

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS: EVIDENCE

LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

Paul Caron

Charles Hartsock Professor of Law
University of Cincinnati College of Law

Olympia Duhart

Professor of Law and Director of Lawyering Skills & Values Program
Nova Southeastern University, Shepard Broad Law School

Samuel Estreicher

Dwight D. Opperman Professor of Law
Director, Center for Labor and Employment Law
NYU School of Law

Steven I. Friedland

Professor of Law and Senior Scholar
Elon University School of Law

Joan Heminway

College of Law Distinguished Professor of Law
University of Tennessee College of Law

Edward Imwinkelried

Edward L. Barrett, Jr. Professor of Law
UC Davis School of Law

Paul Marcus

Haynes Professor of Law
William and Mary Law School

John Sprankling

Distinguished Professor of Law
McGeorge School of Law

Melissa Weresh

Director of Legal Writing and Professor of Law
Drake University Law School

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS: EVIDENCE

*Multiple-Choice and Short-Answer
Questions and Answers*

THIRD EDITION

THE LATE DAVID P. LEONARD

*Professor of Law & William M. Rains Fellow
Loyola Law School, Los Angeles*

and

PAUL C. GIANNELLI

*Distinguished University Professor and Weatherhead Professor of Law
Case Western Reserve University*

ISBN: 978-0-7698-6422-8 (Print)

ISBN: 978-0-3271-8761-5 (eBook)

ISBN: 978-0-3271-8874-2 (Mobile App)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2013 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

NOTE TO USERS

To ensure that you are using the latest materials available in this area, please be sure to periodically check the LexisNexis Law School web site for downloadable updates and supplements at www.lexisnexis.com/lawschool.

Editorial Offices

121 Channon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

The late David Leonard was an Associate Dean for Research, Professor of Law, and William M. Rains Fellow at Loyola Law School, Los Angeles. Prior to joining the Loyola faculty in 1991, Professor Leonard was a Professor of Law at Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis.

Leonard was the author of numerous law review articles as well as two volumes of *The New Wigmore: A Treatise on Evidence*. Along with Roger C. Park and Steven H. Goldberg, he was co-author of the hornbook *Evidence Law: A Student's Guide to the Law of Evidence as Applied in American Trials*.

Paul C. Giannelli is a Distinguished University Professor and the Weatherhead Professor of Law at Case Western Reserve University. He is the author of numerous law review articles and the author or co-author of more than 10 books, including *Understanding Evidence*, *Scientific Evidence*, and *Courtroom Criminal Evidence*. He has taught evidence for 40 years.

PREFACE

The law of evidence is complex, but if you work hard at it, you can develop an understanding of the individual rules and of the way the rules interact to form a coherent system. The key to learning evidence law is to ask several questions about each problem:

- (1) What is the questioned evidence? (This is a very important step; isolating the exact evidence at issue often provides clues to the rules that must be satisfied for the evidence to be admissible.)
- (2) What is the evidence offered to prove?
- (3) Is the evidence relevant when offered for that purpose?
- (4) If the evidence is relevant, are there any other rules of evidence that might require its exclusion?

These simple steps will always get you off to a good start. You can also develop a series of more specific questions for each area of evidence law. For example, if you suspect that the problem might deal with witness impeachment, here are the questions you should ask after you have answered those listed above:

- (1) Is the offered to impeach or support the credibility of a witness?
- (2) If the evidence is offered to impeach or support a witness's credibility, what method of impeachment is involved? (Among many possibilities: Is this impeachment by contradiction? Is it impeachment by showing a bad character for truthfulness? Is it impeachment by showing that the witness did not have a good opportunity to observe the event about which she has testified, or by showing that her capacity to observe, remember, or narrate is impaired?)
- (3) Are there any specific rules that govern the use of the evidence for that method of impeachment? If so, have those rules been followed? To determine whether the rules have been followed, ask:
 - (a) Is the evidence admissible only after the opponent has offered evidence to the contrary?
 - (b) Are there limits on the form the evidence may take?
- (4) If there are no rules that specifically govern this method of impeachment, would admission of the evidence violate any other rules, such as FRE 403?
- (5) Do any foundational requirements apply, such as giving the witness an opportunity to explain or deny the statement or showing the evidence to the witness, apply? If so, have those rules been followed?

If you work methodically through each problem, and if you *read the rules* with care, you will succeed.

Though the explanations in this book contain a good deal of information you will find useful, the purpose of this book is not to teach you the rules of evidence. The book's main purposes are to test what you have learned from reading your primary course materials and from the classroom, to broaden your understanding of that material, and to help you to see where you might need to devote additional study time. In this book, you will find questions and answers in sixteen main subject areas that correspond to the basic topics you are likely to cover in an evidence course. There is also a practice final exam that tests your knowledge of rules from most of these subject areas. The practice final also contains questions that require you to apply two or more different rules. Though the book is organized in roughly the same way as some of the popular texts, it will work for you even if your class covers the material in a different order.

The problems in this book are based almost entirely on the Federal Rules of Evidence. The Federal Rules have been extremely influential in the development of state evidence codes, and where there are differences between federal practice and the law of particular states, those differences are usually quite easy to learn once you have mastered the Federal Rules. Because the Multistate Bar Examination tests federal evidence law, you need to learn the Federal Rules in any event. Throughout the book, "Federal Rules of Evidence" is abbreviated "FRE."

One final thought: Take the time to answer every question as carefully as possible. If the question calls for a short answer, write out the entire answer. It is easy to look at a problem, think briefly about how you would answer the question, and then read the answer printed in the book. Try to avoid this shortcut. It is a much better test of your understanding, and much more beneficial to the learning process, for you to write out an answer to each short answer question before you look at the response printed in the book.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS	1
TOPIC 1	PRESERVING ERROR; APPELLATE REVIEW 3
TOPIC 2	OBJECTIONS TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION 7
TOPIC 3	WITNESS COMPETENCY 11
TOPIC 4	LOGICAL RELEVANCE; EXCLUSION FOR REASONS OF PREJUDICE OR OTHER DANGERS 15
TOPIC 5	PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS OF FACT 21
TOPIC 6	CLASSIFICATION OF EVIDENCE AS HEARSAY OR NOT HEARSAY 25
TOPIC 7	EXCEPTIONS TO (AND EXEMPTIONS FROM) THE HEARSAY RULE 39
TOPIC 8	EVIDENCE OF CHARACTER, “OTHER CRIMES, WRONGS, OR ACTS,” HABIT, AND SIMILAR EVENTS 61
TOPIC 9	EVIDENCE OF SUBSEQUENT REMEDIAL MEASURES, COMPROMISE, HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE, CRIMINAL PLEAS, AND LIABILITY INSURANCE 71
TOPIC 10	IMPEACHMENT AND CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES 79
TOPIC 11	AUTHENTICATION 91
TOPIC 12	THE BEST EVIDENCE RULE 93
TOPIC 13	JUDICIAL NOTICE 97
TOPIC 14	BURDENS OF PROOF AND PRESUMPTIONS 99
TOPIC 15	EVIDENTIARY PRIVILEGES 103
TOPIC 16	LAY AND EXPERT OPINION; SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE 109
PRACTICE FINAL EXAM: QUESTIONS	113
ANSWERS	145
TOPIC 1	PRESERVING ERROR; APPELLATE REVIEW 147
TOPIC 2	OBJECTIONS TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION 151
TOPIC 3	WITNESS COMPETENCY 155
TOPIC 4	LOGICAL RELEVANCE; EXCLUSION FOR REASONS OF PREJUDICE OR OTHER DANGERS 159
TOPIC 5	PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS OF FACT 165
TOPIC 6	CLASSIFICATION OF EVIDENCE AS HEARSAY OR NOT HEARSAY 169
TOPIC 7	EXCEPTIONS TO (AND EXEMPTIONS FROM) THE HEARSAY RULE 183
TOPIC 8	EVIDENCE OF CHARACTER, “OTHER CRIMES, WRONGS, OR ACTS,” HABIT, AND SIMILAR EVENTS 209
TOPIC 9	EVIDENCE OF SUBSEQUENT REMEDIAL MEASURES, COMPROMISE, HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE, CRIMINAL PLEAS, AND LIABILITY INSURANCE 219
TOPIC 10	IMPEACHMENT AND CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES 227
TOPIC 11	AUTHENTICATION 239
TOPIC 12	THE BEST EVIDENCE RULE 241
TOPIC 13	JUDICIAL NOTICE 245
TOPIC 14	BURDENS OF PROOF AND PRESUMPTIONS 247
TOPIC 15	EVIDENTIARY PRIVILEGES 251
TOPIC 16	LAY AND EXPERT OPINION; SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE 257
PRACTICE FINAL EXAM: ANSWERS	263
INDEX	293

