opager</i>	206
III. Final Thoughts on Impeachment	208
IV. Rape Shield Law	209
Overview Problem	210
Focus Questions: <i>Doe v. United States</i>	212
<i>Doe v. United States</i>	212
Focus Questions: <i>Stephens v. Miller</i>	214
<i>Stephens v. Miller</i>	215
Problem 6-4	219
Problem 6-5	220
Professional Development Questions	220
<b>Chapter 7 • Hearsay</b>	223
I. Unraveling Hearsay	223
Overview Problem	223
Hearsay: The Quest for Reliable, Accurate Information	224
Hearsay: Rule Deconstruction	225
A. The Hearsay Declarant	226
B. For the Truth of the Matter Asserted	226
C. The Hearsay Statement	228
1. Assertive Conduct as a “Statement”	228
2. Oral and Written Communication as a Statement	229
D. Mini-Review	231
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Parry</i>	233
<i>United States v. Parry</i>	233
Focus Questions: <i>State v. Galvan</i>	235
<i>State v. Galvan</i>	235
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Long</i>	237
<i>United States v. Long</i>	237
Focus Questions: <i>State v. Dullard</i>	238
<i>State v. Dullard</i>	239
Hearsay Quiz	243
II. The Hearsay Exemptions	245
Introduction	246
A. Prior Statements of Testifying Witnesses	246
1. Prior Inconsistent Statements	246
Problem 7-1	248
Problem 7-2	248
2. Prior Consistent Statements	249
Focus Questions: <i>Tome v. United States</i>	249
<i>Tome v. United States</i>	250

Problem 7-3	255
Problem 7-4	256
Problem 7-5	256
3. Statements of Identification	257
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Owens</i>	257
<i>United States v. Owens</i>	257
B. Admissions by Opposing Parties	259
1. Individual Admissions	259
Problem 7-6	259
2. Adoptive Admissions	260
Problem 7-7	261
Problem 7-8	262
Problem 7-9	262
Problem 7-10	263
3. Statements of Agents	264
Focus Questions: <i>Mahlandt v. Wild Canid Survival &amp; Research Center, Inc.</i>	264
<i>Mahlandt v. Wild Canid Survival &amp; Research Center, Inc.</i>	265
Problem 7-11	268
Problem 7-12	268
Problem 7-13	269
4. Coconspirator Statements	270
Focus Questions: <i>Bourjaily v. United States</i>	271
<i>Bourjaily v. United States</i>	271
Problem 7-14	275
Problem 7-15	275
III. The FRE 803 Exceptions	277
A. Present Sense Impressions and Excited Utterances	277
Problem 7-16	279
Problem 7-17	279
Problem 7-18	280
Problem 7-19	280
Problem 7-20	280
B. Then-Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Condition	281
Focus Questions: <i>Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Hillmon</i>	282
<i>Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Hillmon</i>	283
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Houlihan</i>	285
<i>United States v. Houlihan</i>	286
Problem 7-21	288
Problem 7-22	289
C. Statements for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment	289
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Iron Shell</i>	290
<i>United States v. Iron Shell</i>	291
Problem 7-23	294
Problem 7-24	294
Problem 7-25	295
D. Writing to Refresh Memory/Recorded Recollection	295
Focus Questions: <i>Baker v. State</i>	297
<i>Baker v. State</i>	297

Problem 7-26	301
E. Business Records	301
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Kim</i>	303
<i>United States v. Kim</i>	304
Focus Questions: <i>Scheerer v. Hardee's</i>	307
<i>Scheerer v. Hardee's Food Systems, Inc.</i>	307
Problem 7-27	309
Problem 7-28	309
Problem 7-29	310
F. Public Records	311
Focus Questions: <i>Beech Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey</i>	312
<i>Beech Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey</i>	312
Problem 7-30	317
Problem 7-31	318
IV. The FRE 804 Exceptions	318
A. Unavailability	318
Problem 7-32	319
Problem 7-33	319
B. Former Testimony	320
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Feldman</i>	321
<i>United States v. Feldman</i>	321
Focus Questions: <i>Clay v. Johns-Manville Sales Corp.</i>	324
<i>Clay v. Johns-Manville Sales Corp.</i>	324
Problem 7-34	326
Problem 7-35	326
C. Dying Declarations	326
Focus Questions: <i>State v. Adamson</i>	327
<i>State v. Adamson</i>	327
Problem 7-36	330
Problem 7-37	331
D. Statements Against Interest	331
Focus Questions: <i>Williamson v. United States</i>	333
<i>Williamson v. United States</i>	333
Problem 7-38	337
Problem 7-39	338
E. Forfeiture by Wrongdoing	338
Problem 7-40	339
Problem 7-41	340
V. The Residual Hearsay Exception	340
Focus Questions: <i>Dallas County v. Commercial Union Assurance Co.</i>	342
<i>Dallas County v. Commercial Union Assurance Co.</i>	342
Problem 7-42	345
Problem 7-43	346
VI. Final Thoughts on Hearsay	346
Professional Development Questions	347
<b>Chapter 8 · The Confrontation Clause and Due Process</b>	<b>349</b>
I. The Confrontation Clause	349
A. Overview to the Confrontation Clause	349

Focus Questions: <i>Crawford v. Washington</i>	350
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i>	350
Focus Questions: <i>Davis v. Washington</i> and <i>Hammon v. Indiana</i>	362
<i>Davis v. Washington, Hammon v. Indiana</i>	363
B. The Evolution of the Confrontation Clause after <i>Crawford</i> and <i>Davis</i>	372
Focus Questions: <i>Michigan v. Bryant</i>	373
<i>Michigan v. Bryant</i>	373
Focus Questions: <i>Bullcoming v. New Mexico</i>	387
<i>Bullcoming v. New Mexico</i>	388
C. The Continuing Evolution of the Confrontation Clause	398
Problem 8-1	401
Problem 8-2	402
Problem 8-3	402
II. Due Process	403
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i>	403
Problem 8-4	410
Professional Development Questions	410
<b>Chapter 9 • Authentication and Best Evidence</b>	413
I. Authentication	413
Overview Problem	415
Focus Questions: <i>Bruther v. General Electric Co.</i>	417
<i>Bruther v. General Electric Co.</i>	417
Problem 9-1	419
Problem 9-2	419
Problem 9-3	420
Problem 9-4	421
II. The Best Evidence Rule	422
Overview Problem	423
Focus Questions: <i>Meyers v. United States</i>	425
<i>Meyers v. United States</i>	425
Problem 9-5	428
Problem 9-6	428
Problem 9-7	428
Professional Development Questions	429
<b>Chapter 10 • Lay and Expert Evidence</b>	431
I. Layperson Testimony	431
Focus Questions: <i>Government of the Virgin Islands v. Knight</i>	433
<i>Government of the Virgin Islands v. Knight</i>	433
Problem 10-1	434
Problem 10-2	434
II. Expert Testimony	435
Overview Problem	435
A. Proper Qualification	436
<i>United States v. Locascio</i>	437
Problem 10-3	437
B. Proper Topic	438
<i>United States v. Locascio</i>	440

Focus Questions: <i>Torres v. County of Oakland</i>	441
<i>Torres v. County of Oakland</i>	441
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Hines</i>	444
<i>United States v. Hines</i>	445
Problem 10-4	447
Problem 10-5	448
C. Proper Basis	449
<i>United States v. Locascio</i>	451
Problem 10-6	452
Problem 10-7	454
D. Proper Methodology	455
Focus Questions: <i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow</i>	455
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals</i>	455
Focus Questions: <i>Kumho Tire Company v. Carmichael</i>	463
<i>Kumho Tire Company v. Carmichael</i>	463
Focus Questions: <i>Hernandez v. City of Albuquerque</i>	471
<i>Hernandez v. City of Albuquerque</i>	471
Professional Development Questions	479
<b>Chapter 11 • Privileges</b>	481
I. Overview to Privileges	481
II. Attorney-Client Privilege	482
A. Communication	483
B. Made in Confidence	483
C. Between Privileged Parties	484
D. Legal Assistance	485
E. Exceptions/Waiver	485
Focus Questions: <i>Sandra T.E. v. South Berwyn School District 100</i>	486
<i>Sandra T.E. v. South Berwyn School District 100</i>	486
Focus Questions: <i>United States v. Lentz</i>	491
<i>United States v. Lentz</i>	491
Problem 11-1	497
Problem 11-2	497
Problem 11-3	498
Problem 11-4	498
Problem 11-5	499
III. Marital Privileges	499
A. The Spousal Testimonial Privilege	500
B. The Marital Communications Privilege	500
C. Comparison of the Privileges	501
Focus Questions: <i>Trammel v. United States</i>	501
<i>Trammel v. United States</i>	502
Problem 11-6	506
Problem 11-7	506
Problem 11-8	507
Problem 11-9	507
IV. The Doctor and Psychotherapist Privileges	507
Focus Questions: <i>Jaffee v. Redmond</i>	508
<i>Jaffee v. Redmond</i>	509

Problem 11-10	516
V. Other Privileges	516
Professional Development Questions	518
<b>Appendix · Federal Rules of Evidence</b>	<b>519</b>
Article I. General Provisions	519
Article II. Judicial Notice	520
Article III. Presumptions in Civil Cases	521
Article IV. Relevance and its Limits	521
Article V. Privileges	526
Article VI. Witnesses	527
Article VII. Opinions and Expert Testimony	530
Article VIII. Hearsay	532
Article IX. Authentication and Identification	537
Article X. Contents of Writings, Recordings, and Photographs	540
Article XI. Miscellaneous Rules	541
<b>Index</b>	<b>543</b>



# Table of Principal Cases

---

- Baker v. State, 297  
Beech Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey, 312  
Bourjaily v. United States, 271  
Broyles v. Commonwealth, 155  
Bruther v. General Electric Co., 417  
Bullcoming v. New Mexico, 388  
Chambers v. Mississippi, 403  
Clay v. Johns-Manville Sales Corp., 324  
Crawford v. Washington, 350  
Dallas County v. Commercial Union Assurance Co., 342  
Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 455  
Davis v. Washington, 363  
Doe v. United States, 212  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Gear Petroleum, Inc., 91  
Government of the Virgin Islands v. Knight, 433  
Hammon v. Indiana, 363  
Henderson v. DeTella, 184  
Hernandez v. City of Albuquerque, 471  
Jaffee v. Redmond, 509  
Jones v. Pak-Mor Manufacturing Co., 45  
Kumho Tire Company v. Carmichael, 463  
Mahlandt v. Wild Canid Survival & Research Center, Inc., 265  
McInnis v. A.M.F. Inc., 93  
Meyers v. United States, 425  
Michigan v. Bryant, 373  
Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Hillmon, 283  
Old Chief v. United States, 66  
People v. Zackowitz, 116  
Reyes v. Missouri Pacific R.R. Co., 145  
Sandra T.E. v. South Berwyn School District 100, 486  
Scheerer v. Hardee's Food Systems, Inc., 307  
State v. Adamson, 327  
State v. Dullard, 239  
State v. Galvan, 235  
State v. Morgan, 188  
State v. Peterson, 4, 44, 63, 121  
Stephens v. Miller, 215  
Tanner v. United States, 17  
Tome v. United States, 250  
Torres v. County of Oakland, 441  
Trammel v. United States, 502  
United States v. Abel, 180  
United States v. Brewer, 196  
United States v. Feldman, 321  
United States v. Gilliland, 159  
United States v. Guardia, 168  
United States v. Hernandez, 138  
United States v. Hines, 445  
United States v. Houlihan, 286  
United States v. Iron Shell, 291  
United States v. James, 51  
United States v. Kim, 304  
United States v. LeCompte, 166  
United States v. Lentz, 491  
United States v. Locascio, 437, 440, 451  
United States v. Long, 237  
United States v. Opager, 206  
United States v. Owens, 257

United States v. Parry, 233

United States v. Robinson, 130

United States v. Winchenbach, 202

Williams v. McCoy, 104

Williamson v. United States, 333

Wood v. Morbark Industries, Inc., 84

# Series Editor's Preface

---

Welcome to a new type of law text. Designed by leading experts in law school teaching and learning, Context and Practice casebooks assist law professors and their students to work together to learn, minimize stress, and prepare for the rigors and joys of practicing law. **Student learning and preparation for law practice are the guiding ethics of these books.**

Why would we depart from the tried and true? Why have we abandoned the legal education model by which we were trained? Because legal education can and must improve.

In Spring 2007, the Carnegie Foundation published *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Practice of Law* and the Clinical Legal Education Association published *Best Practices for Legal Education*. Both works reflect in-depth efforts to assess the effectiveness of modern legal education, and both conclude that legal education, as presently practiced, falls quite short of what it can and should be. Both works criticize law professors' rigid adherence to a single teaching technique, the inadequacies of law school assessment mechanisms, and the dearth of law school instruction aimed at teaching law practice skills and inculcating professional values. Finally, the authors of both books express concern that legal education may be harming law students. Recent studies show that law students, in comparison to all other graduate students, have the highest levels of depression, anxiety and substance abuse.

**The problems with traditional law school instruction begin with the textbooks law teachers use.** Law professors cannot implement *Educating Lawyers* and *Best Practices* using texts designed for the traditional model of legal education. Moreover, even though our understanding of how people learn has grown exponentially in the past 100 years, no law school text to date even purports to have been designed with educational research in mind.

The Context and Practice Series is an effort to offer a genuine alternative. Grounded in learning theory and instructional design and written with *Educating Lawyers* and *Best Practices* in mind, Context and Practice casebooks make it easy for law professors to change.

I welcome reactions, criticisms, and suggestions; my e-mail address is michael.schwartz@washburn.edu. Knowing the author(s) of these books, I know they, too, would appreciate your input; we share a common commitment to student learning. In fact, students, if your professor cares enough about your learning to have adopted this book, I bet s/he would welcome your input, too!

Professor Michael Hunter Schwartz, Series Designer and Editor  
Co-Director, Institute for Law Teaching and Learning  
Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Development  
Washburn University School of Law



# Preface and Acknowledgements

---

People learn best when they answer their own questions and receive feedback on their efforts. They achieve their best insights when they fight through confusion through thought, reflection, and problem solving. In this way, knowledge is constructed, not received.

In this book, most of our focus will be on the ambiguity and uncertainty in evidence law—what I often refer to as the “gray area.” In each section, the core tests and rules are presented right up front, as clearly as I could write them. The rest of the section explores uncertainty: What are the ambiguities in the rules? How do courts apply the test? Upon what does the court rely in making its determination? By recognizing these gray areas, grappling with them, rethinking our assumptions, and examining our mental models of reality, we can turn confusion into insight.

It is my hope that this book will help you construct knowledge through a natural, critical learning environment in your classroom. By “natural,” I mean that you will explore authentic, real-world application of evidence law. By “critical,” I mean that you will not only examine your understanding of the law, its application, and its synthesis, but also have the opportunity to provoke an imagination that leads to possibilities and solutions. I hope it will help you develop all the skills that a practitioner must possess, such as creativity, practical judgment, fact finding, persuasive advocacy, strategic planning, passion, and engagement.

Most of all, I hope that journey is a good one for you. Have fun with this book: actively engage in the motivations of the parties and lawyers in the cases, try to predict the outcome of the problems, and do not ignore the emotions that arise in you as you go through these materials. In other words, dive into the ambiguity and make the knowledge your own.

## Acknowledgements

Tremendous thanks go to my wife, Joy, who supported me in writing this book in every way imaginable. This book would not exist without her love, patience, and hard work. I also owe so much to my children, Eva and Charles—yes, the book is done, and, yes, I now have more time to play. Words simply cannot express my love and gratitude to you all.

I am very grateful to Michael Hunter Schwartz for his faith and patience. I would also like to thank the excellent people at Carolina Academic Press for their hard work on this book and commitment to this series.

Denis Poncet and Jean-Xavier de Lestrade created a remarkable documentary in “The Staircase,” and I thank them for use of excerpts of their work.

Many research assistants have their fingerprints all over this book. Roni Pomerantz deserves special mention, as her excellent work served as a model for me and for all the

other research assistants. I would also like to thank Andrea Alarcon, Adam Beshara, Michael Sier, Kimberlina McKinney, Lindsey Harms, Rosie Kim, and Amira Hasenbush.

My Evidence classes at UCLA School of Law in 2010 and 2011 had to suffer through drafts of this book. They did so with grace and good humor. I thank them for their insights and constructive criticism.

Pavel Wonsowicz  
July, 2012