

Law, Science and Experts

Civil and Criminal Forensics

William S. Bailey

Terence J. McAdam



Carolina Academic Press

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2014
Carolina Academic Press
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bailey, William S. (William Scherer) author

Law, science and experts : civil and criminal forensics / William S. Bailey and Terence J. McAdam.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-61163-188-3 (alk. paper)

1. Evidence, Expert—United States. 2. Forensic sciences—United States. 3. Criminal investigation—United States. I. McAdam, Terence J. author. II. Title.

KF8961.B35 2014
347.73'67--dc23

2014027968

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

Printed in the United States of America

I dedicate the book to my wife Sylvia. "After all these years, we're still having fun, and you're still the one."

William S. Bailey

This is for you, Elizabeth. Without your patience, understanding and gentle prodding, this book would not have been written. Thank you for always being there for me.

Terence J. McAdam

Contents

Acknowledgments	xvii
Chapter 1 · Introduction to Forensics	3
Chapter 2 · The Strategic Role of Experts	7
Sorting Out the Variables	8
Social Science Studies of Persuasion and Attitude Change	8
Stripping Away Advocacy Positions	9
Expert Opinion—Persuasion or Rationalization?	10
How Experts Help You Win	11
Do Résumés Matter?	11
Experts Affect How Lawyers Feel about Their Cases	11
Taking Out Opposing Experts through Motions	12
Experts in Plaintiff’s Proof Sequence—Theory of the Triangle	12
Use of Rules and Standards	13
Technical Cases Increase an Expert’s Importance	13
Making Harmful Evidence Relevant	14
Disciplines Subject to Juror Disbelief	14
Opportunity to Manipulate Data Inputs	14
Experts Can Be the Tipping Point	15
Takeaways—The Strategic Role of Experts	15
Chapter 3 · The Shape of the World after <i>Daubert</i>	17
Social Science Attempts to Measure <i>Daubert</i>	18
Quantitative Studies	18
Survey Studies	19
Key Lessons from the Research	19
Making and Defending a <i>Daubert</i> Motion	20
The Judge’s Role: Gatekeeping vs. Deferring to the Jury	20
The Importance of Peer-Review Literature to Judges	21
Disproportionality: <i>Daubert</i> ’s Lack of Impact on Criminal Cases	22
What Triggers Exclusion?	22
State Court Realities	23

The Bottom Line	24
Takeaways—The Shape of the World after <i>Daubert</i>	24
Chapter 4 · The Scientific Enterprise	27
Scientific Method Basics	27
Consensus, Competition and Change	28
Challenges to Colleagues	29
Resistance to Changes in Conventional Wisdom	30
Manipulation and Bias	30
Implementation of Research Findings	31
In and Out of the Laboratory	32
Proving Causal Relationships	33
Junk Science	34
Big Data on the Rise—The <i>Moneyball</i> Effect	34
Differences between Research Facilities	36
Differences of Approach between Branches of Science	36
Evidence-Based Medicine	36
The Outsized Impact of DNA Analysis on Criminal Forensics	37
Takeaways—The Scientific Enterprise	38
Chapter 5 · Science and Law—When Worlds Collide	41
Two Completely Different Methods of Searching for the Truth	42
Questions about the Trier of Fact's Capacity	43
Policymaking and Science	44
Differences in Access to Information	44
Corrupting Influence and Bias	45
Questions about Prosecution Experts	45
What Quality of Experts Do We End Up Getting?	46
Differences between Legal and Scientific Standards of Proof	46
Takeaways—Science and Law: When Worlds Collide	47
Chapter 6 · Hard and Soft Science	51
Credibility Implications	51
Move towards Greater Quantification	52
Genuine Differences between Hard and Soft Science	53
Willingness to Tackle Tough Scientific Questions	53
The Impact of Hard Science on Criminal Cases	54
Defense Challenges to DNA Evidence	54
Other Prosecution Forensic Tools	54
The Bottom Line: Forensic Evidence Makes Criminal Cases Tougher to Defend	55
Questions Left Unanswered by Hard Science	56
Use of Soft Science in Plea Bargaining	57
Eyewitness Identification and False Confessions	57
Personality Testing: How Objective?	58

Juries Try to Base Their Decisions on the Facts	59
Takeaways—Hard and Soft Science	60
Chapter 7 · Criminal Forensic Science	63
Definition and Scope	63
History and Development	63
Functions of a Criminal Forensic Scientist	68
CSI—Myth vs. Reality	68
Application of Scientific Method to Criminal Forensics	69
Lawyers and Criminal Forensic Science	69
Strengthening Forensic Science	72
Takeaways—Criminal Forensic Science	73
Chapter 8 · The Crime Laboratory	75
Evidence Unit	75
DNA Unit	77
Firearms Unit	78
Latent Fingerprint Unit	79
Trace Evidence Unit	80
Crime Scene Investigation Unit	81
Takeaways—The Crime Laboratory	82
Chapter 9 · Crime Scene	83
Protecting the Scene	85
Documentation of the Location, Scene and Evidence	86
Collection and Preservation of the Potential Evidence	90
Chain of Custody Considerations	92
Takeaways—Crime Scene	92
Chapter 10 · Physical Evidence	93
Identification	93
Comparison	93
Class Characteristics and Individual Characteristics	94
Takeaways—Physical Evidence	95
Chapter 11 · Latent Fingerprints	97
History and Nature of Fingerprints	97
Fundamental Principles of Fingerprints	98
Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems	100
Latent Print Development	101
Accuracy of Decisions Made by Latent Print Examiners	101
Fingerprints and the Law	103
Takeaways—Latent Fingerprints	105

Chapter 12 · Firearms and Toolmarks	107
Takeaways—Firearms and Toolmarks	110
Chapter 13 · DNA Evidence	111
What Is DNA?	111
Where Is DNA Found?	112
DNA in the Lab	112
Blood	113
Semen	114
Saliva	115
DNA Typing	116
Y-STR	116
Mitochondrial DNA	117
How Results Are Interpreted	117
National Research Council Report and DNA	119
Takeaways—DNA Evidence	120
Chapter 14 · Trace Evidence	123
Hairs	124
Fibers	126
Paint	126
Glass	127
Soil	128
Arson and Explosives Investigation	128
Takeaways—Trace Evidence	130
Chapter 15 · Drugs	131
Takeaways—Drugs	134
Chapter 16 · The Gatekeeper’s Perspective	135
The Limited Guidance of Cases on Expert Testimony	135
What Qualifies Judges to Rule on Scientific Issues?	135
How Do Judges Evaluate the Reliability of Experts?	136
How Judges See Their Gatekeeper Role	137
Judicial Concerns over How Attorneys Present Experts	138
Judges and the CSI Effect	139
How Much Expert Testimony Do Judges Exclude?	139
What Lines Do Judges Not Want to See Crossed?	140
Hired Guns	141
The Role of Motion Practice in Triggering Gatekeeper Rulings	141
Lawyers Have Become the Real Gatekeepers	142
Takeaways—The Gatekeeper’s Perspective	142
Chapter 17 · Casting Director	145
Aversion to Expert Witness Work	146

Why Would Any Good Expert Agree to Serve?	146
Finding the Right Expert: Networking, Hard Work and Luck	146
Searching the Literature	147
Personal Experience with the Issue	147
How Will Your Expert's Personality Fit in the Courtroom?	147
Communication Skills	148
Advocates Lack Credibility	149
Bonding with Your Experts	150
The Two Things All Lawyers Want from Their Experts	150
The Need to Be Crisp and Definitive	150
Special Considerations for Doctor Experts	151
Face Time and Cross-Pollination	151
“The Usual Suspects”	152
Judicial Response to Frequent Experts	153
Experts Who Don't Make the Cut	153
Takeaways—Casting Director	153
Chapter 18 · Experts and Attorney Work Product	155
Range of Discovery Obligations for Experts	156
A Split of Authority	156
The Protections of FRCP 26(b)(4)	157
Testifying vs. Consulting Experts	157
The Impact of Redesignation on Discovery	157
Redesignation to Insulate Experts	158
What Is the Bottom Line?	159
Takeaways—Experts and Attorney Work Product	159
Chapter 19 · How People Learn	161
The Story Drives the “Stickiness” of Your Case	161
The Multi-Media Impact on Learning and Persuasion	162
Two Processing Systems	162
Working Memory and Retention	162
The Challenges of Teaching about Science and Technology	163
How Words and Pictures Reinforce One Another	164
Using PowerPoint with Experts	164
How Effective Is PowerPoint?	164
Research Studies on How Visuals Aid Learning	165
Things to Avoid When Using PowerPoint	166
Helping the Trier of Fact to Retain Science and Technology	172
Different Learning Styles	175
Graphics: A Critical Instructional Tool	176
The Bottom Line: Multi-Media Learning Works	176
Unanswered Questions	177
The Bottom Line: Visuals Work	177
Takeaways—How People Learn	177

Chapter 20 · Teaching Judges and Juries about Science and Technology	181
The Steep Learning Curve	181
Use Your Experts as Teachers	182
Learn the Science	182
Evidence-Based Medicine	183
Latent Injuries and Toxic Torts	183
Keep It Simple	183
Show and Tell	185
Active Listening: Stay Engaged and Ask Follow-Up Questions	185
The Need to Track with Common Experience	186
The Side with the Best Teachers Often Wins	187
Use of Visuals in Teaching	189
Perceived Expertise	191
Movement and Choreography	193
Live Demonstrations in the Courtroom	194
Takeaways—Teaching Judges and Juries about Science and Technology	195
Chapter 21 · Deposing Experts	197
Deposition Planning	197
Strategy	197
The Downside of Expert Depositions	198
Why Take an Expert’s Deposition?	199
What to Do in a Deposition	199
The Value of Videotape Depositions	200
Takeaways—Deposing Experts	200
Chapter 22 · Using the Literature	203
Print Alone Does Not Make It True	203
Indicia of Reliability	204
The Pluses and Minuses of Using Scientific Literature	204
The Challenges of Using Literature Effectively in Cross	205
Takeaways—Using the Literature	206
Chapter 23 · Law and Medicine	209
Culture Conflict between Law and Medicine	209
Medical Reaction to Lawyer Questions	211
The Emotion of Being Cross-Examined	212
Differences in Medical and Legal Standards of Proof	212
Changing Attitudes toward Information Sharing	213
Difficulty of Testifying against Colleagues	213
Evidence-Based Medicine	214
Changes in Expert Testimony with Evidence-Based Medicine	214
Takeaways—Law and Medicine	215

Chapter 24 · Using Data, Statistics and Probability	217
The Critical Role of Math in Science	217
The Challenges Math Presents to Lawyers	218
Math Is Hard	219
Statistics Are the Basis for Proving Causal Relationships	219
The Applications of Mathematical Probability	220
Predictions through 20/20 Hindsight	220
The Ultimate Forensic Use of Statistics: DNA Testimony	221
Measurement of Individual Differences in Social Science	221
Using the Statistical References of Mean, Median or Mode	222
Correlation: Does a Causal Relationship Exist?	222
Peer-Review Studies Often Get It Wrong	223
Getting Up to Speed on the Math	224
Keep It Simple: Show Pictures, Not Figures	224
Economists and the Assumptions They Make	228
Takeaways—Using Data, Statistics and Probability	229
Chapter 25 · Direct Examination	231
What’s Your Expert Mix?	231
A Good Direct Examination Is Like a Play	231
Preparation Is Critical	232
Finding the Comfort Zone through Face Time	232
Vignettes and Stories	233
“Teach Me”	233
Use Visuals	234
Getting Direct off on the Right Foot	236
Expert Credentials: A Little Bit Goes a Long Way	236
Maximizing the Jurors’ Learning Capabilities	237
Tight Succession and Credibility Building	237
Admit and Explain Any Weaknesses	238
Enhancing Persuasion	238
Keep Scientific Literature to a Minimum	239
National Standards	239
Conclusion	239
Takeaways—Direct Examination	240
Chapter 26 · Cross-Examination of Experts	243
A Realistic View of Cross-Examination	243
How Aggressive Should You Be with an Opposing Expert?	243
In-Depth Understanding of the Science or Discipline	244
Identifying the Weak Spots	244
The Element of Surprise	244
Get In and Get Out	245
You Can’t Win on Cross but You Can Lose	246
How Much Is Enough?	247

Keep the Heat Out	247
Use of Emotional Intelligence	248
Primacy and Recency	248
What Points Does the Opposing Expert Have to Agree On?	248
Avoid Direct Challenges	249
Read Everything the Expert Has Written	249
Use Learned Treatises Sparingly	250
Avoid Overdoing Bias Questions	250
Experienced Experts Know the Cross-Examination Drill and Are Ready for You	252
Concession-Based Cross-Examination in Criminal Cases	253
Defense Avoids Direct Challenges to Crime Labs	253
Foundation Deficiencies	253
Junk-Science Attacks	253
Use Visual Anchors	254
Only Use Good Deposition Q's and A's to Impeach	254
Video Deposition Impeachment	255
Index Video Depositions and Carve Out Clips	256
Takeaways—Cross-Examination of Experts	256
Conclusion	259
Appendix A · Case Problems	261
Biomechanical Engineering	263
Computer Forensics	264
DNA	265
Economic Loss to Estate—Wrongful Death	266
Employment Discrimination	267
Fingerprints	268
Forensic Anthropology	270
Insanity Defense	271
Insurance Claims Practices	272
Medical Malpractice	274
Structural Engineering	275
Toxicology	276
Vocational Assessment—Loss to Estate	277
Appendix B · Cross-Examination of an Opposing Medical Expert	281
Background Facts	281
General Strategic Approach	281
Sequencing	282
The Contrast Method of Cross-Examination	283
Cross-Examination—William B. Grimm, M.D.	284
The Underlying Theme: Forensic Medical Experts Are Advocates	285
Using Professional Ethical Standards	287

The Expert's Report	289
Opinions Beyond the Expertise of a Witness	293
Follow the Money	296
The Outcome	300
Appendix C · Creation of Computer Animation Illustrating Engineering Expert's Opinion	301
Facts— <i>Roger v. Property Development Associates</i>	301
The Need for Expert Consultation	302
Finding the Right Expert	302
Collecting Background Material	302
The Elevator Expert's Findings	303
Building the Foundation for the Animation	303
Expert's Comments on Animation Drafts	308
Final Version of Animation	308
Notes	311
Photo and Illustration Credits	325
Index	329

Acknowledgments

In his seminal book *Emotional Intelligence*, Daniel Goleman describes the research of the legendary Bell Labs as “beyond the capacity of any one person to tackle.” The same easily can be said of Forensics, as science and technology increasingly take center stage in the resolution of legal matters. I have been the beneficiary of generously shared wisdom and insight from a broad range of outstanding judges, law professors, trial attorneys, and scientists, all of whom played a critical role in this book.

I am much in the debt of my good friend and mentor Professor John Mitchell of Seattle University School of Law, a dynamic, creative scholar and classroom teacher. John designed a Forensics course, taught it for years and then encouraged me to step up and take it over. This book never would have happened without him.

The advice, guidance and wisdom of teachers and mentors has made all the difference in my life. I owe them a huge collective debt. I am particularly grateful for the support of Justice Tom Chambers, Paul N. Luvera and Professor John J. Sullivan.

I was fortunate to have the opportunity to work with my co-author Terence J. McAdam, a skilled forensic scientist and a dynamic teacher.

Since *Daubert*, trial judges occupy the critical role of gatekeeper in the use of expert testimony. The Hon. Harry T. Edwards, Senior Circuit Judge, the Hon. Robert T. Lasknik, District Court Judge, and King County (Washington) Superior Court Judges Andrea A. Darvas, William L. Downing and Ronald Kessler provided me with keen insight into the challenges faced by trial courts in regulating expert testimony, as well as the impact it has had on jury decisions. They also helped me to understand better how this information is most effectively communicated to jurors.

My colleagues at the University of Washington School of Law have been generous in their support, guidance and encouragement. Professor Peter Nicolas planted the idea for this book. Professors Sanne Knudsen, Michael Townsend and Todd Wildermuth have a phenomenal breadth of scientific literacy, helping me to understand the relationship between law and science. Reference librarian Mary Whisner kept me up on all the latest developments in the forensic world. Dean Kellye Testy and Professors Robert Aronson, Bill Covington, Deborah Maranville and Kate O’Neill were encouraging throughout the writing process.

This book has benefitted greatly from the depth of talent and experience of some of the best trial lawyers in America. I am grateful to David Beninger, Ralph J. Brindley, John

Budlong, Erin Ehlert, C. Steven Fury, Todd W. Gardner, Ian Goodhew, Karen Koehler, Mark R. Larson, Elizabeth A. Leedom, James S. Rogers, Malcolm Ross and Michael S. Wampold. They personify the best practices of the trial bar, serving both their clients and our justice system with great distinction.

Scott Patrick Kennedy was an invaluable research assistant, creatively and methodically sorting out the trends and patterns in federal and state judicial opinions after *Daubert*. Kathy Bremner used her considerable editorial skills to improve the book, identifying corrections with pinpoint accuracy. Matthew Wurdeman transformed the Notes with his unerring sense of form and function.

A number of scientists, scholars and technical experts were very important to my understanding of this subject. I thank the following experts for their input, thought and guidance: Geoffrey Baird, MD, PhD; Robert Feldman, MD; John Fountaine, MA, CRC; Philip T. Hoffman, PhD; B.J. Oneal, PhD; Peter M. McGough, MD; Kenneth Muscatel, PhD; Denise Rodier, MS; David Stenhouse, Christina Tapia, PhD; Allan F. Tencer, PhD; Michele Triplett; and Philip J. Vogelzang, MD.

The advice, encouragement and friendship of Chicago DEA Special Agent In Charge Jack Riley has been enormously helpful to me. Sergeant Robert Vallor and Detective Alan Cruise of the Seattle Police Department Homicide Unit consistently have been very generous in providing real world information on criminal forensics.

I have had many great clients over my career, who have inspired me to do my best work. I am grateful to Roger Murray and the Philippides family for permitting me to use events from their lives.

Visualization is critical to the understanding of expert testimony. I wish to thank Duane Hoffmann for his elegant illustrations, which required enormous time and effort. I also am grateful to Kathy A. Cochran, Kevin C. Kealty, Jr., Patrick O'Neill, David Newman, Jay Syverson and Aaron Weholt for their outstanding visuals.

Keith Sipe of Carolina Academic Press is a publisher who always is open to new ideas, bringing out the best in his authors. I am grateful for his confidence in me and this book. He is backed by a top production staff, including editor Linda Lacy, production coordinator Ryland Bowman and design/layout specialist Tim Colton.

The support staff team at William Gates Hall is phenomenal, juggling as many responsibilities as air traffic controllers. Their capable assistance was a necessary ingredient to writing this book and I am much indebted to Tabitha Acosta, Dawn Bell and Laurie Carlsson.

—William S. Bailey

The person who deserves the greatest acknowledgment is the love of my life Elizabeth. When I would come home after a long day at the Crime Lab or from teaching or occasionally from both, she was the one who kept me on task. Without her support I would not have completed this book.

I'd also like to thank my co-author Bill Bailey for his patience and insight. I have truly enjoyed working on this endeavor with him.

I owe a great debt to the dedicated men and women of the Washington State Patrol Crime Laboratories. Jim Tarver, the Crime Laboratory Division Commander graciously gave permission for me to work on this project. Randy Watson and Sarah Trejo from the Olympia Crime Lab produced the latent print images. Jeff Teitelbaum, from the Seattle Crime Lab, one of the best forensic librarians in the world, discovered many pertinent articles I was able to reference. Denise Rodier and Victor El Koury from the Seattle Crime Lab assisted greatly with the editing of the DNA and Evidence chapters. Kris Kern from the Crime Scene Response Team helped with the presentation of the 3-D scanner images. Melody Yu provided English translation assistance on Chinese forensic articles.

Lastly, Ray Kusumi, also from the Seattle Crime Lab, lent his photographic skills, and his talent is evident in many of the photos he provided for this book.

—Terry McAdam

Renton, WA, July 2014.

For the rational study of the law, the black-letter man may be the man of the present, but the man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics.

—Oliver Wendell Holmes, *The Path of the Law*,
10 HARV. L. REV. 457, 469 (1897)

It is unrealistic to expect either members of the judiciary or state officials to be well versed in the rigors of experimental or statistical technique.

—*Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 204 (1976)