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For decades, Paul Rice’s Evidence casebook has been perhaps the most comprehensive text on the market. Professor Rice himself was a giant in the field, and his thorough casebook straddled the line between teaching text and treatise. This version attempts to update the existing text while preserving Professor Rice’s effort to produce a book that would be useful for students attempting to learn the subject and provide them with a text thorough enough to serve as a reference for them when they enter practice.

New evidence teachers will find this book somewhat overwhelming in its coverage. Our respect for the dual casebook/treatise role of the book led us to retain its considerable coverage. Teachers should choose the parts they wish to emphasize and make reference to the coverage in the remainder of the book, allowing students to begin to treat the book as a reference text.

Finally, we should note that at this point, the title of the book is somewhat misleading. When Paul Rice produced the first edition of this book, the Federal Rules of Evidence were new. An understanding of the common law rules of evidence provided an essential backdrop for the Federal Rules of Evidence. Decades later, the common law background is rarely needed, and so for the most part has been eliminated. We retain the original name of the book, as this remains the book that Paul Rice first produced with updates to keep it current.

We are honored to be a part of the work Professor Rice started decades ago and hope to do justice to this book on which we have each relied as practitioners and teachers.

Wesley M. Oliver
Dale B. Durrer
Kirsha Weyandt Trychta
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