

Evidence: The Objection
Method
Fourth Edition

LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

William Araiza

Professor of Law

Brooklyn Law School

Lenni B. Benson

Professor of Law & Associate Dean for Professional Development

New York Law School

Raj Bhala

Rice Distinguished Professor

University of Kansas, School of Law

Ruth Colker

Distinguished University Professor & Heck-Faust Memorial Chair in Constitutional Law

Ohio State University, Moritz College of Law

David Gamage

Assistant Professor of Law

UC Berkeley 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

David I. C. Thomson

LP Professor & Director, Lawyering Process Program

University of Denver, Sturm College of Law

Melissa Weresh

Director of Legal Writing and Professor of Law

Drake University Law School

Evidence: The Objection Method

Fourth Edition

Dennis D. Prater
Connell Teaching Professor of Law, University of Kansas School of Law

Daniel J. Capra
Philip Reed Professor of Law, Fordham University School of Law

Stephen A. Saltzburg
Wallace and Beverley Woodbury University Professor, George Washington
University Law School

Hon. Christine M. Arguello
United States District Court Judge, District of Colorado

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Evidence : the objection method / Dennis D. Prater ... [et al.]. -- 4th ed.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-4224-9538-4 (hardbound)

1. Evidence (Law)--United States--Cases. I. Prater, Dennis D.

KF8935.E957 2011

347.73'6--dc23

2011032828

This publication is designed to provide accurate and 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 and Michie is a trademark 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 © 2011 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.
All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material exceeding fair use, 17 U.S.C. § 107, may be licensed for a fee of 25¢ per page per copy 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 Chanlon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

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

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

This Fourth Edition plays to what we feel were the strengths of the first three editions. Most importantly, the book is stocked with transcript style problems in which lawyers present evidence and argue evidentiary points, and a trial judge is called on to rule. We hope that these problems will be useful to readers both in and out of class. In this Edition, we have made a special effort to update and amplify the problems in order to provide a real challenge for students seeking to master the rules of evidence as well as the art of objection and argument over evidentiary points in a real trial.

This new edition was necessitated by a major development in the law of evidence. The Evidence Rules Restyling Project changed the text of every single one of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Those restyling changes are effective as of December 1, 2011. The Restyled Rules are set forth in full in an Introduction to the book — in side-by-side form, old and new — together with committee notes. Particular Restyled Rules are also set forth individually where pertinent to the topic discussed in the book.

One of the authors of this book, Professor Daniel Capra, serves as Reporter to the Judicial Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules and so had front-line responsibility for the restyled rules. Another co-author, Professor Saltzburg, served as a consultant on the Restyling project. Where possible, the drafters' perspective on the Restyling amendments has been emphasized. So for example, the Introduction contains an explanation of the Restyling project prepared by Professor Capra.

Of course, the principal cases in the book were decided before the Restyled Rules of Evidence went into effect. Where those cases quote the language of the rule, we have tried to indicate that the quotation is from the rule before it was restyled. Editorial comments concerning restyling are contained in brackets in the cases. It is important to note that none of the results in any of the cases would be changed by applying the Restyled Rule — because the very premise of the Restyling is that no substantive changes have been made.

A few words on the format of the book. Citations included in cases are usually omitted without so specifying. Footnotes that are included in the cases are numbered as they were in the original case. Footnotes that are ours in the text are numbered sequentially from the beginning of each chapter. If we have deleted material from a case, it is noted with three asterisks. If the court has deleted material — for example from a quote taken from another case — it is noted with three periods.

This Edition continues the practice of the previous edition by including extensive excerpts from the *Federal Rules of Evidence Manual*, coauthored by Professors Stephen Saltzburg, Michael Martin, and Daniel Capra. We hope that these excerpts will help students master the important concepts of evidence that do not arise in the principal cases. We thank Lexis-Nexis for the permission to use this material.

The co-authors owe a special debt of thanks to Professors Capra and Saltzburg, who spent countless hours in preparing new problems, finding new cases, and reworking and modernizing the material for this new edition.

Dedication

The authors dedicate this book to all our families and loved ones. Their patience, endurance, and endearments provide us monumental support.

D.D.P. to Burns, Vivian, Derek, and Scott

D.J.C. to Anne, Emily, and David

S.A.S. to Susan, David, Diane, Lisa, and Mark

C.M.A. to Ron, Ronnie, Tiffany, Jennifer, and Kenny

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	MODE AND ORDER OF PRESENTING EVIDENCE	1
A.	CONTROL BY THE COURT	1
[1]	Federal Rules of Evidence 102, 403, and 611(a)	1
[2]	An Application of Judicial Authority	2
	<i>United States v. Reaves</i>	2
	NOTES	5
B.	FORM OF QUESTIONS TO WITNESSES	8
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 611(c)	8
[2]	Direct Examination	8
	<i>Straub v. Reading Co.</i>	8
	NOTES	11
[3]	Cross-Examination	13
	<i>United States v. McKenna</i>	13
	NOTES	14
C.	SCOPE OF CROSS-EXAMINATION	15
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 611(b)	15
	<i>United States v. Williams</i>	15
[2]	The American Rule: Cross-Examination Within the Subject Matter of the Direct	21
	<i>Macaulay v. Anas</i>	21
	NOTE	24
	PROBLEM 1-1	25
Chapter 2	OBJECTIONS AND OFFERS OF PROOF	31
A.	INTRODUCTION	31
[1]	Illustration	31
[2]	Federal Rule of Evidence 103	32
B.	CONTEMPORANEOUS OBJECTION	32
	<i>United States v. Spriggs</i>	32
	NOTES	34
C.	REQUIREMENT OF SPECIFIC OBJECTION	39
	<i>United States v. Wilson</i>	39
	NOTE	41
D.	THE RATIONALE FOR REQUIRING SPECIFIC AND TIMELY OBJECTIONS	42
	<i>Owen v. Patton</i>	42
	NOTES	44
E.	OFFER OF PROOF	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>United States v. Winkle</i>	46
	NOTES	48
	PROBLEM 2-1	50
	PROBLEM 2-2	51
Chapter 3	COMPETENCY	55
A.	INTRODUCTION	55
B.	STATUS	55
	[1] Federal Rule of Evidence 601	55
	[2] Competency vs. Credibility	56
	<i>United States v. Bedonie</i>	56
	NOTES	58
	[3] Jurors	60
	[a] Federal Rule of Evidence 606	60
	[b] Advisory Committee Note to the 2006 Amendment to Rule 606(b): . .	60
	[c] Illustration	61
	[d] Attacking the Judgment	62
	<i>Tanner v. United States</i>	62
	NOTES	66
	[4] Judges	68
	[a] Federal Rule of Evidence 605	68
	[b] Advisory Committee’s Note to Rule 605	68
	NOTES	68
C.	FOUNDATIONAL COMPETENCE	69
	[1] The Oath	69
	[a] Federal Rule of Evidence 603	69
	[b] Religious Convictions	69
	[i] Illustration	69
	[ii] Substitutes for the Oath	70
	<i>Ferguson v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue</i>	70
	NOTES	73
	[c] Children	74
	[i] Illustration	74
	[ii] A Minimal Standard	74
	<i>Capps v. Commonwealth</i>	74
	NOTES	76
	[d] The Competent Incompetent	77
	[i] Illustration	77
	[ii] Prior Determinations	77
	<i>United States v. Phibbs</i>	77
	NOTES	79

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[2]	Perception	80
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 602	80
[b]	Illustration	80
[c]	Witness’s Own Testimony	81
	<i>United States v. Davis</i>	81
	NOTES	84
[d]	Extent of Personal Knowledge	86
	<i>Gladden v. State</i>	86
	NOTES	87
	PROBLEM 3-1	88
[3]	Recollection	90
[a]	Memory Refreshed	90
[i]	Illustration	90
[ii]	Federal Rule of Evidence 612	91
	NOTE	91
[iii]	Any Statement or Object	92
	<i>Baker v. State</i>	92
	NOTES	96
[b]	Past Recollection Recorded	97
[i]	Illustration	97
[ii]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(5)	97
[iii]	Adopted Statement	98
	<i>United States v. Williams</i>	98
	NOTES	103
	PROBLEM 3-2	104
[c]	Hypnotically Refreshed Memory	106
	<i>People v. Zayas</i>	106
	NOTES	109
[4]	Communication	111
[a]	Illustration	111
[b]	Interpreters	111
	<i>Watson v. State</i>	111
	NOTES	116
Chapter 4	RELEVANCE	117
A.	INTRODUCTION	117
[1]	Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, and 403	117
	NOTES	117
B.	ANY TENDENCY	119
	<i>United States v. Foster</i>	119
	NOTES	121

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C.	FACT OF CONSEQUENCE	123
D.	SOURCES OF AUTHORITY FOR EXCLUDING RELEVANT EVIDENCE	124
	<i>United States v. Lowery</i>	124
E.	RULE 403 BALANCING	127
	<i>McQueeney v. Wilmington Trust Co.</i>	127
	NOTES	131
	<i>People of the Territory of Guam v. Shymanovitz</i>	132
	NOTES	138
F.	COMMON APPLICATIONS OF THE RULE 403 BALANCING TEST	141
[1]	Consciousness of Guilt	141
[a]	Illustration	141
[b]	Flight and Escape	142
	<i>United States v. Hankins</i>	142
	NOTE	144
[2]	Poverty or Wealth	145
[a]	Illustration	145
[b]	Punitive Damages	145
	<i>Hall v. Montgomery Ward & Co.</i>	145
[3]	Similar Occurrences	147
[a]	Illustration	147
[b]	Substantial Identity	147
	<i>Nachtsheim v. Beech Aircraft Corp.</i>	147
	NOTES	153
[4]	Gruesome Visual Presentations	156
	<i>Terry v. State</i>	156
[5]	Implicating Another	157
[a]	Illustration	157
[b]	Alternative Perpetrator Evidence	158
	<i>United States v. McVeigh</i>	158
[c]	Alternative Perpetrator Evidence and the Constitutional Right to an Effective Defense	166
	<i>Holmes v. South Carolina</i>	166
	NOTE	171
G.	EVIDENTIARY ALTERNATIVES AND STIPULATIONS	172
	<i>Old Chief v. United States</i>	172
	NOTES	179
	PROBLEM 4-1	182

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 5	RELEVANCE — SPECIAL RULES	185
A.	SUBSEQUENT REMEDIAL MEASURES	185
[1]	Federal Rule 407	185
[2]	Committee Note to 1997 Amendment to Rule 407 [edited to apply to the restyled rule]	185
[3]	Illustration	186
[4]	Strict Liability, Feasibility and Control	186
	<i>Cameron v. Otto Bock Orthopedic Industry, Inc.</i>	186
	NOTES	188
B.	COMPROMISE AND OFFER OF COMPROMISE	194
[1]	Federal Rule 408	194
[2]	Committee Note to 2006 Amendment to Rule 408 [edited to comport with restyling of text in 2011]	194
[3]	Illustration	197
[4]	Disputes, Waiver and Other Purposes	197
	<i>Alpex Computer Corp. v. Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i>	197
	NOTES	201
C.	PAYMENT OF MEDICAL OR SIMILAR EXPENSES	202
[1]	Federal Rule 409	202
[2]	Illustration	203
[3]	Admission of Fault	203
	<i>Galarnyk v. Hostmark Management, Inc.</i>	203
	NOTE	204
D.	PLEAS AND DISCUSSIONS	204
[1]	Federal Rule 410	204
[2]	Illustration	205
[3]	Use of Pleas for Impeachment	206
	<i>United States v. Udeagu</i>	206
	NOTE	207
[4]	Can the Protection be Waived?	208
	<i>United States v. Mezzanatto</i>	208
	<i>United States v. Burch</i>	214
E.	LIABILITY INSURANCE	218
[1]	Federal Rule 411	218
[2]	Illustration	218
[3]	Permissible Uses of Liability Insurance	218
	<i>Bernier v. Board of County Road Commissioners</i>	218
	NOTES	219
	PROBLEM 5-1	220
	PROBLEM 5-2	222

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 6	CHARACTER EVIDENCE, PRIOR BAD ACTS, AND HABIT	227
A.	INTRODUCTION	227
B.	FEDERAL RULES 404, 405, 406	229
C.	COMMITTEE NOTE TO 2006 AMENDMENT TO RULE 404 [edited to conform to text of restyled rule effective December 2011]	230
D.	THE 11 RULES OF SUBSTANTIVE CHARACTER EVIDENCE, SIMILAR ACTS AND HABIT	231
Rule # 1		231
[1]	Illustration	231
[2]	General Rule	232
	<i>Ginter v. Northwestern Mutual Life Ins. Co.</i>	232
Rule # 2		233
[1]	Character In Issue	233
	<i>Schafer v. Time, Inc.</i>	233
[2]	Illustration	236
Rule # 3		237
	<i>United States v. Williams</i>	237
	NOTE	239
Rule # 4		239
	<i>Michelson v. United States</i>	240
	NOTES	243
Rule # 5		245
	<i>United States v. Keiser</i>	245
	NOTES	249
	PROBLEM 6-1	250
Rule # 6		250
	<i>State v. Hicks</i>	250
	PROBLEM 6-2	252
Rule # 7		252
Rule # 8		252
	<i>United States v. Holt</i>	253
	<i>United States v. Bruguier</i>	254
	NOTES	257
Rule # 9		259
[1]	Federal Rule 404(b)	259
[2]	Plan and Identity	260
	<i>United States v. Carroll</i>	260
	NOTE	262
[3]	Motive	263
	<i>United States v. Potter</i>	263

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	NOTES	265
[4]	Intent or Knowledge	266
	<i>United States v. Hearst</i>	266
	<i>United States v. Martinez</i>	269
	<i>United States v. Jones</i>	272
	NOTE	277
[5]	Other Not-For-Character Uses for Uncharged Acts of Misconduct	278
	<i>United States v. Woods</i>	278
[6]	The Effect of Stipulation	281
	<i>United States v. Crowder</i>	281
[7]	Standard of Proof for Acts of Uncharged Misconduct	288
	<i>Huddleston v. United States</i>	288
	NOTES	291
[8]	Procedural Issues Raised by Rule 404(b)	292
[a]	Acts That Are Inextricably Intertwined With the Crime Charged	292
[b]	Applicability of Rule 403	295
[c]	Rule 404(b) and Civil Cases	296
[d]	The Notice Requirement	297
Rule # 10	297
[1]	Introduction	298
[2]	Federal Rule 406	299
	<i>United States v. Angwin</i>	299
	NOTES	303
[3]	Example in Distinguishing Between Character and Habit	305
	<i>Perrin v. Anderson</i>	305
	NOTE	307
	PROBLEM 6-3	308
	PROBLEM 6-4	312
Rule # 11	314
[1]	Federal Rule 412	315
[2]	Rape Shield Protection and the Criminal Defendant’s Constitutional Rights	316
	<i>United States v. Bear Stops</i>	316
	NOTES	322
[3]	Federal Rules 413, 414, 415	324
[a]	The Congressional Enactments	324
[b]	Scope of the Rules Permitting Use of the Defendant’s Prior Sex Offenses	326
[c]	Constitutional Challenges and the Applicability of Rule 403 to Uncharged Acts of Sexual Misconduct	327
	<i>United States v. Lemay</i>	327

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PROBLEM 6-5	336
Chapter 7	FOUNDATIONAL REQUIREMENTS	339
A.	REAL EVIDENCE	339
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 901	339
[2]	Illustration	339
[3]	Chain of Custody	340
	<i>Lockhart v. McCotter</i>	340
	NOTES	342
[4]	Evidence of Tampering	344
	<i>United States v. Edwards</i>	344
[5]	Hearsay Problems	350
	<i>United States v. Bonds</i>	350
	NOTE	353
B.	ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE	354
[1]	Illustrative Evidence Defined	354
	<i>Smith v. Ohio Oil Co.</i>	354
[2]	Limits on Use of Illustrative Evidence	356
	<i>Carson v. Polley</i>	356
C.	PHOTOGRAPHS, VIDEOTAPES, AND RECORDINGS	362
[1]	Illustration	362
[2]	Foundation	363
	<i>Brown v. Barnes</i>	363
	NOTES	364
[3]	X-Rays	366
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b)(9)	366
[b]	Illustration	366
[c]	Foundation	367
	<i>King v. Williams</i>	367
	NOTE	368
D.	VOICE IDENTIFICATION AND PHONE CALLS	368
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b)(4)-(6)	368
[2]	Advisory Committee's Note to Rule 901	369
[3]	Voice Identification	370
[a]	Illustration	370
[b]	Identification at Any Time	370
	<i>United States v. Watson</i>	370
	NOTE	372
[4]	Incoming Telephone Calls	373
[a]	Illustration	373
[b]	Context of the Statements	373

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>United States v. Parker</i>	373
[5]	Outgoing Telephone Calls	375
[a]	Illustration	375
[b]	Calls to Businesses	375
	<i>Barrickman v. National Utilities Co.</i>	375
	NOTE	377
E.	HANDWRITING AND WRITINGS	377
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b)(2)-(4)	377
[2]	Handwriting	377
[a]	Illustration	377
[b]	Extent and Timing of Perception	378
	<i>In Re Diggins' Estate</i>	378
	NOTE	378
[3]	Comparisons by the Jury	379
[a]	Illustration	379
[b]	Genuine Example	379
	<i>United States v. Ranta</i>	379
	NOTE	381
[4]	Circumstantial Evidence	381
	<i>United States v. McMahon</i>	381
	NOTE	383
F.	PUBLIC RECORDS	384
[1]	Federal Rules of Evidence 901 and 902	384
	NOTES	385
G.	BUSINESS RECORDS	385
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 902 (11) and (12)	385
[2]	Committee Note to 2000 Amendment to Rule 902	386
[3]	Translation Issues	386
	<i>Kassim v. City of Schenectady</i>	386
	NOTE	389
H.	E-MAIL AND INTERNET	389
	<i>United States v. Safavian</i>	389
	PROBLEM 7-1	399
	PROBLEM 7-2	405
 Chapter 8		
	BEST EVIDENCE RULE	409
A.	DEFINITION	409
[1]	Federal Rules of Evidence 1001–1008	409
[2]	Illustration	410
B.	GENERAL RULE — PROVING THE CONTENTS OF A WRITING OR RECORDING	411

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[1]	Proving the Contents of a Writing	411
	<i>Demarco v. Ohio Decorative Products, Inc.</i>	411
	NOTES	413
[2]	Writings Defined	414
	<i>Seiler v. Lucasfilm, Ltd.</i>	414
[3]	Physical Evidence	418
	<i>United States v. Duffy</i>	418
	NOTE	420
[4]	Tape Recordings	420
	<i>United States v. Howard</i>	420
	NOTES	422
[5]	Pictures, Films, and X-Rays	422
	<i>United States v. Levine</i>	422
	NOTES	424
C.	DUPLICATES AND SECONDARY EVIDENCE	425
[1]	Duplicates	425
	<i>Railroad Management Company LLC v. CFS</i>	
	<i>Louisiana Midstream Co.</i>	425
	NOTES	429
[2]	Secondary Evidence	430
	<i>Neville Construction Co. v. Cook Paint and Varnish</i>	430
	NOTES	432
D.	APPLICATION OF BEST EVIDENCE RULE TO DIGITAL EVIDENCE	433
	<i>United States v. Bennett</i>	433
	<i>United States v. Diaz-Lopez</i>	435
	<i>Vagenos v. LDG Financial Services, LLC.</i>	438
E.	SUMMARIES	441
	<i>United States v. North American Reporting, Inc.</i>	441
	NOTES	443
	PROBLEM 8-1	445
Chapter 9		551
OPINION TESTIMONY		551
A.	LAY OPINIONS	551
[1]	Illustration	551
[2]	Federal Rules of Evidence 701 and 704	452
[3]	Rationally Based on Perception	453
	<i>United States v. Hoffner</i>	453
	NOTE	455
[4]	Helpful to the Jury	455
[a]	Short-Hand Rendition	455

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>United States v. Yazzie</i>	455
	NOTE	458
[b]	State of Mind of Another	460
	<i>United States v. Rea</i>	460
	NOTE	464
[c]	Ultimate Issue	464
	<i>Kostecky v. NL Acme Tool/NL Industries, Inc.</i>	464
	NOTES	466
[5]	The Line Between Lay and Expert Testimony	467
[a]	Lay Witnesses Giving Expert Testimony	467
	<i>United States v. Figueroa-Lopez</i>	467
[b]	Advisory Committee Note to 2000 Amendment to Rule 701	471
[c]	Comment by Reporter on 2000 Amendment to Rule 701	473
[d]	Post-2000 Amendment Case Law	474
	<i>United States v. Perkins</i>	474
B.	EXPERTS	479
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 702	479
[2]	Qualification of Experts	480
	<i>Berry v. City of Detroit</i>	480
	NOTES	483
[3]	Proper Subject Matter for Expert Testimony	486
	<i>Scott v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i>	486
	NOTES	489
	<i>Nimely v. City of New York</i>	491
[4]	The Requirement that Expert Testimony be Reliable	496
[a]	Scientific Expert Testimony — The General Acceptance Test	496
	<i>Frye v. United States</i>	496
[b]	Scientific Expert Testimony — The Reliability Test and the Trial Court’s Gatekeeping Function	497
	<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i>	497
[c]	Applications of the <i>Daubert</i> Gatekeeping Function to Scientific Expert Testimony	504
	<i>General Electric Co. v. Joiner</i>	504
	<i>Westberry v. Gislaved Bummi AB</i>	511
[e]	Applications of the <i>Daubert</i> Gatekeeping Function to Evidence in Electronic Form	517
	<i>In Re Three Mile Island Litigation</i>	517
	<i>United States v. Quinn</i>	521
[f]	Applications of the <i>Daubert</i> Gatekeeping Function to Non-Scientific Expert Testimony	523
	<i>Kumho Tire Company, Ltd. v. Carmichael</i>	523

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[e]	The 2000 Amendment to Federal Rule 702 (as restyled in 2011) . . .	532
[f]	Cases Decided Under the 2000 Amendment to Rule 702	539
[g]	<i>Daubert</i> and Forensic Testimony	543
	<i>United States v. Baines</i>	543
[h]	A Specialized Application of Reliability Standards: Proof of Probability	552
	<i>People v. Collins</i>	552
	NOTES	558
[5]	Basis of Opinion and Underlying Data	561
[a]	Federal Rules of Evidence 703 and 705	561
[b]	The 2000 Amendment to Rule 703 — Committee Note and Reporter’s Observations	561
[c]	Facts Reasonably Relied Upon	565
	<i>Thomas v. Metz</i>	565
	<i>United States v. Leeson</i>	568
	NOTES	572
[6]	Ultimate Issue	574
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 704	574
[b]	Use of Terminology With Both Legal and Colloquial Connotations .	575
	<i>United States v. Perkins</i>	575
	NOTE	577
[b]	Mental State of a Criminal Defendant	578
	<i>United States v. Thigpen</i>	578
	NOTES	579
	PROBLEM 9-1	580
	PROBLEM 9-2	581
Chapter 10 HEARSAY DEFINED		587
A.	FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE 801 AND 802	587
B.	TRUTH OF THE MATTER ASSERTED	587
[1]	Illustrations	587
[2]	Independent Legal Significance	588
[a]	Oral Contracts	588
	<i>Creaghe v. Iowa Home Mutual Casualty Co.</i>	588
	NOTE	590
[b]	Threats and Fraud	591
	<i>United States v. Jones</i>	591
	NOTE	592
[3]	Notice - Statement Offered for its Effect on the Listener	593
	<i>Vinyard v. Vinyard Funeral Home, Inc.</i>	593
	NOTE	594

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>McClure v. State</i>	594
	NOTE	596
[4]	Other Not-For-Truth Purposes	597
	<i>United States v. Wicks</i>	597
	NOTES	598
	PROBLEM 10-1	600
C.	STATEMENT	602
[1]	Assertive Conduct	602
[a]	Illustration	602
[b]	Act of Production	603
	<i>Stevenson v. Commonwealth</i>	603
	NOTES	604
[2]	Non-Assertive Conduct and Words	605
[a]	Illustrations	605
[b]	Implied Assertions	606
	<i>United States v. Zenni</i>	606
	NOTE	609
D.	OUT-OF-COURT STATEMENTS OF DECLARANTS WHO TESTIFY AT TRIAL	613
	<i>United States v. Check</i>	613
Chapter 11 HEARSAY EXCLUSIONS		619
A.	STATEMENTS THAT ARE “NOT HEARSAY” UNDER FEDERAL RULE 801(d)	619
B.	PRIOR STATEMENTS BY A WITNESS	620
[1]	Inconsistent Statements Under Oath	620
[a]	Common Law	620
[b]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(1)(A)	620
[c]	Illustrations	620
[d]	Other Proceeding	622
	<i>United States v. Livingston</i>	622
	NOTES	625
[2]	Consistent Statements	626
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(1)(B)	626
[b]	Illustration	626
[c]	Allegations of Recent Fabrication	627
	<i>Tome v. United States</i>	627
	NOTES	635
[3]	Prior Identifications	638
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(1)(C)	638
[b]	Illustration	368

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[c]	Subject to Cross-Examination	639
	<i>United States v. Owens</i>	369
	NOTES	643
C.	STATEMENTS OF A PARTY-OPONENT	644
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)	644
[2]	Own Statement	645
	<i>State v. Johnson</i>	646
	NOTES	648
[3]	Statements Adopted by the Party-Opponent	649
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(B)	649
[b]	By Conduct or Silence	649
	<i>Carr v. Deeds</i>	649
	<i>United States v. Hoosier</i>	652
	NOTES	653
[4]	Authorized-Agent Statements and Statements by Agents About Matters Within the Scope of Their Authority	654
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(C), (D)	654
[b]	Applying the Rules on Party-Opponent Statements, Statements by Agents Authorized to Speak, and Statement by Agents About Matters Within the Scope of Their Authority	654
	<i>Mahlandt v. Wild Canid Survival & Research Center, Inc.</i>	654
	NOTES	657
[c]	Within the Scope of the Agency or Employment	658
	<i>Hill v. Spiegel, Inc.</i>	658
	NOTES	660
[5]	Co-Conspirators	667
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(E)	667
[b]	Existence of Conspiracy	668
	<i>Bourjaily v. United States</i>	668
	NOTES	672
[c]	In Furtherance of the Conspiracy	675
	<i>United States v. Harris</i>	675
	NOTES	676
[6]	Relationship Between Agency-Statements and Coconspirator Statements	678
	<i>City of Tuscaloosa v. Harcros Chemicals, Inc.</i>	678
	PROBLEM 11-1	681
	PROBLEM 11-2	682

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 12	HEARSAY EXCEPTIONS DEPENDENT ON THE UNAVAILABILITY OF THE DECLARANT	685
A.	INTRODUCTION	685
B.	UNAVAILABILITY DEFINED	685
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)	685
[2]	Privilege	686
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)(1)	686
[b]	Illustration	686
[c]	Burden of Proof	686
	<i>United States v. Pelton & Rich</i>	686
	NOTES	688
[3]	Refusal	689
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)(2)	689
[b]	Illustration	689
	NOTE	690
[4]	Lack of Memory	690
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)(3)	690
[b]	Illustration	690
[c]	Permanent Loss	691
	<i>United States v. Amaya</i>	691
	NOTE	692
[5]	Death or Disability	692
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)(4)	692
[b]	Illustration	693
[c]	Temporary Disability	693
	<i>United States v. Faison</i>	693
	NOTE	695
[6]	Absence	696
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)(5)	696
	NOTE	696
[7]	Procurement or Wrongdoing	697
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a)	697
[b]	Negligence	698
	<i>United States v. Mathis</i>	698
C.	UNAVAILABILITY EXCEPTIONS	698
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)	698
[2]	Former Testimony	699
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(1)	699
[b]	Predecessor in Interest and Similarity of Motive	700
	<i>In the Matter of Johns-Manville/Asbestosis Cases</i>	700
	NOTES	703

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[3]	Dying Declarations	708
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(2)	708
[b]	Declarant’s Belief in Imminent Death	708
	<i>State v. Quintana</i>	708
	NOTES	711
[4]	Statement Against Interest	713
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(3)	713
[b]	Pecuniary Interest	713
	<i>Ghelin v. Johnson</i>	713
	NOTE	714
[c]	Penal Interest	715
	<i>Williamson v. United States</i>	715
	<i>United States v. Paguio</i>	719
	NOTES	723
[5]	Family History	729
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(4)	729
[6]	Forfeiture by Wrongdoing	729
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(6)	729
[b]	Standards for Finding Forfeiture By Wrongdoing	730
	<i>United States v. Cherry</i>	730
	NOTES	734
	PROBLEM 12-1	734
	PROBLEM 12-2	735
	PROBLEM 12-3	736
	PROBLEM 12-4	737
	PROBLEM 12-5	738
	PROBLEM 12-6	741
Chapter 13	HEARSAY EXCEPTIONS NOT REQUIRING DECLARANT UNAVAILABILITY	743
<hr/>		
A.	PRESENT SENSE IMPRESSION	743
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(1)	743
[2]	Illustration	743
[3]	Event, Perception, and Time Requirements	744
	<i>United States v. Brewer</i>	744
	NOTES	746
B.	EXCITED UTTERANCES	749
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(2)	749
[2]	Illustration	749
[3]	Under the Influence of the Startling Event	750
	<i>United States v. Marrowbone</i>	750

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	NOTES	752
[4]	Unknown Declarant	755
	<i>Miller v. Keating</i>	755
	NOTE	759
C.	STATEMENT OF EXISTING MENTAL, EMOTIONAL OR PHYSICAL CONDITION	760
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(3)	760
[2]	Illustration	760
[3]	Statements Offered to Prove Conduct	761
	<i>Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York v. Hillmon</i>	761
	NOTES	765
[4]	Past Acts	769
	<i>Shepard v. United States</i>	769
	NOTE	772
	PROBLEM 13-1	775
D.	STATEMENT FOR TREATMENT OR DIAGNOSIS	775
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(4)	775
[2]	Illustration	776
[3]	Causation	776
	<i>Rock v. Huffco Gas & Oil Co.</i>	776
	NOTES	780
E.	HEARSAY WITHIN HEARSAY	784
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 805	784
[2]	Illustration	784
[3]	The Non-Hearsay Problem	785
	<i>United States v. Dotson</i>	785
	NOTE	786
F.	BUSINESS RECORDS EXCEPTION	786
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(6)	786
[2]	Illustration	787
[3]	Recording Information from Other Sources	788
	<i>Johnson v. Lutz</i>	788
	<i>United States v. Vigneau</i>	789
	NOTES	793
[4]	Records Prepared in Anticipation of Litigation	797
	<i>Palmer v. Hoffman</i>	797
	NOTES	799
G.	PUBLIC RECORDS	802
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8)	802
[2]	Illustration	802
[3]	Opinions and Factual Findings	803
	<i>Beech Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey</i>	803

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	NOTES	808
	PROBLEM 13-2	817
H.	LEARNED TREATISE	817
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 803(18)	817
[2]	Illustration	818
[3]	Reliable Authority	818
	<i>Costantino v. Herzog</i>	818
	NOTES	827
	PROBLEM 13-3: REVIEW OF RULE 803	828
<hr/>		
Chapter 14	RESIDUAL EXCEPTION TO THE HEARSAY RULE ..	833
<hr/>		
A.	INTRODUCTION	833
B.	RESIDUAL EXCEPTION	833
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 807	833
[2]	Relationship to Other Exceptions	834
	<i>United States v. Valdez-Soto</i>	834
	NOTE	837
[3]	Circumstantial Guarantees of Trustworthiness, and More Probative Than Any Other Evidence Reasonably Available	838
	<i>Larez v. City of Los Angeles</i>	838
	NOTES	841
	PROBLEM 14-1	847
<hr/>		
Chapter 15	HEARSAY AND THE CONFRONTATION CLAUSE ...	851
<hr/>		
A.	CONFRONTATION CLAUSE	851
B.	CONFRONTATION CLAUSE VS. ADMISSION OF OUT OF COURT DECLARATIONS	851
C.	REJECTION OF THE TWO-PRONGED RELIABILITY-BASED TEST	852
	<i>Crawford v. Washington</i>	852
D.	POST-CRAWFORD ATTEMPTS TO DEFINE WHICH HEARSAY STATEMENTS ARE “TESTIMONIAL”	872
[1]	<i>The Primary Motivation Test</i>	872
	<i>Michigan v. Bryant</i>	872
[2]	<i>Laboratory Reports Prepared for Trial</i>	888
	<i>Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts</i>	888
E.	FORFEITURE OF THE RIGHT TO CONFRONTATION	911
E.	THE <i>BRUTON</i> ISSUES	914
	<i>Richardson v. Marsh</i>	914
	<i>Gray v. Maryland</i>	920
	NOTES	927

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PROBLEM 15-1	928
Chapter 16	SHORTCUTS TO PROOF: JUDICIAL NOTICE AND PRESUMPTIONS	931
A.	JUDICIAL NOTICE	931
[1]	An Overview	931
[2]	Federal Rule of Evidence 201	931
[3]	Generally Known Facts	932
	<i>Varcoe v. Lee</i>	932
	NOTES	935
[4]	Judicial Notice in Criminal Cases — Instructing the Jury	936
	<i>United States v. Bello</i>	936
	NOTES	940
[5]	Legislative Facts	941
[a]	Advisory Committee’s Note	941
	ADVISORY COMMITTEE’S NOTE [TO RULE 201]	941
[b]	Adjudicative vs. Legislative Facts	942
	<i>United States v. Gould</i>	942
	NOTES	945
B.	PRESUMPTIONS	947
[1]	An Overview	947
[2]	Federal Rules of Evidence 301 and 302	947
[3]	The Basic Choice: To Shift the Burden of Persuasion or Not in Civil Cases?	948
	<i>McCann v. The George W. Newman Irrevocable Trust</i>	948
	NOTES	952
[4]	Presumptions in Criminal Cases	953
	<i>County Court of Ulster v. Allen</i>	953
	NOTES	955
	PROBLEM 16-1	957
	PROBLEM 16-2	959
Chapter 17	IMPEACHMENT	963
A.	INTRODUCTION	963
B.	IMPEACHING YOUR OWN WITNESS: THE VOUCHING RULE AND ITS REJECTION BY THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE	964
[1]	The Vouching Rule at Common Law	964
[2]	Illustration	964
[3]	Federal Rule of Evidence 607	965
	NOTES	965
C.	TYPES OF IMPEACHMENT	968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[1]	Capacity	968
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 610	969
[b]	Beliefs Impairing Credibility: General Rule of Exclusion	969
	<i>United States v. Sampol</i>	969
	NOTE	970
[c]	To Show Bias or Motive	971
	<i>Slagle v. Bagley</i>	971
	NOTES	975
[2]	Impeachment of a Witness’s Character for Truthfulness	978
[a]	Illustration	978
[b]	Federal Rule of Evidence 609	979
[c]	The Balancing Process	980
	<i>United States v. Hayes</i>	980
	<i>United States v. Gant</i>	982
	<i>United States v. Cavender</i>	983
	NOTES	986
[d]	Dishonesty or False Statement	990
	<i>United States v. Brackeen</i>	990
	NOTES	993
[e]	Advisory Committee Note to 2006 Amendment to Rule 609	995
[a]	Common Law	997
[b]	Illustration	998
[c]	Federal Rule of Evidence 608(b)	998
[d]	Advisory Committee Note to 2003 Amendment to Rule 608(b)	999
[e]	Balancing Probative Value and Prejudicial Effect, and the Prohibition on Extrinsic Evidence of Untruthfulness	1000
	<i>Simmons, Inc. v. Pinkerton’s, Inc.</i>	1000
	NOTES	1003
[a]	Common Law	1007
[b]	Federal Rule of Evidence 608(a)	1008
[c]	Expert Testimony as to Truthfulness	1008
	<i>United States v. Barnard</i>	1008
	NOTES	1009
[3]	Level Three — Inconsistencies	1010
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 613	1010
[b]	General Requirements	1010
	<i>United States v. Rogers</i>	1010
	NOTE	1015
[c]	Illustrations	1016
[a]	Illustration	1017
[b]	Overview	1017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[c]	Extrinsic Evidence to Contradict	1018
[d]	Facts Relevant to a Material Issue: Intent	1018
	<i>State v. Gore</i>	1018
[e]	Facts Relevant to Another Impeaching Point: Bias	1019
	<i>United States v. Robinson</i>	1019
[f]	Facts That Only Contradict	1021
	<i>United States v. Beauchamp</i>	1021
	<i>United States v. Castillo</i>	1024
	NOTE	1026
[4]	Level Four — Bias	1027
[a]	Illustration	1027
[b]	Admissibility Under the Federal Rules	1028
	<i>United States v. Abel</i>	1028
	NOTES	1032
F.	REHABILITATION	1034
[1]	Truthfulness After Attack	1034
[a]	Federal Rule of Evidence 608(a)	1034
[b]	Cross-Examination as Attack	1035
	<i>United States v. Medical Therapy Sciences, Inc.</i>	1035
[2]	Prior Consistent Statements	1037
	<i>United States v. Harris</i>	1037
	NOTES	1039
G.	IMPEACHMENT OF HEARSAY DECLARANTS	1041
[1]	Federal Rule of Evidence 806	1041
[2]	Scope of Impeachment	1041
	<i>United States v. Grant</i>	1041
	NOTE	1046
	PROBLEM 17-1	1047
Chapter 18 PRIVILEGE		1057
A.	FEDERAL RULE 501	1057
B.	ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE	1057
[1]	Advisory Committee Draft of Attorney-Client Privilege	1057
[2]	Rationale for Attorney-Client Privilege and Application to Corporate Representation	1060
	<i>Upjohn Co. v. United States</i>	1060
	NOTES	1065
[3]	The Privilege and Government Attorneys	1073
	<i>In Re County of Erie</i>	1073
	NOTE	1079
[4]	The Privilege and the Death of the Client	1082

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Swidler & Berlin v. United States</i>	1082
	NOTE	1087
[5]	Waiver of the Attorney-Client Privilege	1089
[a]	Introduction	1089
[b]	Authority to Waive the Privilege	1089
[c]	“Selective” Waiver	1090
[d]	Mistaken Disclosures	1092
	<i>Coburn Group v. Whitecap Advisors, LLC</i>	1102
	PROBLEM 18-1	1107
C.	MARITAL PRIVILEGES	1111
	<i>Trammel v. United States</i>	1111
	NOTES	1115
	PROBLEM 18-2	1118
D.	PRIVILEGES RELATING TO MENTAL OR PHYSICAL HEALTH	1122
	<i>Jaffee v. Redmond</i>	1122
	NOTES	1130
E.	PRIVILEGE FOR COMMUNICATIONS TO CLERGY	1131
	<i>In Re Grand Jury Investigation</i>	1131
	NOTES	1138
F.	NEWS REPORTER’S PRIVILEGE	1138
	<i>McKevitt v. Pallasch</i>	1138
	<i>In Re: Grand Jury Subpoena, Judith Miller</i>	1141
G.	INFORMANT’S PRIVILEGE	1148
	<i>McCray v. Illinois</i>	1148
	NOTES	1152
H.	EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE	1153
	<i>United States v. Nixon</i>	1153
	NOTE	1158
I.	STATE’S SECRET PRIVILEGE	1160
	<i>Sterling v. Tenet</i>	1160
	NOTE	1168
J.	PARENT-CHILD PRIVILEGE?	1169
	<i>In Re Grand Jury</i>	1169
Appendix A	ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOTES TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE	1179
Table of Cases	TC-1
Index	I-1

Introduction: The Restyled Rules of Evidence

This edition of the casebook highlights the Restyled Rules of Evidence. The Judicial Conference Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure has led a decades-long effort to adopt clear and consistent style conventions for all of the national rules of procedure. The rules had been enacted without consistent style conventions, so there were differences from one set of rules to another, and even from one rule to another within the same set. Different rules expressed the same thought in different ways, leading to a risk that they would be interpreted differently. Different rules sometimes used the same word or phrase to mean different things, again leading to a risk of misinterpretation. Drafters made no effort to write the rules in plain English.

Despite some initial opposition, each of the restyling projects has proved enormously successful — substantially assisting lawyers, judges and law students in understanding and applying the rules. The Restyled Evidence Rules have won legal writing awards, including a Clear Mark award for plain language and the Burton Award for Legal Reform.

The Process for Restyling the Evidence Rules

With the approval of the Chief Justice of the United States — the Chair of the Judicial Conference — the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules undertook its restyling project beginning in the Fall of 2007. The Committee established a step-by-step process for restyling in compliance with previous restyling projects and with the Rules Enabling Act. Those steps involved multiple levels of drafting and review by the Evidence Rules Committee, the Style Subcommittee of the Standing Committee, as well as substantial input from judges, lawyers and academics.

Professor Capra, a co-author of this Casebook, served as the Reporter for the restyling. Professor Saltzburg, another co-author of this Casebook, served as a consultant to the Advisory Committee. Professor Joseph Kimble, a legal writing professor, served as the principal restylist.

The most challenging part of the restyling process was to improve the style of the Evidence Rules *without changing the substance*. The Advisory Committee established a working definition of a substantive change — a proposed change is “substantive” if:

- under the existing practice in any circuit, it could lead to a different result on a question of admissibility;
- under the existing practice in any circuit, it could lead to a change in the procedure by which an admissibility decision is made; or
- it changes the structure of a rule or method of analysis in a manner that would fundamentally alter how courts and litigants have thought about, or argued about, the rule; or
- it changes what Professor Kimble has referred to as a “sacred phrase” — phrases that have become “so familiar as to be fixed in cement.”

Goals of Restyling

The restyling effort provides consistent terminology, plain language, and generally makes the Evidence Rules more user-friendly. That end-product results from many specific techniques applied consistently throughout the rules.

First, the restyled Evidence Rules use a special format to achieve clearer presentations. The rules are broken down into constituent parts, using progressively indented subparagraphs with headings and substituting vertical for horizontal lists. “Hanging indents” are used throughout. These formatting changes make the structure of the rules graphic and make the restyled rules easier to read and understand even when the words are not changed.

Second, the Restyled Rules reduce the use of inconsistent terms that say the same thing in different ways. Because different words are presumed to have different meanings, such inconsistencies can result in confusion. The restyled rules reduce inconsistencies by using the same words to express the same meaning. For example, consistent expression is achieved by not switching between “accused” and “defendant” or between “party opponent” and “opposing party” or between the various formulations of civil and criminal action/case/proceeding.

Third, the Restyled Rules minimize the use of inherently ambiguous words. For example, the word “shall” can mean “must,” “may,” or something else, depending on context. The potential for confusion is exacerbated by the fact the word “shall” is no longer generally used in spoken or clearly written English. The restyled rules replace “shall” with “must,” “may,” or “should,” depending on which one the context and established interpretation make correct in each rule.

Fourth, the Restyled Rules minimize the use of redundant “intensifiers.” These are expressions that attempt to add emphasis, but instead state the obvious and create negative implications for other rules.

Fifth, the Restyled Rules improve the drafting of the Evidence Rules by changing passive to active voice whenever possible; eliminating unnecessary, vague, or redundant language; and correcting inadvertent errors in the original rules.

Sixth, the Restyled Rules seek to accommodate technological advances in the presentation of evidence by including, in a new definitions section, language that defines written material to include material stored in electronic form.

Seventh, the Restyled Rules streamline the rules by placing recurring terms in the definition section so that those terms do not have to be fully stated in each rule.

Status of the Restyled Rules of Evidence

The Restyled Rules of Evidence took effect on December 1, 2011.

The Restyled Rules and This Casebook

Immediately below, we have reproduced all of the Restyled Rules of Evidence for your reference — together with the Committee Note for each rule. (Most of the Committee Notes are the same — just a disclaimer that no change in meaning was intended. But when the Committee thought that the change would give rise to questions, it included a longer note.)

The Rules are reproduced in side-by-side format — on the left is the original rule, and on the right is the Restyled Rule.

Excerpts from the Restyled Rules are also set forth throughout the book in discussion of subject matter pertinent to each respective rule.

The cases included in this book were all decided before the Restyled Rules were enacted. When these cases quote a rule, they are of course quoting a pre-restyled rule. We have added bracketed material within the cases to remind the reader that the language used by the court is not the same as it is today. ***It must be remembered that even though the language used is often different, the result of the case will, by definition, not change — because the Restyled Rules change style only.***