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Attachment 1 --- Excerpt on *Pena-Rodriguez* from a Memo to the Advisory Committee

This memorandum addresses the Supreme Court’s decision in *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*. It was handed down on March 6, 2017. The Court’s decision has an impact on Evidence Rule 606(b). Essentially it holds that the rule is subject to unconstitutional application in a certain limited situation.

*Pena-Rodriguez* involved racist statements made by a juror during deliberations. The Court held that applying Rule 606(b) to exclude a juror’s statement about these racist comments violated the defendant’s Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial. [The case involved Colorado Rule 606(b), but that rule is virtually identical to the Federal Rule.]

**Here is the passage in the opinion that provides its specific holding and stated limitation:**

For the reasons explained above, the Court now holds that where a juror makes a clear statement that indicates he or she relied on racial stereotypes or animus to convict a criminal defendant, the Sixth Amendment requires that the no-impeachment rule give way in order to permit the trial court to consider the evidence of the juror’s statement and any resulting denial of the jury trial guarantee.

Not every offhand comment indicating racial bias or hostility will justify setting aside the no-impeachment bar to allow further judicial inquiry. For the inquiry to proceed, there must be a showing that one or more jurors made statements exhibiting overt racial bias that cast serious doubt on the fairness and impartiality of the jury’s deliberations and resulting verdict. To qualify, the statement must tend to show that racial animus was a significant motivating factor in the juror’s vote to convict. Whether that threshold showing has been satisfied is a matter committed to the substantial discretion of the trial court in light of all the circumstances, including the content and timing of the alleged statements and the reliability of the proffered evidence.

______________________________

It should be noted, though, that even though the Court found a constitutional violation, it had good things to say about Rule 606(b) as a general matter. The Court stated that the bar on juror testimony imposed by Rule 606(b) “has substantial merit. It promotes full and vigorous discussion by providing jurors with considerable assurance that after being discharged they will not be
summoned to recount their deliberations, and they will not otherwise be harassed or annoyed by litigants seeking to challenge the verdict. The rule gives stability and finality to verdicts.”

The question for the Committee is whether Rule 606(b) should be amended to respond to the Court’s decision in *Pena-Rodriguez*. There are four possibilities: 1) Do nothing; 2) Add another exception to (b)(2) that would allow juror testimony about racially biased statements made during deliberations; 3) Add an exception that would go beyond the result in *Pena-Rodriguez* and allow juror testimony insofar as it would cover other matters that might affect the right to a fair trial; or 4) Add another exception to (b)(2) that would provide a generic reference to constitutional limitations. Each of these options will be discussed in turn.

1. **Doing Nothing**

It surely can be argued that no amendment to Rule 606(b) is necessary in response to *Pena-Rodriguez*. No amendment is needed to remove the Rule 606(b) bar on testimony about racist statements during deliberation. The Sixth Amendment has already removed that bar.

But the contrary argument, in favor of some action, is that the Evidence Rules Committee has always sought to avoid a situation in which a Rule could be applied in violation of the Constitution. This has been true going back to the original Advisory Committee --- the original rules are replete with attempts to avoid unconstitutional applications. See, e.g., Rule 201(f) (judicial notice in criminal cases); Rule 803(8) (law enforcement reports in criminal cases); 804(b)(1) (prior testimony in criminal cases). And the abiding interest in preventing unconstitutional applications has carried over to the reconstituted Advisory Committee. See, e.g., Rule 412(b)(1)(C)(constitutional right of an accused to an effective defense); Rule 803(10)(amendment to protect the right to confrontation).

One reason for avoiding the possibility of unconstitutional applications is simply that the optics are bad. Good rulemaking should mean that a rule could never plausibly be applied to violate a constitutional right. But another reason is to avoid a trap for the unwary. Any lawyer, even a neophyte, should be able to look at a rule and know what it means; ideally the lawyer should not have to look outside the rule to determine the scope of its application. Certainly many lawyers approach rules that way--- thinking that the language of the rule is controlling and they need look no further. And the client of such a lawyer can be unfairly surprised when the rule is subject to an unconstitutional application. For example, an unwary lawyer (not having read the latest Supreme Court opinion) might think that he could not use juror statements to attack a verdict, even if he
hears from a juror that someone in deliberations made racist comments. After all, looking at the Rule, there is no exception that would allow the proof. And the client would suffer because the Rule as written is different from the Rule as applied.

So both policy and rulemaking history support taking action in response to the Supreme Court’s decision finding an unconstitutional application of Rule 606(b). The question is, what action is appropriate when an opinion raises problems of line-drawing, as *Pena-Rodriguez* undoubtedly does.

### 2. Codifying the Result

If action is to be taken, one possibility is essentially to codify the result in *Pena-Rodriguez* by adding a new exception to the no-impeachment rule in Rule 606(b)(2). A codification might look like this:

(2) **Exceptions.** A juror may testify about whether:

(A) extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury’s attention;

(B) an outside influence was improperly brought to bear on any juror; or

(C) a mistake was made in entering the verdict on the verdict form; or

(D) a juror made a clear statement indicating that the juror relied on racial stereotypes or animus to convict a defendant in a criminal case.¹

**The Committee Note can be short:**

Rule 606(b) has been amended to provide an exception allowing juror testimony that another juror made a clear statement indicating that the juror relied on racial stereotypes or animus to convict a defendant in a criminal case. The intent is to make the rule consistent with the guarantees provided by the Sixth Amendment in criminal cases. *See* *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*, [cite].²

---

¹ The *Pena-Rodriguez* Court noted that a number of states provide an exception to the no-impeachment rule for racially-based comments. It is notable, though, that none of those states has rule text leading to that result. It has all been done by case law. So there are no state models to work from. The attempt here is simply to codify what the Court wrote.

² While citing cases is now usually verboten in Committee Notes, there appears to be an exception when the Committee Note is explaining a change that was required by a change in the law. See the 2013 amendment to Rule
This proposal would be akin to the 2013 amendment to Rule 803(10). That amendment added a notice-and-demand provision to the Rule, in order to comply with the accused’s right to confrontation as established in Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts. After Melendez-Diaz, Rule 803(10) was subject to unconstitutional application, as it permitted the government to prove the absence of a public record by way of affidavit. The Court in Melendez-Diaz stated that the solution to the potential unconstitutionality was to implement a notice-and-demand procedure. The 2013 amendment did exactly that: it added a notice-and-demand procedure, which is essentially a way to establish that the defendant waived the right to require production of a witness to testify. The text of the notice-and-demand procedure was lifted directly from Melendez-Diaz.

There is one difference between the codification here and that in Rule 803(10), though. The notice-and-demand procedure by definition answers any question about the unconstitutionality (as applied) of Rule 803(10). There is no real chance that the Court, in subsequent decisions, will require more of the government than that. (There is a fair chance that Melendez-Diaz will be overruled, but no real chance that it will be extended, and no chance at all that a notice-and-demand procedure will be found ineffective to protect the constitutional right.). In contrast, there is a possibility that the constitutional right found in Pena-Rodriguez could be extended --- for example, to statements that indicate a sexual bias, or a religious bias, or a bias against old people, or a failure to respect the defendant’s right not to testify, and so forth. Everyone has a Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial, and while the Court bent over backwards to say that race was unique, it is hard to know whether, in a future case, the Court will extend the right of inquiry to other types of statements. Certainly the dissenters were of the view that the line drawn by the Court was arbitrary and subject to extension.

There is also a pretty fair possibility that the holding in Pena-Rodriguez could be extended to civil cases. The holding is stated as applicable only to a criminal case. But many of the cases cited by the Court are civil, including its last case on Rule 606(b) before this one --- Warger v. Shauers. And it was in Warger where the Court stated that the no-impeachment rule may admit of exceptions for “juror bias so extreme that, almost by definition, the jury trial right has been abridged.” While the Sixth Amendment --- on which Pena-Rodriguez is grounded --- is limited to criminal cases, civil parties have a due process right to a fair trial and a right to a jury trial. There would appear to be no reason why the rule in Pena-Rodriguez would not be extendable to civil cases.

---

803(10), which cites Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts as the reason for amending the rule.
This means that if the Committee proposes an amendment that codifies the specific result in *Pena-Rodriguez*, there is a possibility that not very far down the road it will have to revisit the rule when the Court extends its exception to other kinds of problematic juror statements, or to civil cases. That is a big downside to codification of the specific holding in *Pena-Rodriguez*.

3. Broadening the Exception Beyond the Pena-Rodriguez Result

One possible way to get ahead of the problem of possible expansion of the Constitutional right is to craft an exception that would provide rule-protection for other types of objectionable statements that might be made by a juror --- and also to extend the amendment to civil cases. In other words, the Committee might as a matter of policy propose a substantive amendment that would allow jurors to testify to statements made in deliberations that would implicate a fair trial, civil or criminal.

The problem with this venture is, of course, line-drawing. Just what kind of statements are a serious enough threat that the protection for jury deliberations should be discarded? The states have established various types of expanded exceptions, as seen in the appendix to the majority’s opinion:

*Codified Exceptions in Addition to Those Enumerated in Fed. Rule Evid. 606(b)*


It is pretty obvious that significant research and study and Committee discussion will have to occur before a reasoned decision could be made on whether to adopt any of the above exceptions, or more broadly any other exceptions that are more related to bias, such as religious-based or sex-based statements. Or for that matter whether the exception should cover obese-animus, or age-animus, or New England Patriots-animus.
Another point of research and discussion is whether there should be an exception for statements made during deliberations that comment negatively on the defendant’s right not to testify. A statement like, “I am voting guilty because the defendant must be hiding something. He could have taken the stand and didn’t” is an incursion on the defendant’s Fifth Amendment right. It is hard to see how that injury --- of constitutional stature --- is any less serious than a statement evoking racial prejudice.

It is not just a problem of line-drawing, however. It is a problem of balancing the right to a fair trial against the public interest in the sanctity of jury verdicts and the finality of judgments. Rule 606(b) strikes that balance largely in favor of protecting the jury process. Even after *Pena-Rodriguez*, it is not obvious that the balance should be recast in such a way that jury deliberations generally should be subject to more openness. The Supreme Court essentially approved the balance that was struck in Rule 606(b) but for one (allegedly) unique exception.

If the Committee does wish to consider an expansion of exceptions to the no-impeachment rule beyond that one carved out by the Supreme Court in *Pena-Rodriguez*, then the Reporter will prepare a detailed memorandum on the possible options and issues for the next meeting.
4. A Generic Reference to Constitutional Considerations

The final possibility for responding to *Pena-Rodriguez* is to add generic “warning” language that the Constitution might require an exception that is not set forth in the Rule itself. This was the solution implemented in Rule 412, after the Committee determined that a criminal defendant’s right to an effective defense could, with some frequency, require admission of evidence that was barred by the terms of Rule 412. That same type of solution was implemented in Rule 615, after Congress passed a Victim’s Bill of Rights that barred victim-witnesses from being sequestered even though the terms of Rule 615 mandated sequestration.

There are definite advantages to adding generic language referring to constitutional law that would create an exception to the text of an Evidence Rule. The first is that it warns the unwary to be on the lookout for a possible constitutional problem. The second is that it assures that the rule will never be unconstitutional as applied—the exception makes the rule contiguous with the Constitution. The third advantage is flexibility. The rule works no matter how far the Court expands the constitutional protection. It never has to be changed.

The downside of such a generic addition is that it changes no result. It states the obvious --- that the rule must bend to the Constitution. But on the other hand, as a practical matter it is a flag that may be useful to practitioners for rules that are likely to run up against constitutional guarantees. As to Rule 606(b), that likelihood has been documented.

One response might be, if you are going to flag a constitutional issue in Rule 606(b), why not put such a flag in every rule? Arguably every evidence rule is subject to an unconstitutional application if you think hard enough about it. The best answer to this argument is that there is a difference between a random possibility and an actuality. In Rule 803(10), and now in Rule 606(b), the Court has actually found the Evidence Rule to be unconstitutional as applied. The working principle could be --- there is no reason to raise a constitutional flag until the Supreme Court declares a rule unconstitutional as applied. Under that reasonable standard, flagging the constitutional issue in Rule 606(b) makes sense while mentioning the Constitution in, say, Rule 803(4) does not.

*Here is what the generic change would look like:*

(2) **Exceptions.** A juror may testify if:

(A) the testimony is about whether:

(i) extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury’s attention;

(ii) an outside influence was improperly brought to bear on any juror; or

(iii) a mistake was made in entering the verdict on the verdict form.; or
(B) excluding the testimony would violate a party’s constitutional right.
Attachment 2 --- Amendment to Rule 404(b) and Committee Note, Scheduled to Take Effect on December 1, 2020

Rule 404. Character Evidence; Other Crimes, Wrongs or Other Acts

* * *

(b) Other Crimes, Wrongs, or Other Acts.

(1) Prohibited Uses. Evidence of a any other crime, wrong, or other act is not admissible to prove a person’s character in order to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character.

(2) Permitted Uses; Notice in a Criminal Case. This evidence may be admissible for another purpose, such as proving motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident. On request by a defendant in a criminal case, the prosecutor must:

(3) Notice in a Criminal Case. In a criminal case, the prosecutor must:

(A) provide reasonable notice of the general nature of any such evidence that the prosecutor intends to offer at trial, so that the defendant has a fair opportunity to meet it; and

(B) articulate in the notice the permitted purpose for which the prosecutor intends to offer the evidence and the reasoning that supports the purpose; and

(C) do so in writing before trial— or in any form during trial if the court, for good cause, excuses lack of pretrial notice.

Committee Note

Rule 404(b) has been amended principally to impose additional notice requirements on the prosecution in a criminal case. In addition, clarifications have been made to the text and headings.

The notice provision has been changed in a number of respects:

● The prosecution must not only identify the evidence that it intends to offer pursuant to the rule but also articulate a non-propensity purpose for which the evidence is offered and the basis for concluding that the evidence is relevant in light of this purpose. The earlier requirement that the prosecution provide notice of only the “general nature” of the evidence was understood by some courts to permit the government to satisfy the notice obligation without describing the
specific act that the evidence would tend to prove, and without explaining the relevance of the evidence for a non-propensity purpose. This amendment makes clear what notice is required.

- The pretrial notice must be in writing—which requirement is satisfied by notice in electronic form. See Rule 101(b)(6). Requiring the notice to be in writing provides certainty and reduces arguments about whether notice was actually provided.

- Notice must be provided before trial in such time as to allow the defendant a fair opportunity to meet the evidence, unless the court excuses that requirement upon a showing of good cause. See Rules 609(b), 807, and 902(11). Advance notice of Rule 404(b) evidence is important so that the parties and the court have adequate opportunity to assess the evidence, the purpose for which it is offered, and whether the requirements of Rule 403 have been satisfied—even in cases in which a final determination as to the admissibility of the evidence must await trial. When notice is provided during trial after a finding of good cause, the court may need to consider protective measures to assure that the opponent is not prejudiced. See, e.g., United States v. Lopez-Gutierrez, 83 F.3d 1235 (10th Cir. 1996) (notice given at trial due to good cause; the trial court properly made the witness available to the defendant before the bad act evidence was introduced); United States v. Perez-Tosta, 36 F.3d 1552 (11th Cir. 1994) (defendant was granted five days to prepare after notice was given, upon good cause, just before voir dire).

- The good cause exception applies not only to the timing of the notice as a whole but also to the timing of the obligations to articulate a non-propensity purpose and the reasoning supporting that purpose. A good cause exception for the timing of the articulation requirements is necessary because in some cases an additional permissible purpose for the evidence may not become clear until just before, or even during, trial.

- Finally, the amendment eliminates the requirement that the defendant must make a request before notice is provided. That requirement is not found in any other notice provision in the Federal Rules of Evidence. It has resulted mostly in boilerplate demands on the one hand, and a trap for the unwary on the other. Moreover, many local rules require the government to provide notice of Rule 404(b) material without regard to whether it has been requested. And in many cases, notice is provided when the government moves in limine for an advance ruling on the admissibility of Rule 404(b) evidence. The request requirement has thus outlived any usefulness it may once have had.

As to the textual clarifications, the word “other” is restored to the location it held before restyling in 2011, to confirm that Rule 404(b) applies to crimes, wrongs and acts “other” than those at issue in the case; and the headings are changed accordingly. No substantive change is intended.
Attachment 3: Explanation by the Reporter to the Evidence Rules Committee of two new provisions, Rules 902(13) and (14), including text and Committee Note, effective 2017.

The 2017 Amendment to Rule 902, Adding Authentication by Certification for Electronic Evidence

As of December 1, 2017, two subdivisions to Rule 902 have been added with the goal of reducing the costs of authenticating digital evidence. The first provision, Rule 902(13), allows self-authentication of machine-generated information, upon a submission of a certification prepared by a qualified person. The second Rule provides a similar certification procedure for a copy of data taken from an electronic device, medium or file. These proposals are analogous to Rules 902(11) and (12) of the Federal Rules of Evidence, which permit a foundation witness to establish the authenticity of business records by way of certification.

The new rules have a common goal of making authentication easier for certain kinds of electronic evidence that are, under current law, likely to be authenticated under Rule 901 but only by calling a witness to testify to authenticity. The Advisory Committee concluded that the types of electronic evidence covered by the two proposed rules are rarely the subject of a legitimate authenticity dispute, but it has often been the case that the proponent is nonetheless forced to produce an authentication witness, incurring expense and inconvenience—and often, at the last minute, opposing counsel ends up stipulating to authenticity in any event.

The self-authentication proposals, by following the approach taken in Rule 902(11) and (12) regarding business records, essentially leave the burden of going forward on authenticity questions to the opponent of the evidence. Under those rules a business record is authenticated by a certificate, but the opponent is given “a fair opportunity” to challenge both the certificate and the underlying record. The proposals for new Rules 902(13) and 902(14) would have the same effect of shifting to the opponent the burden of going forward (not the burden of proof) on authenticity disputes regarding the described electronic evidence.

These new amendments do not change the standards for authentication of electronic evidence. Rather, they change the manner in which the proponent’s submission on authenticity can be made. Instead of calling a witness, the proponent can provide a certificate prepared by the witness of the submission that he would have made if required to testify. Of course, if that submission would be insufficient if he had testified, these new amendments will be of no use. An insufficient showing of authenticity does not somehow become better by way of a certificate in lieu of testimony.

It should be remembered that while these new rules allow the party to present a certificate in lieu of authenticating testimony, a party may well choose to call an authenticating witness to trial, especially if the process by which the electronic information is obtained would be difficult for a
jury to understand. A live witness may be useful to explain the particulars, and will also show the jury that the proponent is not trying to hide anything about the procedure in a certificate.

*Here is the text and the Committee Notes to new Rules 902(13) and (14):*

**Rule 902. Evidence That Is Self-Authenticating**

The following items of evidence are self-authenticating; they require no extrinsic evidence of authenticity in order to be admitted:

* * *

(13)  **Certified Records Generated by an Electronic Process or System.** A record generated by an electronic process or system that produces an accurate result, as shown by a certification of a qualified person that complies with the certification requirements of Rule 902(11) or (12). The proponent must also meet the notice requirements of Rule 902(11).

(14)  **Certified Data Copied from an Electronic Device, Storage Medium, or File.** Data copied from an electronic device, storage medium, or file, if authenticated by a process of digital identification, as shown by a certification of a qualified person that complies with the certification requirements of Rule 902(11) or (12). The proponent also must meet the notice requirements of Rule 902(11).
Committee Note to Rule 902(13)

The amendment sets forth a procedure by which parties can authenticate certain electronic evidence other than through the testimony of a foundation witness. As with the provisions on business records in Rules 902(11) and (12), the Committee has found that the expense and inconvenience of producing a witness to authenticate an item of electronic evidence is often unnecessary. It is often the case that a party goes to the expense of producing an authentication witness and then the adversary either stipulates authenticity before the witness is called or fails to challenge the authentication testimony once it is presented. The amendment provides a procedure under which the parties can determine in advance of trial whether a real challenge to authenticity will be made, and can then plan accordingly.

Nothing in the amendment is intended to limit a party from establishing authenticity of electronic evidence on any ground provided in these Rules, including through judicial notice where appropriate.

A proponent establishing authenticity under this Rule must present a certification containing information that would be sufficient to establish authenticity were that information provided by a witness at trial. If the certification provides information that would be insufficient to authenticate the record if the certifying person testified, then authenticity is not established under this Rule. The Rule specifically allows the authenticity foundation that satisfies Rule 901(b)(9) to be established by a certification rather than the testimony of a live witness.

The reference to the “certification requirements of Rule 902(11) or (12)” is only to the procedural requirements for a valid certification. There is no intent to require, or permit, a certification under this rule to prove the requirements of Rule 803(6). Rule 902(13) is solely limited to authentication and any attempt to satisfy a hearsay exception must be made independently.

A certification under this Rule can establish only that the proffered item has satisfied the admissibility requirements for authenticity. The opponent remains free to object to admissibility of the proffered item on other grounds—including hearsay, relevance, or in criminal cases the right to confrontation. For example, assume that a plaintiff in a defamation case offers what purports to be a printout of a webpage on which a defamatory statement was made. Plaintiff offers a certification under this Rule in which a qualified person describes the process by which the webpage was retrieved. Even if that certification sufficiently establishes that the webpage is authentic, defendant remains free to object that the statement on the webpage was not placed there by defendant. Similarly, a certification authenticating a computer output, such as a spreadsheet, does not preclude an objection that the information produced is unreliable—the authentication establishes only that the output came from the computer.
A challenge to the authenticity of electronic evidence may require technical information about the system or process at issue, including possibly retaining a forensic technical expert; such factors will effect whether the opponent has a fair opportunity to challenge the evidence given the notice provided.

The reference to Rule 902(12) is intended to cover certifications that are made in a foreign country.

Committee Note to Rule 902(14)

The amendment sets forth a procedure by which parties can authenticate data copied from an electronic device, storage medium, or an electronic file, other than through the testimony of a foundation witness. As with the provisions on business records in Rules 902(11) and (12), the Committee has found that the expense and inconvenience of producing an authenticating witness for this evidence is often unnecessary. It is often the case that a party goes to the expense of producing an authentication witness, and then the adversary either stipulates authenticity before the witness is called or fails to challenge the authentication testimony once it is presented. The amendment provides a procedure in which the parties can determine in advance of trial whether a real challenge to authenticity will be made, and can then plan accordingly.

Today, data copied from electronic devices, storage media, and electronic files are ordinarily authenticated by “hash value.” A hash value is a number that is often represented as a sequence of characters and is produced by an algorithm based upon the digital contents of a drive, medium, or file. If the hash values for the original and copy are different, then the copy is not identical to the original. If the hash values for the original and copy are the same, it is highly improbable that the original and copy are not identical. Thus, identical hash values for the original and copy reliably attest to the fact that they are exact duplicates. This amendment allows self-authentication by a certification of a qualified person that she checked the hash value of the proffered item and that it was identical to the original. The rule is flexible enough to allow certifications through processes other than comparison of hash value, including by other reliable means of identification provided by future technology.

Nothing in the amendment is intended to limit a party from establishing authenticity of electronic evidence on any ground provided in these Rules, including through judicial notice where appropriate.

A proponent establishing authenticity under this Rule must present a certification containing information that would be sufficient to establish authenticity were that information provided by a
witness at trial. If the certification provides information that would be insufficient to authenticate
the record if the certifying person testified, then authenticity is not established under this Rule.

The reference to the “certification requirements of Rule 902(11) or (12)” is only to the procedural
requirements for a valid certification. There is no intent to require, or permit, a certification under
this rule to prove the requirements of Rule 803(6). Rule 902(14) is solely limited to authentication
and any attempt to satisfy a hearsay exception must be made independently.

A certification under this Rule can only establish that the proffered item is authentic. The opponent
remains free to object to admissibility of the proffered item on other grounds—including hearsay,
relevance, or in criminal cases the right to confrontation. For example, in a criminal case in which
data copied from a hard drive is proffered, the defendant can still challenge hearsay found in the
hard drive, and can still challenge whether the information on the hard drive was placed there by
the defendant.

A challenge to the authenticity of electronic evidence may require technical information about the
system or process at issue, including possibly retaining a forensic technical expert; such factors
will effect whether the opponent has a fair opportunity to challenge the evidence given the notice
provided.

The reference to Rule 902(12) is intended to cover certifications that are made in a foreign country.

________________________________________________________________________

Applications of Rules 902(13) and (14)

In order to assist the Bench and the Bar in evaluating how these new self-authentication rules can
be used, the Reporter to the Advisory Committee, with the assistance of John Haried, an attorney
from the Justice Department, prepared the following illustrative examples:

Examples of how Rule 902(13) can be used:

1. **Proving that a USB device was connected to (i.e., plugged into) a computer**: In a
hypothetical civil or criminal case in Chicago, a disputed issue is whether Devera Hall used her
computer to access files stored on a USB thumb drive owned by a co-worker. Ms. Hall’s computer
uses the Windows operating system, which automatically records information about every USB
device connected to her computer in a database known as the “Windows registry.” The Windows
registry database is maintained on the computer by the Windows operating system in order to facilitate the computer’s operations. A forensic technician, located in Dallas, Texas, has provided a printout from the Windows registry that indicates that a USB thumb drive, identified by manufacturer, model, and serial number, was last connected to Ms. Hall’s computer at a specific date and time.

**Without Rule 902(13):** Without Rule 902(13), the proponent of the evidence would need to call the forensic technician who obtained the printout as a witness, in order to establish the authenticity of the evidence. During his or her testimony, the forensic technician would typically be asked to testify about his or her background and qualifications; the process by which digital forensic examinations are conducted in general; the steps taken by the forensic technician during the examination of Ms. Hall’s computer in particular; the process by which the Windows operating system maintains information in the Windows registry, including information about USB devices connected to the computer; and the steps taken by the forensic examiner to examine the Windows registry and to produce the printout identifying the USB device.

**Impact of Rule 902(13):** With Rule 902(13), the proponent of the evidence could obtain a written certification from the forensic technician, stating that the Windows operating system regularly records information in the Windows registry about USB devices connected to a computer; that the process by which such information is recorded produces an accurate result; and that the printout accurately reflected information stored in the Windows registry of Ms. Hall’s computer. The proponent would be required to provide reasonable written notice of its intent to offer the printout as an exhibit and to make the written certification and proposed exhibit available for inspection. If the opposing party did not dispute the accuracy or reliability of the process that produced the exhibit, the proponent would not need to call the forensic technician as a witness to establish the authenticity of the exhibit. (There are many other examples of the same types of machine-generated information on computers, for example, internet browser histories and wifi access logs.)

2. **Proving that a server was used to connect to a particular webpage:** Hypothetically, a malicious hacker executed a denial-of-service attack against Acme’s website. Acme’s server maintained an Internet Information Services (IIS) log that automatically records information about every internet connection routed to the web server to view a web page, including the IP address, webpage, user agent string and what was requested from the website. The IIS logs reflected repeated access to Acme’s website from an IP address known to be used by the hacker. The proponent wants to introduce the IIS log to prove that the hacker’s IP address was an instrument of the attack.

**Without Rule 902(13):** The proponent would have to call a website expert to testify about the mechanics of the server’s operating system; his search of the IIS log; how the IIS log works; and that the exhibit is an accurate record of the IIS log.
**With Rule 902(13):** The proponent would obtain the website expert’s certification of the facts establishing authenticity of the exhibit and provide the certification and exhibit to the opposing party with reasonable notice that it intends to offer the exhibit at trial. If the opposing party does not timely dispute the reliability of the process that produced the registry key, then the proponent would not need to call the website expert to establish authenticity.

3. **Proving that a person was or was not near the scene of an event:** Hypothetically, Robert Jackson is a defendant in a civil (or criminal) action alleging that he was the driver in a hit-and-run collision with a U.S. Postal Service mail carrier in Atlanta at 2:15 p.m. on March 6, 2015. Mr. Jackson owns an iPhone, which has software that records machine-generated dates, times, and GPS coordinates of each picture he takes with his iPhone. Mr. Jackson’s iPhone contains two pictures of his home in an Atlanta suburb at about 1 p.m. on March 6. He wants to introduce into evidence the photos together with the metadata, including the date, time, and GPS coordinates, recovered forensically from his iPhone to corroborate his alibi that he was at home several miles from the scene at the time of the collision.

**Without Rule 902(13):** The proponent would have to call the forensic technician to testify about Mr. Jackson’s iPhone’s operating system; his search of the phone; how the metadata was created and stored with each photograph; and that the exhibit is an accurate record of the photographs.

**With Rule 902(13):** The proponent would obtain the forensic technician’s certification of the facts establishing authenticity of the exhibits and provide the certification and exhibit to the opposing party with reasonable notice that it intends to offer the exhibit at trial. If the opposing party does not timely dispute the reliability of the process that produced the iPhone’s logs, then the proponent would not have to call the technician to establish authenticity.

4. **Proving association and activity between alleged co-conspirators:** Hypothetically, Ian Nichols is charged with conspiracy to commit the robbery of First National Bank that occurred in San Diego on January 30, 2015. Two robbers drove away in a silver Ford Taurus. The alleged co-conspirator was Dain Miller. Dain was arrested on an outstanding warrant on February 1, 2015, and in his pocket was his Samsung Galaxy phone. The Samsung phone’s software automatically maintains a log of text messages that includes the text content, date, time, and number of the other phone involved. Pursuant to a warrant, forensic technicians examined Dain’s phone and located four text messages to Ian’s phone from January 29: “Meet my house @9”; “Is Taurus the Bull out of shop?”; “Sheri says you have some blow”; and “see ya tomorrow.” In the separate trial of Ian, the government wants to offer the four text messages to prove the conspiracy.

**Without Rule 902(13):** The proponent would have to call the forensic technician to testify about Dain’s phone’s operating system; his search of the phone’s text message log; how logs are created; and that the exhibit is an accurate record of the iPhone’s logs.
With Rule 902(13): The proponent would obtain the forensic technician’s certification of the facts establishing authenticity of the exhibit and provide the certification and exhibit to the opposing party with reasonable notice that it intends to offer the exhibit at trial. If the opposing party does not timely dispute the reliability of the process that produced the iPhone’s logs, then the court would make the Rule 104 threshold authenticity finding and admit the exhibits, absent other proper objection.

Hearsay Objection Retained: Under Rule 902(13), the opponent—here, criminal defendant Ian—would retain his hearsay objections to the text messages found on Dain’s phone. For example, the judge would evaluate the text “Sheri says you have some blow” under F.R.E. 801(d)(2)(E) to determine whether it was a coconspirator’s statement during and in furtherance of a conspiracy, and under F.R.E. 805, to assess the hearsay within hearsay. The court might exclude the text “Sheri says you have some blow” under either rule or both.

Example of how Rule 902(14) can be used:

In the armed robbery hypothetical, above, forensic technician Smith made a forensic copy of Dain’s Samsung Galaxy phone in the field. Smith verified that the forensic copy was identical to the original phone’s text logs using an industry standard methodology (e.g., hash value or other means). Smith gave the copy to forensic technician Jones, who performed his examination at his lab. Jones used the copy to conduct his entire forensic examination so that he would not inadvertently alter the data on the phone. Jones found the text messages. The government wants to offer the copy into evidence as part of the basis of Jones’s testimony about the text messages he found.

Without Rule 902(14): The government would have to call two witnesses. First, forensic technician Smith would need to testify about making the forensic copy of information from Dain’s phone, and about the methodology that he used to verify that the copy was an exact copy of information inside the phone. Second, the government would have to call Jones to testify about his examination.

With Rule 902(14): The proponent would obtain Smith’s certification of the facts establishing how he copied the phone’s information and then verified the copy was true and accurate. Before trial the government would provide the certification and exhibit to the opposing party—here defendant Ian—with reasonable notice that it intends to offer the exhibit at trial. If Ian’s attorney does not timely dispute the reliability of the process that produced the Samsung Galaxy’s text message logs, then the proponent would only call Jones.
Attachment 4 --- Amendment to Rule 803(16), Effective December 1, 2017

Rule 803. Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay --- Regardless of Whether the Declarant Is Available as a Witness

The following are not excluded by the rule against hearsay, regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness:

* * *

(16) Statements in Ancient Documents. A statement in a document that is at least 20 years old that was prepared before January 1, 1998, and whose authenticity is established.

Committee Note

The ancient documents exception to the rule against hearsay has been limited to statements in documents prepared before January 1, 1998. The Committee has determined that the ancient documents exception should be limited due to the risk that it will be used as a vehicle to admit vast amounts of unreliable electronically stored information (ESI). Given the exponential development and growth of electronic information since 1998, the hearsay exception for ancient documents has now become a possible open door for large amounts of unreliable ESI, as no showing of reliability needs to be made to qualify under the exception.

The Committee is aware that in certain cases --- such as cases involving latent diseases and environmental damage --- parties must rely on hardcopy documents from the past. The ancient documents exception remains available for such cases for documents prepared before 1998. Going forward, it is anticipated that any need to admit old hardcopy documents produced after January 1, 1998 will decrease, because reliable ESI is likely to be available and can be offered under a reliability-based hearsay exception. Rule 803(6) may be used for many of these ESI documents, especially given its flexible standards on which witnesses might be qualified to provide an adequate foundation. And Rule 807 can be used to admit old documents upon a showing of reliability --- which will often (though not always) be found by circumstances such as that the document was prepared with no litigation motive in mind, close in time to the relevant events. The limitation of the ancient documents exception is not intended to raise an inference that 20 year-old documents are, as a class, unreliable, or that they should somehow not qualify for admissibility under Rule 807. Finally, many old documents can be admitted for the non-hearsay purpose of proving notice, or as party-opponent statements.
The limitation of the ancient documents hearsay exception is not intended to have any effect on authentication of ancient documents. The possibility of authenticating an old document under Rule 901(b)(8) --- or under any ground available for any other document --- remains unchanged.

The Committee carefully considered, but ultimately rejected, an amendment that would preserve the ancient documents exception for hardcopy evidence only. A party will often offer hardcopy that is derived from ESI. Moreover, a good deal of old information in hardcopy has been digitized or will be so in the future. Thus, the line between ESI and hardcopy was determined to be one that could not be drawn usefully.

The Committee understands that the choice of a cut-off date has a degree of arbitrariness. But January 1, 1998 is a rational date for treating concerns about old and unreliable ESI. And the date is no more arbitrary than the 20-year cutoff date in the original rule. See Committee Note to Rule 901(b)(8) (“Any time period selected is bound to be arbitrary.”).

Under the amendment, a document is “prepared” when the statement proffered was recorded in that document. For example, if a hardcopy document is prepared in 1995, and a party seeks to admit a scanned copy of that document, the date of preparation is 1995 even though the scan was made long after that --- the subsequent scan does not alter the document. The relevant point is the date on which the information is recorded, not when the information is prepared for trial. However, if the content of the document is itself altered after the cut-off date, then the hearsay exception will not apply to statements that were added in the alteration.
Attachment 5 --- Amendment to Rule 807, and Committee Note, Scheduled to Effective December 1, 2019

Rule 807. Residual Exception

(a) In General. Under the following circumstances, a hearsay statement is not excluded by the rule against hearsay even if the statement is not specifically covered by admissible under a hearsay exception in Rule 803 or 804:

(1) the statement is supported by sufficient guarantees of trustworthiness—after considering the totality of circumstances under which it was made and evidence, if any, corroborating the statement; and

(2) it is offered as evidence of a material fact;

(3) it is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence that the proponent can obtain through reasonable efforts; and

(4) admitting it will best serve the purposes of these rules and the interests of justice.

(b) Notice. The statement is admissible only if, before the trial or hearing, the proponent gives an adverse party reasonable notice of the intent to offer the statement and its particulars, including the declarant’s name and address, including its substance and the declarant’s name—so that the party has a fair opportunity to meet it. The notice must be provided in writing before the trial or hearing—or in any form during the trial or hearing if the court, for good cause, excuses a lack of earlier notice.

Committee Note

Rule 807 has been amended to fix a number of problems that the courts have encountered in applying it.

Courts have had difficulty with the requirement that the proffered hearsay carry “equivalent” circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness. The “equivalence” standard is difficult to apply, given the different types of guarantees of reliability, of varying strength, found among the categorical exceptions (as well as the fact that some hearsay exceptions, e.g., Rule
804(b)(6), are not based on reliability at all). The “equivalence” standard has not served to guide a court’s discretion to admit hearsay, because the court is free to choose among a spectrum of exceptions for comparison. Moreover, experience has shown that some statements offered as residual hearsay cannot be compared usefully to any of the categorical exceptions and yet might well be trustworthy. Thus the requirement of an equivalence analysis has been eliminated. Under the amendment, the court should proceed directly to a determination of whether the hearsay is supported by guarantees of trustworthiness. See Rule 104(a). As with any hearsay statement offered under an exception, the court’s threshold finding that admissibility requirements are met merely means that the jury may consider the statement and not that it must assume the statement to be true.

The amendment specifically requires the court to consider corroborating evidence in the trustworthiness enquiry. Most courts have required the consideration of corroborating evidence, though some courts have disagreed. The rule now provides for a uniform approach, and recognizes that the existence or absence of corroboration is relevant to, but not dispositive of, whether a statement should be admissible under this exception. Of course, the court must consider not only the existence of corroborating evidence but also the strength and quality of that evidence.

The amendment does not alter the case law prohibiting parties from proceeding directly to the residual exception, without considering admissibility of the hearsay under Rules 803 and 804. A court is not required to make a finding that no other hearsay exception is applicable. But the proponent cannot seek admission under Rule 807 if it is apparent that the hearsay could be admitted under another exception.

The rule in its current form applies to hearsay “not specifically covered” by a Rule 803 or 804 exception. The amendment makes the rule applicable to hearsay “not admissible under” those exceptions. This clarifies that a court assessing guarantees of trustworthiness may consider whether the statement is a “near-miss” of one of the Rule 803 or 804 exceptions. If the court employs a “near-miss” analysis it should – in addition to evaluating all relevant guarantees of trustworthiness – take into account the reasons that the hearsay misses the admissibility requirements of the standard exception.

In deciding whether the statement is supported by sufficient guarantees of trustworthiness, the court should not consider the credibility of any witness who relates the declarant’s hearsay statement in court. The credibility of an in-court witness does not present a hearsay question. To base admission or exclusion of a hearsay statement on the witness’s credibility would usurp the jury’s role of determining the credibility of testifying witnesses. The rule provides that the focus for trustworthiness is on circumstantial guarantees surrounding the making of the statement itself, as well as any independent evidence corroborating the statement. The credibility of the witness relating the statement is not a part of either enquiry.
Of course, even if the court finds sufficient guarantees of trustworthiness, the independent requirements of the Confrontation Clause must be satisfied if the hearsay statement is offered against a defendant in a criminal case.

The Committee decided to retain the requirement that the proponent must show that the hearsay statement is more probative than any other evidence that the proponent can reasonably obtain. This necessity requirement will continue to serve to prevent the residual exception from being used as a device to erode the categorical exceptions.

The requirements that residual hearsay must be evidence of a material fact and that its admission will best serve the purposes of these rules and the interests of justice have been deleted. These requirements have proved to be superfluous in that they are already found in other rules. See Rules 102, 401.

The notice provision has been amended to make four changes in the operation of the rule:

First, the amendment requires the proponent to disclose the “substance” of the statement. This term is intended to require a description that is sufficiently specific under the circumstances to allow the opponent a fair opportunity to meet the evidence. See Rule 103(a)(2) (requiring the party making an offer of proof to inform the court of the “substance” of the evidence).

Second, the prior requirement that the declarant’s address must be disclosed has been deleted. That requirement was nonsensical when the declarant was unavailable, and unnecessary in the many cases in which the declarant’s address was known or easily obtainable. If prior disclosure of the declarant’s address is critical and cannot be obtained by the opponent through other means, then the opponent can seek relief from the court.

Third, the amendment requires that the pretrial notice be in writing—which is satisfied by notice in electronic form. See Rule 101(b)(6). Requiring the notice to be in writing provides certainty and reduces arguments about whether notice was actually provided.

Finally, the pretrial notice provision has been amended to provide for a good cause exception. Most courts have applied a good cause exception under Rule 807 even though the rule in its current form does not provide for it, while some courts have read the rule as it was written. Experience under the residual exception has shown that a good cause exception is necessary in certain limited situations. For example, the proponent may not become aware of the existence of the hearsay statement until after the trial begins; or the proponent may plan to call a witness who without warning becomes unavailable during trial, and the proponent might then need to resort to residual hearsay.
The rule retains the requirement that the opponent receive notice in a way that provides a fair opportunity to meet the evidence. When notice is provided during trial after a finding of good cause, the court may need to consider protective measures, such as a continuance, to assure that the opponent is not prejudiced.
I. (Relatively) Recent Supreme Court Confrontation Cases

A. Ohio v. Clark

The Court's most recent opinion on the Confrontation Clause and hearsay, Ohio v. Clark, 135 S.Ct. 2173 (2015), shed light on how to determine whether hearsay is or is not “testimonial.” As shown in the outline below, the Court has found a statement to be testimonial when the “primary motivation” behind the statement is that it be used in a criminal prosecution. Clark raised three questions about the application of the primary motivation test:

1. Can a statement be primarily motivated for use in a prosecution when it is not made with the involvement of law enforcement? (Or put the other way, is law enforcement involvement a prerequisite for a finding of testimoniality?).

2. If a person is required to report information to law enforcement, does that requirement render them law enforcement personnel for the purpose of the primary motivation test?

3. How does the primary motivation test apply to statements made by children, who are too young to know about use of statements for law enforcement purposes?
In *Clark*, teachers at a preschool saw indications that a 3 year-old boy had been abused, and asked the boy about it. The boy implicated the defendant. The boy's statement was admitted at trial under the Ohio version of the residual exception. The boy was not called to testify --- nor could he have been, because under Ohio law, a child of his age is incompetent to testify at trial. The defendant argued that the boy's statement was testimonial, relying in part on the fact that under Ohio law, teachers are required to report evidence of child abuse to law enforcement. The defendant argued that the reporting requirement rendered the teachers agents of law enforcement.

The Supreme Court in *Clark*, in an opinion by Justice Alito for six members of the Court, found that the boy's hearsay statement was not testimonial. It made no categorical rulings as to the issues presented, but did make the following points about the primary motive test of testimoniality:

1. Statements of young children are *extremely unlikely* to be testimonial because a young child is not cognizant of the criminal justice system, and so will not be making a statement with the primary motive that it be used in a criminal prosecution.

2. A statement made without law enforcement involvement is *extremely unlikely* to be found testimonial because if law enforcement is not involved, there is probably some other motive for making the statement other than use in a criminal prosecution. Moreover, the formality of a statement is a critical component in determining primary motive, and if the statement is not made with law enforcement involved, it is much less likely to be formal in nature.

3. The fact that the teachers were subject to a reporting requirement was essentially irrelevant, because the teachers would have sought information from the child whether or not there was a reporting requirement --- their primary motivation was to protect the child, and the reporting requirement did nothing to change that motivation. (So there may be room left for a finding of testimoniality if the government sets up mandatory reporting in a situation in which the individual would not otherwise think of, or be interested in, obtaining information).

---

3 All nine Justices found that the boy’s statement was not testimonial. Justices Scalia and Ginsburg concurred in the judgment, but challenged some of the language in the majority opinion on the ground that it appeared to be backsliding from the *Crawford* decision. Justice Thomas concurred in the judgment, finding that the statement was not testimonial because it lacked the solemnity required to meet his definition of testimoniality.
In *Williams v. Illinois*, 567 U.S. 50 (2012), the Court brought substantial uncertainty to how courts are supposed to regulate hearsay offered against an accused under the Confrontation Clause. The case involved an expert who used testimonial hearsay as part of the basis for her opinion. The expert relied in part on a Cellmark DNA report to conclude that the DNA found at the crime scene belonged to Williams. The splintered opinions in *Williams* create confusion not only for how and whether experts may use testimonial hearsay, but more broadly about how some of the hearsay exceptions square with the Confrontation Clause bar on testimonial hearsay.

The question in *Williams* was whether an expert’s testimony violates the Confrontation Clause when the expert relies on hearsay. A plurality of four Justices, in an opinion written by Justice Alito, found no confrontation violation for two independent reasons:

1) First, the hearsay (the report of a DNA analyst) was never admitted for its truth, but was only used as a basis of the expert’s own conclusion that Williams’s DNA was found at the crime scene. Justice Alito emphasized that the expert witness conducted her own analysis of the data and did not simply parrot the conclusions of the out-of-court analyst.

2) Second, the DNA test results were not testimonial in any event, because at the time the test was conducted the suspect was at large, and so the DNA was not prepared with the intent that it be used against a targeted individual.

Justice Kagan, in a dissenting opinion for four Justices, rejected both of the grounds on which Justice Alito relied to affirm Williams’s conviction. She stated that it was a “subterfuge” to say that it was only the expert’s opinion (and not the underlying report) that was admitted against Williams. She reasoned that where the expert relies on a report, the expert’s opinion is useful only if the report itself is true. Therefore, according to Justice Kagan, the argument that the Cellmark report was not admitted for its truth rests on an artificial distinction that cannot satisfy the right to confrontation. As to Justice Alito’s “targeting the individual” test of testimoniality, Justice Kagan declared that it was not supported by the Court’s prior cases defining testimoniality in terms of primary motive. Her test of “primary motive” is whether the statement was prepared primarily for the purpose of any criminal prosecution, which the Cellmark report clearly was.4

Justice Breyer wrote a concurring opinion. He argued that rejecting the premise that an expert can rely on testimonial hearsay --- as permitted by Fed.R.Evid. 703 --- would end up requiring the government to call every person who had anything to do with a forensic test. That was a result he found untenable. He also set forth several possible approaches to permitting/limiting experts’ reliance on lab reports, some of which he found “more compatible with *Crawford* than others” and some of which “seem more easily considered
Justice Thomas was the tiebreaker. He essentially agreed completely with Justice Kagan’s critique of Justice Alito’s two grounds for affirming the conviction. But Justice Thomas concurred in the judgment nonetheless, because he had his own reason for affirming the conviction. In his view, the use of the Cellmark report for its truth did not offend the Confrontation Clause because that report was not sufficiently “formalized.” He declared that the Cellmark report lacks the solemnity of an affidavit of deposition, for it is neither a sworn nor a certified declaration of fact. Nowhere does the report attest that its statements accurately reflect the DNA testing processes used or the results obtained. . . . And, although the report was introduced at the request of law enforcement, it was not the product of any sort of formalized dialogue resembling custodial interrogation.

**Fallout from Williams:**

The irony of Williams is that eight members of the Court rejected Justice Thomas’s view that testimoniality is defined by whether a statement is sufficiently formal as to constitute an affidavit or certification. Yet if a court is counting Justices, it appears that it might be necessary for the government to comply with the rather amorphous standards for “informality” established by Justice Thomas. Thus, if the government offers hearsay that would be testimonial under the Kagan view of “primary motive” but not under the Alito view, then the government may have to satisfy the Thomas requirement that the hearsay is not tantamount to a formal affidavit. Similarly, if the government proffers an expert who relies on testimonial hearsay, but the declarant does not testify, then it can be argued that the government must establish that the hearsay is not tantamount to a formal affidavit --- because five members of the Court rejected the argument that the Confrontation Clause is satisfied so long as the testimonial hearsay is used only as the basis of the expert’s opinion.

by a rules committee” than the Court.

The problem of course with consideration of these alternatives by a rules committee is that if the Confrontation Clause bars these approaches, the rules committee is just wasting its time. And given the uncertainty of Williams, it is fair to state that none of the approaches listed by Justice Breyer are clearly constitutional.
There is a strong argument, though, that counting Justices after *Williams* is a fool’s errand for now --- because of the death of Justice Scalia and the retirement of Justice Kennedy, and the uncertainty over the views of Justices Gorsuch and Kavanagh.

It should be noted that much of the post-*Crawford* landscape is unaltered by *Williams*. For example, take a case in which a victim has just been shot. He makes a statement to a neighbor “I’ve just been shot by Bill. Call an ambulance.” Surely that statement --- admissible against the accused as an excited utterance --- satisfies the Confrontation Clause on the same grounds after *Williams* as it did before. Such a statement is not testimonial because even under the Kagan view, it was not made with the primary motive that it would be used in a criminal prosecution. And *a fortiori* it satisfies the less restrictive Alito view. Thus Justice Thomas’s “formality” test is not controlling, but even if it were, such a statement is not tantamount to an affidavit and so Justice Thomas would find no constitutional problem with its admission. See *Michigan v. Bryant*, 562 U.S. 344 (2011) (Thomas, J., concurring) (excited utterance of shooting victim “bears little if any resemblance to the historical practices that the Confrontation Clause aimed to eliminate.”).

Similarly, there is extensive case law both before and after *Williams* allowing admission of testimonial statements on the ground that they are not offered for their truth. For example, if a statement is legitimately offered to show the background of a police investigation, or offered to show that the statement is in fact false, then it is not hearsay and it also does not violate the right to confrontation. This is because if the statement is not offered for its truth, there is no reason to cross-examine the declarant, and cross-examination is the procedure right that the Confrontation Clause guarantees. As will be discussed further below, while both Justice Thomas and Justice Kagan in *Williams* reject the not-for-truth analysis in the context of expert reliance on hearsay, they both distinguish that use from admitting a statement for a legitimate not-for-truth purpose. Moreover, both approve of the language in *Crawford* that the Confrontation Clause “does not bar the use of testimonial statements offered for purposes other than establishing the truth of the matter asserted.” And they both approve of the result in *Tennessee v. Street*, 471 U.S. 409 (1985), in which the Court held that the Confrontation Clause was not violated when an accomplice confession was admitted only to show that it was different from the defendant’s own confession. For the Kagan-Thomas camp, the question will be whether the testimonial statement is offered for a purpose as to which its probative value is not dependent on the statement being true --- and that is the test that is essentially applied by the lower courts in determining whether statements ostensibly offered for a not-for-truth purpose are consistent with the Confrontation Clause.
II. Post-*Crawford* Cases Discussing the Relationship Between the Confrontation Clause and the Hearsay Rule and its Exceptions, Arranged By Subject Matter

“Admissions” --- Hearsay Statements by the Defendant

Defendant’s own hearsay statement was not testimonial: *United States v. Lopez*, 380 F.3d 538 (1st Cir. 2004): The defendant blurted out an incriminating statement to police officers after they found drugs in his residence. The court held that this statement was not testimonial under *Crawford*. The court declared that “for reasons similar to our conclusion that appellant’s statements were not the product of custodial interrogation, the statements were also not testimonial.” That is, the statement was spontaneous and not in response to police interrogation.

Note: The *Lopez* court had an easier way to dispose of the case. Both before and after *Crawford*, an accused has no right to confront himself. If the solution to confrontation is cross-examination, as the Court in *Crawford* states, then it is silly to argue that a defendant has the right to have his own statements excluded because he had no opportunity to cross-examine himself. See *United States v. Hansen*, 434 F.3d 92 (1st Cir. 2006) (admission of defendant’s own statements does not violate *Crawford*); *United States v. Orm Hieng*, 679 F.3d 1131 (9th Cir. 2012): “The Sixth Amendment simply has no application [to the defendant’s own hearsay statements] because a defendant cannot complain that he was denied the opportunity to confront himself.”

Defendant’s own statements, reporting statements of another defendant, are not testimonial under the circumstances: *United States v. Gibson*, 409 F.3d 325 (6th Cir. 2005): In a case involving fraud and false statements arising from a mining operation, the trial court admitted testimony from a witness that Gibson told him that another defendant was planning on doing something that would violate regulations applicable to mining. The court recognized that the testimony encompassed double hearsay, but held that each level of hearsay was admissible as a statement by a party-opponent. Gibson also argued that the testimony violated *Crawford*. But the court held that Gibson’s statement and the underlying statement of the other defendant were both casual remarks made to an acquaintance, and therefore were not testimonial.
Text messages were properly admitted as coming from the defendant: United States v. Brinson, 772 F.3d 1314 (10th Cir. 2014). In a prosecution for sex trafficking, text messages sent to a prostitute were admitted against the defendant. The defendant argued that admitting the texts violated his right to confrontation, but the court disagreed. The court stated that the texts were properly admitted as statements of a party-opponent, because the government had established by a preponderance of the evidence that the texts were sent by the defendant. They were therefore “not hearsay” under Rule 801(d)(2)(A), and “[b]ecause the messages did not constitute hearsay their introduction did not violate the Confrontation Clause.”

Note: The court in Brinson was right but for the wrong reasons. It is true that if a statement is “not hearsay” its admission does not violate the Confrontation Clause. (See the many cases collected under the “not hearsay” headnote, infra). But party-opponent statements are only technically “not hearsay.” They are in fact hearsay because they are offered for their truth --- they are hearsay subject to an exemption. The Evidence Rules’ technical categorization in Rule 801(d)(2) cannot determine the scope of the Confrontation Clause. If that were so, then coconspirator statements would automatically satisfy the Confrontation Clause because they, too, are classified as “not hearsay” under the Federal Rules. That would have made the Supreme Court’s decision in Bourjaily v. United States unnecessary; and the Court in Crawford would not have had to discuss the fact that coconspirator statements are ordinarily not testimonial. The real reason that party-opponent statements are not hearsay is that when the defendant makes a hearsay statement, he has no right to confront himself.
**Bruton --- Statements of Co-Defendants**

*Bruton* line of cases not applicable unless accomplice’s hearsay statement is testimonial: *United States v. Figueroa-Cartagena*, 612 F.3d 69 (1st Cir. 2010): The defendant’s codefendant had made hearsay statements in a private conversation that was taped by the government. The statements directly implicated both the codefendant and the defendant. At trial the codefendant’s statements were admitted against him, and the defendant argued that the *Bruton* line of cases required severance. But the court found no *Bruton* error, because the hearsay statements were not testimonial in the first place. The statements were from a private conversation so the speaker was not primarily motivated to have the statements used in a criminal prosecution. The court stated that the “*Bruton/Richardson* framework presupposes that the aggrieved co-defendant has a Sixth Amendment right to confront the declarant in the first place.”

*Bruton* does not apply unless the testimonial hearsay directly implicates the nonconfessing codefendant: *United States v. Lung Fong Chen*, 393 F.3d 139, 150 (2d Cir. 2004): The court held that a confession of a co-defendant, when offered only against the co-defendant, is regulated by *Bruton*, not *Crawford*: so that the question of a Confrontation violation is dependent on whether the confession is powerfully incriminating against the non-confessing defendant. If the confession does not directly implicate the defendant, then there will be no violation if the judge gives an effective limiting instruction to the jury. *Crawford* does not apply because if the instruction is effective, the co-defendant is not a witness “against” the defendant within the meaning of the Confrontation Clause. *See also Chrysler v. Guiney*, 806 F.3d 104 (2nd Cir. 2015) (noting that if an accomplice confession is properly redacted to satisfy *Bruton*, then *Crawford* is not violated because the accomplice is not a witness “against” the defendant within the meaning of the Confrontation Clause).

*Bruton* protection limited to testimonial statements: *United States v. Berrios*, 676 F.3d 118 (3rd Cir. 2012): “[B]ecause *Bruton* is no more than a byproduct of the Confrontation Clause, the Court’s holdings in *Davis* and *Crawford* likewise limit *Bruton* to testimonial statements. Any protection provided by *Bruton* is therefore only afforded to the same extent as the Confrontation Clause, which requires that the challenged statement qualify as testimonial. To the extent we have held otherwise, we no longer follow those holdings.” *See also United States v. Shavers*, 693 F.3d 363 (3rd Cir. 2012) (admission of non-testifying co-defendant’s inculpatory statement did not violate *Bruton* because it was made casually to an acquaintance and so was non-testimonial; the statement bore “no resemblance to the abusive governmental investigation tactics that the Sixth Amendment seeks to prevent”).
**Bruton** protection does not apply unless the codefendant’s statements are testimonial: *United States v. Dargan*, 738 F.3d 643 (4th Cir. 2013): The court held that a statement made to a cellmate in an informal setting was not testimonial --- therefore admitting the statement against the nonconfessing codefendant did not violate *Bruton*, because the premise of *Bruton* is that the nonconfessing defendant’s confrontation rights are violated when the confessing defendant’s statement is admitted at trial. But after *Crawford* there can be no confrontation violation unless the hearsay statement is testimonial.

**Bruton** remains in place to protect against admission of testimonial hearsay against a non-confessing co-defendant: *United States v. Ramos-Cardenas*, 524 F.3d 600 (5th Cir. 2008): In a multiple-defendant case, the trial court admitted a post-arrest statement by one of the defendants, which indirectly implicated the others. The court found that the confession could not be admitted against the other defendants, because the confession was testimonial under *Crawford*. But the court found that *Crawford* did not change the analysis with respect to the admissibility of a confession against the confessing defendant (because he has no right to confront himself); nor did it displace the case law under *Bruton* allowing limiting instructions to protect the non-confessing defendants under certain circumstances. The court found that the reference to the other defendants in the confession was vague, and therefore a limiting instruction was sufficient to assure that the confession would not be used against them. Thus, the *Bruton* problem was resolved by a limiting instruction.

**Codefendant’s testimonial statements were not admitted “against” the defendant in light of limiting instruction:** *United States v. Harper*, 527 F.3d 396 (5th Cir. 2008): Harper’s co-defendant made a confession, but it did not directly implicate Harper. At trial the confession was admitted against the co-defendant and the jury was instructed not to use it against Harper. The court recognized that the confession was testimonial, but held that it did not violate Harper’s right to confrontation because the co-defendant was not a witness “against” him. The court relied on the post-*Bruton* case of *Richardson v. Marsh*, and held that the limiting instruction was sufficient to protect Harper’s right to confrontation because the co-defendant’s confession did not directly implicate Harper and so was not as “powerfully incriminating” as the confession in *Bruton*. The court concluded that because “the Supreme Court has so far taken a pragmatic approach to resolving whether jury instructions preclude a Sixth Amendment violation in various categories of cases, and because *Richardson* has not been expressly overruled, we will apply *Richardson* and its pragmatic approach, as well as the teachings in *Bruton*.”
**Bruton** inapplicable to statement made by co-defendant to another prisoner, because that statement was not testimonial: *United States v. Vasquez*, 766 F.3d 373 (5th Cir. 2014): The defendant’s co-defendant made a statement to a jailhouse snitch that implicated the defendant in the crime. The defendant argued that admitting the codefendant’s statement at his trial violated **Bruton**, but the court disagreed. It stated that **Bruton** “is no longer applicable to a non-testimonial prison yard conversation because **Bruton** is no more than a by-product of the Confrontation Clause.” The court further stated that “statements from one prisoner to another are clearly non-testimonial.”

**Bruton** protection does not apply unless codefendant’s statements are testimonial: *United States v. Johnson*, 581 F.3d 320 (6th Cir. 2009): The court held that after **Crawford**, **Bruton** is applicable only when the codefendant’s statement is testimonial.

**Bruton** protection does not apply unless codefendant’s statements are testimonial: *United States v. Dale*, 614 F.3d 942 (8th Cir. 2010): The court held that after **Crawford**, **Bruton** is applicable only when the codefendant’s statement is testimonial.

**Bruton** protection does not apply unless codefendant’s statements are testimonial: *Lucero v. Holland*, 902 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2018): The defendant was charged with others for attempting to murder a fellow prisoner. At trial, the government offered a handwritten gang memo that was found on another defendant the day after the murder attempt. It detailed the assault on the victim and identified the perpetrators. The memo was admitted only against the defendant who wrote it, as a party-opponent statement. The defendant argued that admission of the memo was a violation of **Bruton**. But the court found that the memo among gang members was clearly not testimonial, as it was not prepared with the primary motive of use in a criminal prosecution. (Far from it.). The court found that “...the specialized rules of **Bruton** fit comfortably within the **Crawford** umbrella” - -- meaning that **Bruton** is premised on a violation of the non-confessing defendant’s right to confrontation and, after **Crawford**, the right to confrontation applies only to the admission of testimonial hearsay. The court concluded that “only testimonial codefendant statements are subject to the federal Confrontation Clause limits established in **Bruton**.”

**Statement admitted against co-defendant only does not implicate Crawford:** *Mason v. Yarborough*, 447 F.3d 693 (9th Cir. 2006): A non-testifying codefendant confessed during police interrogation. At the trial of both defendants, the government introduced only the fact that the codefendant confessed, not the content of the statement. The court first found that there was no **Bruton** violation, because the defendant’s name was never mentioned --- **Bruton** does not prohibit...
the admission of hearsay statements of a non-testifying codefendant if the statements implicate the defendant only by inference and the jury is instructed that the evidence is not admissible against the defendant. For similar reasons, the court found no *Crawford* violation, because the codefendant was not a “witness against” the defendant. “Because Fenton’s words were never admitted into evidence, he could not ‘bear testimony’ against Mason.”

**Statement that is non-testimonial cannot raise a Bruton problem:** *United States v. Patterson,* 713 F.3d 1237 (10th Cir. 2013): The defendant challenged a statement by a non-testifying codefendant on *Bruton* grounds. The court found no error, because the statement was made in furtherance of the conspiracy. Accordingly, it was non-testimonial. That meant there was no *Bruton* problem because *Bruton* does not apply to non-testimonial hearsay. *Bruton* is a confrontation case and the Supreme Court has held that the Confrontation Clause extends only to testimonial hearsay. *See also United States v. Clark,* 717 F.3d 790 (10th Cir. 2013) (No *Bruton* violation because the codefendant hearsay was a coconspirator statement made in furtherance of the conspiracy and so was not testimonial); *United States v. Morgan,* 748 F.3d 1024 (10th Cir. 2014) (statement admissible as a coconspirator statement cannot violate *Bruton* because “*Bruton* applies only to testimonial statements” and the statements were made between coconspirators dividing up the proceeds of the crime and so “were not made to be used for investigation or prosecution of crime.”).

**Admission of codefendant’s incriminating statement, made in an informal conversation with a friend, did not violate Bruton:** *United States v. Hano,* 922 F.3d 1272 (11th Cir. 1999): The court stated that “the same principles that govern whether the admission of testimony violated the Confrontation Clause control whether the admission of the statements of a nontestifying codefendant against a defendant at a joint trial violate *Bruton.” In this case there was no *Bruton* violation because the codefendant’s incriminating statement was made as part of a “friendly and informal” exchange with a friend.
Child-Declarants

**Statements of young children are extremely unlikely to be testimonial: Ohio v. Clark,** 135 S.Ct. 2173 (2015): This case is fully discussed in Part I. The case involved a statement from a three-year-old boy to his teachers. It accused the defendant of injuring him. The Court held that a statement from a young child is extremely unlikely to be testimonial because the child is not aware of the possibility of use of statements in criminal prosecutions, and so cannot be speaking with the primary motive that the statement will be so used. The Court refused to adopt a bright-line rule, but it is hard to think of a case in which the statement of a young child will be found testimonial under the primary motivation test.

**Following Clark, the court finds that a report of sex abuse to a nurse by a 4 ½ year old child is not testimonial: United States v. Barker,** 820 F.3d 167 (5th Cir. 2016): The court held that a statement by a 4 ½ year-old girl, accusing the defendant of sexual abuse, was not testimonial in light of Ohio v. Clark. The girl made the statement to a nurse who was registered by the state to take such statements. The court held that like in Clark the statement was not testimonial because: 1) it was made by a child too young to understand the criminal justice system; 2) it was not made to law enforcement; 3) the nurse’s primary motive was to treat the child; and 4) the fact that the nurse was required to report the abuse to law enforcement did not change her motivation to treat the child.
Coconspirator Statements

Coconspirator statement not testimonial: *United States v. Felton*, 417 F.3d 97 (1st Cir. 2005): The court held that a statement by the defendant’s coconspirator, made during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy, was not testimonial under *Crawford*. Accord *United States v. Sanchez-Berrios*, 424 F.3d 65 (1st Cir. 2005) (noting that *Crawford* “explicitly recognized that statements made in furtherance of a conspiracy by their nature are not testimonial.”). See also *United States v. Turner*, 501 F.3d 59 (1st Cir. 2007) (coconspirator’s statement made during a private conversation were not testimonial); *United States v. Ciresi*, 697 F.3d 19 (1st Cir. 2012) (statements admissible as coconspirator hearsay under Rule 801(d)(2)(E) are “by their nature” not testimonial because they are “made for a purpose other than use in a prosecution.”) *United States v. Mayfield*, 909 F.3d 956 (8th Cir. 2018): Affirming convictions for conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine, the court found that the trial court did not err in admitting statements by one coconspirator about a completed act of distribution, and by another who informed the defendant what the police had found when he was arrested. The defendant argued that both sets of statements were testimonial, but the court found that statements made in furtherance of a conspiracy are not testimonial because, by definition, they are not made for the primary purpose of being used as evidence in a prosecution.

Statements made pursuant to a conspiracy to commit kidnapping are not testimonial: *United States v. Stimler*, 864 F.3d 253 (3rd Cir. 2017): The defendants were prosecuted for conspiracy to kidnap and related crimes arising out of Orthodox Jewish divorce proceedings. Statements were made at a *beth din* which was convened when the alleged victim of one of the kidnappings had challenged the validity of the *get* he signed. The court found that those statements were made pursuant to the kidnapping conspiracy, and reasoned that “none of the individuals at the *beth din* -- all of whom were charged in the conspiracy --- would have reasonably believed that they were making statements for the purpose of assisting a criminal prosecution.”

Surreptitiously recorded statements of coconspirators are not testimonial: *United States v. Hendricks*, 395 F.3d 173 (3rd Cir. 2005): The court found that surreptitiously recorded statements of an ongoing criminal conspiracy were not testimonial within the meaning of *Crawford* because they were informal statements among coconspirators. Accord *United States v. Bobb*, 471 F.3d 491 (3rd Cir. 2006) (noting that the holding in *Hendricks* was not limited to cases in which the declarant was a confidential informant).
Statement admissible as coconspirator hearsay is not testimonial: *United States v. Robinson*, 367 F.3d 278 (5th Cir. 2004): The court affirmed a drug trafficker’s murder convictions and death sentence. It held that coconspirator statements are not testimonial under *Crawford* as they are made under informal circumstances and not for the purpose of creating evidence. *Accord United States v. Delgado*, 401 F.3d 290 (5th Cir. 2005); *United States v. Olguin*, 643 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Alaniz*, 726 F.3d 586 (5th Cir. 2013); *United States v. Ayelotan*, 917 F.3d 394 (5th Cir. 2019). *See also United States v. King*, 541 F.3d 1143 (5th Cir. 2008) (“Because the statements at issue here were made by co-conspirators in the furtherance of a conspiracy, they do not fall within the ambit of *Crawford’s* protection”). Note that the court in *King* rejected the defendant’s argument that the co-conspirator statements were testimonial because they were “presented by the government for their testimonial value.” Accepting that definition would mean that all hearsay is testimonial simply by being offered at trial. The court observed that “*Crawford’s* emphasis clearly is on whether the statement was testimonial at the time it was made.”

**Statement by an anonymous coconspirator is not testimonial: United States v. Martinez**, 430 F.3d 317 (6th Cir. 2005). The court held that a letter written by an anonymous coconspirator during the course and in furtherance of a conspiracy was not testimonial under *Crawford* because it was not written with the intent that it would be used in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See also United States v. Mooneyham*, 473 F.3d 280 (6th Cir. 2007) (statements made by coconspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy are not testimonial because the one making them “has no awareness or expectation that his or her statements may later be used at a trial”); the fact that the statements were made to a law enforcement officer was irrelevant because the officer was undercover and the declarant did not know he was speaking to a police officer); *United States v. Stover*, 474 F.3d 904 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that under *Crawford* and *Davis*, “co-conspirators’ statements made in pendency and furtherance of a conspiracy are not testimonial” and therefore that the defendant’s right to confrontation was not violated when a statement was properly admitted under Rule 801(d)(2)(E)); *United States v. Damra*, 621 F.3d 474 (6th Cir. 2010) (statements made by a coconspirator “by their nature are not testimonial”) *United States v. Tragas*, 727 F.3d 610 (6th Cir. 2013) (“As coconspirator statements were made in furtherance of the conspiracy, they were categorically non-testimonial.”).

Coconspirator statements made to an undercover informant are not testimonial: *United States v. Hargrove*, 508 F.3d 445 (7th Cir. 2007): The defendant, a police officer, was charged with taking part in a conspiracy to rob drug dealers. One of his coconspirators had a discussion with a potential member of the conspiracy (in fact an undercover informant) about future robberies. The defendant argued that the coconspirator’s statements were testimonial, but the court disagreed. It held that “*Crawford* did not affect the admissibility of coconspirator statements.” The court
specifically rejected the defendant’s argument that *Crawford* somehow undermined *Bourjaily*, noting that in both *Crawford* and *Davis*, “the Supreme Court specifically cited *Bourjaily* --- which as here involved a coconspirator’s statement made to a government informant --- to illustrate a category of nontestimonial statements that falls outside the requirements of the Confrontation Clause.”

**Statements by a coconspirator during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy are not testimonial: United States v. Lee**, 374 F.3d 637 (8th Cir. 2004): The court held that statements admissible under the coconspirator exemption from the hearsay rule are by definition not testimonial. As those statements to be admissible must be made during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy, they cannot be the kind of formalized, litigation-oriented statements that the Court found testimonial in *Crawford*. The court reached the same result on co-conspirator hearsay in *United States v. Reyes*, 362 F.3d 536 (8th Cir. 2004); *United States v. Singh*, 494 F.3d 653 (8th Cir. 2007); and *United States v. Hyles*, 521 F.3d 946 (8th Cir. 2008) (noting that the statements were not elicited in response to a government investigation and were casual remarks to co-conspirators); *United States v. Furman*, 867 F.3d 981 (8th Cir. 2017) (statements by a coconspirator over a prison telephone were not testimonial even though the declarant knew the statements were recorded by law enforcement: “[A]lthough Gerald was aware that law enforcement might listen to his telephone conversations and use them as evidence, the primary purpose of the calls was to further the drug conspiracy, not to create a record for a criminal prosecution.”).

**Statements in furtherance of a conspiracy are not testimonial: United States v. Allen**, 425 F.3d 1231 (9th Cir. 2005): The court held that “co-conspirator statements are not testimonial and therefore beyond the compass of *Crawford*’s holding.” See also *United States v. Larson*, 460 F.3d 1200 (9th Cir. 2006) (statement from one conspirator to another identifying the defendants as the source of some drugs was made in furtherance of the conspiracy; conspiratorial statements were not testimonial as there was no expectation that the statements would later be used at trial); *United States v. Grasso*, 724 F.3d 1077 (9th Cir. 2013) (“co-conspirator statements in furtherance of a conspiracy are not testimonial”); *United States v. Cazares*, 788 F.3d 956 (9th Cir. 2015) (“a conversation between two gang members about the journey of their burned gun is not testimonial”).

**Statements admissible under the co-conspirator exemption are not testimonial: United States v. Townley**, 472 F.3d 1267 (10th Cir. 2007): The court rejected the defendant’s argument that hearsay is testimonial under *Crawford* whenever “confrontation would have been required at
common law as it existed in 1791.” It specifically noted that *Crawford* did not alter the rule from *Bourjaily* that a hearsay statement admitted under Federal Rule 801(d)(2)(E) does not violate the Confrontation Clause. *Accord United States v. Ramirez*, 479 F.3d 1229 (10th Cir. 2007) (statements admissible under Rule 801(d)(2)(E) are not testimonial under *Crawford*); *United States v. Patterson*, 713 F.3d 1237 (10th Cir. 2013) (same); *United States v. Morgan*, 748 F.3d 1024 (10th Cir. 2014) (statements made between coconspirators dividing up the proceeds of the crime were not testimonial because they “were not made to be used for investigation or prosecution of crime.”); *United States v. Yurek*, 925 F.3d 423 (10th Cir. 2019) (coconspirator hearsay is not testimonial).

**Statements made during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy are not testimonial:***

*United States v. Underwood*, 446 F.3d 1340 (11th Cir. 2006): In a narcotics prosecution, the defendant argued that the admission of an intercepted conversation between his brother Darryl and an undercover informant violated *Crawford*. But the court found no error and affirmed. The court noted that the statements “clearly were not made under circumstances which would have led [Darryl] reasonably to believe that his statement would be available for use at a later trial. Had Darryl known that Hopps was a confidential informant, it is clear that he never would have spoken to her in the first place.” The court concluded as follows:

Although the foregoing discussion would probably support a holding that the evidence challenged here is not "testimonial," two additional aspects of the *Crawford* opinion seal our conclusion that Darryl's statements to the government informant were not "testimonial" evidence. First, the Court stated: "most of the hearsay exceptions covered statements that by their nature were not testimonial -- for example, business records or statements in furtherance of a conspiracy." Also, the Court cited *Bourjaily v. United States*, 483 U.S. 171 (1987) approvingly, indicating that it "hew[ed] closely to the traditional line" of cases that *Crawford* deemed to reflect the correct view of the Confrontation Clause. In approving *Bourjaily*, the *Crawford* opinion expressly noted that it involved statements unwittingly made to an FBI informant. * * * The co-conspirator statement in *Bourjaily* is indistinguishable from the challenged evidence in the instant case.

**See also United States v. Lopez**, 649 F.3d 1222 (11th Cir. 2011): co-conspirator’s statement, bragging that he and the defendant had drugs to sell after a robbery, was admissible under Rule 801(d)(2)(E) and was not testimonial, because it was merely “bragging to a friend” and not a formal statement intended for trial.
Cross-Examination

Cross-examination of a witness during prior testimony was adequate even though defense counsel was found ineffective on other grounds: *Rolan v. Coleman*, 680 F.3d 311 (3rd Cir. 2012): The habeas petitioner argued that his right to confrontation was violated when he was retried and testimony from the original trial was admitted against him. The prior testimony was obviously testimonial under *Crawford*. The question was whether the witness --- who was unavailable for the second trial --- was adequately cross-examined at the first trial. The defendant argued that cross-examination could not have been adequate because the court had already found defense counsel to be constitutionally ineffective at that trial (by failing to investigate a self-defense theory and failing to call two witnesses). The court, however, found the cross-examination to be adequate. The court noted that the state court had found the cross-examination to be adequate --- that court found “baseless” the defendant’s argument that counsel had failed to explore the witness’s immunity agreement. Because the witness had made statements before that agreement was entered into that were consistent with his in-court testimony, counsel could reasonably conclude that exploring the immunity agreement would do more harm than good. The court of appeals concluded that “[t]here is no Supreme Court precedent to suggest that Goldstein’s cross-examination was inadequate, and the record does not support such a conclusion. Consequently, the Superior Court’s finding was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, *Crawford*.”

Attorney’s cross-examination at a prior trial was adequate and therefore admitting the testimony at a later trial did not violate the right to confrontation: *United States v. Richardson*, 781 F. 3d 287 (5th Cir. 2015): The defendant was convicted on drug and gun charges, but the conviction was reversed on appeal. By the time of retrial on mostly the same charges, a prosecution witness had become unavailable, and the trial court admitted the transcript of the witness’s testimony from the prior trial. The court found no violation of the right to confrontation. The court found that *Crawford* did not change the long-standing rule as to the opportunity that must be afforded for cross-examination to satisfy the Confrontation Clause. What is required is an “adequate opportunity to cross-examine” the witness: enough to provide the jury with “sufficient information to appraise the bias and the motives of the witness.” The court noted that while the lawyer’s cross-examination of the witness at the first trial could have been better, it was adequate, as the lawyer explored the witness’s motive to cooperate, his arrests and convictions, his relationship with the defendant, and “the contours of his trial testimony.”

Cross-examination at a deposition was adequate to satisfy the right to confrontation: *United States v. Mallory*, 902 F.3d. 584 (6th Cir. 2018): The defendant was charged with a scheme to
pilfer money from an old person, by forging a will. One of his accomplices, with whom he had fallen out, testified against him at a deposition, and was unavailable to testify at trial, due to dementia. The trial court admitted the deposition transcript, and the defendant argued that this violated his right to confrontation. The court held that the defendant had a meaningful opportunity to cross-examine the witness at the deposition. The defendant argued that he had insufficient time to prepare for the deposition given voluminous discovery; but the court found that the defendant had failed to specify what his counsel could have reviewed but did not, and concluded that “counsel’s preparation, even if hurried, was not so rushed as to significantly limit his ability to cross-examine.” The defendant next argued that he received discovery after the deposition, but the court found that none of this information was pertinent to cross-examining the witness. The defendant next argued that he did not know that the witness had been diagnosed with dementia at the time of the deposition, and would have like to cross-examine the witness on that. But the court responded that the defendant had information that the witness was confused, and actually asked him if he had been diagnosed with Alzheimer’s; and moreover, the defendant was allowed to impeach the deposition at trial with information about the witness’s mental condition.

State court was not unreasonable in finding that cross-examination by defense counsel at the preliminary hearing was sufficient to satisfy the defendant’s right to confrontation: Williams v. Bauman, 759 F.3d 630 (9th Cir. 2014): The defendant argued that his right to confrontation was violated when the transcript of the preliminary hearing testimony of an eyewitness was admitted against him at his state trial. The witness was unavailable for trial and the defense counsel cross-examined him at the preliminary hearing. The court found that the state court was not unreasonable in concluding that the cross-examination was adequate, thus satisfying the right to confrontation. The court noted that “there is some question whether a preliminary hearing necessarily offers an adequate opportunity to cross-examine for Confrontation Clause purposes” but concluded that there was “reasonable room for debate” on the question, and therefore the state court’s decision to align itself on one side of the argument was beyond the federal court’s power to remedy on habeas review.
Declarations Against Penal Interest (Including Accomplice Statements to Law Enforcement)

Accomplice’s jailhouse statement was admissible as a declaration against interest and accordingly was not testimonial: United States v. Pelletier, 666 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2011): The defendant’s accomplice made hearsay statements to a jailhouse buddy, indicating among other things that he had smuggled marijuana for the defendant. The court found that the statements were properly admitted as declarations against interest. The court noted specifically that the fact that the accomplice made the statements “to fellow inmate Hafford, rather than in an attempt to curry favor with police, cuts in favor of admissibility.” For similar reasons, the hearsay was not testimonial under Crawford. The court stated that the statements were made “not under formal circumstances, but rather to a fellow inmate with a shared history, under circumstances that did not portend their use at trial against Pelletier.”

Statement admissible as a declaration against penal interest, after Williamson, is not testimonial: United States v. Saget, 377 F.3d 223 (2nd Cir. 2004) (Sotomayor, J.): The defendant’s accomplice spoke to an undercover officer, trying to enlist him in the defendant’s criminal scheme. The accomplice’s statements were admitted at trial as declarations against penal interest under Rule 804(b)(3), as they tended to implicate the accomplice in a conspiracy. After Williamson v. United States, hearsay statements made by an accomplice to a law enforcement officer while in custody are not admissible under Rule 804(b)(3) when they implicate the defendant, because the accomplice may be currying favor with law enforcement. But in the instant case, the accomplice’s statement was not barred by Williamson, because it was made to an undercover officer---the accomplice didn’t know he was talking to a law enforcement officer and therefore had no reason to curry favor by implicating the defendant. For similar reasons, the statement was not testimonial under Crawford --- it was not the kind of formalized statement to law enforcement, prepared for trial, such as a “witness” would provide. See also United States v. Williams, 506 F.3d 151 (2d Cir. 2007): Statement of accomplice implicating himself and defendant in a murder was admissible under Rule 804(b)(3) where it was made to a friend in informal circumstances; for the same reason the statement was not testimonial. The defendant’s argument about insufficient indicia of reliability was misplaced because the Confrontation Clause no longer imposes a reliability requirement. Accord United States v. Wexler, 522 F.3d 194 (2nd Cir. 2008) (inculpatory statement made to friends found admissible under Rule 804(b)(3) and not testimonial).
Intercepted conversations were admissible as declarations against penal interest and were not testimonial: *United States v. Berrios*, 676 F.3d 118 (3rd Cir. 2012): Authorities intercepted a conversation between two criminal associates in a prison yard. The court held that the statements were non-testimonial, because neither of the declarants “held the objective of incriminating any of the defendants at trial when their prison yard conversation was recorded; there is no indication that they were aware of being overheard; and there is no indication that their conversation consisted of anything but casual remarks to an acquaintance.” A defendant also lodged a hearsay objection, but the court found that the statements were admissible as declarations against interest. The declarants unequivocally incriminated themselves in acts of carjacking and murder, as well as shooting a security guard, and they mentioned the defendant “only to complain that he crashed the getaway car.” See also *Mitchell v. Superintendent*, 902 F.3d 156 (3rd Cir. 2016) (jailhouse conversations among inmates, admissible as declarations against interest, were not testimonial).

Accomplice statement made to a friend, admitting complicity in a crime, was admissible as a declaration against interest and was not testimonial: *United States v. Jordan*, 509 F.3d 191 (4th Cir. 2007): The defendant was convicted of murder while engaged in a drug-trafficking offense. He contended that the admission of a statement of an accomplice was error under the Confrontation Clause and the hearsay rule. The accomplice confessed her part in the crime in a statement to her roommate. The court found no error in the admission of the accomplice’s statement. It was not testimonial because it was made to a friend, not to law enforcement. The court stated: “To our knowledge, no court has extended *Crawford* to statements made by a declarant to friends or associates.” The court also found the accomplice’s statement properly admitted as a declaration against interest. The court elaborated as follows:

Here, although Brown’s statements to Adams inculpated Jordan, they also subject her to criminal liability for a drug conspiracy and, by extension, for Tabon’s murder. Brown made the statements to a friend in an effort to relieve herself of guilt, not to law enforcement in an effort to minimize culpability or criminal exposure.

Accomplice’s statements to the victim, in conversations taped by the victim, were not testimonial: *United States v. Udeozor*, 515 F.3d 260 (4th Cir.2008): The defendant was convicted for conspiracy to hold another in involuntary servitude. The evidence showed that the defendant and her husband brought a teenager from Nigeria into the United States and forced her to work without compensation. The victim also testified at trial that the defendant’s husband raped her on a number of occasions. On appeal the defendant argued that the trial court erroneously admitted two taped conversations between the victim and the defendant. The victim taped the conversations surreptitiously in order to refer them to law enforcement. The court found no error in admitting
the tapes. The conversations were hearsay, but the husband’s statements were admissible as declarations against penal interest, as they admitted wrongdoing and showed an attempt to evade prosecution. The defendant argued that even if admissible under Rule 804(b)(3), the conversations were testimonial under *Crawford*. He argued that a statement is testimonial if the government’s primary motivation is to prepare the statement for use in a criminal prosecution --- and that in this case, the victim was essentially acting as a government agent in obtaining statements to be used for trial. But the court found that the conversation was not testimonial because the husband did not know he was talking to anyone affiliated with law enforcement, and the husband’s primary motivation was not to prepare a statement for any criminal trial. The court observed that the “intent of the police officers or investigators is relevant to the determination of whether a statement is testimonial only if it is first the case that a person in the position of the declarant reasonably would have expected that his statements would be used prosecutorially.”

**Note:** This case was decided before *Michigan v. Bryant*, infra, but it consistent with the holding in *Bryant* that the primary motive test considers the motivation of all the parties to a communication --- and that all of them must be primarily motivated to have the statement used in a criminal prosecution for the statement to be testimonial.

**Accomplice’s confessions to law enforcement agents were testimonial:** *United States v. Harper*, 514 F.3d 456 (5th Cir. 2008): The court held that confessions made by the codefendant to law enforcement were testimonial, even though the codefendant did not mention the defendant as being involved in the crime. The statements were introduced to show that the codefendant owned some of the firearms and narcotics at issue in the case, and these facts implicated the defendant as well. The court did not consider whether the confessions were admissible under a hearsay exception --- but they would not have been admissible as a declaration against interest, because *Williamson* bars confessions of cohorts made to law enforcement.

**Accomplice’s statements to a friend, implicating both the accomplice and the defendant in the crime, were not testimonial:** *Ramirez v. Dretke*, 398 F.3d 691 (5th Cir. 2005): The defendant was convicted of murder. Hearsay statements of his accomplice were admitted against him. The accomplice made statements both before and after the murder that directly implicated both himself and the defendant. These statements were made to the accomplice’s roommate. The court found that these statements were not testimonial under *Crawford*: “There is nothing in *Crawford* to suggest that testimonial evidence includes spontaneous out-of-court statements made outside any arguably judicial or investigatorial context.”
Declaration against penal interest, made to a friend, is not testimonial: *United States v. Franklin*, 415 F.3d 537 (6th Cir. 2005): The defendant was charged with bank robbery. One of the defendant’s accomplices (Clarke), was speaking to a friend (Wright) sometime after the robbery. Wright told Clarke that he looked “stressed out.” Clarke responded that he was indeed stressed out, because he and the defendant had robbed a bank and he thought the authorities were on their trail. The court found no error in admitting Clarke’s hearsay statement against the defendant as a declaration against penal interest, as it disserved Clark’s interest and was not made to law enforcement officers in any attempt to curry favor with the authorities. On the constitutional question, the court found that Clarke’s statement was not testimonial under *Crawford*:

Clarke made the statements to his friend by happenstance; Wright was not a police officer or a government informant seeking to elicit statements to further a prosecution against Clarke or Franklin. To the contrary, Wright was privy to Clarke’s statements only as his friend and confidant.

The court distinguished other cases in which an informant’s statement to police officers was found testimonial, on the ground that those other cases involved accomplice statements knowingly made to police officers, so that “the informant’s statements were akin to statements elicited during police interrogation, i.e., the informant could reasonably anticipate that the statements would be used to prosecute the defendant.”

*See also United States v. Gibson,* 409 F.3d 325 (6th Cir. 2005) (describing statements as nontestimonial where “the statements were not made to the police or in the course of an official investigation, nor in an attempt to curry favor or shift the blame”); *United States v. Johnson,* 440 F.3d 832 (6th Cir. 2006) (statements by accomplice to an undercover informant he thought to be a cohort were properly admitted against the defendant; the statements were not testimonial because the declarant didn’t know he was speaking to law enforcement, and so a person in his position “would not have anticipated that his statements would be used in a criminal investigation or prosecution of Johnson.”).
Statement admissible as a declaration against penal interest is not testimonial: *United States v. Johnson*, 581 F.3d 320 (6th Cir. 2009): The court held that the tape-recorded confession of a coconspirator describing the details of an armed robbery, including his and the defendant’s roles, was properly admitted as a declaration against penal interest. The court found that the statements tended to disserve the declarant’s interest because “they admitted his participation in an unsolved murder and bank robbery.” And the statements were trustworthy because they were made to a person the declarant thought to be his friend, at a time when the declarant did not know he was being recorded “and therefore could not have made his statement in order to obtain a benefit from law enforcement.” Moreover, the hearsay was not testimonial, because the declarant did not know he was being recorded or that the statement would be used in a criminal proceeding against the defendant.

Accomplice confession to law enforcement is testimonial, even if redacted: *United States v. Jones*, 371 F.3d 363 (7th Cir. 2004): An accomplice’s statement to law enforcement was offered against the defendant, though it was redacted to take out any direct reference to the defendant. The court found that even if the confession, as redacted, could be admissible as a declaration against interest (a question it did not decide), its admission would violate the Confrontation Clause after *Crawford*. The court noted that even though redacted, the confession was testimonial, as it was made during interrogation by law enforcement. And because the defendant never had a chance to cross-examine the accomplice, “under *Crawford*, no part of Rock’s confession should have been allowed into evidence.”

Declaration against interest made to an accomplice who was secretly recording the conversation for law enforcement was not testimonial: *United States v. Watson*, 525 F.3d 583 (7th Cir. 2008): After a bank robbery, one of the perpetrators was arrested and agreed to cooperate with the FBI. She surreptitiously recorded a conversation with Anthony, in which Anthony implicated himself and Watson in the robbery. The court found that Anthony’s statement was against his own interest, and rejected Watson’s contention that it was testimonial. The court noted that Anthony could not have anticipated that the statement would be used at a trial, because he did not know that the FBI was secretly recording the conversation. It concluded: “A statement unwittingly made to a confidential informant and recorded by the government is not testimonial for Confrontation Clause purposes.” Accord *United States v. Volpendesto*, 746 F.3d 273 (7th Cir. 2014): Statements of an accomplice made to a confidential informant were properly admitted as declarations against interest and for the same reasons were not testimonial. The defendant argued that the court should reconsider its ruling in *Watson* because the Supreme Court, in *Michigan v. Bryant*, had in the interim stated that in determining primary motive, the court must look at the motivation of both the declarant and the other party to the conversation, and in this case as in
Watson the other party was a confidential informant trying to obtain statements to use in a criminal prosecution. But the court noted that in Bryant the Court stated that the relevant inquiry “is not the subjective or actual purpose of the individuals involved in a particular encounter, but rather the purpose that reasonable participants would have had.” Applying this objective approach, the court concluded that the conversation “looks like a casual, confidential discussion between co-conspirators.”

**Statement admissible as a declaration against penal interest, after Williamson, is not testimonial:** United States v. Manfre, 368 F.3d 832 (8th Cir. 2004): An accomplice made a statement to his fiancee that he was going to burn down a nightclub for the defendant. The court held that this statement was properly admitted as a declaration against penal interest, as it was not a statement made to law enforcement to curry favor. Rather, it was a statement made informally to a trusted person. For the same reason, the statement was not testimonial under Crawford; it was a statement made to a loved one and was “not the kind of memorialized, judicial-process-created evidence of which Crawford speaks.”

**Accomplice statements to cellmate were not testimonial:** United States v. Johnson, 495 F.3d 951 (8th Cir. 2007): The defendant’s accomplice made statements to a cellmate, implicating himself and the defendant in a number of murders. The court found that these hearsay statements were not testimonial, as they were made under informal circumstances and there was no involvement with law enforcement.

**Accomplice’s confession to law enforcement was testimonial, even if redacted:** United States v. Shaw, 758 F.3d 1187 (10th Cir. 2014): At the defendant’s trial, the court permitted a police officer to testify about a confession made by the defendant’s alleged accomplice. The accomplice was not a co-defendant, but the court, relying on the Bruton line of cases, ruled that the confession could be admitted so long as all references to the defendant were replaced with a neutral pronoun. The court of appeals found that this was error, because the confession to law enforcement was, under Crawford, clearly testimonial. It stated that “[r]edaction does not override the Confrontation Clause. It is just a tool to remove, in appropriate cases, the prejudice to the defendant from allowing the jury to hear evidence admissible against the codefendant but not admissible against the defendant.” The trial court’s reliance on the Bruton cases was flawed because in those cases the accomplice is joined as a codefendant and the confession is admissible against the accomplice. In this case, where the defendant was tried alone and the confession was offered against him only, it was inadmissible for any purpose, whether or not redacted.
Jailhouse confession implicating defendant was admissible as a declaration against penal interest and was not testimonial: *United States v. Smalls*, 605 F.3d 765 (10th Cir. 2010): The court found no error in admitting a jailhouse confession that implicated a defendant in the murder of a government informant. The fact that the statements were made in a conversation with a government informant did not make them testimonial because the declarant did not know he was being interrogated, and the statement was not made under the formalities required for a statement to be testimonial. And the statements were properly admitted under Rule 804(b)(3), because they implicated the declarant in a serious crime committed with another person, there was no attempt to shift blame to the defendant, and the declarant did not know he was talking to a government informant and therefore was not currying favor with law enforcement.

Declaration against interest is not testimonial: *United States v. U.S. Infrastructure, Inc.*, 576 F.3d 1195 (11th Cir. 2009): The declarant, McNair, made a hearsay statement that he was accepting bribes from one of the defendants. The statement was made in private to a friend. The court found that the statement was properly admitted as a declaration against McNair’s penal interest, as it showed that he accepted bribes from an identified person. The court also held that the hearsay was not testimonial, because it was “part of a private conversation” and no law enforcement personnel were involved. See also, *United States v. Hano*, 922 F.3d 1272 (11th Cir. 1999) (Incriminating statement was made as part of a “friendly and informal” exchange with a friend; the statement was nontestimonial, and was properly admitted as a declaration against interest).
Excited Utterances, 911 Calls, Etc.

911 calls and statements to responding officers may be testimonial, but only if the primary purpose is to establish or prove past events in a criminal prosecution: *Davis v. Washington and Hammon v. Indiana*, 547 U.S. 813 (2006): In companion cases, the Court decided whether reports of crime by victims of domestic abuse were testimonial under *Crawford*. In *Davis*, the victim’s statements were made to a 911 operator while and shortly after the victim was being assaulted by the defendant. In *Hammon*, the statements were made to police, who were conducting an interview of the victim after being called to the scene. The Court held that the statements in *Davis* were not testimonial, but came to the opposite result with respect to one of the statements in *Hammon*. The Court set the dividing line for such statements as follows:

Statements are nontestimonial when made in the course of police interrogation under circumstances objectively indicating that the primary purpose of the interrogation is to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency. They are testimonial when the circumstances objectively indicate that there is no such ongoing emergency, and that the primary purpose of the interrogation is to establish or prove past events potentially relevant to later criminal prosecution.

The Court defined testimoniality by whether the primary motivation in making the statements was for use in a criminal prosecution.

**Pragmatic application of the emergency and primary purpose standards:** *Michigan v. Bryant*, 562 U.S. 344 (2011): The Court held that the statement of a shooting victim to police, identifying the defendant as the shooter --- and admitted as an excited utterance under a state rule of evidence --- was not testimonial under *Davis* and *Crawford*. The Court applied the test for testimoniality established by *Davis* --- whether the primary motive for making the statement was to have it used in a criminal prosecution --- and found that in this case such primary motive did not exist. The Court noted that *Davis* focused on whether statements were made to respond to an emergency, as distinct from an investigation into past events. But it stated that the lower court had construed that distinction too narrowly to bar, as testimonial, essentially all statements of past events. The Court made the following observations about how to determine testimoniality when statements are made to responding police officers:

1. The primary purpose inquiry is objective. The relevant inquiry into the parties’ statements and actions is not the subjective or actual purpose of the particular parties, but the purpose that reasonable participants would have had, as ascertained from the parties’ statements and actions and the circumstances in which the encounter occurred.
2. As Davis notes, the existence of an “ongoing emergency” at the time of the encounter is among the most important circumstances informing the interrogation’s primary purpose. An emergency focuses the participants not on proving past events potentially relevant to later criminal prosecution, but on ending a threatening situation. But there is no categorical distinction between present and past fact. Rather, the question of whether an emergency exists and is ongoing is a highly context-dependent inquiry. An assessment of whether an emergency threatening the police and public is ongoing cannot narrowly focus on whether the threat to the first victim has been neutralized, because the threat to the first responders and public may continue.

3. An emergency's duration and scope may depend in part on the type of weapon involved; in Davis and Hammon the assailants used their fists, which limited the scope of the emergency --- unlike in this case where the perpetrator used a gun, and so questioning could permissibly be broader.

4. A victim's medical condition is important to the primary purpose inquiry to the extent that it sheds light on the victim's ability to have any purpose at all in responding to police questions and on the likelihood that any such purpose would be a testimonial one. It also provides important context for first responders to judge the existence and magnitude of a continuing threat to the victim, themselves, and the public.

5. Whether an ongoing emergency exists is simply one factor informing the ultimate inquiry regarding an interrogation's “primary purpose.” Another is the encounter's informality. Formality suggests the absence of an emergency, but informality does not necessarily indicate the presence of an emergency or the lack of testimonial intent.

6. The statements and actions of both the declarant and interrogators provide objective evidence of the interrogation's primary purpose. Looking to the contents of both the questions and the answers ameliorates problems that could arise from looking solely to one participant, because both interrogators and declarants may have mixed motives.

Applying all these considerations to the facts, the Court found that the circumstances of the encounter as well as the statements and actions of the shooting victim and the police objectively indicated that the interrogation’s “primary purpose” was “to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency.” The circumstances of the interrogation involved an armed shooter, whose motive for and location after the shooting were unknown and who had mortally wounded the victim within a few blocks and a few minutes of the location where the police found him. Unlike the emergencies in Davis and Hammon, the circumstances presented in Bryant indicated a potential threat to the police and the public, even if not the victim. And because this case involved a gun,
the physical separation that was sufficient to end the emergency in *Hammon* was not necessarily sufficient to end the threat.

The Court concluded that the statements and actions of the police and victim objectively indicated that the primary purpose of their discussion was not to generate statements for trial. When the victim responded to police questions about the crime, he was lying in a gas station parking lot bleeding from a mortal gunshot wound, and his answers were punctuated with questions about when emergency medical services would arrive. Thus, the Court could not say that a person in his situation would have had a primary purpose “to establish or prove past events potentially relevant to later criminal prosecution.” For their part, the police responded to a call that a man had been shot. They did not know why, where, or when the shooting had occurred; the shooter’s location; or anything else about the crime. They asked exactly the type of questions necessary to enable them “to meet an ongoing emergency” --- essentially, who shot the victim and where did the act occur. Nothing in the victim’s responses indicated to the police that there was no emergency or that the emergency had ended. The informality suggested that their primary purpose was to address what they considered to be an ongoing emergency --- apprehending a suspect with a gun --- and the circumstances lacked the formality that would have alerted the victim to or focused him on the possible future prosecutorial use of his statements.

Justice Sotomayor wrote the majority opinion for five Justices. Justice Thomas concurred in the judgment, adhering to his longstanding view that testimoniality is determined by whether the statement is the kind of formalized accusation that was objectionable under common law --- he found no such formalization in this case. Justices Scalia and Ginsburg wrote dissenting opinions. Justice Kagan did not participate.

911 call reporting drunk person with an unloaded gun was not testimonial: *United States v. Cadieux*, 500 F.3d 37 (1st Cir. 2007): In a felon-firearm prosecution, the trial court admitted a tape of a 911 call, made by the daughter of the defendant’s girlfriend, reporting that the defendant was drunk and walking around with an unloaded shotgun. The court held that the 911 call was not testimonial. It relied on the following factors: 1) the daughter spoke about events “in real time, as she witnessed them transpire”; 2) she specifically requested police assistance; 3) the dispatcher’s questions were tailored to identify “the location of the emergency, its nature, and the perpetrator”; and 4) the daughter was “hysterical as she speaks to the dispatcher, in an environment that is neither tranquil nor, as far as the dispatcher could reasonably tell, safe.” The defendant argued that the call was testimonial because the daughter was aware that her statements to the police could be used in a prosecution. But the court found that after *Davis*, awareness of possible use in a prosecution is
not enough for a statement to be testimonial. A statement is testimonial only if the “primary motivation” for making it is for use in a criminal prosecution.

**911 call was not testimonial under the circumstances: United States v. Brito, 427 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2005):** The court affirmed a conviction of firearm possession by an illegal alien. It held that statements made in a 911 call, indicating that the defendant was carrying and had fired a gun, were properly admitted as excited utterances, and that the admission of the 911 statements did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation. The court declared that the relevant question is whether the statement was made with an eye toward “legal ramifications.” The court noted that under this test, statements to police made while the declarant or others are still in personal danger are ordinarily not testimonial, because the declarant in these circumstances “usually speaks out of urgency and a desire to obtain a prompt response.” In this case the 911 call was properly admitted because the caller stated that she had “just” heard gunshots and seen a man with a gun, that the man had pointed the gun at her, and that the man was still in her line of sight. Thus the declarant was in “imminent personal peril” when the call was made and therefore her report was not testimonial. The court also found that the 911 operator’s questioning of the caller did not make the answers testimonial, because “it would blink reality to place under the rubric of interrogation the single off-handed question asked by the dispatcher --- a question that only momentarily interrupted an otherwise continuous stream of consciousness.”

**911 call --- including statements about the defendant’s felony status --- was not testimonial: United States v. Proctor, 505 F.3d 366 (5th Cir. 2007):** In a firearms prosecution, the court admitted a 911 call from the defendant’s brother (Yogi), in which the brother stated that the defendant had stolen a gun and shot it into the ground twice. Included in the call were statements about the defendant’s felony status and that he was probably on cocaine. The court held that the entire call was nontestimonial. It applied the “primary purpose” test and evaluated the call in the following passage:

Yogi's call to 911 was made immediately after Proctor grabbed the gun and fired it twice. During the course of the call, he recounts what just happened, gives a description of his brother, indicates his brother's previous criminal history, and the fact that his brother may be under the influence of drugs. All of these statements enabled the police to deal appropriately with the situation that was unfolding. The statements about Proctor's possession of a gun indicated Yogi's understanding that Proctor was armed and possibly dangerous. The information about Proctor's criminal history and possible drug use necessary for the police to respond appropriately to the emergency, as it allowed
the police to determine whether they would be encountering a violent felon. Proctor argues that the emergency had already passed, because he had run away with the weapon at the time of the 911 call and, therefore, the 911 conversation was testimonial. It is hard to reconcile this argument with the facts. During the 911 call, Yogi reported that he witnessed his brother, a felon possibly high on cocaine, run off with a loaded weapon into a nightclub. This was an ongoing emergency -- not one that had passed. Proctor's retreat into the nightclub provided no assurances that he would not momentarily return to confront Yogi * * *. Further, Yogi could have reasonably feared that the people inside the nightclub were in danger. Overall, a reasonable viewing of the 911 call is that Yogi and the 911 operator were dealing with an ongoing emergency involving a dangerous felon, and that the 911 operator's questions were related to the resolution of that emergency.

See also United States v. Mouzone, 687 F.3d 207 (5th Cir. 2012) (911 calls found non-testimonial as “each caller simply reported his observation of events as they unfolded”; the 911 operators were not attempting to “establish or prove past events”; and “the transcripts simply reflect an effort to meet the needs of the ongoing emergency”).

911 call, and statements made by the victim after police arrived, are excited utterances and not testimonial: United States v. Arnold, 486 F.3d 177 (6th Cir. 2007) (en banc): In a felon-firearm prosecution, the court admitted three sets of hearsay statements made by the daughter of the defendant’s girlfriend, after an argument between the daughter (Tamica) and the defendant. The first set were statements made in a 911 call, in which Tamica stated that Arnold pulled a pistol on her and is “fixing to shoot me.” The call was made after Tamica got in her car and went around the corner from her house. The second set of statements occurred when the police arrived within minutes; Tamica was hysterical, and without prompting said that Arnold had pulled a gun and was trying to kill her. The police asked what the gun looked like and she said “a black handgun.” At the time of this second set of statements, Arnold had left the scene. The third set of statements was made when Arnold returned to the scene in a car a few minutes later. Tamica identified Arnold by name and stated “that’s the guy that pulled the gun on me.” A search of the vehicle turned up a black handgun underneath Arnold’s seat.

The court first found that all three sets of statements were properly admitted as excited utterances. For each set of statements, Tamica was clearly upset, she was concerned about her safety, and the statements were made shortly after or right at the time of the two startling events (the gun threat for the first two sets of statements and Arnold’s return for the third set of statements).

The court then concluded that none of Tamica’s statements fell within the definition of “testimonial” as developed by the Court in Davis. Essentially the court found that the statements were not testimonial for the very reason that they were excited utterances --- Tamica was upset,
she was responding to an emergency and concerned about her safety, and her statements were largely spontaneous and not the product of an extensive interrogation.

911 call is not testimonial: United States v. Thomas, 453 F.3d 838 (7th Cir. 2006): The court held that statements made in a 911 call were non-testimonial under the analysis provided by the Supreme Court in Davis/Hammon. The anonymous caller reported a shooting, and the perpetrator was still at large. The court analyzed the statements as follows:

[T]he caller here described an emergency as it happened. First, she directed the operator's attention to Brown's condition, stating "[t]here's a dude that just got shot . . .", and " . . . the guy who shot him is still out there." Later in the call, she reiterated her concern that " . . . [t]here is somebody shot outside, somebody needs to be sent over here, and there's somebody runnin' around with a gun, somewhere." Any reasonable listener would know from this exchange that the operator and caller were dealing with an ongoing emergency, the resolution of which was paramount in the operator's interrogation. This fact is evidenced by the operator's repeatedly questioning the caller to determine who had the gun and where Brown lay injured. Further, the caller ended the conversation immediately upon the arrival of the police, indicating a level of interrogation that was significantly less formal than the testimonial statement in Crawford. Because the tape-recording of the call is nontestimonial, it does not implicate Thomas's right to confrontation.

See also United States v. Dodds, 569 F.3d 336 (7th Cir. 2009) (unidentified person’s identification of a person with a gun was not testimonial: “In this case, the police were responding to a 911 call reporting shots fired and had an urgent need to identify the person with the gun and to stop the shooting. The witness’s description of the man with a gun was given in that context, and we believe it falls within the scope of Davis.”).

Statement made by a child immediately after an assault on his mother was admissible as excited utterance and was not testimonial: United States v. Clifford, 791 F.3d 884 (8th Cir. 2015): In an assault trial, the court admitted a hearsay statement from the victim’s three-year-old son, made to a trusted adult, that the defendant “hurt mama.” The statement was made immediately after the event and the child was shaking and crying; the statement was in response to the adult asking “what happened?” The court of appeals held that the statement was admissible as an excited utterance and was not testimonial. There was no law enforcement involvement and the court noted that the defendant “identifies no case in which questions from a private individual acting without any direction from state officials were determined to be equivalent to police interrogation.” The court also noted that the interchange between the child and the adult was informal, and was in
response to an emergency. Finally, the court relied on the Supreme Court’s most recent decision in Ohio v. Clark:

As in Clark, the record here shows an informal, spontaneous conversation between a very young child and a private individual to determine how the victim had just been injured. [The child’s] age is significant since “statements by very young children will rarely, if ever, implicate the Confrontation Clause.”

911 calls and statements made to officers responding to the calls were not testimonial: United States v. Brun, 416 F.3d 703 (8th Cir. 2005): The defendant was charged with assault with a deadly weapon. The police received two 911 calls from the defendant’s home. One was from the defendant’s 12-year-old nephew, indicating that the defendant and his girlfriend were arguing, and requesting assistance. The other call came 20 minutes later, from the defendant’s girlfriend, indicating that the defendant was drunk and had a rifle, which he had fired in the house and then left. When officers responded to the calls, they found the girlfriend in the kitchen crying; she told the responding officers that the defendant had been drunk, and shot his rifle in the bathroom while she was in it. The court had little problem in finding that all three statements were properly admitted as excited utterances, and addressed whether the admission of the statements violated the defendant’s right to confrontation after Crawford. The court first found that the nephew’s 911 call was not testimonial because it was not the kind of statement that was equivalent to courtroom testimony. The court had “no doubt that the statements of an adolescent boy who has called 911 while witnessing an argument between his aunt and her partner escalate to an assault would be emotional and spontaneous rather than deliberate and calculated.” The court used similar reasoning to find that the girlfriend’s 911 call was not testimonial. The court also found that the girlfriend’s statement to the police was not testimonial. It reasoned that the girlfriend’s conversation with the officers “was unstructured, and not the product of police interrogation.”

Note: The court’s decision in Brun preceded the Supreme Court’s treatment of 911 calls and statements to responding officers in Davis/Hammon and then Bryant, but the analysis appears consistent with that of the Supreme Court. It is true that in Hammon the Court found statements by the victim to responding police officers to be testimonial, but that was largely because the police officers engaged in a structured interview about past criminal activity; in Brun the victim spoke spontaneously in response to an emergency. And the Court in Davis/Hammon acknowledged that statements to responding officers are non-testimonial if they were directed more toward dealing with an emergency than toward investigating or prosecuting a crime. The Brun decision is especially consistent with the pragmatic approach
to finding an emergency (and to the observation that emergency is only one factor in the primary motive test) that the Court found in *Michigan v. Bryant*.

**Statements made by mother to police, after her son was taken hostage, were not testimonial:** *United States v. Lira-Morales*, 759 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2014): The defendant was charged with hostage-taking and related crimes. At trial, the court admitted statements from the hostage’s mother, describing a telephone call with her son’s captors. The call was arranged as part of a sting operation to rescue the son. The court found that the mother’s statements to the officers about what the captors had said were not testimonial, because the primary motive for making the call --- and thus the report about it to the police officers --- was to rescue the son. The court noted that throughout the event the mother was “very nervous, shaking, and crying in response to continuous ransom demands and threats to her son’s life.” Thus the agents faced an “emergency situation” and “the primary purpose of the telephone call was to respond to these threats and to ensure [the son’s] safety.” The defendant argued that the statements were testimonial because an agent attempted, unsuccessfully, to record the call that they had set up. But the court rejected this argument, noting that the agent “primarily sought to record the call to obtain information about Aguilar’s location and to facilitate the plan to rescue Aguilar. Far from an attempt to build a case for prosecution, Agent Goyco’s actions were good police work directed at resolving a life-threatening hostage situation. * * * That Agent Goyco may have also recorded the call in part to build a criminal case does not alter our conclusion that the primary purpose of the call was to diffuse the emergency hostage situation.”

**Excited utterance not testimonial under the circumstances, even though made to law enforcement:** *Leavitt v. Arave*, 371 F.3d 663 (9th Cir. 2004): In a murder case, the government introduced the fact that the victim had called the police the night before her murder and stated that she had seen a prowler who she thought was the defendant. The court found that the victim’s statement was admissible as an excited utterance, as the victim was clearly upset and made the statement just after an attempted break-in. The court held that the statement was not testimonial under *Crawford*. The court explained as follows:

Although the question is close, we do not believe that Elg’s statements are of the kind with which *Crawford* was concerned, namely, testimonial statements. * * * Elg, not the police, initiated their interaction. She was in no way being interrogated by them but instead sought their help in ending a frightening intrusion into her home. Thus, we do not believe that the admission of her hearsay
statements against Leavitt implicate the principal evil at which the Confrontation Clause was directed: the civil-law mode of criminal procedure, and particularly its use of ex parte examinations as evidence against the accused.

Note: The court’s decision in Leavitt preceded the Supreme Court’s treatment of 911 calls and statements to responding officers in Davis/Hammon, but the analysis appears consistent with that of the Supreme Court. The Court in Davis/Hammon acknowledged that statements to responding officers are non-testimonial if they are directed toward dealing with an emergency rather than prosecuting a crime. It is especially consistent with the pragmatic approach to applying the primary motive test established in Michigan v. Bryant.

911 call that a man had put a gun to another person’s head was not testimonial: United States v. Hughes, 840 F.3d 1368 (11th Cir. 2016): In a felon-firearm prosecution, the trial court admitted a 911 call in which a bystander reported that the defendant had cocked a gun and put it to the head of a couple of people. The defendant argued that the 911 call was testimonial, but the court of appeals found no error. It concluded that “Hughes fails to distinguish the 911 caller’s statements from those in Davis in any way whatsoever.”
Expert Witnesses

Confusion over expert witnesses testifying on the basis of testimonial hearsay: Williams v. Illinois, 567 U.S. 50 (2012): This case is fully set forth in Part One. To summarize, the confusion is over whether an expert can, consistently with the Confrontation Clause, rely on testimonial hearsay so long as the hearsay is not explicitly introduced for its truth and the expert makes an independent judgment, i.e., is not just a conduit for the hearsay. That practice is permitted by Rule 703. Five members of the Court rejected the use of testimonial hearsay in this way, on the ground that it was based on an artificial distinction. But the plurality decision by Justice Alito embraces this Rule 703 analysis. At this stage, the answer appears to be that an expert can rely on testimonial hearsay so long as it is not in the form of an affidavit or certificate --- that proviso would then get Justice Thomas’s approval. As seen elsewhere in this outline, some courts have found Williams to have no precedential effect other than over cases that present the same facts as Williams. And many courts have held that the use of testimonial hearsay by an expert is permitted without regard to its formality, so long as the expert makes an independent conclusion and the hearsay itself is not admitted into evidence.

Expert’s reliance on testimonial hearsay does not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Law, 528 F.3d 888 (D.C. Cir. 2008): The court found that an expert’s testimony about the typical practices of narcotics dealers did not violate Crawford. While the testimony was based on interviews with informants, “Thomas testified based on his experience as a narcotics investigator; he did not relate statements by out-of-court declarants to the jury.”

Note: This opinion precedes Williams and is questionable if you count the votes in Williams. But the case is quite consistent with the Alito opinion in Williams and many --- allowing the expert to use testimonial hearsay as long as the hearsay is not introduced at trial and the expert is not simply parroting the hearsay. And lower courts are treating the Alito opinion as controlling on an expert’s reliance on testimonial hearsay.

Confrontation Clause violated where expert does no more that restate the results of a testimonial lab report: United States v. Ramos-Gonzalez, 664 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2011): In a drug case, a lab report indicated that substances found in the defendant’s vehicle tested positive for cocaine. The lab report was testimonial under Melendez-Diaz, and the person who conducted the test was not produced for trial. The government sought to avoid the Melendez-Diaz problem by calling an expert to testify to the results, but the court found that the defendant’s right to...
confrontation was nonetheless violated, because the expert did not make an independent assessment, but rather simply restated the report. The court explained as follows:

Where an expert witness employs her training and experience to forge an independent conclusion, albeit on the basis of inadmissible evidence, the likelihood of a Sixth Amendment infraction is minimal. Where an expert acts merely as a well-credentialed conduit for testimonial hearsay, however, the cases hold that her testimony violates a criminal defendant’s right to confrontation. See, e.g., United States v. Ayala, 601 F.3d 256, 275 (4th Cir.2010) ( “[Where] the expert is, in essence, ... merely acting as a transmitter for testimonial hearsay,” there is likely a Crawford violation); United States v. Johnson, 587 F.3d 625, 635 (4th Cir.2009) (same); United States v. Lombardo, 491 F.3d 61, 72 (2d Cir.2007) (“[T]he admission of [the expert's] testimony was error ... if he communicated out-of-court testimonial statements ... directly to the jury in the guise of an expert opinion.”). In this case, we need not wade too deeply into the thicket, because the testimony at issue here does not reside in the middle ground.

The government is hard-pressed to paint Morales's testimony as anything other than a recitation of Borrero's report. On direct examination, the prosecutor asked Morales to “say what are the results of the test,” and he did exactly that, responding “[b]oth bricks were positive for cocaine.” This colloquy leaves little room for interpretation. Morales was never asked, and consequently he did not provide, his independent expert opinion as to the nature of the substance in question. Instead, he simply parroted the conclusion of Borrero's report. Morales's testimony amounted to no more than the prohibited transmission of testimonial hearsay. While the interplay between the use of expert testimony and the Confrontation Clause will undoubtedly require further explication, the government cannot meet its Sixth Amendment obligations by relying on Rule 703 in the manner that it was employed here.

Note: Whatever Williams may mean, the court’s analysis in Ramos-Gonzalez surely remains valid. Five members of the Williams Court rejected the proposition that an expert can rely at all on testimonial hearsay even if the expert testifies to his own opinion. And even Justice Alito cautions that an expert may not testify if he does nothing more than parrot the testimonial hearsay.

Confrontation Clause not violated where testifying expert conducts his own testing that confirms the results of a testimonial report: United States v. Soto, 720 F.3d 51 (1st Cir. 2013): In a prosecution for identity theft and related offenses, a technician did a review of the defendant’s laptop and came to conclusions that inculpated the defendant. At trial, a different expert testified
that he did the same test and it came out exactly the same as the test done by the absent technician. The defendant argued that this was surrogate testimony that violated *Bullcoming v. New Mexico*, in which the Court held that production of a surrogate who simply reported testimonial hearsay did not satisfy the Confrontation Clause. But the court disagreed:

Agent Pickett did not testify as a surrogate witness for Agent Murphy. **Unlike in *Bullcoming*, Agent Murphy's forensic report was not introduced into evidence through Agent Pickett. Agent Pickett testified about a conclusion he drew from his own independent examination of the hard drive. The government did not need to get Agent Murphy's report into evidence through Agent Pickett. We do not interpret *Bullcoming* to mean that the agent who testifies against the defendant cannot know about another agent's prior examination or that agent's results when he conducts his examination. The government may ask an agent to replicate a forensic examination if the agent who did the initial examination is unable to testify at trial, so long as the agent who testifies conducts an independent examination and testifies to his own results.

The court reviewed the votes in *Bullcoming* and found that “it appears that six justices would find no Sixth Amendment violation when a second analyst retests evidence and testifies at trial about her conclusions about her independent examination.” This count resulted from the fact that Justice Ginsburg, joined by Justice Scalia, stated that the Confrontation problem in *Bullcoming* could have been avoided if the testifying expert had simply retested the substance and testified on the basis of the retest.

The *Soto* court did express concern, however, that the testifying expert did more than simply replicate the results of the prior test: he also testified that the tests came to identical results:

Soto's argument that Agent Murphy's report bolstered Agent Pickett's testimony hits closer to the mark. At trial, Agent Pickett testified that the incriminating documents in Exhibit 20 were found on a laptop that was seized from Soto's car. Although Agent Pickett had independent knowledge of that fact, he testified that "everything that was in John Murphy's report was exactly the way he said it was," and that Exhibit 20 "was contained in the same folder that John Murphy had said that he had found it in." **These two out-of-court statements attributed to Agent Murphy were arguably testimonial and offered for their truth. Agent Pickett testified about the substance of Agent Murphy's report which Agent Murphy prepared for use in Soto's trial.** **Agent Pickett's testimony about Agent Murphy's prior examination of the hard drive bolstered Agent Pickett's independent conclusion that the Exhibit 20 documents were found on Soto's hard drive.**

But the court found no plain error, in large part because the bolstering was cumulative.
See also Barbosa v. Mitchell, 812 F.3d 62 (1st Cir. 2016): On habeas review, the court found it not clearly established that expert reliance on a testimonial lab report violates the Confrontation Clause. The defendant was convicted in the time between Melendez-Diaz and Williams. The Court held that, “[t]o the contrary, four Justices [in Williams] later read Melendez-Diaz as not establishing at all, much less beyond doubt” the principle that such testimony violates the Confrontation Clause.

Testimony by lay witnesses that they had seen lab reports does not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Ocean, 904 f.3d 25 (1st Cir. 2018): In a drug prosecution, police officers testifying as lay witnesses, identified the substance found on the defendant as drugs. The government did not introduce lab reports and the witnesses did not refer to them on direct examination. On cross, the officers testified that they had seen lab reports. The court found no confrontation violation because the government never sought to offer the reports into evidence and the witnesses did not rely on the reports.

Expert reliance on a manufacturing label to conclude on point of origin did not violate the Confrontation Clause, because the label was not testimonial: United States v. Torres-Colon, 790 F.3d 26 (1st Cir. 2015): In a trial on a charge of unlawful possession of a firearm, the government’s expert testified that the firearm was made in Austria. He relied on a manufacturing inscription on the firearm that stated “made in Austria.” The court found no confrontation violation in the expert’s testimony. The statement on the firearm was clearly not made by the manufacturer with the primary purpose of use in a criminal prosecution.

No relief under AEDPA where expert relied on informal notations regarding testing of buccal swab: Washington v. Griffin, 876 F.3d 395 (2nd Cir. 2017) (Livingston, J.): In this habeas petition, the constitutional challenge in state court presented facts close to those of Williams: a buccal swab of the defendant was subjected to DNA testing, and an expert relied on notations by lab personnel indicating the process of extraction, amplification, and chain of custody. The expert who testified was not involved in conducting or supervising that process, but the expert did conduct her own review and made an independent conclusion that the DNA from the buccal swab matched the DNA from the crime scene. The court held that the petitioner had not established a clear violation of the Confrontation Clause --- as required under AEDPA --- when the state court allowed the expert to testify and did not require production of the lab analysts. The court found that Melendez-Diaz and Bullcoming were distinguishable because “Washington does not rely on a lab analyst’s affidavit, as in Melendez-Diaz, or on the formal certificate of an analyst attesting to his results, as in Bullcoming, to make out his constitutional claim. He instead points to a medley of unsworn, uncertified notations by often unspecified lab personnel ** . Such notations, standing
alone, are potentially as suggestive of a purpose to record tasks, in order to accomplish the lab’s work, as of any purpose to make an out-of-court statement for admission at trial.” The court also noted that the lab reports on the buccal swab were never entered into evidence. The court found that the disarray in Williams only highlighted the fact that the state court had not violated clearly established law in allowing the expert to testify and not requiring the lab analysts to do so.

Judge Katzmann, concurring, suggested that the prosecution could avoid any litigation risk by simply having the expert supervise a new test when the case is going to trial. He noted, and the court agreed, that the supervising analyst “need not conduct every step of the process herself. Instead, by supervising the process, she could personally attest to the extraction and correct labeling of the sample, that a proper chain of custody was maintained, and that the DNA profile match was in fact a comparison of the defendant’s DNA to that of the DNA found on the crime scene evidence.

**Expert’s reliance on out-of-court accusations does not violate Crawford, unless the accusations are directly presented to the jury:** *United States v. Lombardozzi*, 491 F.3d 61 (2nd Cir. 2007): The court stated that Crawford is inapplicable if testimonial statements are not used for their truth, and that “it is permissible for an expert witness to form an opinion by applying her expertise because, in that limited instance, the evidence is not being presented for the truth of the matter asserted.” The court concluded that the expert’s testimony would violate the Confrontation Clause “only if he communicated out-of-court testimonial statements . . . directly to the jury in the guise of an expert opinion.” See also *United States v. Mejia*, 545 F.3d 179 (2nd Cir. 2008) (violation of Confrontation Clause where expert directly relates statements made by drug dealers during an interrogation).

**Statements made to psychiatric expert were testimonial and were used by the jury for their truth at trial:** *Lambert v. Warden*, 861 F.3d 459 (3rd Cir. 2017): Tillman shot two people and Lambert drove him to and from the crime. Tillman challenged his mental capacity and called a psychiatric expert to whom he made statements. Tillman did not testify at trial. The court found that the jury may have used these statements, related inferentially in the expert’s testimony, against Lambert for their truth --- in which case there would have been a confrontation violation. The government argued that the statements were not offered to prove anything, only for judging the expert’s opinion, but the court found that in the context of the case this was not a “legitimate” not for truth purpose --- the prosecutor raised the statements as inferential proof of Lambert’s involvement and the trial court gave no limiting instruction. The court remanded for an assessment of whether the defense counsel’s failure to object constituted ineffective assistance of counsel.
Expert reliance on printout from machine does not violate *Crawford: United States v. Summers*, 666 F.3d 192 (4th Cir. 2011): The defendant objected to the admission of DNA testing performed on a jacket that linked him to drug trafficking. The court first considered whether the Confrontation Clause was violated by the government’s failure to call the FBI lab employees who signed the internal log documenting custody of the jacket. The court found no error in admitting the log, because chain-of-custody evidence had been introduced by the defense and therefore the defendant had opened the door to rebuttal. The court next considered whether the Confrontation Clause was violated by testimony of an expert who relied on DNA testing results by lab analysts who were not produced at trial. The court again found no error. It emphasized that the expert did his own testing, and his reliance on the report was limited to a “pure instrument read-out.” The court stated that “[t]he numerical identifiers of the DNA allele here, insofar as they are nothing more than raw data produced by a machine” should be treated the same as gas chromatograph data, which the courts have held to be non-testimonial. See also *United States v. Shanton*, 2013 WL 781939 (4th Cir.) (Unpublished) (finding that the result concerning the admissibility of the expert testimony in *Summers* was unaffected by *Williams*: “[W]e believe five justices would affirm: Justice Thomas on the ground that the statements at issue were not testimonial and Justice Alito, along with the three justices who joined his plurality opinion, on the ground that the statements were not admitted for the truth of the matter asserted.”).
Expert reliance on confidential informants in interpreting coded conversation does not violate *Crawford: United States v. Johnson*, 587 F.3d 625 (4th Cir. 2009): The court found no error in admitting expert testimony that decoded terms used by the defendants and coconspirators during recorded telephone conversations. The defendant argued that the experts relied on hearsay statements by cooperators to help them reach a conclusion about the meaning of particular conversations. The defendant asserted that the experts were therefore relying on testimonial hearsay. The court recognized that it is “appropriate to recognize the risk that a particular expert might become nothing more than a transmitter of testimonial hearsay.” But in this case, the experts never made reference to their interviews, and the jury heard no testimonial hearsay. “Instead, each expert presented his independent judgment and specialized understanding to the jury.” Because the experts “did not become mere conduits” for the testimonial hearsay, their consideration of that hearsay “poses no Crawford problem.” *Accord United States v. Ayala*, 601 F.3d 256 (4th Cir. 2010) (no violation of the Confrontation Clause where the experts “did not act as mere transmitters and in fact did not repeat statements of particular declarants to the jury.”). *Accord United States v Palacios*, 677 F.3d 234 (4th Cir. 2012): Expert testimony on operation of a criminal enterprise, based in part on interviews with members, did not violate the Confrontation Clause because the expert “did not specifically reference” any of the testimonial interviews during his testimony, and simply relied on them as well as other information to give his own opinion.

Note: These cases are in doubt if you count the votes in *Williams*, but most courts have come to the same result after *Williams*: Finding no confrontation problem where an expert relies on testimonial hearsay, so long as the hearsay is not admitted into evidence and the expert draws his own conclusion from the data (rather than just parroting it).

Expert testimony translating coded conversations violated the right to confrontation where the government failed to make a sufficient showing that the expert was relying on her own evaluations rather than those of informants: *United States v. Garcia*, 752 F.3d 382 (4th Cir. 2014): The court reversed drug convictions in part because the law enforcement expert who translated purportedly coded conversations had relied, in coming to her conclusion, on input from coconspirators whom she had debriefed. The court distinguished *Johnson, supra*, on the ground that in this case the government had not done enough to show that the expert had conducted her own independent analysis in reaching her conclusions as to the meaning of certain conversations. The court noted that “the question is whether the expert is, in essence, giving an independent judgment or merely acting as a transmitter for testimonial hearsay.” In this case, “we cannot say that Agent Dayton was giving such independent judgments. While it is true she never made direct reference to the content of her interviews, this could just as well have been the result of the Government’s failure to elicit a proper foundation for Agent Dayton’s interpretations.”
government argued that the information from the coconspirators only served to confirm the Agent’s interpretations after the fact, but the court concluded that “[t]he record is devoid of evidence that this was, in fact, the sequence of Dayton’s analysis, to Garcia’s prejudice.” Compare United States v. Smith, 919 F.3d 825 (4th Cir. 2019) (expert translating coded conversation was not acting as a conduit; he was “not simply replaying the conspirators’ interpretations” but rather relying on his own expertise, and “exercised his judgment independent of any later debriefings”).

Expert testimony on gangs, based in part on testimonial hearsay, did not violate the Confrontation Clause when the hearsay was not transmitted to the jury: United States v. Rios, 830 F.3d 403 (6th Cir. 2016): In a prosecution of Latin Kings gang members for racketeering and drug offenses, the court found it was not error to allow a law enforcement officer to testify as an expert about the organization of the gang. The testimony was based in large part on listening to jail conversations and interviewing former members. The court found no violation of the Confrontation Clause to the extent the underlying statements were not transmitted to the jury. The one instance in which a statement was related to the jury was found to be harmless error.

Expert opinion based in part on information learned during custodial interrogation did not violate Crawford where expert was more than a conduit: United States v. Lockhart, 844 F.3d 501 (5th Cir. 2016): In a sex trafficking prosecution, an officer testified as an expert that the defendants were gang members. The defendant argued that the testimony violated his right to confrontation because the officer, in reaching his conclusion, relied on statements made during custodial interrogations, as well as statements of other officers describing their experiences during interrogations. But the court found no error. The court explained that Crawford “in no way prevents expert witnesses from offering their independent judgments merely because those judgments were in some part informed by their exposure to otherwise inadmissible evidence.” It further stated that “when the expert witness has consulted numerous sources, and uses that information, together with his own professional knowledge and experience, to arrive at his opinion, that opinion is regarded as evidence in its own right and not as hearsay in disguise.” The court concluded that in this case the expert “did not serve as a conduit for inadmissible testimonial hearsay.”

Expert testimony by technical reviewer, rather than the case analyst, does not clearly violate the Confrontation Clause: Jenkins v. Hall, 910 F.3d 828 (5th Cir. 2018): In a drug prosecution, the case analyst weighed the drug and the supervisor testified to the weight on the basis of reviewing the case analyst’s technical data. The court found no confrontation violation under the AEDPA standard of review. The court found Bullcoming to be distinguishable because in that case the supervisor who testified did not review the technical data and come to his own
conclusion. Accord Grim v. Fisher, 816 F.3d 296 (5th Cir. 2016) (no clear confrontation violation where the supervisor “examined the analyst’s report and all of the data, including everything the analyst did to the item of evidence; ensured that the analyst did the proper tests and that the analyst’s interpretation of the test results was correct; agreed . . . with the examinations and results of the report; and signed the report.”)

Police officer’s reliance on statements from people he had arrested for drug crimes did not violate Crawford: United States v. Collins, 799 F.3d 554 (6th Cir. 2015): In a trial involving manufacture of methamphetamine, a law enforcement officer testified as an expert on the conversion ratio between pseudoephedrine and methamphetamine. He relied in part on statements from people he had interviewed after he had arrested them for manufacturing methamphetamine. The court found no plain error because there was “no evidence that the suspected methamphetamine manufacturers Agent O’Neil questioned throughout his career ‘intended to bear testimony’ against Collins or his co-defendants.” Thus the expert was not relying on testimonial hearsay.

Note: The court appears to be applying --- maybe without realizing it --- Justice Alito’s definition of testimoniality in Williams. The court is saying that the arrestees did not target their testimony toward the defendant. But under the view of five Justices in Williams, the statements of the arrestees would probably be testimonial, as they were under arrest --- just like Mrs. Crawford --- and the statements could be thought to be motivated toward some criminal prosecution.

Expert reliance on printout from machine and another expert’s lab notes does not violate Crawford: United States v. Moon, 512 F.3d 359 (7th Cir. 2008): The court held that an expert’s testimony about readings taken from an infrared spectrometer and a gas chromatograph (which determined that the substance taken from the defendant was narcotics) did not violate Crawford because “data is not ‘statements’ in any useful sense. Nor is a machine a ‘witness against’ anyone.” Moreover, the expert’s reliance on another expert’s lab notes did not violate Crawford because the court concluded that an expert is permitted to rely on hearsay (including testimonial hearsay) in reaching his conclusion. The court noted that the defendant could “insist that the data underlying an expert’s testimony be admitted, see Fed.R.Evid. 705, but by offering the evidence themselves defendants would waive any objection under the Confrontation Clause.” The court observed that the notes of the chemist, evaluating the data from the machine, were testimonial and should not have been independently admitted, but it found no plain error in the admission of these notes.
Note: The court makes two holdings in *Moon.* The first is that expert reliance on a machine output does not violate *Crawford* because the machine is not a witness. That holding appears unaffected by *Williams* --- at least it can be said that *Williams* says nothing about whether machine output is testimony. The second holding, that an expert’s reliance on lab notes he did not prepare, is at the heart of *Williams.* It would appear that such a practice would be permissible even after *Williams* because 1) post-*Williams* courts have found that an expert may rely on testimonial hearsay so long as the expert does his own analysis and the hearsay is not introduced at trial; and 2) in any case, lab “notes” are not certificates or affidavits so they do not appear to be the kind of formalized statement that Justice Thomas finds to be testimonial.

Expert reliance on drug test conducted by another does not violate the Confrontation Clause --- though on remand from *Williams* the court states that part of the expert’s testimony might have violated the Confrontation Clause, but finds harmless error: *United States v. Turner,* 591 F.3d 928 (7th Cir. 2010), on remand from Supreme Court, 709 F.3d 1187 (7th Cir. 2013) : At the defendant’s drug trial, the government called a chemist to testify about the tests conducted on the substance seized from the defendant --- the tests indicating that it was cocaine. The defendant objected that the witness did not conduct the tests and was relying on testimonial statements from other chemists, in violation of *Crawford.* The court found no error, emphasizing that no statements of the official who actually tested the substance were admitted at trial, and that the witness unequivocally established that his opinions about the test reports were his own.

Note: The Supreme Court vacated the decision in *Turner* and remanded for reconsideration in light of *Williams.* On remand, the court declared that while a rule from *Williams* was difficult to divine, it at a minimum “casts doubt on using expert testimony in place of testimony from an analyst who actually examined and tested evidence bearing on a defendant's guilt, insofar as the expert is asked about matters which lie solely within the testing analyst's knowledge.” But the court noted that even after *Williams,* much of what the expert testified to was permissible because it was based on personal knowledge:

We note that the bulk of Block's testimony was permissible. Block testified as both a fact and an expert witness. In his capacity as a supervisor at the state crime laboratory, he described the procedures and safeguards that employees of the laboratory observe in handling substances submitted for analysis. He also noted that he reviewed Hanson's work in this case pursuant to the laboratory's standard peer review procedure. As an expert forensic chemist, he went on to explain for the jury how suspect substances are tested using gas chromatography, mass spectrometry, and infrared spectroscopy to yield data from which the nature of the substance may be determined. He then opined, based on his experience and expertise, that the data Hanson had produced in testing
the substances that Turner distributed to the undercover officer-introduced at trial as Government Exhibits 1, 2, and 3-indicated that the substances contained cocaine base. * * *

As we explained in our prior decision, an expert who gives testimony about the nature of a suspected controlled substance may rely on information gathered and produced by an analyst who does not himself testify. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 703, the information on which the expert bases his opinion need not itself be admissible into evidence in order for the expert to testify. Thus, the government could establish through Block's expert testimony what the data produced by Hanson's testing revealed concerning the nature of the substances that Turner distributed, without having to introduce either Hanson's documentation of her analysis or testimony from Hanson herself. And because the government did not introduce Hanson's report, notes, or test results into evidence, Turner was not deprived of his rights under the Sixth Amendment's Confrontation Clause simply because Block relied on the data contained in those documents in forming his opinion. Nothing in the Supreme Court's Williams decision undermines this aspect of our decision. On the contrary, Justice Alito's plurality opinion in Williams expressly endorses the notion that an appropriately credentialed individual may give expert testimony as to the significance of data produced by another analyst. Nothing in either Justice Thomas's concurrence or in Justice Kagan's dissent takes issue with this aspect of the plurality's reasoning. Moreover, as we have indicated, Block in part testified in his capacity as Hanson's supervisor, describing both the procedures and safeguards that employees of the state laboratory are expected to follow and the steps that he took to peer review Hanson's work in this case. Block's testimony on these points, which were within his personal knowledge, posed no Confrontation Clause problem.

The Turner court on remand saw two Confrontation problems in the expert’s testimony: 1) his statement that Hanson followed standard procedures in testing the substances that Turner distributed to the undercover officer, and 2) his testimony that he reached the same conclusion about the nature of the substances that the analyst did. The court held that on those two points, “Block necessarily was relying on out-of-court statements contained in Hanson's notes and report. These portions of Block's testimony strengthened the government's case; and, conversely, their exclusion would have diminished the quantity and quality of evidence showing that the substances Turner distributed comprised cocaine base in the form of crack cocaine.” And while the case was much like Williams, the court found two distinguishing factors: 1) it was tried to a jury, thus raising a question of whether Justice Alito’s not-for-truth analysis was fully applicable; and 2) the test was conducted with a suspect in mind, as Turner had been arrested with the substances to be tested in his possession. The defendant also argued that the report was “certified” and so was formal under the Thomas view. But the court noted that the analysts did not formally certify the results --- the certification was made by the Attorney General to the effect that the report was a correct copy of the report. Yet the court implied that it was sufficiently formal in any
case, because it was “both official and signed, it constituted a formal record of the result of the laboratory tests that Hanson had performed, and it was clearly designed to memorialize that result for purposes of the pending legal proceeding against Turner, who was named in the report.”

Ultimately the court found it unnecessary to decide whether the defendant’s Confrontation rights were violated because the error, if any, in the use of the analyst’s report was harmless.

No confrontation violation where expert did not testify that he relied on a testimonial report: United States v. Maxwell, 724 F.3d 724 (7th Cir. 2013): In a narcotics prosecution, the analyst from the Wisconsin State Crime Laboratory who originally tested the substance seized from Maxwell retired before trial, so the government offered the testimony of his co-worker instead. The coworker did not personally analyze the substance herself, but concluded that it contained crack cocaine after reviewing the data generated by the original analyst. The court found no plain error in permitting this testimony, explaining that there could be no Confrontation problem, even after Bullcoming and Williams, where there is no testimony that the expert relied on the report:

What makes this case different (and relatively more straightforward) from those we have dealt with in the past is that Gee did not read from Nied's report while testifying ***, she did not vouch for whether Nied followed standard testing procedures or state that she reached the same conclusion as Nied about the nature of the substance (as in Turner), and the government did not introduce Nied's report itself or any readings taken from the instruments he used (as in Moon). Maxwell argues that Nied's forensic analysis is testimonial, but Gee never said she relied on Nied's report or his interpretation of the data in reaching her own conclusion. Instead, Gee simply testified (1) about how evidence in the crime lab is typically tested when determining whether it contains a controlled substance, (2) that she had reviewed the data generated for the material in this case, and (3) that she reached an independent conclusion that the substance contained cocaine base after reviewing that data.

The court concluded that concluded that “Maxwell was not deprived of his Sixth Amendment right simply by virtue of the fact that Gee relied on Nied’s data in reaching her own conclusions, especially since she never mentioned what conclusions Nied reached about the substance.”

Expert’s reliance on report of another law enforcement agency did not violate the right to confrontation: United States v. Huether, 673 F.3d 789 (8th Cir. 2012): In a trial on charges of
sexual exploitation of minors, an expert testified in part on the basis of a report by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The court found no confrontation violation because the NCMEC report was not introduced into evidence and the expert drew his own conclusion and was not a conduit for the hearsay.

No confrontation violation where expert who testified did so on the basis of his own retesting: United States v. Ortega, 750 F.3d 1020 (8th Cir. 2014): In a drug conspiracy prosecution, the defendant argued that his right to confrontation was violated because the expert who testified at trial that the substances seized from a coconspirator’s car were narcotics had tested composite samples that another chemist had produced from the substances found in the car. But the court found no error, because the testifying expert had personally conducted his own test of the composite substances, and the original report of the other chemist who prepared the composite (and who concluded the substances were narcotics) was not offered by the government; nor was the testifying expert asked about the original test. The court noted that any objection about the composite really went to the chain of custody --- whether the composite tested by the expert witness was in fact derived from what was found in the car --- and the court observed that “it is up to the prosecution to decide what steps are so crucial as to require evidence.” The defendant made no showing of bad faith or evidence tampering, and so any question about the chain of custody was one of weight and not admissibility. Moreover, the government’s introduction of the original chemist’s statement about creating the composite sample did not violate the Confrontation Clause because “chain of custody alone does not implicated the Confrontation Clause” as it is “not a testimonial statement offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted.”

No Confrontation Clause violation where expert’s opinion was based on his own assessment and not on the testimonial hearsay: United States v. Vera, 770 F.3d 1232 (9th Cir. 2014): Appealing from convictions for drug offenses, the defendants argued that the testimony of a prosecution expert on gangs violated the Confrontation Clause because it was nothing but a conduit for testimonial hearsay from former gang members. The court agreed with the premise that expert testimony violates the Confrontation Clause when the expert “is used as little more than a conduit or transmitter for testimonial hearsay, rather than as a true expert whose considered opinion sheds light on some specialized factual situation.” But the court disagreed that the expert operated as a conduit in this case. The court found that the witness relied on his extensive experience with gangs and that his opinion “was not merely repackaged testimonial hearsay but was an original product that could have been tested through cross-examination.”
Expert’s reliance on notes prepared by lab technicians did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Pablo, 625 F.3d 1285 (10th Cir. 2010), on remand for reconsideration under Williams, 696 F.3d 1280 (10th Cir. 2012): The defendant was tried for rape and other charges. Two lab analysts conducted tests on the rape kit and concluded that the DNA found at the scene matched the defendant. The defendant complained that the lab results were introduced through the testimony of a forensic expert and the lab analysts were not produced for cross-examination. In the original appeal the court found no plain error, reasoning that the notes of the lab analysts were not admitted into evidence and were never offered for their truth. To the extent they were discussed before the jury, it was only to describe the basis of the expert’s opinion --- which the court found to be permissible under Rule 703. The court observed that “[t]he extent to which an expert witness may disclose to a jury otherwise inadmissible testimonial hearsay without implicating a defendant’s confrontation rights * * * is a matter of degree.” According to the court, if an expert “simply parrots another individual’s testimonial hearsay, rather than conveying her own independent judgment that only incidentally discloses testimonial hearsay to assist the jury in evaluating her opinion, then the expert is, in effect, disclosing the testimonial hearsay for its substantive truth and she becomes little more than a backdoor conduit for otherwise inadmissible testimonial hearsay.” In this case the court, applying the plain error standard, found insufficient indication that the expert had operated solely as a conduit for testimonial hearsay.

Pablo was vacated for reconsideration in light of Williams. On remand, the court once again affirmed the conviction. The court stated that “we need not decide the precise mandates and limits of Williams, to the extent they exist.” The court noted that five members of the Williams Court “might find” that the expert’s reliance on the lab test in this case was for its truth. But “we cannot say the district court plainly erred in admitting Ms. Snider’s testimony, as it is not plain that a majority of the Supreme Court would have found reversible error with the challenged admission.” The court explained as follows in a parsing of Williams:

On the contrary, it appears that five Justices would affirm the district court in this case, albeit with different Justices relying on different rationales as they did in Williams. The four-Justice plurality in Williams likely would determine that Ms. Snider’s testimony was not offered for the truth of the matter asserted in Ms. Dick’s report, but rather was offered for the separate purpose of evaluating Ms. Snider’s credibility as an expert witness per Fed.R.Evid. 703; and therefore that the admission of her testimony did not offend the Confrontation Clause. Meanwhile, although Justice Thomas likely would conclude that the testimony was being offered for the truth of the matter asserted, he likely would further determine that the testimony was nevertheless constitutionally admissible because the appellate record does not show that the report was certified, sworn to, or otherwise imbued with the requisite “solemnity” required for the statements therein to be considered testimonial for purposes of the Confrontation Clause. Since Ms. Dick’s report is not a part of the appellate record, we naturally cannot say that it plainly would meet Justice Thomas’s solemnity
test. In sum, it is not clear or obvious under current law that the district court erred in admitting Ms. Snider's testimony, so reversal is unwarranted on this basis.

The Pablo court on remand concluded that “the manner in which, and degree to which, an expert may merely rely upon, and reference during her in-court expert testimony, the out-of-court testimonial conclusions in a lab report made by another person not called as a witness is a nuanced legal issue without clearly established bright line parameters, particularly in light of the discordant 4-1-4 divide of opinions in Williams.”

**Expert’s testimony on gang structure and practice did not violate the Confrontation Clause even though it was based in part on testimonial hearsay, where expert applied his own expertise.** United States v. Kamahele, 748 F.3d 984 (10th Cir. 2014): Appealing from convictions for gang-related activity, the defendants argued that a government expert’s testimony about the structure and operation of the gang violated the Confrontation Clause because it was based in part on interviews with cooperating witnesses and other gang members. The court found no error and affirmed, concluding that the admission of expert testimony violates the Confrontation Clause “only when the expert is simply parroting a testimonial fact.” The court noted that in this case the expert “applied his expertise, formed by years of experience and multiple sources, to provide an independently formed opinion.” Therefore, no testimonial hearsay was offered for its truth against the defendant. Compare United States v. Garcia, 793 F.3d 1194 (10th Cir. 2015) (gang-expert’s testimony violated the Confrontation Clause, where he parroted statements from former gang members that were testimonial hearsay: “The government cannot plausibly argue that Webb applied his expertise to this statement. It involves no interpretation of gang culture or iconography, no calibrated judgment based on years of experience and the synthesis of multiple sources of information. He simply relayed what DV gang members told him. Admission of the testimony violated the Confrontation Clause.”).

**Forfeiture**

**Constitutional standard for forfeiture --- like Rule 804(b)(6) --- requires a showing that the defendant acted wrongfully with the intent to keep the witness from testifying:** Giles v. California, 554 U.S. 353 (2008): The Court held that a defendant does not forfeit his constitutional right to confront testimonial hearsay unless the government shows that the defendant engaged in wrongdoing designed to keep the witness from testifying at trial. Giles was charged with the murder of his former girlfriend. A short time before the murder, Giles had assaulted the victim, and she made statements to the police implicating Giles in that assault. The victim’s hearsay statements
were admitted against the defendant on the ground that he had forfeited his right to invoke the Confrontation Clause, because he murdered the victim. The government made no showing that Giles murdered the victim with the intent to keep her from testifying. The Court found an intent-to-procure requirement in the common law, and therefore, under the historical analysis mandated by *Crawford*, there is necessarily an intent-to-procure requirement for forfeiture of confrontation rights. Also, at one point in the opinion, the Court in dictum stated that “statements to friends and neighbors about abuse and intimidation, and statements to physicians in the course of receiving treatment,” are not testimonial --- presumably because the primary motivation for making such statements is for something other than use at trial.

**Murder of witness by co-conspirators as a sanction to protect the conspiracy against testimony constitutes forfeiture of both hearsay and Confrontation Clause objections: United States v. Martinez**, 476 F.3d 961 (D. Cir. 2007): Affirming drug and conspiracy convictions, the court found no error in the admission of hearsay statements made to the DEA by an informant involved with the defendant’s drug conspiracy. The trial court found by a preponderance of the evidence that the informant was murdered by members of the defendant’s conspiracy, in part to procure his unavailability as a witness. The court of appeals affirmed this finding --- rejecting the defendant’s argument that forfeiture could not be found because his co-conspirators would have murdered the informant anyway, due to his role in the loss of a drug shipment. The court stated that it is “surely reasonable to conclude that anyone who murders an informant does so intending *both* to exact revenge *and* to prevent the informant from disclosing further information and testifying.” It concluded that the defendant’s argument would have the “perverse consequence” of allowing criminals to avoid forfeiture if they could articulate more than one bad motivation for disposing of a witness. Finally, the court held that forfeiture under Rule 804(b)(6) by definition constituted forfeiture of the Confrontation Clause objection. It stated that *Crawford* and *Davis* “foreclose” the possibility that the admission of evidence under Rule 804(b)(6) could nonetheless violate the Confrontation Clause.

**Fleeing prosecution constitutes forfeiture: United States v. Ponzo**, 853 F.3d 558 (1st Cir. 2017): At the defendant’s racketeering trial the government offered prior testimony of a witness from the trial of the defendant’s coconspirators. The defendant was not tried with his coconspirators because he had fled prosecution. By the time he was caught and tried, the witness had died. The defendant argued that admitting the dead witness’s testimony at his trial violated his right to confrontation, but the court found that the defendant had forfeited that right by absenting himself from the prior trial. It reasoned as follows: “Had Ponzo been at the 1988 trial, he could have cross-examined Hildonen. But like a defendant who obtains a witness’s absence by killing him, by fleeing and
remaining on the lam for years, Ponzo effectively schemed to silence Hildonen’s testimony against him. And Hildonen’s subsequent unavailability signifies the success of that scheming. So Ponzo forfeited his confrontation rights. To hold otherwise would allow Ponzo to profit from his own wrong and would undermine the integrity of the criminal-trial system --- which we cannot allow.”

**Forfeiture through veiled threats and prior history of violence: United States v. Pratt,** 915 F.3d 266 (4th Cir. 2019): Appealing convictions for sex trafficking and child pornography, the defendant argued that it was error to admit a hearsay statement made by one of the trafficking victims to a police officer. The court found no error in the trial court’s determination that the defendant had forfeited his hearsay objection and also his right to confrontation. The defendant called the victim three times while he was in jail --- in violation of the magistrate judge’s order not to contact her. The court noted that “[a]s an ineffective ruse, Pratt would pretend to be talking to someone other than” the victim; in each of the calls he urged her to deny any knowledge, and his instructions sounded like “veiled threats.” This was particularly so “against the backdrop of several women at trial who detailed how Pratt would beat prostitutes --- including [the declarant] --- whom he considered disobedient.” The court concluded that these threats, in the context of a history of violence toward the victim, caused the victim not to testify. It recognized that the victim might have had another motivation for refusing to testify: her feelings for the defendant, whom she considered to be her boyfriend. But the court noted that “those feelings were tied up in the same abusive relationship.”

**Fact that defendant had multiple reasons for killing a witness does not preclude a finding of forfeiture: United States v. Jackson,** 706 F.3d 262 (4th Cir. 2013): The defendant argued that the constitutional right to confrontation can be forfeited only when a defendant was motivated exclusively by a desire to silence a witness. (In this case the defendant argued that while he murdered a witness to silence him, he had additional reasons, including preventing the witness from harming the defendant’s drug operation and as retaliation for robbing one of the defendant’s friends.) The court rejected the argument, finding nothing in Giles to support it. To the contrary, the Court in Giles reasoned that the common law forfeiture rule was designed to prevent the defendant from profiting from his own wrong. Moreover, under a multiple-motive exception to forfeiture, defendants might be tempted to murder witnesses and then cook up another motive for the murder after the fact.

**Forfeiture can be found on the basis of Pinkerton liability: United States v. Dinkins,** 691 F.3d 358 (4th Cir. 2012): The court found that the defendant had forfeited his right of confrontation when a witness was killed by a coconspirator as an act to further the conspiracy by silencing the
witness. The court concluded that in light of *Pinkerton* liability, “the Constitution does not guarantee an accused person against the legitimate consequence of his own wrongful acts.”

**Retaliatory murder of witnesses who testified against the accused in a prior case is not a forfeiture in the trial for murdering the witnesses: United States v. Henderson, 626 F.3d 626 (6th Cir. 2010):** The defendant was convicted of bank robbery after two people (including his accomplice) testified against him. Shortly after the defendant was released from prison, the two witnesses were found murdered. At the trial for killing the two witnesses, the government offered statements made by the victims to police officers during the investigation of the bank robbery. These statements concerned their cooperation and threats made by the defendant. The trial judge admitted the statements after finding by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant killed the witnesses. That decision, grounded in forfeiture, was made before *Giles* was decided. On appeal, the court found error under *Giles* because “Bass and Washington could not have been killed, in 1996 and 1998, respectively, to prevent them from testifying against [the defendant] in the bank robbery prosecution in 1981.” Thus there was no showing of intent to keep the witnesses from testifying, as *Giles* requires for a finding of forfeiture. The court found the errors to be harmless.

**Forfeiture of confrontation rights, like forfeiture under Federal Rule 804(b)(6), is found upon a showing by a preponderance of the evidence: United States v. Johnson, 767 F.3d 815 (9th Cir. 2014):** The court affirmed convictions for murder and armed robbery. At trial hearsay testimony of an unavailable witness was admitted against the defendant, after the government made a showing that the defendant had threatened the witness; the trial court found that the defendant had forfeited his right under both the hearsay rule and the Confrontation Clause to object to the hearsay. The court found no error. It held that a forfeiture of the right to object under the hearsay rule and under the Confrontation Clause is governed by the same standard: the government must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant acted wrongfully to cause the unavailability of a government witness, with the intent that the witness would not testify at trial. The defendant argued that the Constitution requires a showing of clear and convincing evidence before forfeiture of a right to confrontation can be found. But the court disagreed. It noted that a clear and convincing evidence standard had been applied by some lower courts when the Confrontation Clause regulated the admission of unreliable hearsay. But now, after *Crawford v. Washington*, the Confrontation Clause does not bar unreliable hearsay from being admitted; rather it regulates testimonial hearsay. The court stated that after *Crawford*, “the forfeiture exception is consistent with the Confrontation Clause, not because it is a means for determining whether hearsay is reliable, but because it is an equitable doctrine designed to prevent defendants from profiting from their own wrongdoing.” The court also noted that the Supreme Court’s post-
Crawford decisions of Davis v. Washington and Giles v. California “strongly suggest, if not squarely hold, that the preponderance standard applies.” On the facts, the court concluded that “the evidence tended to show that Johnson alone had the means, motive, and opportunity to threaten [the witness], and did not show anyone else did. This was sufficient to satisfy the preponderance standard.”

Evaluating the kind of action the defendant must take to justify a finding of forfeiture: Carlson v. Attorney General of California, 791 F.3d 1003 (9th Cir. 2015): Reviewing the denial of a habeas petition, the court found that statements of victims to police were testimonial, but that the state trial court was not unreasonable in finding that the petitioner had forfeited his right to confront the declarants. In a careful analysis of Supreme Court cases, the court provided “a standard for the kind of action a defendant must take” to be found to have forfeited the right to confrontation. The court concluded that

[T]he forfeiture-by-wrongdoing doctrine applies where there has been affirmative action on the part of the defendant that produces the desired result, non-appearance by a prospective witness against him in a criminal case. Simple tolerance of, or failure to foil, a third party’s previously unexpressed decision either to skip town himself rather than testifying or to prevent another witness from appearing [is] not a sufficient reason to foreclose a defendant’s Sixth Amendment confrontation rights at trial.

On the merits --- and applying the standard of deference required by AEDPA, the court concluded that the trial court could reasonably have found, on the basis of circumstantial evidence, that the petitioner more likely than not was actively involved in procuring unavailability, with the intent to keep the witness from testifying.

Note: The court says that a defendant’s mere “acquiescence” is not enough to justify forfeiture. That language might raise a doubt as to whether a forfeiture may be found by the defendant’s mere membership in a conspiracy; many courts have found such membership to be sufficient where disposing of a witness is within the course and furtherance of the underlying conspiracy. See, e.g., United States v. Dinkins, 691 F.3d 358 (4th Cir. 2012). The Carlson court, however, cited the conspiracy cases favorably, and noted that in such cases, the defendant has acted affirmatively and committed wrongdoing by joining a conspiracy in which a foreseeable result is killing witnesses.
A different panel of the Ninth Circuit, in a case decided around the same time as *Carlson*, upheld a finding of forfeiture based on conspiratorial liability. *See United States Cazares*, 788 F.3d 956 (9th Cir. 2015).

The *Carlson* court noted that the restyled Rule 804(b)(6) provides that mere passive agreement with the wrongful act of another is not enough to find forfeiture, but that that forfeiture can be found if a defendant “acquiesced in wrongfully causing” the absence of the witness --- and that would include joining a conspiracy where one of the foreseeable consequences is to kill witnesses. The court found the restyling to be a helpful clarification of what the original rule meant by “acquiescence.”
Grand jury testimony and plea allocution statement are both testimonial: *United States v. Bruno*, 383 F.3d 65 (2nd Cir. 2004): The court held that a plea allocution statement of an accomplice was testimonial, even though it was redacted to take out any direct reference to the defendant. It noted that the Court in *Crawford* had taken exception to previous cases decided by the Circuit that had admitted such statements as sufficiently reliable under *Roberts*. Those prior cases have been overruled by *Crawford*. The court also noted that the admission of grand jury testimony was error as it was clearly testimonial after *Crawford*. See also *United States v. Becker*, 502 F.3d 122 (2nd Cir. 2007) (plea allocution is testimonial even though redacted to take out direct reference to the defendant: “any argument regarding the purposes for which the jury might or might not have actually considered the allocations necessarily goes to whether such error was harmless, not whether it existed at all”); *United States v. Snype*, 441 F.3d 119 (2nd Cir. 2006) (plea allocution of the defendant’s accomplice was testimonial even though all direct references to the defendant were redacted); *United States v. Gotti*, 459 F.3d 296 (2nd Cir. 2006) (redacted guilty pleas of accomplices, offered to show that a bookmaking business employed five or more people, were testimonial under *Crawford*); *United States v. Al-Sadawi*, 432 F.3d 419 (2nd Cir. 2005) (*Crawford* violation where the trial court admitted portions of a cohort’s plea allocution against the defendant, even though the statement was redacted to take out any direct reference to the defendant).

Defendant charged with aiding and abetting has confrontation rights violated by admission of primary wrongdoer’s guilty plea: *United States v. Head*, 707 F.3d 1026 (8th Cir. 2013): The defendant was charged with aiding and abetting a murder committed by her boyfriend in Indian country. The trial court admitted the boyfriend’s guilty plea to prove the predicate offense. The court found that the guilty plea was testimonial and reversed the aiding and abetting conviction. The court relied on *Crawford*’s statement that “prior testimony that the defendant was unable to cross-examine” is one of the “core class of ‘testimonial’ statements.”

Grand jury testimony is testimonial: *United States v. Wilmore*, 381 F.3d 868 (9th Cir. 2004): The court held, unsurprisingly, that grand jury testimony is testimonial under *Crawford*. It could hardly have held otherwise, because even under the narrowest definition of “testimonial” (i.e., the specific types of hearsay mentioned by the *Crawford* Court) grand jury testimony is covered within the definition.
Implied Testimonial Statements

Testimony that a police officer’s focus changed after hearing an out-of-court statement impliedly included accusatorial statements from an accomplice and so violated the defendant’s right to confrontation: *United States v. Meises*, 645 F.3d 5 (1st Cir. 2011): At trial an officer testified that his focus was placed on the defendant after an interview with a cooperating witness. The government did not explicitly introduce the statement of the cooperating witness. On appeal, the defendant argued that the jury could surmise that the officer’s focus changed because of an out-of-court accusation of a declarant who was not produced at trial. The government argued that there was no confrontation violation because the testimony was all about the actions of the officer and no hearsay statement was admitted at trial. But the court agreed with the defendant and reversed the conviction. The court noted that it was irrelevant that the government did not introduce the actual statements, because such statements were effectively before the jury in the context of the trial. The court stated that “any other conclusion would permit the government to evade the limitations of the Sixth Amendment and the Rules of Evidence by weaving an unavailable declarant’s statements into another witness’s testimony by implication. The government cannot be permitted to circumvent the Confrontation Clause by introducing the same substantive testimony in a different form.” *Compare United States v. Occhiuto*, 784 F.3d 862 (1st Cir. 2015): In a narcotics prosecution, an officer testified that he arranged for a cooperating informant to buy drugs from the defendant; that he monitored the transactions; and that the drugs that were in evidence were the same ones that the defendant had sold to the informant. The defendant argued that the officer’s conclusion about the drugs must have rested on assertions from the informant, and therefore his right to confrontation was violated. The defendant relied upon *Meises*, but the court distinguished that case, because here the officer’s testimony was based on his own personal observations and did not necessarily rely on anything said by the informant. The fact that the officer’s surveillance was not airtight did not raise a confrontation issue, rather it raised a question of weight as to the officer’s conclusion.

Testimonial statements to law enforcement were admitted by implication, in violation of the Confrontation Clause: *United States v. Kizzee*, 877 F.3d 650 (5th Cir. 2017): The defendant was suspected of drug-dealing; an officer arrested Brown after leaving the defendant’s house and Brown implicated the defendant. At trial, the officer was asked only whether he asked Brown about the defendant’s drug activity. The officer responded that he asked but did not state Brown’s answers. The officer was asked what he did after receiving Brown’s answers and he responded that he got a warrant to search the defendant’s house. The court found that the officer’s testimony “introduced Brown’s out-of-court testimonial statements by implication” and that an officer’s testimony “that allows a fact-finder to infer the statements made to him --- even without revealing the content of those statements --- is hearsay.” *Compare United States v. Sosa*, 897 F.3d 615 (5th
Cir. 2018): Appealing a conviction for bringing methamphetamine into the United States, the defendant argued that his right to confrontation was violated when an officer was allowed to testify that an undercover agent told him that the defendant’s mother was recruiting drug couriers. The court found no error because the statement was not offered for its truth. Rather it was offered to explain why the officer took investigative steps regarding the defendant’s mother. The court stated that “there is not a hearsay or a confrontation problem when the evidence is not offered for the truth of the matter asserted.” The court emphasized, citing Kizzee, that “courts must be vigilant in ensuring that these attempts to ‘explain the officer’s actions’ with out-of-court statements do not allow the backdoor introduction of highly inculpatory statements that the jury may also consider for its truth.” In this case, the court found no such danger, because the undercover officer’s statement was probative in explaining the police investigation, and the prejudicial effect was not high because the statement only implicated the defendant’s mother, who was an acknowledged participant in the drug activity.

Statements to law enforcement were testimonial, and right to confrontation was violated even though the statements were not stated in detail at trial: Ocampo v. Vail, 649 F.3d 1098 (9th Cir. 2011): In a murder case, an officer testified that on the basis of an interview with Vazquez, the police were able to rule out suspects other than the defendant. Vazquez was not produced for trial. The state court found no confrontation violation on the ground that the officer did not testify to the substance of anything Vazquez said. But the court found that the state court unreasonably applied Crawford and reversed the district court’s denial of a grant of habeas corpus. The statements from Vazquez were obviously testimonial because they were made during an investigation of a murder. And the court held that the Confrontation Clause bars not only quotations from a declarant, but also any testimony at trial that conveys the substance of a declarant’s testimonial hearsay statement. It reasoned as follows:

Where the government officers have not only “produced” the evidence, but then condensed it into a conclusory affirmation for purposes of presentation to the jury, the difficulties of testing the veracity of the source of the evidence are not lessened but exacerbated. With the language actually used by the out-of-court witness obscured, any clues to its truthfulness provided by that language --- contradictions, hesitations, and other clues often used to test credibility --- are lost, and instead a veneer of objectivity conveyed.

* * *

Whatever locution is used, out-of-court statements admitted at trial are “statements” for the purpose of the Confrontation Clause * * * if, fairly read, they convey to the jury the substance of an out-of-court, testimonial statement of a witness who does not testify.
See also United States v. Brooks, 772 F.3d 1161 (9th Cir. 2014): An agent testified that he telephoned a postal supervisor and provided him a description of the suspect, and then later searched a particular parcel with a tracking number and mailing information he had been provided over the phone as identifying the package mailed by the suspect. The postal supervisor was not produced for trial. The government argued that the agent’s testimony did not violate the Confrontation Clause because the postal supervisor’s actual statements were never offered at trial. But the court declared that “out-of-court statements need not be repeated verbatim to trigger the protections of the Confrontation Clause.” Fairly read, the agent’s testimony revealed the substance of the postal supervisor’s statements. And those statements were made with the motivation that they be used in a criminal prosecution. Therefore the agent’s testimony violated the Confrontation Clause. Accord United States v. Benamor, 925 F.3d 1159 (9th Cir. 2019): In a felon-firearm prosecution, the trial judge declared that an officer’s conversation with the defendant’s landlord (in which the landlord said that the defendant had a shotgun in his car) could not be admitted because the landlord’s accusations were testimonial. The government called the officer who was asked only whether the conversation “affected your decision to investigate” and “confirmed your decision to arrest” the defendant. The officer answered yes to both questions. The court of appeals held that this testimony violated the defendant’s right to confrontation. It noted that in context, the answers “implied that the landlord confirmed that Defendant possessed the shotgun” and that the government “made that implication unmistakable during closing argument by again emphasizing the landlord’s statement.” The court stated that it would be an unreasonable application of Crawford “to allow police officers to testify to the substance of an unavailable witness’s testimonial statements so long as they do so descriptively rather than verbatim or in detail.” The court also noted that a brief description may actually be worse for the defendant than a verbatim description of the testimonial hearsay: “With the language actually used by the out-of-court witness obscured, any clues to its truthfulness provided by that language --- contradictions, hesitations, and other clues often used to test credibility --- are lost, and instead, a veneer of objectivity conveyed.”
Informal Circumstances, Private Statements, No Law Enforcement Involvement, etc.

Statement of young child to his teacher is not sufficiently formal to be testimonial: *Ohio v. Clark*, 135 S.Ct. 2173 (2015): This case is fully discussed in Part I. The case involved a statement from a three-year-old boy to his teachers. It accused the defendant of injuring him. The Court held that a statement is extremely unlikely to be found testimonial in the absence of some participation by or with law enforcement. The presence of law enforcement is what signifies that a statement is made formally with the motivation that it will be used in a criminal prosecution. The Court did not establish a bright-line rule, however, leaving at least the remote possibility that an accusation might be testimonial even if law enforcement had no role in the making of the statement.

Private conversations and casual remarks are not testimonial: *United States v. Malpica-Garcia*, 489 F.3d 393 (1st Cir. 2007): In a drug prosecution, the defendant argued that testimony of his former co-conspirators violated *Crawford* because some of their assertions were not based on personal knowledge but rather were implicitly derived from conversations with other people (e.g., that the defendant ran a protection racket). The court found that if the witnesses were in fact relying on accounts from others, those accounts were not testimonial. The court noted that the information was obtained from people “in the course of private conversations or in casual remarks that no one expected would be preserved or later used at trial.” There was no indication that the statements were made “to police, in an investigative context, or in a courtroom setting.”

Threats to cooperating witness were not testimonial: *United States v. Kirk Tang Yuk*, 855 F.3d 57 (2nd Cir. 2018): A cooperating witness testified that he felt intimidated by two inmates who were friends of the defendant. The defendant argued that the threats were testimonial, but the court held that the threats were obviously not intended to be used as part of an investigation or prosecution, and so were not testimonial.

Informal letter found reliable under the residual exception is not testimonial: *United States v. Morgan*, 385 F.3d 196 (2nd Cir. 2004): In a drug trial, a letter written by the co-defendant was admitted against the defendant. The letter was written to a boyfriend and implicated both the defendant and the co-defendant in a conspiracy to smuggle drugs. The court found that the letter was properly admitted under Rule 807, and that it was not testimonial under *Crawford*. The court noted the following circumstances indicating that the letter was not testimonial: 1) it was not written in a coercive atmosphere; 2) it was not addressed to law enforcement authorities; 3) it was
written to an intimate acquaintance; 4) it was written in the privacy of the co-defendant’s hotel room; 5) the co-defendant had no reason to expect that the letter would ever find its way into the hands of the police; and 6) it was not written to curry favor with the authorities or with anyone else. These were the same factors that rendered the hearsay statement sufficiently reliable to qualify under Rule 807.

Informal conversation between defendant and undercover informant was not testimonial under Davis: United States v. Burden, 600 F.3d 204 (2nd Cir. 2010): Appealing RICO and drug convictions, the defendant argued that the trial court erred in admitting a recording of a drug transaction between the defendant and a cooperating witness. The defendant argued that the statements on the recording were testimonial, but the court disagreed and affirmed. The defendant’s part of the conversation was not testimonial because he was not aware at the time that the statement was being recorded or would be potentially used at his trial. As to the informant, “anything he said was meant not as an accusation in its own right but as bait.”

Note: Other courts, as seen in the “Not Hearsay” section below, have come to the same result as the Second Circuit in Burden, but using a different analysis: 1) admitting the defendant’s statement does not violate the Confrontation Clause because it is his own statement and he doesn’t have a right to confront himself; 2) the informant’s statement, while testimonial, is not offered for its truth but only to put the defendant’s statements in context --- therefore it does not violate the right to confrontation because it is not offered as an accusation.

Prison telephone calls between defendant and his associates were not testimonial: United States v. Jones, 716 F.3d 851 (4th Cir. 2013): Appealing from convictions for marriage fraud, the defendant argued that the trial court erred in admitting telephone conversations between the defendant and his associates, who were incarcerated at the time. The calls were recorded by the prison. The court found no error in admitting the conversations because they were not testimonial. The calls involved discussions to cover up and lie about the crime, and they were casual, informal statements among criminal associates, so it was clear that they were not primarily motivated to be used in a criminal prosecution. The defendant argued that the conversations were testimonial because the parties knew they were being recorded. But the court noted that “a declarant’s understanding that a statement could potentially serve as criminal evidence does not necessarily denote testimonial intent” and that “just because recorded statements are used at trial does not mean they were created for trial.” The court also noted that a prison “has significant institutional reasons for recording phone calls outside or procuring forensic evidence --- i.e., policing its own facility by monitoring prisoners’ contact with individuals outside the prison.”
Following Clark, the court finds that a report of sex abuse to a nurse by a 4 ½ year old child is not testimonial: United States v. Barker, 820 F.3d 167 (5th Cir. 2016): The court held that a statement by a 4 ½ year-old girl, accusing the defendant of sexual abuse, was not testimonial in light of Ohio v. Clark. The girl made the statement to a nurse who was registered by the state to take such statements. The court held that like in Clark the statement was not testimonial because: 1) it was made by a child too young to understand the criminal justice system; 2) it was not made to law enforcement; 3) the nurse’s primary motive was to treat the child; and 4) the fact that the nurse was required to report the abuse to law enforcement did not change her motivation to treat the child.

Statements made to an undercover informant setting up a drug transaction are not testimonial: Brown v. Epps, 686 F.3d 281 (5th Cir. 2012): The court found no error in the state court’s admission of an intercepted conversation between the defendant, an accomplice, and an undercover informant. The conversation was to set up a drug deal. The court held that statements “unknowingly made to an undercover officer, confidential informant, or cooperating witness are not testimonial in nature because the statements are not made under circumstances which would lead an objective witness to reasonably believe that the statements would be available for later use at trial.” The court elaborated further:

The conversations did not consist of solemn declarations made for the purpose of establishing some fact. Rather, the exchange was casual, often profane, and served the purpose of selling cocaine. Nor were the unidentified individuals' statements made under circumstances that would lead an objective witness reasonably to believe that they would be available for use at a later trial. To the contrary, the statements were furthering a criminal enterprise; a future trial was the last thing the declarants were anticipating. Moreover, they were unaware that their conversations were being preserved, so they could not have predicted that their statements might subsequently become available at trial. * * * No witness goes into court to proclaim that he will sell you crack cocaine in a Wal-Mart parking lot. An objective analysis would conclude that the primary purpose of the unidentified individuals' statements was to arrange the drug deal. Their purpose was not to create a record for trial and thus is not within the scope of the Confrontation Clause.
Statements made by a victim to her friends and family are not testimonial: *Doan v. Carter*, 548 F.3d 449 (6th Cir. 2008): The defendant challenged a conviction for murder of his girlfriend. The trial court admitted a number of statements from the victim concerning physical abuse that the defendant had perpetrated on her. The defendant argued that these statements were testimonial but the court disagreed. The defendant contended that under *Davis* a statement is nontestimonial only if it is in response to an emergency, but the court rejected the defendant’s “narrow characterization of nontestimonial statements.” The court relied on the statement in *Giles v. California* that “statements to friends and neighbors about abuse and intimidation * * * would be excluded, if at all, only by hearsay rules.” See also *United States v. Boyd*, 640 F.3d 657 (6th Cir. 2011) (statements were non-testimonial because the declarant made them to a companion; stating broadly that “statements made to friends and acquaintances are non-testimonial”).

Suicide note implicating the declarant and defendant in a crime was testimonial under the circumstances: *Miller v. Stovall*, 608 F.3d 913 (6th Cir. 2010): A former police officer involved in a murder wrote a suicide note to his parents, indicating he was going to kill himself so as not go to jail for the crime that he and the defendant committed. The note was admitted against the defendant. The court found that the note was testimonial and its admission against the defendant violated his right to confrontation, because the declarant could “reasonably anticipate” that the note would be passed on to law enforcement --- especially because the declarant was a former police officer.

Note: The court’s “reasonable anticipation” test appears to be a broader definition of testimoniality than that applied by the Supreme Court in *Davis* and especially *Bryant*. The Court in *Davis* looked to the “primary motivation” of the speaker. In this case, the “primary motivation” of the declarant was probably to explain to his parents why he was going to kill himself, rather than to prepare a case against the defendant. So the case appears wrongly decided.

Informal statements made about planned criminal activity are not testimonial: *United States v. Klemis*, 899 F.3d 436 (7th Cir. 2017): In a narcotics prosecution in which a user died, the court held that statements by the victim to a friend, that he had stolen from her in order to pay a drug debt to the defendant, were not testimonial. The court reasoned that the Supreme Court in *Ohio v. Clark* declared that a statement was very unlikely to be testimonial if it was made outside the law enforcement context. Here, spontaneous statements to a friend about attempts to borrow or steal from her to pay a drug debt, were not “efforts to create an out-of-court substitute for trial testimony.”
Statements made by an accomplice to a jailhouse informant are not testimonial: *United States v. Honken*, 541 F.3d 1146 (8th Cir. 2008): When the defendant’s murder prosecution was pending, the defendant’s accomplice (Johnson) was persuaded by a fellow inmate (McNeese) that Johnson could escape responsibility for the crime by getting another inmate to falsely confess to the crime --- but that in order to make the false confession believable, Johnson would have to disclose where the bodies were buried. Johnson prepared maps and notes describing where the bodies were buried, and gave it to McNeese with the intent that it be delivered to the other inmate who would falsely confess. In fact this was all a ruse concocted by McNeese and the authorities to get Johnson to confess, in which event McNeese would get a benefit from the government. The notes and maps were admitted at the defendant’s trial, over the defendant’s objection that they were testimonial. The defendant argued that Johnson had been subjected to the equivalent of a police interrogation. But the court held that the evidence was not testimonial, because Johnson didn’t know that he was speaking to a government agent. It explained as follows:

Johnson did not draw the maps with the expectation that they would be used against Honken at trial * * *. Further, the maps were not a “solemn declaration” or a “formal statement.” Rather, Johnson was more likely making a casual remark to an acquaintance. We simply cannot conclude Johnson made a “testimonial” statement against Honken without the faintest notion that she was doing so.

See also *United States v. Spotted Elk*, 548 F.3d 641 (8th Cir. 2008) (private conversation between inmates about a future course of action is not testimonial).

Incriminatory statements made by an accomplice from a telephone in jail are not testimonial: *United States v. LeBeau*, 867 F.3d 960 (8th Cir. 2017): The defendant’s codefendant made coded calls while in jail to further drug activity. The defendant argued that these statements were testimonial because the codefendant was aware --- based on a message played at the beginning of the call --- that his call was being monitored by law enforcement. But the court rejected this argument, stating that even though the codefendant might have anticipated that his statements were used in a criminal prosecution, his primary motivation was not related to law enforcement: “the primary purpose of the calls was to further the drug conspiracy, not to create a record for a criminal prosecution.” The fact that the codefendant spoke in code was strong evidence that his primary motivation was not to have his statement used in a criminal prosecution.

Statement from one friend to another in private circumstances is not testimonial: *United States v. Wright*, 536 F.3d 819 (8th Cir. 2008): The defendant was charged with shooting two people in the course of a drug deal. One victim died and one survived. The survivor testified at trial to a private conversation he had with the other victim, before the shootings occurred. The
court held that the statements of the victim who died were not testimonial. The statements were made under informal circumstances to a friend. The court relied on the Supreme Court’s statement in *Giles v. California* that “statements to friends and neighbors about abuse and intimidation, and statements to physicians in the course of receiving treatment,” are not testimonial.

**Accusatory statements in a victim’s diary are not testimonial:** *Parle v. Runnels*, 387 F.3d 1030 (9th Cir. 2004): In a murder case, the government offered statements of the victim that she had entered in her diary. The statements recounted physical abuse that the victim received at the hand of the defendant. The court held that the victim’s diary was not testimonial, as it was a private diary of daily events. There was no indication that it was prepared for use at a trial.

**Jailhouse conversations among coconspirators were not testimonial:** *United States v. Alcorta*, 853 F.3d 1123 (10th Cir. 2017): Affirming drug convictions, the court rejected the defendant’s argument that admitting jailhouse conversations of his coconspirators violated his right to confrontation. The court stated that to be testimonial, the statements must be made “with the primary purpose of creating evidence for the prosecution.” The court concluded that “[t]he statements here --- jailhouse conversations between criminal codefendants (none of whom were cooperating with the government) --- do not satisfy that definition because that was not their purpose; quite the opposite.”

**Private conversation between mother and son is not testimonial:** *United States v. Brown*, 441 F.3d 1330 (11th Cir. 2006): In a murder prosecution, the court admitted testimony that the defendant’s mother received a phone call, apparently from the defendant; the mother asked the caller whether he had killed the victim, and then the mother started crying. The mother’s reaction was admitted at trial as an excited utterance. The court found no violation of *Crawford*. The court reasoned as follows:

We need not divine any additional definition of “testimonial” evidence to conclude that the private conversation between mother and son, which occurred while Sadie Brown was sitting at her dining room table with only her family members present, was not testimonial. The phone conversation Davis overheard obviously was not made under examination, was not transcribed in a formal document, and was not made under circumstances leading an objective person to reasonably believe the statement would be available for use at a later trial. Thus, it is not testimonial and its admission is not barred by *Crawford*. (Citations omitted).
Defendant’s lawyer’s informal texts with I.R.S. agent found not testimonial: *United States v. Wilson*, 788 F.3d 1298 (11th Cir. 2015): The defendant was charged with converting checks that he knew to be issued as a result of fraudulently filed income tax returns. He claimed that he was a legitimate cashier and did not know that the checks were obtained by fraud. The trial court admitted texts sent by the defendant’s lawyer to the I.R.S. The texts involved the return of certain records that the I.R.S. agent had allowed the defendant to take to copy; the texts contradicted the defendant’s account at trial that he didn’t know he had to return the boxes (in essence a showing of consciousness of guilt). The defendant argued that the lawyer’s texts to the I.R.S. agent were testimonial, but the court disagreed: “Here, the attorney communicated through informal text messages to coordinate the delivery of the boxes. The cooperative and informal nature of those text messages was such that an objective witness would not reasonably expect the texts to be used prosecutorially.” *See also United States v. Mathis*, 767 F.3d 1264 (11th Cir. 2014) (text messages between defendant and a minor concerning sex were informal, haphazard communications and therefore not made with the primary motive to be used in a criminal prosecution).
Interpreters

Interpreter is not a witness but merely a language conduit and so testimony recounting the interpreter’s translation does not violate *Crawford: United States v. Orm Hieng*, 679 F.3d 1131 (9th Cir. 2012): At the defendant’s drug trial, an agent testified to inculpatory statements the defendant made through an interpreter. The interpreter was not called to testify, and the defendant argued that admitting the interpreter’s statements about what the defendant said violated his right to confrontation. The court found that the interpreter had acted as a “mere language conduit” and so he was not a witness against the defendant within the meaning of the Confrontation Clause. The court noted that in determining whether an interpreter acts as a language conduit, a court must undertake a case-by-case approach, considering factors such as “which party supplied the interpreter, whether the interpreter had any motive to lead or distort, the interpreter’s qualifications and language skill, and whether actions taken subsequent to the conversation were consistent with the statements as translated.” The court found that these factors cut in favor of the lower court’s finding that the interpreter in this case had acted as a language conduit. Because the interpreter was only a conduit, the witness against the defendant was not the interpreter, but rather himself. The court concluded that when it is the defendant whose statements are translated, “the Sixth Amendment simply has no application because a defendant cannot complain that he was denied the opportunity to confront himself.” See also *United States v. Romo-Chavez*, 681 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 2012)(where an interpreter served only as a language conduit, the defendant’s own statements were properly admitted under Rule 801(d)(2)(A), and the Confrontation Clause was not violated because the defendant was his own accuser and he had no right to cross-examine himself); *United States v. Aifang Ye*, 808 F.3d 395 (9th Cir. 2015) (adhering to pre-*Crawford* case law that a translator acting as a language conduit does not implicate the Confrontation Clause, because that case law “is not clearly irreconcilable with *Crawford*”; finding on the facts that the translator was a language conduit, by applying the four-factor test from *Orm Hieng*). .

**Interpreter’s statements were testimonial:** *United States v. Charles*, 722 F.3d 1319 (11th Cir. 2013): The defendant was convicted of knowingly using a fraudulently authored travel document. When the defendant was detained at the airport, he spoke to the Customs Officer through an interpreter. At trial, the defendant’s statements were reported by the officer. The interpreter was not called. The court held that the defendant had the right to confront the interpreter. It stated that the interpreter’s translations were testimonial because they were rendered in the course of an interrogation and for these purposes the interpreter was the relevant declarant. But the court found that the error was not plain and affirmed the conviction. The court did not address the conflicting authority in the Ninth Circuit, supra. See also *United States v. Curbelo*, 726 F.3d 1260 (11th Cir. 2013) (transcripts of a wiretapped conversation that were translated constituted the translator’s
implicit out-of-court representation that the translation was correct, and the translator’s implicit assertions were testimonial; but there was no violation of the Confrontation Clause because a party to the conversation testified to what was said based on his independent review of the recordings and the transcript, and the transcript itself was never admitted at trial).
Interrogations, Tips to Law Enforcement, Etc.

Formal statement to police officer is testimonial: *United States v. Rodriguez-Marrero*, 390 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2004): The defendant’s accomplice gave a signed confession under oath to a prosecutor in Puerto Rico. The court held that any information in that confession that incriminated the defendant, directly or indirectly, could not be admitted against him after *Crawford*. Whatever the limits of the term “testimonial,” it clearly covers sworn statements by accomplices to police officers.

Accomplice’s statements during police interrogation are testimonial: *United States v. Alvarado-Valdez*, 521 F.3d 337 (5th Cir. 2008): The trial court admitted the statements of the defendant’s accomplice that were made during a police interrogation. The statements were offered for their truth --- to prove that the accomplice and the defendant conspired with others to transport cocaine. Because the accomplice had absconded and could not be produced for trial, admission of his testimonial statements violated the defendant’s right to confrontation.

Identification of a defendant, made to police by an incarcerated person, is testimonial: *United States v. Pugh*, 405 F.3d 390 (6th Cir. 2005): In a bank robbery prosecution, the court found a *Crawford* violation when the trial court admitted testimony from a police officer that he had brought a surveillance photo down to a person who was incarcerated, and that person identified the defendant as the man in the surveillance photo. This statement was testimonial under *Crawford* because “the term ‘testimonial’ at a minimum applies to police interrogations.” The court also noted that the statement was sworn and that a person who “makes a formal statement to government officers bears testimony.” *See also United States v. McGee*, 529 F.3d 691 (6th Cir. 2008) (confidential informant’s statement identifying the defendant as the source of drugs was testimonial).

Circuit Court’s opinion that an anonymous tip to law enforcement is testimonial was reversed by the Supreme Court on AEPDA grounds: *Etherton v. Rivard*, 800 F.3d 737 (6th Cir. 2015), *rev’d sub nom., Woods v. Etherton*, 136 S.Ct. 1149 (2016): On habeas review, the court held that an anonymous tip to law enforcement, accusing the defendant of criminal misconduct, was testimonial. It further held that the defendant’s right to confrontation was violated at his trial where the tip was admitted into evidence for its truth. It noted that “[t]he prosecutor’s repeated references both to the existence and the details of the tip went far beyond what was necessary for background --- thereby indicating the content of the tip was admitted for its truth.” But the
Supreme Court, in a per curiam opinion, reversed the Sixth Circuit, holding that it gave insufficient deference to the state court’s determination that the anonymous tips were properly admitted for the non-hearsay purpose of explaining the context of the police investigation. The Court stated that a “fairminded jurist” could conclude “that repetition of the tip did not establish that the uncontested facts it conveyed were submitted for their truth. Such a jurist might reach that conclusion by placing weight on the fact that the truth of the facts was not disputed. No precedent of this Court clearly forecloses that view.”

Accomplice statement to law enforcement is testimonial: United States v. Nielsen, 371 F.3d 574 (9th Cir. 2004): Nielsen resided in a house with Volz. Police officers searched the house for drugs. Drugs were found in a floor safe. An officer asked Volz who had access to the floor safe. Volz said that she did not but that Nielsen did. This hearsay statement was admitted against Nielsen at trial. The court found this to be error, as the statement was testimonial under Crawford, because it was made to police officers during an interrogation. The court noted that even the first part of Volz’s statement --- that she did not have access to the floor safe --- violated Crawford because it provided circumstantial evidence that Nielsen did have access.

Statement made by an accomplice after arrest, but before formal interrogation, is testimonial: United States v. Summers, 414 F.3d 1287 (10th Cir. 2005): The defendant’s accomplice in a bank robbery was arrested by police officers. As he was walked over to the patrol car, he said to the officer, “How did you guys find us?” The court found that the admission of this statement against the defendant violated his right to confrontation under Crawford. The court explained as follows:

Although Mohammed had not been read his Miranda rights and was not subject to formal interrogation, he had nevertheless been taken into physical custody by police officers. His question was directed at a law enforcement official. Moreover, Mohammed’s statement * * * implicated himself and thus was loosely akin to a confession.

Statements made by accomplice to police officers during a search are testimonial: United States v. Arbolaez, 450 F.3d 1283 (11th Cir. 2006): In a marijuana prosecution, the court found error in the admission of statements made by one of the defendant’s accomplices to law enforcement officers during a search. The government argued that the statements were offered not for truth but to explain the officers’ reactions to the statements. But the court found that “testimony
as to the details of statements received by a government agent . . . even when purportedly admitted not for the truthfulness of what the informant said but to show why the agent did what he did after he received that information constituted inadmissible hearsay.” The court also found that the accomplice’s statements were testimonial under Crawford, because they were made in response to questions from police officers.

**Statements by victims to an officer about why they were refusing to testify were not testimonial:** United States v. Cooper, 926 F.3d 718 (11th Cir. 2019): The defendant was charged with fraud and sex trafficking, resulting from a scheme in which he brought foreign exchange students to the U.S. but then hired them out for sex. By the time of trial, two of the victims were back in their country and were refusing to cooperate. An officer testified that he had contacted them and that they were refusing to cooperate because they feared humiliation, embarrassment, and further stress. The defendant argued that this testimony violated the Confrontation Clause because the victims’ statements to the officer were testimonial. But the court disagreed. It stated that because the agent had questioned the victims “to understand why they refused to testify, not to investigate or establish any fact that was part of an element of the charged offenses or necessary to prove Cooper’s guilt, their statements were not testimonial and did not implicate the Confrontation Clause.”

**Statements by customers to police officer about their motivation to obtain sex were testimonial:** United States v. Cooper, 926 F.3d 718 (11th Cir. 2019): The defendant was charged with fraud and sex trafficking, resulting from a scheme in which he brought foreign exchange students to the U.S. but then hired them out for sex. At trial the government offered visitor logs for apartments leased by the defendant. The defendant argued that the logbooks did not show that the visitor were seeking sex when they visited. In response, the government called an officer who testified that he interviewed the men who registered on the log and they told him that they had visited the apartment to obtain sexual services. The court held that the officer’s testimony violated the Confrontation Clause because the reports of the visitors about their motivation were testimonial. The court stated: “Statements to police officers are generally testimonial if the primary purpose is investigative. Agent Nguyen questioned the visitors during his investigation to gain facts probative of Cooper’s guilt. Their statements were testimonial.” The court found the error to be harmless.
Investigative Reports

Reports by a law enforcement officer on prior statements made by a cooperating witness were testimonial: *United States v. Moreno*, 809 F.3d 766 (3rd Cir. 2016): After a cooperating witness testified on direct, defense counsel attacked his credibility on the ground that he had made a deal. On redirect, the trial court allowed the witness to read into evidence the reports of a law enforcement officer who had interviewed the witness. The reports indicated that the witness had made statements consistent with his in-court testimony. The court of appeals found a violation of the Confrontation Clause, because the officer’s hearsay statements (about what the witness had told him) were testimonial and the officer was not produced for cross-examination. The court found that the reports were “investigative reports prepared by a government agent in actual anticipation of trial.”
Testimonial hearsay offered by another defendant violates Crawford where the statement can be used against the defendant: United States v. Nguyen, 565 F.3d 668 (9th Cir. 2009): In a trial of multiple defendants in a fraud conspiracy, one of the defendants offered statements he made to a police investigator. These statements implicated the defendant. The court found that the admission of the codefendant’s statements violated the defendant’s right to confrontation. The statements were clearly testimonial because they were made to a police officer during an interrogation. The court noted that the confrontation analysis “does not change because a co-defendant, as opposed to the prosecutor, elicited the hearsay statement. The Confrontation Clause gives the accused the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. The fact that Nguyen’s co-counsel elicited the hearsay has no bearing on her right to confront her accusers.”

Judicial Findings and Judgments

Judicial findings and an order of judicial contempt are not testimonial: United States v. Sine, 493 F.3d 1021 (9th Cir. 2007): The court held that the admission of a judge’s findings and order of criminal contempt, offered to prove the defendant’s lack of good faith in a tangentially related fraud case, did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation. The court found “no reason to believe that Judge Carr wrote the order in anticipation of Sine’s prosecution for fraud, so his order was not testimonial.”

See also United States v. Ballesteros-Selinger, 454 F.3d 973 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that an immigration judge’s deportation order was nontestimonial because it “was not made in anticipation of future litigation”).
Law Enforcement Involvement

Following Clark, the court finds that a report of sex abuse to a nurse by a 4 ½ year old child is not testimonial: United States v. Barker, 820 F.3d 167 (5th Cir. 2016): The court held that a statement by a 4 ½ year-old girl, accusing the defendant of sexual abuse, was not testimonial in light of Ohio v. Clark. The girl made the statement to a nurse who was registered by the state to take such statements. The court held that like in Clark the statement was not testimonial because: 1) it was made by a child too young to understand the criminal justice system; 2) it was not made to law enforcement; 3) the nurse’s primary motive was to treat the child; and 4) the fact that the nurse was required to report the abuse to law enforcement did not change her motivation to treat the child.

Accusations made to child psychologist appointed by law enforcement were testimonial: McCarley v. Kelly, 759 F.3d 535 (6th Cir. 2014): A three-year-old boy witnessed a murder but would not talk to the police about it. The police sought out a child psychologist, who interviewed the boy with the understanding that she would try to “extract information” from him about the crime and refer that information to the police. Helping the child was, at best, a secondary motive. Under these circumstances, the court found that the child’s statements to the psychologist were testimonial and erroneously admitted in the defendant’s state trial. The court noted that the sessions “were more akin to police interrogations than private counseling sessions.”

Note: McCarley was decided before Ohio v. Clark, where the Supreme Court held that the statement of a young child is extremely unlikely to be testimonial, because the child would not have a primary motive that the statement would be used in a criminal prosecution. McCarley differs in one respect from Clark, though. In McCarley, the party taking the statement definitely had a primary motive to use it in a criminal prosecution. This was not the case in Clark, where the child was being interviewed by his teachers. Still, the result in McCarley is questionable after Clark --- and especially so in light of the holding in Michigan v. Bryant that primary motivation must be assessed from the perspective of a reasonable person in the position of both the speaker and the interviewer.

Police officer’s count of marijuana plants found in a search is testimonial: United States v. Taylor, 471 F.3d 832 (7th Cir. 2006): The court found plain error in the admission of testimony by a police officer about the number of marijuana plants found in the search of the defendant’s premises. The officer did not himself count all of the plants; part of his total count was based on a
hearsay statement of another officer who assisted in the count. The court held that the officer’s hearsay statement about the amount of plants counted was clearly testimonial as it was an evaluation prepared for purposes of criminal prosecution.

Social worker’s interview of child-victim, with police officers present, was the functional equivalent of interrogation and therefore testimonial: Bobadilla v. Carlson, 575 F.3d 785 (8th Cir. 2009): The court affirmed the grant of a writ of habeas after a finding that the defendant’s state conviction for child sexual abuse was tainted by the admission of a testimonial statement by the child-victim. A police officer arranged to have the victim interviewed at the police station five days after the alleged abuse. The officer sought the assistance of a social worker, who conducted the interview using a forensic interrogation technique designed to detect sexual abuse. The court found that “this interview was no different than any other police interrogation: it was initiated by a police officer a significant time after the incident occurred for the purpose of gathering evidence during a criminal investigation.” The court found it important that the interview took place at the police station, it was recorded for use at trial, and the social worker utilized a structured, forensic method of interrogation at the behest of the police. Under the circumstances, the social worker “was simply acting as a surrogate interviewer for the police.”

Note: Bobadilla was decided before Ohio v. Clark, where the Supreme Court held that the statement of a young child is extremely unlikely to be testimonial, because the child would not have a primary motive that the statement would be used in a criminal prosecution. Bobadilla differs in one respect from Clark, though. In Bobadilla, the party taking the statement definitely had a primary motive to use it in a criminal prosecution. This was not the case in Clark, where the child was being interviewed by his teachers. Still, the result in Bobadilla is questionable after Clark --- and especially so in light of the holding in Michigan v. Bryant that primary motivation must be assessed from the perspective of a reasonable person in the position of both the speaker and the interviewer.

Statements made by a child-victim to a forensic investigator are testimonial: United States v. Bordeaux, 400 F.3d 548 (8th Cir. 2005): In a child sex abuse prosecution, the trial court admitted hearsay statements made by the victim to a forensic investigator. The court reversed the conviction, finding among other things that the hearsay statements were testimonial under Crawford. The court likened the exchange between the victim and the investigator to a police interrogation. It elaborated as follows:
The formality of the questioning and the government involvement are undisputed in this case. The purpose of the interview (and by extension, the purpose of the statements) is disputed, but the evidence requires the conclusion that the purpose was to collect information for law enforcement. First, as a matter of course, the center made one copy of the videotape of this kind of interview for use by law enforcement. Second, at trial, the prosecutor repeatedly referred to the interview as a “forensic” interview . . .  That [the victim’s] statements may have also had a medical purpose does not change the fact that they were testimonial, because Crawford does not indicate, and logic does not dictate, that multi-purpose statements cannot be testimonial.

Note: This case was decided before Ohio v. Clark, where the Supreme Court held that the statement of a young child is extremely unlikely to be testimonial, because the child would not have a primary motive that the statement would be used in a criminal prosecution. This case differs in one respect from Clark, though --- the party taking the statement definitely had a primary motive to use it in a criminal prosecution. This was not the case in Clark, where the child was being interviewed by his teachers. Still, the result here is questionable after Clark --- and especially so in light of the holding in Michigan v. Bryant that primary motivation must be assessed from the perspective of a reasonable person in the position of both the speaker and the interviewer.

Moreover, the court concedes that there may have been a dual motive here --- treatment being the other motive. At a minimum, a court would have to make the finding that the prosecutorial motive was primary, and the court did not do this.

See also United States v. Eagle, 515 F.3d 794 (8th Cir. 2008) (statements from a child concerning sex abuse, made to a forensic investigator, are testimonial).  Compare United States v. Peneaux, 432 F.3d 882 (8th Cir. 2005) (distinguishing Bordeaux where the child’s statement was made to a treating physician rather than a forensic investigator, and there was no evidence that the interview resulted in any referral to law enforcement: “Where statements are made to a physician seeking to give medical aid in the form of a diagnosis or treatment, they are presumptively nontestimonial.”); United States v. DeLeon, 678 F.3d 317 (4th Cir. 2012) (discussed below under “medical statements” and distinguishing Bordeaux and Bobodilla as cases where statements were essentially made to law enforcement officers and not for treatment purposes).
Machine-Generated Information

Printout from machine is not hearsay and therefore its admission does not violate Crawford: United States v. Washington, 498 F.3d 225 (4th Cir. 2007): The defendant was convicted of operating a motor vehicle under the influence of drugs and alcohol. At trial, an expert testified on the basis of a printout from a gas chromatograph machine. The machine issued the printout after testing the defendant’s blood sample. The expert testified to his interpretation of the data issued by the machine --- that the defendant’s blood sample contained PCP and alcohol. The defendant argued that Crawford was violated because the expert had no personal knowledge of whether the defendant’s blood contained PCP or alcohol. He read Crawford to require the production of the lab personnel who conducted the test. But the court rejected this argument, finding that the machine printout was not hearsay, and therefore its use at trial by the expert could not violate Crawford even though it was prepared for use at trial. The court reasoned as follows:

The technicians could neither have affirmed or denied independently that the blood contained PCP and alcohol, because all the technicians could do was to refer to the raw data printed out by the machine. Thus, the statements to which Dr. Levine testified in court . . . did not come from the out-of-court technicians [but rather from the machine] and so there was no violation of the Confrontation Clause. . . . The raw data generated by the diagnostic machines are the “statements” of the machines themselves, not their operators. But statements” made by machines are not out-of-court statements made by declarants that are subject to the Confrontation Clause.

The court noted that the technicians might have needed to be produced to provide a chain of custody, but observed that the defendant made no objection to the authenticity of the machine’s report.

Note: The result in Washington appears unaffected by Williams, as the Court in Williams had no occasion to consider whether a machine output can be testimonial hearsay.

See also United States v. Summers, 666 F.3d 192 (4th Cir. 2011): (expert’s reliance on a “pure instrument read-out” did not violate the Confrontation Clause because such a read-out is not “testimony”).

Printout from machine is not hearsay and therefore does not violate Crawford: United States v. Moon, 512 F.3d 359 (7th Cir. 2008): The court held that an expert’s testimony about readings taken from an infrared spectrometer and a gas chromatograph (which determined that the
substance taken from the defendant was narcotics) did not violate *Crawford* because “data is not ‘statements’ in any useful sense. Nor is a machine a ‘witness against’ anyone.”

**Google satellite images, and machine-generated location markers, are not hearsay and therefore, even if prepared for trial, their admission does not violate the Confrontation Clause:** *United States v. Lizarraga-Tirado*, 789 F.3d 1107 (4th Cir. 2015): The defendant was convicted of illegal entry as a previously removed alien. The defendant contended that when he was arrested, he was still on the Mexican side of the border. At trial the arresting officer testified that she contemporaneously recorded the coordinates of the defendant’s arrest using a handheld GPS device. To illustrate the location of these coordinates, the government introduced a Google Earth satellite image. The image contained a “tack” showing the location of the coordinates to be on the United States side of the border. There was no testimony on whether the tack was automatically generated or manually placed and labeled. The defendant argued that both the satellite image and the tack were inadmissible hearsay and that their admission violated his right to confrontation. As to the satellite image itself, the court found that “[b]ecause a satellite image, like a photograph, makes no assertion, it isn’t hearsay.” The court found the tack to be a more difficult question. It noted that “[u]nlike a satellite image itself, labeled markers added to a satellite image do make clear assertions. Indeed, that is what makes them useful.” The court concluded that if a tack is placed manually and then labeled, “it’s classic hearsay” --- for example, a dot manually labeled with the name of a town “asserts that there’s a town where you see the dot.” On the other hand, “[a] tack placed by the Google Earth program and automatically labeled with GPS coordinates isn’t hearsay” because it is completely machine-generated and so no assertion is being made.

In this case, the court took judicial notice that the tack was automatically generated because the court itself accessed Google Earth and typed in the same coordinates to which the arresting officer testified --- which resulted in a tack identical to the one shown on the satellite image admitted at trial. Thus the program “analyze[d] the GPS coordinates and, without any human intervention, place[d] a labeled tack on the satellite image.” The court concluded that “[b]ecause the program makes the relevant assertion --- that the tack is accurately placed at the labeled GPS coordinates --- there’s no statement as defined by the hearsay rule.” The court noted that any issues of malfunction or tampering present questions of authenticity, not hearsay, and the defendant made no authenticity objection. Finally, “[b]ecause the satellite images and tack-coordinates pair weren’t hearsay, their admission also didn’t violate the Confrontation Clause.”
Electronic tabulation of phone calls is not a statement and therefore cannot be testimonial hearsay: *United States v. Lamons*, 532 F.3d 1251 (11th Cir. 2008): Bomb threats were called into an airline, resulting in the disruption of a flight. The defendant was a flight attendant accused of sending the threats. The trial court admitted a CD of data collected from telephone calls made to the airline; the data indicated that calls came from the defendant’s cell phone at the time the threats were made. The defendant argued that the information on the CD was testimonial hearsay, but the court disagreed, because the information was entirely machine-generated. The court stated that “the witnesses with whom the Confrontation Clause is concerned are human witnesses” and that the purposes of the Confrontation Clause “are ill-served through confrontation of the machine’s human operator. To say that a wholly machine-generated statement is unreliable is to speak of mechanical error, not mendacity. The best way to advance the truth-seeking process * * * is through the process of authentication as provided in Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b)(9).” The court concluded that there was no hearsay statement at issue, and therefore the Confrontation Clause was inapplicable.
Medical/Therapeutic Statements

Statements of victim to her therapist, discussing the effect of defendants’ actions on her emotional condition, were not testimonial: United States v. Gonzalez, 905 F.3d 165 (3rd Cir. 2018): The defendants were charged with stalking and cyberstalking causing death. The victim made statements to her therapist (and others) about the anxiety and depression caused by the defendant’s activities. The statements to the therapist were admitted under Rule 803(4), and the appellate court found no error in that ruling. The defendant argued that the statements were testimonial but the court disagreed. The court stated that “the purpose of a visit to a therapist is not to create a record in a criminal case.” See also United States v. Gonzalez, 905 F.3d 165 (3rd Cir. 2018) (Cyberstalking prosecution: “Belford's statements to her therapist are not testimonial in nature. As her therapist testified, the purpose of Belford's visits were to receive therapy to treat her anxiety and depression. The purpose of a visit to a therapist is not to create a record for a future criminal case. * * * Accordingly, the admission of Belford's statements as evidence did not violate the Confrontation Clause.”)

Statements by victim of abuse to treatment manager of Air Force medical program were admissible under Rule 803(4) and non-testimonial: United States v. DeLeon, 678 F.3d 317 (4th Cir. 2012): The defendant was convicted of murdering his eight-year-old son. Months before his death, the victim had made statements about incidents in which he had been physically abused by the defendant as part of parental discipline. The statements were made to the treatment manager of an Air Force medical program that focused on issues of family health. The court found that the statements were properly admitted under Rule 803(4) and (essentially for that reason) were non-testimonial because their primary purpose was not for use in a criminal prosecution of the defendant. The court noted that the statements were not made in response to an emergency, but that emergency was only one factor under Bryant. The court also recognized that the Air Force program “incorporates reporting requirements and a security component” but stated that these factors were not sufficient to render statements to the treatment manager testimonial. The court explained why the “primary motive” test was not met in the following passage:

We note first that Thomas [the treatment manager] did not have, nor did she tell Jordan [the child] she had, a prosecutorial purpose during their initial meeting. Thomas was not employed as a forensic investigator but instead worked * * * as a treatment manager. And there is no evidence that she recorded the interview or otherwise sought to memorialize Jordan’s answers as evidence for use during a criminal prosecution. * * * Rather, Thomas used the information she gathered from Jordan and his family to develop a written treatment plan and continued to provide counseling and advice on parenting techniques in subsequent meetings with family members. * * * Thomas
also did not meet with Jordan in an interrogation room or at a police station but instead spoke with him in her office in a building that housed * * * mental health service providers.

Importantly, ours is also not a case in which the social worker operated as an agent of law enforcement. * * * Here, Thomas did not act at the behest of law enforcement, as there was no active criminal investigation when she and Jordan spoke. * * * An objective review of the parties’ actions and the circumstances of the meeting confirms that the primary purpose was to develop a treatment plan --- not to establish facts for a future criminal prosecution. Accordingly, we hold that the contested statements were nontestimonial and that their admission did not violate DeLeon’s Sixth Amendment rights.

Note: The court’s analysis is strongly supported by the subsequent Supreme Court decision in Ohio v. Clark. The Clark Court held that: 1) Statements by children are extremely unlikely to be primarily motivated for use in a criminal prosecution; and 2) public officials do not become an agent of law enforcement by asking about suspected child abuse.

Following Clark, the court finds that a report of sex abuse to a nurse by a 4 ½ year old child is not testimonial: United States v. Barker, 820 F.3d 167 (5th Cir. 2016): The court held that a statement by a 4 ½ year-old girl, accusing the defendant of sexual abuse, was not testimonial in light of Ohio v. Clark. The girl made the statement to a nurse who was registered by the state to take such statements. The court held that like in Clark the statement was not testimonial because: 1) it was made by a child too young to understand the criminal justice system; 2) it was not made to law enforcement; 3) the nurse’s primary motive was to treat the child; and 4) the fact that the nurse was required to report the abuse to law enforcement did not change her motivation to treat the child.

Statements admitted under Rule 803(4) are presumptively non-testimonial: United States v. Peneaux, 432 F.3d 882 (8th Cir. 2005): “Where statements are made to a physician seeking to give medical aid in the form of a diagnosis or treatment, they are presumptively nontestimonial.”
Miscellaneous

Labels on electronic devices, indicating that they were made in Taiwan, are not testimonial: United States v. Napier, 787 F.3d 333 (6th Cir. 2015): In a child pornography prosecution, the government proved the interstate commerce element by offering two cellphones used to commit the crimes. The cellphones were each labeled “Made in Taiwan.” The defendant argued that the statements on the labels were hearsay and testimonial. But the court found that the labels clearly were not made with the primary motive of use in a criminal prosecution.

Note: The court in Napier reviewed the confrontation argument for plain error, because the defendant objected at trial only on hearsay grounds; a hearsay objection does not preserve a claim of error on confrontation grounds.

Statement of an accomplice made to his attorney is not testimonial: Jensen v. Pliler, 439 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2006): Taylor was in custody for the murder of Kevin James. He confessed the murder to his attorney, and implicated others, including Jensen. After Taylor was released from jail, Jensen and others murdered him because they thought he talked to the authorities. Jensen was tried for the murder of both James and Taylor, and the trial court admitted the statements made by Taylor to his attorney (Taylor’s next of kin having waived the privilege). The court found that the statements made by Taylor to his attorney were not testimonial, as they “were not made to a government officer with an eye toward trial, the primary abuse at which the Confrontation Clause was directed.” Finally, while Taylor’s statements amounted to a confession, they were not given to a police officer in the course of interrogation.
Non-Testimonial Hearsay and the Right to Confrontation

Clear statement and holding that *Crawford* overruled *Roberts* even with respect to non-testimonial hearsay: *Whorton v. Bockting*, 549 U.S. 406 (2007): The habeas petitioner argued that testimonial hearsay was admitted against him in violation of *Crawford*. His trial was conducted ten years before *Crawford*, however, and so the question was whether *Crawford* applies retroactively to benefit habeas petitioners. Under Supreme Court jurisprudence, a new rule is applicable on habeas only if it is a “watershed” rule that is critical to the truthseeking function of a trial. The Court found that *Crawford* was a new rule because it overruled *Roberts*. It further held that *Crawford* was not essential to the truthseeking function; its analysis on this point is pertinent to whether *Roberts* retains any vitality with respect to non-testimonial hearsay. The Court declared as follows:

*Crawford* overruled *Roberts* because *Roberts* was inconsistent with the original understanding of the meaning of the Confrontation Clause, not because the Court reached the conclusion that the overall effect of the *Crawford* rule would be to improve the accuracy of fact finding in criminal trials. Indeed, in *Crawford* we recognized that even under the *Roberts* rule, this Court had never specifically approved the introduction of testimonial hearsay statements. Accordingly, it is not surprising that the overall effect of *Crawford* with regard to the accuracy of fact-finding in criminal cases is not easy to assess.

With respect to testimonial out-of-court statements, *Crawford* is more restrictive than was *Roberts*, and this may improve the accuracy of fact-finding in some criminal cases. Specifically, under *Roberts*, there may have been cases in which courts erroneously determined that testimonial statements were reliable. But see 418 F.3d at 1058 (O'Scanlain, J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc) (observing that it is unlikely that this occurred "in anything but the exceptional case"). *But whatever improvement in reliability Crawford produced in this respect must be considered together with Crawford's elimination of Confrontation Clause protection against the admission of unreliable out-of-court nontestimonial statements. Under Roberts, an out-of-court nontestimonial statement not subject to prior cross-examination could not be admitted without a judicial determination regarding reliability. Under Crawford, on the other hand, the Confrontation Clause has no application to such statements and therefore permits their admission even if they lack indicia of reliability. (Emphasis added).*

One of the main reasons that *Crawford* is not retroactive (the holding in *Bochting*) is that it is not essential to the accuracy of a verdict. And one of the reasons *Crawford* is not essential to accuracy is that, with respect to non-testimonial statements, *Crawford* conflicts with accurate factfinding
because it lifts all constitutional reliability requirements imposed by \textit{Roberts}. Thus, if hearsay is non-testimonial, there is no constitutional limit on its admission.
Non-Verbal Information

Videotape of drug transaction was not hearsay and so its introduction did not violate the right to confrontation: United States v. Wallace, 753 F.3d 671 (7th Cir. 2014): In a drug prosecution, the government introduced a videotape, without sound, which appeared to show the defendant selling drugs to an undercover informant. The defendant argued that the tape was inadmissible hearsay and violated his right to confrontation, because the undercover informant was never called to testify. But the court disagreed and affirmed his conviction. The court reasoned that the video was

a picture; it was not a witness who could be cross-examined. The agent narrated the video at trial, and his narration was a series of statements, so he was subject to being cross-examined and was, and thus was “confronted.” [The informant] could have testified to what he saw, but what could he have said about the recording device except that the agents had strapped it on him and sent him into the house, whether the device recorded whatever happened to be in front of it? Rule 801(a) of the Federal Rules of Evidence does define “statement” to include “nonverbal conduct,” but only if the person whose conduct it was “intended it as an assertion.” We can’t fit the videotape in this definition.

Photographs of seized evidence was not testimony so its admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Brooks, 772 F.3d 1161 (9th Cir. 2014): In a narcotics trial, the defendant objected to the admission of photographs of a seized package on the ground it would violate his right to confrontation. But the court disagreed. It noted that the Crawford Court defined “testimony” as “a solemn declaration or affirmation made for the purpose of establishing or proving some fact.” The photographs did not meet that definition because they “were not ‘witnesses’ against Brooks. They did not ‘bear testimony’ by declaring or affirming anything with a ‘purpose.’”

See also the cases under the heading “Machine-Generated Evidence” supra.
Not Offered for Truth

Statements made to defendant in a conversation were testimonial but were not barred by 
\textit{Crawford}, as they were admitted to provide context for the defendant’s own statements: \textit{United States v. Bostick}, 791 F.3d 127 (D.C.Cir. 2015): In a surreptitiously taped conversation, the defendant made incriminating statements to a confidential informant in the course of a drug transaction. The defendant argued that admitting the informant’s part of the conversation violated his right to confrontation because the informant was motivated to develop the conversation for purposes of prosecution. But the court found that the Confrontation Clause was inapplicable because the informant’s statements were not offered for their truth, but rather to provide “context” for the defendant’s own statements regarding the drug transaction. (And the defendant had no right to confront his own statements). Statements that are not hearsay cannot violate the Confrontation Clause even if they fit the definition of testimoniality.

Statements made to defendant in a conversation were testimonial but were not barred by 
\textit{Crawford}, as they were admitted to provide context for the defendant’s own statements: \textit{United States v. Hansen}, 434 F.3d 92 (1st Cir. 2006): After a crime and as part of cooperation with the authorities, the father of an accomplice surreptitiously recorded his conversation with the defendant, in which the defendant admitted criminal activity. The court found that the father’s statements during the conversation were testimonial under \textit{Crawford} --- as they were made specifically for use in a criminal prosecution. But their admission did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation. The defendant’s own side of the conversation was admissible as a statement of a party-opponent, and the father’s side of the conversation was admitted not for its truth but to provide context for the defendant’s statements. \textit{Crawford} does not bar the admission of statements not offered for their truth. \textit{Accord United States v. Walter}, 434 F.3d 30 (1st Cir. 2006) (\textit{Crawford} “does not call into question this court’s precedents holding that statements introduced solely to place a defendant’s admissions into context are not hearsay and, as such, do not run afoul of the Confrontation Clause.”); \textit{United States v. Santiago}, 566 F.3d 65 (1st Cir. 2009) (statements were not offered for their truth “but as exchanges with Santiago essential to understand the context of Santiago’s own recorded statements arranging to ‘cook’ and supply the crack”); \textit{United States v. Liriano}, 761 F.3d 131 (1st Cir. 2014) (even though statements were testimonial, admission did not violation the Confrontation Clause where they were properly offered to place the defendant’s responses in context). \textit{See also Furr v. Brady}, 440 F.3d 34 (1st Cir. 2006) (the defendant was charged with firearms offenses and intimidation of a government witness; an accomplice’s confession to law enforcement did not implicate \textit{Crawford} because it was not admitted for its truth; rather, it was admitted to show that the defendant knew about the confession and, in contacting the accomplice thereafter, intended to intimidate him).
Note: Five members of the Court in Williams disagreed with Justice Alito’s analysis that the Confrontation Clause was not violated because the testimonial lab report was not admitted for its truth. The question from Williams is whether those five Justices (now four, actually) are opposed to any use of the not-for-truth analysis in answering Confrontation Clause challenges. The answer is apparently that their objection to the not-for truth analysis in Williams does not extend to situations in which (in their personal view) the statement has a legitimate not-for-truth purpose. Thus, Justice Thomas distinguishes the expert’s use of the lab report from the prosecution’s admission of an accomplice’s confession in Tennessee v. Street, where the confession “was not introduced for its truth, but only to impeach the defendant’s version of events.” In Street the defendant challenged his confession on the ground that he had been coerced to copy Peele’s confession. Peele’s confession was introduced not for its truth but only to show that it differed from Street’s. For that purpose, it didn’t matter whether it was true. Justice Thomas stated that “[u]nlike the confession in Street, statements introduced to explain the basis of an expert’s opinion are not introduced for a plausible nonhearsay purpose” because “to use the inadmissible information in evaluating the expert’s testimony, the jury must make a preliminary judgment about whether this information is true.” Justice Kagan in her opinion essentially repeats Justice Thomas’s analysis and agrees with his distinction between legitimate and illegitimate use of the “not-for-truth” argument. Both Justices Kagan and Thomas agree with the Court’s statement in Crawford that the Confrontation Clause “does not bar the use of testimonial statements for purposes other than establishing the truth of the matter asserted.” Both would simply add the proviso that the not-for-truth use must be legitimate or plausible.

It follows that the cases under this “not-for-truth” headnote are probably unaffected by Williams, as they largely permit admission of testimonial statements as offered “not-for-truth” only when that purpose is legitimate, i.e., only when the statement is offered for a purpose as to which it is relevant regardless of whether it is true or not.

Statements by informant to police officers, offered implausibly to prove the “background” of the police investigation, probably violate Crawford, but admission is not plain error: United States v. Maher, 454 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 2006): At the defendant’s drug trial, several accusatory statements from an informant (Johnson) were admitted ostensibly to explain why the police focused on the defendant as a possible drug dealer. The court found that these statements were testimonial under Crawford, because “the statements were made while the police were interrogating Johnson after Johnson’s arrest for drugs; Johnson agreed to cooperate and he then
identified Maher as the source of drugs. . . . In this context, it is clear that an objectively reasonable person in Johnson’s shoes would understand that the statement would be used in prosecuting Maher at trial.” The court then addressed the government’s argument that the informant’s statements were not admitted for their truth, but to explain the background of the police investigation:

The government’s articulated justification --- that any statement by an informant to police which sets context for the police investigation is not offered for the truth of the statements and thus not within Crawford --- is impossibly overbroad [and] may be used not just to get around hearsay law, but to circumvent Crawford’s constitutional rule. . . . Here, Officer MacVane testified that the confidential informant had said Maher was a drug dealer, even though the prosecution easily could have structured its narrative to avoid such testimony. The . . . officer, for example, could merely say that he had acted upon “information received,” or words to that effect. It appears the testimony was primarily given exactly for the truth of the assertion that Maher was a drug dealer and should not have been admitted given the adequate alternative approach.

The court noted, however, that the defendant had not objected to the admission of the informant’s statements. It found no plain error, noting among other things, the strength of the evidence and the fact that the testimony “was followed immediately by a sua sponte instruction to the effect that any statements of the confidential informant should not be taken as standing for the truth of the matter asserted, i.e., that Maher was a drug dealer who supplied Johnson with drugs.”

Accomplice statements purportedly offered for “background” were actually admitted for their truth, resulting in a Confrontation Clause violation: United States v. Cabrera-Rivera, 583 F.3d 26 (1st Cir. 2009): In a robbery prosecution, the government offered hearsay statements that accomplices made to police officers. The government argued that the statements were not offered for their truth, but rather to explain how the government was able to find other evidence in the case. But the court found that the accusations were not properly admitted for the purpose of explaining the police investigation. The government at trial emphasized the details of the accusations that had nothing to do with leading the government to other evidence; and the government did not contend that one of the accomplice’s confessions led to any other evidence. Because the statements were testimonial, and because they were in fact offered for their truth, admission of the statements violated Crawford.

Note: The result in Cabrera-Rivera is certainly unchanged by Williams. The prosecution’s was not offering the accusations for any legitimate not-for-truth purpose.
Statements offered to provide context for the defendant’s part of a conversation were not hearsay and therefore could not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Hicks, 575 F.3d 130 (1st Cir. 2009): The court found no error in admitting a telephone call that the defendant placed from jail in which he instructed his girlfriend how to package and sell cocaine. The defendant argued that admission of the girlfriend’s statements in the telephone call violated Crawford. But the court found that the girlfriend’s part of the conversation was not hearsay and therefore did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation. The court reasoned that the girlfriend’s statements were admissible not for their truth but to provide the context for understanding the defendant’s incriminating statements. The court noted that the girlfriend’s statements were “little more than brief responses to Hicks’s much more detailed statements.” See also United States v. Occhiuto, 784 F.3d 862 (1st Cir. 2015) (statements by undercover informant made to defendant during a drug deal were properly admitted; they were offered not for their truth but to provide context for the defendant’s own statements, and so they did not violate the Confrontation Clause).

Accomplice’s confession, when offered in rebuttal to explain why police did not investigate other suspects and leads, is not hearsay and therefore its admission does not violate Crawford: United States v. Cruz-Diaz, 550 F.3d 169 (1st Cir. 2008): In a bank robbery prosecution, defense counsel cross-examined a police officer about the decision not to pursue certain investigatory opportunities after apprehending the defendants. Defense counsel identified “eleven missed opportunities” for tying the defendants to the getaway car, including potential fingerprint and DNA evidence. In response, the officer testified that the defendant’s co-defendant had given a detailed confession. The defendant argued that introducing the cohort’s confession violated his right to confrontation, because it was testimonial under Crawford. But the court found the confession to be not hearsay --- as it was offered for the not-for-truth purpose of explaining why the police conducted the investigation the way they did. Accordingly admission of the statement did not violate Crawford.

The defendant argued that the government’s true motive was to introduce the confession for its truth, and that the not-for-truth purpose was only a pretext. But the court disagreed, noting that the government never tried to admit the confession until defense counsel attacked the thoroughness of the police investigation. Thus, introducing the confession for a not-for-truth purpose was proper rebuttal. The defendant suggested that “if the government merely wanted to explain why the FBI and police failed to conduct a more thorough investigation it could have had the agent testify in a manner that entirely avoided referencing Cruz’s confession” --- for example, by stating that the police chose to truncate the investigation “because of information the agent had.” But the court held that this kind of sanitizing of the evidence was not required, because it “would have come at an unjustified cost to the government.” Such generalized testimony, without any context, “would
not have sufficiently rebutted Ayala’s line of questioning” because it would have looked like one more cover-up. The court concluded that “[w]hile there can be circumstances under which Clause concerns prevent the admission of the substance of a declarant’s out-of-court statement where a less prejudicial narrative would suffice in its place, this is not such a case.” See also United States v. Diaz, 670 F.3d 332 (1st Cir. 2012) (testimonial statement from one police officer to another to effect an arrest did not violate the right to confrontation because it was not hearsay: “The government offered Perez’s out-of-court statement to explain why Veguilla had arrested [the defendant], not as proof of the drug sale that Perez allegedly witnesses. Out-of-court statements providing directions from one individual to another do not constitute hearsay.”).

False alibi statements made to police officers by accomplices are testimonial, but admission does not violate the Confrontation Clause because they are not offered for their truth: United States v. Logan, 419 F.3d 172 (2nd Cir. 2005): The defendant was convicted of conspiracy to commit arson. The trial court admitted statements made by his coconspirators to the police. These statements asserted an alibi, and the government presented other evidence indicating that the alibi was false. The court found no Confrontation Clause violation in admitting the alibi statements. The court relied on Crawford for the proposition that the Confrontation Clause “does not bar the use of testimonial statements for purposes other than proving the truth of the matter asserted.” The statements were not offered to prove that the alibi was true, but rather to corroborate the defendant’s own account that the accomplices planned to use the alibi. Thus “the fact that Logan was aware of this alibi, and that [the accomplices] actually used it, was evidence of conspiracy among [the accomplices] and Logan.”

Note: The Logan court reviewed the defendant’s Confrontation Clause argument under the plain error standard. This was because defense counsel at trial objected on grounds of hearsay, but did not make a specific Confrontation Clause objection.
Statements made to defendant in a conversation were testimonial but were not barred by Crawford, as they were admitted to provide context for the defendant’s statements: United States v. Paulino, 445 F.3d 211 (2nd Cir. 2006): The court stated: “It has long been the rule that so long as statements are not presented for the truth of the matter asserted, but only to establish a context, the defendant’s Sixth Amendment rights are not transgressed. Nothing in Crawford v. Washington is to the contrary.”

Note: This typical use of “context” is not in question after Williams, because the focus is on the defendant’s statements and not on the truth of the declarant’s statements. Use of context could be illegitimate however if the focus is in fact on the truth of the declarant’s statements. See, e.g., United States v. Powers from the Sixth Circuit, infra.
Co-conspirator statements made to government officials to cover-up a crime (whether true or false) do not implicate Crawford because they were not offered for their truth: *United States v. Stewart*, 433 F.3d 273 (2nd Cir. 2006): In the prosecution of Martha Stewart, the government introduced statements made by each of the defendants during interviews with government investigators. Each defendant’s statement was offered against the other, to prove that the story told to the investigators was a cover-up. The court held that the admission of these statements did not violate Crawford, even though they were “provided in a testimonial setting.” It noted first that to the extent the statements were false, they did not violate Crawford because “Crawford expressly confirmed that the categorical exclusion of out-of-court statements that were not subject to contemporaneous cross-examination does not extend to evidence offered for purposes other than to establish the truth of the matter asserted.” The defendants argued, however, that some of the statements made during the course of the obstruction were actually true, and as they were made to government investigators, they were testimonial. The court observed that there is some tension in Crawford between its treatment of co-conspirator statements (by definition not testimonial) and statements made to government investigators (by their nature testimonial), where truthful statements are made as part of a conspiracy to obstruct justice. It found, however, that admitting the truthful statements did not violate Crawford because they were admitted not for their truth, but rather to provide context for the false statements. The court explained as follows:

It defies logic, human experience and even imagination to believe that a conspirator bent on impeding an investigation by providing false information to investigators would lace the totality of that presentation with falsehoods on every subject of inquiry. To do so would be to alert the investigators immediately that the conspirator is not to be believed, and the effort to obstruct would fail from the outset. * * * The truthful portions of statements in furtherance of the conspiracy, albeit spoken in a testimonial setting, are intended to make the false portions believable and the obstruction effective. Thus, the truthful portions are offered, not for the narrow purpose of proving merely the truth of those portions, but for the far more significant purpose of showing each conspirator’s attempt to lend credence to the entire testimonial presentation and thereby obstruct justice.

Note: Offering a testimonial statement to prove it is false is a typical and presumably legitimate not-for-character purpose and so would appear to be unaffected by Williams. That is, to the extent some members of the Court apply a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate not-for-truth usage, offering the statement to prove it is false is certainly on the legitimate side of the line. It is one of the clearest cases of a statement not being offered to prove that the assertions therein are true. Of course, the government must provide independent evidence that the statement is in fact false.
Admission of statement to police officers offered for “context” violated the right to confrontation, given the limited probative value for context: *Orlando v. Nassau County Dist. Attorney’s Office*, 915 F.3d 113 (2nd Cir. 2019): In a habeas proceeding challenging a murder conviction, the court found that Orlando’s right to confrontation was clearly violated. Orlando and his accomplice, Jeannot, were arrested and questioned separately. Jeannot confessed, and the confession was offered at Orlando’s trial purportedly not for its truth, but only to explain why Orlando changed his confession after hearing what Jeannot had said. The court rejected this “context” argument and found that the statement was offered for its truth. It found that at trial, the government explicitly argued that what Jeannot had told the police was true. Moreover, Jeannot’s statement “went far beyond any limited value in showing why Orlando changed his account of what happened that night.” The court noted that “Orlando’s changing his account of the homicide was no different than many investigations when suspects make a series of statements; absent the substance of Jeannot’s statement, the jury still could have learned that after several hours of interrogation, Orlando revised his story and placed himself at the scene of the murder and admitted to lying about his original account. That approach would have significantly advanced the prosecution’s case without a critical narrative gap.”

Note: The court reviews the case under *Bruton*. But *Bruton* was not applicable here because the defendant and the accomplice were not tried together. Rather, this is simply a *Crawford* case, where testimonial hearsay was offered against a criminal defendant. There is no reason to complicate things by adding *Bruton* to it.

Accomplice statements to police officer were testimonial, but did not violate the Confrontation Clause because they were admitted to show they were false: *United States v. Trala*, 386 F.3d 536 (3rd Cir. 2004): An accomplice made statements to a police officer that misrepresented her identity and the source of the money in the defendant’s car. While these were accomplice statements to law enforcement, and thus testimonial, their admission did not violate *Crawford*, as they were not admitted for their truth. In fact the statements were admitted because they were false. Under these circumstances, cross-examination of the accomplice would serve no purpose. *See also United States v. Lore*, 430 F.3d 190 (3rd Cir. 2005) (relying on *Trala*, the court held that grand jury testimony was testimonial, but that its admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause because the self-exculpatory statements denying all wrongdoing “were admitted because they were so obviously false.”).

Confessions of other targets of an investigation were testimonial, but did not violate the Confrontation Clause because they were offered to rebut charges against the integrity of the
investigation: *United States v. Christie*, 624 F.3d 558 (3rd Cir. 2010): In a child pornography investigation, the FBI obtained the cooperation of the administrator of a website, which led to the arrests of a number of users, including the defendant. At trial the defendant argued that the investigation was tainted because the FBI, in its dealings with the administrator, violated its own guidelines in treating informants. Specifically the defendant argued that these misguided law enforcement efforts led to unreliable statements from the administrator. In rebuttal, the government offered and the court admitted evidence that twenty-four other users identified by the administrator confessed to child pornography-related offenses. The defendant argued that admitting the evidence of the others’ confessions violated the hearsay rule and the Confrontation Clause, but the court rejected these arguments and affirmed. It reasoned that the confessions were not offered for their truth, but to show why the FBI could believe that the administrator was a reliable source, and therefore to rebut the charge of improper motive on the FBI’s part. As to the confrontation argument, the court declared that “our conclusion that the testimony was properly introduced for a non-hearsay purpose is fatal to Christie’s *Crawford* argument, since the Confrontation Clause does not bar the use of testimonial statements for purposes other than establishing the truth of the matter asserted.”

**Accomplice’s testimonial statement was properly admitted for impeachment purposes, but failure to give a limiting instruction was error:** *Adamson v. Cathel*, 633 F.3d 248 (3rd Cir. 2011): The defendant challenged his confession at trial by arguing that the police fed him the details of his confession from other confessions by his alleged accomplices, Aljamaar and Napier. On cross-examination, the prosecutor introduced those confessions to show that they differed from the defendant’s confession on a number of details. The court found no error in the admission of the accomplices’ confessions. While testimonial, they were offered for impeachment and not for their truth and so did not violate the Confrontation Clause. However, the trial court gave no limiting instruction, and the court found that failure to be error. The court concluded as follows:

> Without a limiting instruction to guide it, the jury that found Adamson guilty was free to consider those facially incriminating statements as evidence of Adamson’s guilt. The careful and crucial distinction the Supreme Court made between an impeachment use of the evidence and a substantive use of it on the question of guilt was completely ignored during the trial.

**Note:** The use of the cohort’s confessions to show differences from the defendant’s confession is precisely the situation reviewed by the Court in *Tennessee v. Street*. As noted above, while some Justices in *Williams* rejected the “not-for-truth” analysis as applied to expert reliance on testimonial statements, all of the Justices approved of that analysis as applied to the facts of *Street*. 
Statements made in a civil deposition might be testimonial, but admission does not violate the Confrontation Clause if they are offered to prove they are false: *United States v. Holmes*, 406 F.3d 337 (5th Cir. 2005): The defendant was convicted of mail fraud and conspiracy, stemming from a scheme with a court clerk to file a backdated document in a civil action. The defendant argued that admitting the deposition testimony of the court clerk, given in the underlying civil action, violated his right to confrontation after *Crawford*. The clerk testified that the clerk’s office was prone to error and thus someone in that office could have mistakenly backdated the document at issue. The court considered the possibility that the clerk’s testimony was a statement in furtherance of a conspiracy, and noted that coconspirator statements ordinarily are not testimonial under *Crawford*. It also noted, however, that the clerk’s statement “is not the run-of-the-mill co-conspirator’s statement made unwittingly to a government informant or made casually to a partner in crime; rather, we have a co-conspirator’s statement that is derived from a formalized testimonial source --- recorded and sworn civil deposition testimony.” Ultimately the court found it unnecessary to determine whether the deposition testimony was “testimonial” within the meaning of *Crawford* because it was not offered for its truth. Rather, the government offered the testimony “to establish its falsity through independent evidence.” See also *United States v. Gurrola*, 898 F.3d 524 (5th Cir. 2018) (“The Confrontation Clause does not bear on non-testimonial statements. And it is well-settled in this circuit that co-conspirator statements are not testimonial.”); *United States v. Acosta*, 475 F.3d 677 (5th Cir. 2007) (accomplice’s statement offered to impeach him as a witness --- by showing it was inconsistent with the accomplice’s refusal to answer certain questions concerning the defendant’s involvement with the crime --- did not violate *Crawford* because the statement was not admitted for its truth and the jury received a limiting instruction to that effect); *United States v. Smith*, 822 F.3d 755 (5th Cir. 2016)(testimonial statement from an accomplice did not violate the Confrontation Clause because it was “introduced in the context of how Agent Michalik developed suspects . . . for the charged bank robberies. This court has consistently held that out-of-court statements providing background information to explain the actions of investigators are not hearsay” and so do not violate the Confrontation Clause); *United States v. Sosa*, 897 F.3d 615 (5th Cir. 2018) (admitting a tip to police about a cohort of the defendant, offered to explain why the officer investigated the cohort, did not violate the right to confrontation; courts must be “vigilant” in assuring that attempts to explain an officer’s actions “do not allow the backdoor introduction of highly inculpatory statements that the jury may also consider for their truth”; but the greatest risks of backdoor use occur when the statement implicates the defendant directly; this one did not, and the jury already knew about the cohort, so “at a minimum it was not obvious that this statement was offered for its truth”).

Informant’s accusation, purportedly offered to explain the police investigation, was hearsay and violated the Confrontation Clause: *United States v. Kizzee*, 877 F.3d 650 (5th Cir. 2017): In a drug and firearm prosecution, an officer testified (implicitly) that he received information from
an arrestee that the arrestee had purchased drugs from the defendant, and he used that information (as well as other observations of the residence) to obtain a warrant. The government argued that the testimony did not violate the hearsay rule (and so could not violate the Confrontation Clause) because it was offered at trial only to explain the background of the police investigation. But the court disagreed and reversed the conviction. The court stated that the information from the arrestee “was not necessary to explain Detective Schulz’s actions” because “there was minimal need for Detective Schulz to explain the details forming the basis of the search warrant” and his own observations “would have been sufficient to explain his investigatory actions and provide background information.” See also United States v. Jones, 924 F.3d 219 (5th Cir. 2019) (rejecting the government’s argument that an informant’s accusation was properly admitted to explain why a police officer followed the defendant as opposed to another person: “A witness’s statement to police that the defendant is guilty of the crime charged is highly likely to influence the direction of a criminal investigation. But a police officer cannot repeat such out-of-court accusations at trial, even if helpful to explain why the defendant became a suspect.”).

Informant’s accusation, offered to explain why police acted as they did, was testimonial but it was not hearsay, and so its admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Deitz, 577 F.3d 672 (6th Cir. 2009): The court found no error in allowing an FBI agent to testify about why agents tailed the defendant to what turned out to be a drug transaction. The agent testified that a confidential informant had reported to them about Deitz’s drug activity. The court found that the informant’s statement was testimonial --- because it was an accusation made to a police officer --- but it was not hearsay and therefore its admission did not violate Deitz’s right to confrontation. The court found that admitting the testimony “explaining why authorities were following Deitz to and from Dayton was not plain error as it provided mere background information, not facts going to the very heart of the prosecutor’s case.” The court also observed that “had defense counsel objected to the testimony at trial, the court could have easily restricted its scope.” See also United States v. Al-Maliki, 787 F.3d 784 (6th Cir. 2015) (in a prosecution for child sex abuse, the trial court admitted the defendant’s wife’s statement to police accusing the defendant of sexual abuse; the court found no error because it was offered for the limited purpose of explaining why an official investigation began: “Two conclusions follow: It is not hearsay, * * * and the government did not violate the Confrontation Clause”); United States v. Doxey, 833 F.3d 692 (6th Cir. 2016) (informant’s tip leading to search of the defendant’s vehicle was not hearsay as it was offered “merely by way of background”); United States v. Davis, 577 F.3d 660 (6th Cir. 2009): A woman’s statement to police that she had recently seen the defendant with a gun in a car that she described along with the license plate was not hearsay ---and so even though testimonial did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation --- because it was offered only to explain the police investigation that led to the defendant and the defendant’s conduct when he learned the police were looking for him. Accord United States v. Napier, 787 F.3d 333 (6th Cir. 2015): In a
child pornography prosecution, the government offered a document from Time Warner cable, obtained pursuant to a government subpoena, showing that an email address was accessed at the defendant’s home and that the defendant was the subscriber to the account. The court found no confrontation violation because the document was offered not for its truth, but rather “to demonstrate how the Cincinnati office of the FBI located Napier.” The court noted that the trial court gave the jury a limiting instruction that the document could be considered only to prove the course of the investigation.

**Undercover statements offered to show representations about money-laundering, in a sting operation, were not offered for truth and so admitting them did not violate the Confrontation Clause:** *United States v. King*, 865 F.3d 848 (6th Cir. 2017) (Sutton, J.): The defendant was the target of a sting operation. The undercover informant represented in several conversations with the defendant that he had drug money to launder, and the defendant responded with the details of how he would launder the money. The defendant argued that the undercover informant’s part of the conversation was testimonial because it was primarily motivated for use in a criminal prosecution. But the court noted that the threshold requirement for violating the Confrontation Clause is that the out-of-court statement is admitted for its truth. That was not the case here. They were not offered to prove, for example, that the informant had drug money and wanted to clean it. Rather, the prosecution used the statements to prove that the informant made representations about having drug money and the defendant believed him.

**Statement offered to prove the defendant’s knowledge of a crime was non-hearsay and so did not violate the accused’s confrontation rights:** *United States v. Boyd*, 640 F.3d 657 (6th Cir. 2011): A defendant charged with being an accessory after the fact to a carjacking and murder had told police officers that his friend Davidson had told him that he had committed those crimes. At trial the government offered that confession, which included the underlying statements of Boyd. The defendant argued that admitting Davidson’s statements violated his right to confrontation. But the court found no error because the hearsay was not offered for its truth: “Davidson’s statements to Boyd were offered to prove Boyd’s knowledge [of the crimes that Davidson had committed] rather than for the truth of the matter asserted.”

**Admission of complaints offered for non-hearsay purpose did not violate the Confrontation Clause:** *United States v. Adams*, 722 F.3d 788 (6th Cir. 2013): The defendants were convicted for participation in a vote-buying scheme in three elections. They complained that their confrontation rights were violated when the court admitted complaints that were contained within state election reports. The court of appeals rejected that argument, because the complaints were offered for
proper non-hearsay purposes. Some of the information was offered to prove it was false, and other information was offered to show that the defendants adjusted their scheme based on the complaints received. The court did find, however, that the complaints were erroneously admitted under Rule 403, because of the substantial risk that the jury would use the assertions for their truth; that the probative value for the non-hearsay purpose was “minimal at best”; and the government had other less prejudicial evidence available to prove the point. Technically, this should mean that there was a violation of the Confrontation Clause, because the evidence was not properly offered for a not-for-truth purpose. But the court did not make that holding. It reversed on evidentiary grounds.

Informant’s statements were not properly offered for “context,” so their admission violated Crawford: United States v. Powers, 500 F.3d 500 (6th Cir. 2007): In a drug prosecution, a law enforcement officer testified that he had received information about the defendant’s prior criminal activity from a confidential informant. The government argued on appeal that even though the informant’s statements were testimonial, they did not violate the Confrontation Clause, because they were offered “to show why the police conducted a sting operation” against the defendant. But the court disagreed and found a Crawford violation. It reasoned that “details about Defendant’s alleged prior criminal behavior were not necessary to set the context of the sting operation for the jury. The prosecution could have established context simply by stating that the police set up a sting operation.” See also United States v. Hearn, 500 F.3d 479 (6th Cir.2007) (confidential informant’s accusation was not properly admitted for background where the witness testified with unnecessary detail and “[t]he excessive detail occurred twice, was apparently anticipated, and was explicitly relied upon by the prosecutor in closing arguments”).

Admitting informant’s statement to police officer for purposes of “background” did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Gibbs, 506 F.3d 479 (6th Cir. 2007): In a trial for felon-firearm possession, the trial court admitted a statement from an informant to a police officer; the informant accused the defendant of having firearms hidden in his bedroom. Those firearms were not part of the possession charge. While this accusation was testimonial, its admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause, “because the testimony did not bear on Gibbs’s alleged possession of the .380 Llama pistol with which he was charged.” Rather, it was admitted “solely as background evidence to show why Gibbs’s bedroom was searched.” See also United States v. Macias-Farias, 706 F.3d 775 (6th Cir. 2013) (officer’s testimony that he had received information from someone was offered not for its truth but to explain the officer’s conduct, thus no confrontation violation).
Statement offered to prove it was false was not hearsay and so could not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation: United States v. Porter, 886 F.3d 562 (6th Cir. 2018): In a prosecution against a mayor for theft from federal programs and bribery, the government offered statements by an accomplice to investigators. The trial court found that the statements were properly admitted to prove they were false, and that the government established the falsity of statements with independent evidence. The court of appeals held that “because the government’s position was that Chet Crace’s prior statements to investigators during the April 10, 2015 interview were false, Atkins’s statements were not hearsay and did not implicate Porter’s confrontation rights.”

Admission of the defendant’s conversation with an undercover informant does not violate the Confrontation Clause, where the undercover informant’s part of the conversation is offered only for “context”: United States v. Nettles, 476 F.3d 508 (7th Cir. 2007): The defendant made plans to blow up a government building, and the government had an undercover informant contact him and ostensibly offer to help him obtain materials. At trial, the court admitted a recorded conversation between the defendant and the informant. Because the informant was not produced for trial, the defendant argued that his right to confrontation was violated. But the court found no error, because the admission of the defendant’s part of the conversation was not barred by the Confrontation Clause, and the informant’s part of the conversation was admitted only to place the defendant’s part in “context.” Because the informant’s statements were not offered for their truth, they did not implicate the Confrontation Clause.

The Nettles court did express some concern about the breadth of the “context” doctrine, stating: “We note that there is a concern that the government may, in future cases, seek to submit based on ‘context’ statements that are, in fact, being offered for their truth.” But the court found no such danger in this case, noting the following: 1) the informant presented himself as not being proficient in English, so most of his side of the conversation involved asking the defendant to better explain himself; and 2) the informant did not “put words in Nettles’s mouth or try to persuade Nettles to commit more crimes in addition to those that Nettles had already decided to commit.” See also United States v. Tolliver, 454 F.3d 660 (7th Cir. 2006) (statements of one party to a conversation with a conspirator were offered not for their truth but to provide context to the conspirator’s statements: “Crawford only covers testimonial statements proffered to establish the truth of the matter asserted. In this case . . . Shye’s statements were admissible to put Dunklin’s admissions on the tapes into context, making the admissions intelligible for the jury. Statements providing context for other admissible statements are not hearsay because they are not offered for their truth. As a result, the admission of such context evidence does not offend the Confrontation Clause because the declarant is not a witness against the accused.”); United States v. Bermea-Boone, 563 F.3d 621 (7th Cir. 2009): A conversation between the defendant and a coconspirator was properly
admitted; the defendant’s side of the conversation was a statement of a party-opponent, and the accomplice’s side was properly admitted to provide context for the defendant’s statements: “Where there is no hearsay, the concerns addressed in Crawford do not come in to play. That is, the declarant, Garcia, did not function as a witness against the accused.”; United States v. York, 572 F.3d 415 (7th Cir. 2009) (informant’s recorded statements in a conversation with the defendant were admitted for context and therefore did not violate the Confrontation Clause: “we see no indication that Mitchell tried to put words in York’s mouth”); United States v. Hicks, 635 F.3d 1063 (7th Cir. 2011): (undercover informant’s part of conversations were not hearsay, as they were offered to place the defendant’s statements in context; because they were not offered for truth their admission did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation); United States v. Gaytan, 649 F.3d 573 (7th Cir. 2011) (undercover informant’s statements to the defendant in a conversation setting up a drug transaction were clearly testimonial, but not offered for their truth: “Gaytan’s responses [‘what you need?’ and ‘where the loot at?’] would have been unintelligible without the context provided by Worthen’s statements about his or his brother’s interest in ‘rock’”; the court noted that there was no indication that the informant was “putting words in Gaytan’s mouth”); United States v. Foster, 701 F.3d 1142 (7th Cir. 2012) (“Here, the CI’s statement regarding the weight [of the drug] was not offered to show what the weight actually was * * * but rather to explain the defendant’s acts and make his statements intelligible. The defendant’s statement to ‘give me sixteen fifty’ (because the original price was 17) would not have made sense without reference to the CI’s comment that the quantity was off. Because the statements were admitted only to prove context, Crawford does not require confrontation.”); United States v. Faruki, 803 F.3d 847 (7th Cir. 2015) (no confrontation violation where out-of-court statements were offered to place the defendant’s own statements in context).

For more on “context” see United States v. Wright, 722 F.3d 1064 (7th Cir. 2013): In a drug prosecution, the defendant’s statement to a confidential information that he was “stocked up” would have been unintelligible without providing the context of the informant’s statements inquiring about drugs, “and a jury would not have any sense of why the conversation was even happening.” The court also noted that “most of the CI’s statements were inquiries and not factual assertions.” The court expressed concern, however, that the district court’s limiting instruction on “context” was boilerplate, and that the jury “could have been told that the CI’s half of the conversation was being played only so that it could understand what Wright was responding to, and that the CI’s statements standing alone were not to be considered as evidence of Wright’s guilt.”

In United States v. Smith, 816 F.3d 479 (7th Cir. 2016), a public corruption case, the court rejected the use of “context” where placing the defendant’s statement in “context” only worked if the informant’s statement to the defendant were true. In Smith, the court gave an example of an informant saying to the defendant “Last week I paid you $7000 for a letter that my client will use
to seek a grant. Do you remember?” And the defendant says “Yes.” The court noted that the informant’s statement puts the defendant’s answer in context, but only if the informant was speaking the truth. In that situation, the informant’s statement would be hearsay and potentially triggered the right to confrontation --- but that right was not violated in this case because the informant’s statements were not offered for truth but rather were verbal acts establishing a corrupt agreement. See also United States v. Amaya, 828 F.3d 518 (7th Cir. 2016), where an informant’s statement “that was a big ass pistol” was offered to put the defendant’s statement “Hell yea” in context. But the court found that context was unworkable because the informant’s statement was only relevant to context if it were true --- only if a gun was present would the “Hell yea” mean anything pertinent to the case. Yet the informant’s statement was found not testimonial, because it was simply blurted out, and so was not made with the primary motive that it would be used in a criminal prosecution.

Note: The concerns expressed in Nettles and the other 7th Circuit cases discussed above --- about possible abuse of the “context” usage --- are along the same lines as those expressed by Justices Thomas and Kagan in Williams, when they seek to distinguish legitimate and illegitimate not-for-truth purposes. If context is a pretext and the statement is in fact offered for the truth, then the statement is not being offered for a legitimate not-for-truth purpose.

Police report offered for a purpose other than proving the truth of its contents is properly admitted even if it is testimonial: United States v. Price, 418 F.3d 771 (7th Cir. 2005): In a drug conspiracy trial, the government offered a report prepared by the Gary Police Department. The report was an “intelligence alert” identifying some of the defendants as members of a street gang dealing drugs. The report was found in the home of one of the conspirators. The government offered the report at trial to prove that the conspirators were engaging in counter-surveillance, and the jury was instructed not to consider the accusations in the report as true, but only for the fact that the report had been intercepted and kept by one of the conspirators. The court found that even if the report was testimonial, there was no error in admitting the report as proof of awareness and counter-surveillance. It relied on Crawford for the proposition that the Confrontation Clause does not bar the use of out-of-court statements “for purposes other than proving the truth of the matter asserted.” See also United States v. Ambrose, 668 F.3d 943 (7th Cir. 2012) (conversation between two crime family members about actions of a cooperating witness were not offered for their truth but rather to show that information had been leaked; because the statements were not offered for their truth, there was no violation of the right to confrontation).
Accusation offered not for truth, but to explain police conduct, was not hearsay and did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation: *United States v. Dodds*, 569 F.3d 336 (7th Cir. 2009): Appealing a firearms conviction, the defendant argued that his right to confrontation was violated when the trial court admitted a statement from an unidentified witness to a police officer. The witness told the officer that a black man in a black jacket and black cap was pointing a gun at people two blocks away. The court found no confrontation violation because “the problem that *Crawford* addresses is the admission of hearsay” and the witness’s statement was not hearsay. It was not admitted for its truth --- that the witness saw the man he described pointing a gun at people --- but rather “to explain why the police proceeded to the intersection of 35th and Galena and focused their attention on Dodds, who matched the description they had been given.” The court noted that the trial judge did not provide a limiting instruction, but also noted that the defendant never asked the court to do so and that the lack of an instruction was not raised on appeal. See also *United States v. Taylor*, 569 F.3d 742 (7th Cir. 2009): An accusation from a bystander to a police officer that the defendant had just taken a gun across the street was not hearsay because it was offered to explain the officers’ actions in the course of their investigation: “for example, why they looked across the street * * * and why they handcuffed Taylor when he approached.” The court noted that absent “complicating circumstances, such as a prosecutor who exploits nonhearsay statements for their truth, nonhearsay testimony does not present a confrontation problem.” The court found no “complicating circumstances” in this case.

**Note:** The Court’s reference in *Taylor* to the possibility of exploiting a not-for-truth purpose runs along the same lines as those expressed by Justice Thomas and Kagan in *Williams*.

Testimonial statement was not legitimately offered for context or background and so was a violation of *Crawford*: *United States v. Adams*, 628 F.3d 407 (7th Cir. 2010): In a narcotics prosecution, statements made by confidential informants to police officers were offered against the defendant. For example, the government offered testimony from a police officer that he stopped the defendant’s car on a tip from a confidential informant that the defendant was involved in the drug trade and was going to buy crack. A search of the car uncovered a large amount of money and a crack pipe. The government offered the informant’s statement not for the truth of the assertion but as “foundation for what the officer did.” The trial court admitted the statement and gave a limiting instruction. But the court of appeals found error, though harmless, because the informant’s statements “were not necessary to provide any foundation for the officer’s subsequent actions.” It explained as follows:

The CI’s statements here are different from statements we have found admissible that gave context to an otherwise meaningless conversation or investigation. [cites omitted] Here the CI’s accusations did not counter a defense strategy that police officers randomly targeted Adams. And,
there was no need to introduce the statements for context --- even if the CI’s statements were excluded, the jury would have fully understood that the officer searched Adams and the relevance of the items recovered in that search to the charged crime.

See also United States v. Walker, 673 F.3d 649 (7th Cir. 2012) (confidential informant’s statements to the police --- that he got guns from the defendant --- were not properly offered for context but rather were testimonial hearsay: “The government repeatedly hides behind its asserted needs to provide ‘context’ and relate the ‘course of investigation.’ These euphemistic descriptions cannot disguise a ploy to pin the two guns on Walker while avoiding the risk of putting Ringswald on the stand. * * * A prosecutor surely knows that hearsay results when he elicits from a government agent that ‘the informant said he got this gun from X’ as proof that X supplied the gun.”); Jones v. Basinger, 635 F.3d 1030 (7th Cir. 2011) (accusation made to police was not offered for background and therefore its admission violated the defendant’s right to confrontation; the record showed that the government encouraged the jury to use the statements for their truth).

Note: Adams, Walker and Jones are all examples of illegitimate use of not-for-truth purposes and so finding a Confrontation violation in these cases is quite consistent with the analysis of not-for-truth purposes in the Thomas and Kagan opinions in Williams.

Statements by a confidential informant included in a search warrant were testimonial and could not be offered at trial to explain the police investigation: United States v. Holmes, 620 F.3d 836 (8th Cir. 2010): In a drug trial, the defendant tried to distance himself from a house where the drugs were found in a search pursuant to a warrant. On redirect of a government agent --- after defense counsel had questioned the connection of the defendant to the residence --- the trial judge permitted the agent to read from the statement of a confidential informant. That statement indicated that the defendant was heavily involved in drug activity at the house. The government acknowledged that the informant’s statements were testimonial, but argued that the statements were not hearsay, as they were offered only to show the officer’s knowledge and the propriety of the investigation. But the court found the admission to be error. It noted that informants’ statements are admissible to explain an investigation “only when the propriety of the investigation is at issue in the trial.” In this case, the defendant did not challenge the validity of the search warrant and did not dispute the propriety of the investigation. The court stated that if the real purpose of admitting the evidence was to explain the officer’s knowledge and the nature of the investigation, “a question asking whether someone had told him that he had seen Holmes at the residence would have addressed the issue * * * without the need to go into the damning details of what the CI told Officer Singh.” Compare United States v. Brooks, 645 F.3d 971 (8th Cir. 2011) (“In this case, the
statement at issue [a report by a confidential informant that Brooks was selling narcotics and firearms from a certain premises] was not offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted --- that is, that Brooks was indeed a drug and firearms dealer. It was offered purely to explain why the officers were at the multi-family dwelling in the first place, which distinguishes this case from *Holmes*. In *Holmes*, it was undisputed that officers had a valid warrant. Accordingly less explanation was necessary. Here, the CI’s information was necessary to explain why the officers went to the residence without a warrant and why they would be more interested in apprehending the man on the stairs than the man who fled the scene. Because the statement was offered only to show why the officers conducted their investigation in the way they did, the Confrontation Clause is not implicated here.”). See also *United States v. Shores*, 700 F.3d 366 (8th Cir. 2012) (confidential informant’s accusation made to police officer was properly offered to prove the propriety of the investigation: “From the early moments of the trial, it was clear that Shores would be premising his defense on the theory that he was a victim of government targeting.”); *United States v. Wright*, 739 F.3d 1160 (8th Cir. 2014) (Officer’s statement to another officer, “come into the room, I’ve found something” was not hearsay because it was offered only to explain why the second officer came into the room and to rebut the defense counsel’s argument that the officer entered the room in response to a loud noise: “If the underlying statement is testimonial but not hearsay, it can be admitted without violating the defendant’s Sixth Amendment rights.”).

**Accusatory statements offered to explain why an officer conducted an investigation in a certain way are not hearsay and therefore admission does not violate *Crawford*:** *United States v. Brown*, 560 F.3d 754 (8th Cir. 2009): Challenging drug conspiracy convictions, one defendant argued that it was error for the trial court to admit an out-of-court statement from a shooting victim to a police officer. The victim accused a person named “Clean” who was accompanied by a man named Charmar. The officer who took this statement testified that he entered “Charmar” into a database to help identify “Clean” and the database search led him to the defendant. The court found no error in admitting the victim’s statement, stating that “it is not hearsay when offered to explain why an officer conducted an investigation in a certain way.” The defendant argued that the purported nonhearsay purpose for admitting the evidence “was only a subterfuge to get Williams’ statement about Brown before the jury.” But the court responded that the defendant “did not argue at trial that the prejudicial effect of the evidence outweighed its nonhearsay value.” The court also observed that the trial court twice instructed the jury that the statement was admitted for the limited purpose of understanding why the officer searched the database for Charmar. Finally, the court held that because the statement properly was not offered for its truth, “it does not implicate the confrontation clause.”
Statement offered as foundation for good faith basis for asking question on cross-examination does not implicate Crawford: United States v. Spears, 533 F.3d 715 (8th Cir. 2008): In a bank robbery case, the defendant testified and was cross-examined and asked about her knowledge of prior bank robberies. In order to inquire about these bad acts, the government was required to establish to the court a good-faith basis for believing that the acts occurred. The government’s good-faith basis was the confession of the defendant’s associate to having taken part in the prior robberies. The defendant argued that the associate’s statements, made to police officers, were testimonial. But the court held that Crawford was inapplicable because the associate’s statements were not admitted for their truth --- indeed they were not admitted at all. The court noted that there was “no authority for the proposition that use of an out-of-court testimonial statement merely as the good faith factual basis for relevant cross-examination of the defendant at trial implicates the Confrontation Clause.”

Admitting testimonial statements that were part of a conversation with the defendant did not violate the Confrontation Clause because they were not offered for their truth: United States v. Spencer, 592 F.3d 866 (8th Cir. 2010): Affirming drug convictions, the court found no error in admitting tape recordings of a conversation between the defendant and a government informant. The defendant’s statements were statements by a party-opponent and admitting the defendant’s own statements cannot violate the Confrontation Clause. The informant’s statements were not hearsay because they were admitted only to put the defendant’s statements in context.

Statement offered to prove it was false is not hearsay and so did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Yielding, 657 F.3d 688 (8th Cir. 2011): In a fraud prosecution, the trial court admitted the statement of an accomplice to demonstrate that she used a false cover story when talking to the FBI. The court found no error, noting that “the point of the prosecutor’s introducing those statements was simply to prove that the statements were made so as to establish a foundation for later showing, through other admissible evidence, that they were false.” The court found that the government introduced other evidence to show that the declarant’s assertions that a transaction was a loan were false. The court cited Bryant for the proposition that because the statements were not hearsay, their admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause.

Admitting testimonial statements to show a common (false) alibi did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Young, 753 F.3d 757 (8th Cir. 2014): Young was accused of conspiring with Mock to murder Young’s husband and make it look like an accident. The
government introduced the statement that Mock made to police after the husband was killed. The statement was remarkably consistent in all details with the alibi that Young had independently provided, and many of the assertions were false. The government offered Mock’s statement for the inference that she had Young had collaborated on an alibi. Young argued that introducing Mock’s statement to the police violated her right to confrontation, but the court disagreed. It observed that the Confrontation Clause does not bar the admission of out-of-court statements that are not hearsay. In this case, Mock’s statement was not offered for its truth but rather “to show that Young and Mock had a common alibi, scheme, or conspiracy. In fact, Mock’s statements to Deputy Salsberry are valuable to the government because they are false.”

**Statement offered for impeachment was not hearsay and therefore admission did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation:** *United States v. Cotton*, 823 F.3d 430 (8th Cir. 2016): “Cotton first argued that admission of Frazier’s post-arrest statement violated his rights under the Confrontation Clause. Because the statement was offered for impeachment [as a prior inconsistent statement of a hearsay declarant] and not to prove the truth of the matter asserted, there was no Confrontation Clause violation in this case.”

**Informant’s part of a conversation with a coconspirator was properly admitted for context and not for truth:** *United States v. Barragan*, 871 F.3d 689 (9th Cir. 2017): In a prosecution for racketeering and drug crimes, the trial court admitted a taped conversation between a defendant’s coconspirator and an undercover informant. The defendant conceded that the coconspirator’s statement was admissible under Rule 802(d)(2)(E), but contended that admitting the informant’s part of the conversation violated his right to confrontation. But the court found no error, because the informant’s statements were offered only to place the coconspirator’s statements in context, and the jury was instructed to that effect. The court stated that the informant’s statements “were not admitted for their truth, and the admission of such context evidence does not offend the Confrontation Clause.”

**Accusation offered to rebut the defendant’s charge of a sloppy investigation were legitimately offered for a non-hearsay purpose and so admission did not violate the right to confrontation:** *United States v. Johnson*, 875 F.3d 1265 (9th Cir. 2017): The defendant was charged with felon-firearm possession. He claimed that the gun belonged to Jakith Martin and argued at trial that the police investigation was sloppy. The government countered with testimony from an officer that the defendant’s girlfriend told him that the gun was the defendant’s. The girlfriend’s statement was definitely testimonial. But the court found no error, because the
Confrontation Clause does not apply to a statement that is not hearsay. In this case, the statement was offered not to prove that the defendant possessed the gun, but rather to show that the police investigation was proper (and not sloppy) when it focused on the defendant. The court noted that “Courts must exercise caution to ensure that out-of-court testimonial statements, ostensibly offered to explain the course of a police investigation, are not used as an end-around Crawford and hearsay rules, particularly when those statements directly inculpate the defendant.” But in this case, the statements were “relevant to rebutting Johnson’s theory of the case: that the police were sloppy and had no reason to investigate Johnson’s property rather than investigate Jakith Martin’s.” The court emphasized that the trial court “properly and contemporaneously instructed the jury that the statements were to be considered only for nonhearsay purposes” and that the jury “was again reminded of this admonition in the final jury instructions.”

Admitting statements to police officer for purposes of “background” did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Audette, 923 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 2019): The defendant defrauded people into giving him money by stating that he was on the run from the Mafia and if he didn’t get the money, his wife and stepdaughter would be killed. The defendant claimed that he was ordered to make such statements by various CIA and FBI agents. At trial the government offered testimony by an FBI agent who took part in the investigation, to statements made to him by the wife and stepdaughter that contradicted the defendant’s account. The court found no violation of the Confrontation Clause. It recognized that the statements were testimonial because made to an investigating officer in the course of an interrogation. But the statements were not offered to prove that the defendant was responsible for the fraud. Rather, “the government offered Agent Hill’s testimony to explain why they focused on Audette --- rather than the various CIA and FBI agents who allegedly ordered Audette to borrow money from the victims --- as a suspect.”

Statements not offered for truth do not violate the Confrontation Clause even if testimonial: United States v. Faulkner, 439 F.3d 1221 (10th Cir. 2006): The court stated that “it is clear from Crawford that the [Confrontation] Clause has no role unless the challenged out-of-court statement is offered for the truth of the matter asserted in the statement.” See also United States v. Mitchell, 502 F.3d 931 (9th Cir. 2007) (information given by an eyewitness to a police officer was not offered for its truth but rather “as a basis” for the officer’s action, and therefore its admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause); United States v. Brinson, 772 F.3d 1314 (10th Cir. 2014) (In a prosecution for sex trafficking, statements made to an undercover police officer that set up a meeting for sex were properly admitted as not hearsay and so their admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause: “The prosecution did not present the out-of-court statements to prove the truth of the statements about the location, price, or lack of a condom. Rather, the prosecution offered these statements to explain why Officer Osterdyk went to Room 123, how he knew the price, and why he agreed to pay for oral sex.”; the court also found that the statements were not testimonial anyway because the declarant did not know she was talking to a police officer.); United
States v. Ibarra-Diaz, 805 F.3d 908 (10th Cir. 2015) (confidential informant’s statements to a police officer about the defendant’s interest in doing a drug deal were testimonial, but the right to confrontation was not violated because the statements were offered to “explain why the officer did not put a body wire on the CI for this significant drug transaction --- i.e., because, unlike situations where the detective is in control of the informant from the outset and * * * of the circumstances of the informant’s dealings with a potential target, in this instance the CI just called the detective ‘out of the blue’ about the possible drug transaction”; other statements from accomplices were properly admitted because they were not offered for their truth but to explain the conduct of the detective who heard the statements).

Accomplice’s confession, offered to explain a police officer’s subsequent conduct, was not hearsay and therefore did not violate the Confrontation Clause: United States v. Jiminez, 564 F.3d 1280 (11th Cir. 2009): The court found no plain error in the admission of an accomplice’s confession in the defendant’s drug conspiracy trial. The police officer who had taken the accomplice’s confession was cross-examined extensively about why he had repeatedly interviewed the defendant and about his decision not to obtain a written and signed confession from him. This cross-examination was designed to impeach the officer’s credibility and to suggest that he was lying about the circumstances of the interviews and about the defendant’s confession. In explanation, the officer stated that he approached the defendant the way he did because the accomplice had given a detailed confession that was in conflict with what the defendant had said in prior interviews. The court held that in these circumstances, the accomplice’s confession was properly admitted to explain the officer’s motivations, and not for its truth. Accordingly its admission did not violate the Confrontation Clause, even though the statement was testimonial.

Note: The court assumed that the accomplice’s confession was admitted for a proper, not-for-truth purpose, even though there was no such finding on the record, and the trial court never gave a limiting instruction. Part of the reason for this deference is that the court was operating under a plain error standard. The defendant at trial objected only on hearsay grounds, and this did not preserve any claim of error on confrontation clause grounds. The concurring judge noted, however, “that the better practice in this case would have been for the district court to have given an instruction as to the limited purpose of Detective Wharton’s testimony” because “there is no assurance, and much doubt, that a typical jury, on its own, would recognize the limited nature of the evidence.”

See also United States v. Augustin, 661 F.3d 1105 (11th Cir. 2011) (no confrontation violation where declarant’s statements “were not offered for the truth of the matters asserted, but rather to provide context for [the defendant’s] own statements”).
Present Sense Impression

911 call describing ongoing drug crime is admissible as a present sense impression and not testimonial under Bryant: United States v. Polidore, 690 F.3d 705 (5th Cir. 2012): In a drug trial, the defendant objected that a 911 call from a bystander to a drug transaction --- together with the bystander’s answers to questions from the 911 operators --- was testimonial and also admitted in violation of the rule against hearsay. On the hearsay question, the court found that the bystander’s statements in the 911 call were admissible as present sense impressions, as they were made while the transaction was ongoing. As to testimoniality, the court held that the case was unlike the 911 call cases decided by the Supreme Court, as there was no ongoing emergency --- rather the caller was simply recording that a crime was taking place across the street, and no violent activity was occurring. But the court noted that under Bryant an ongoing emergency is relevant but not dispositive of whether statements about a crime are testimonial. Ultimately the court found that the caller’s statements were not testimonial, reasoning as follows:

[A]lthough the 911 caller appeared to have understood that his comments would start an investigation that could lead to a criminal prosecution, the primary purpose of his statements was to request police assistance in stopping an ongoing crime and to provide the police with the requisite information to achieve that objective. * * * The 911 caller simply was not acting as a witness; he was not testifying. What he said was not a weaker substitute for live testimony at trial. In other words, the caller's statements were not ex parte communications that created evidentiary products that aligned perfectly with their courtroom analogues. No witness goes into court to report that a man is currently selling drugs out of his car and to ask the police to come and arrest the man while he still has the drugs in his possession.

Present sense impression, describing an event that occurred months before a crime, is not testimonial: United States v. Danford, 435 F.3d 682 (7th Cir. 2005): The defendant was convicted of insurance fraud after staging a fake robbery of his jewelry store. At trial, one of the employees testified to a statement made by the store manager, indicating that the defendant had asked the manager how to disarm the store alarm. The defendant argued that the store manager’s statement was testimonial under Crawford, but the court disagreed. The court stated that “the conversation between [the witness] and the store manager is more akin to a casual remark than it is to testimony in the Crawford-sense. Accordingly, we hold that the district court did not err in admitting this testimony under Fed.R.Evid. 803(1), the present-sense impression exception to the hearsay rule.”

Present-sense impressions of DEA agents during a buy-bust operation were safety-related and so not testimonial: United States v. Solorio, 669 F.3d 943 (9th Cir. 2012): Appealing from
a conviction arising from a “buy-bust” operation, the defendant argued that hearsay statements of DEA agents at the scene --- which were admitted as present sense impressions --- were testimonial and so should have been excluded under *Crawford.* The court disagreed. It concluded that the statements were made in order to communicate observations to other agents in the field and thus assure the success of the operation, “by assuring that all agents involved knew what was happening and enabling them to gauge their actions accordingly.” Thus the statements were not testimonial because the primary purpose for making them was not to prepare a statement for trial but rather to assure that the arrest was successful and that the effort did not escalate into a dangerous situation. The court noted that the buy-bust operation “was a high-risk situation involving the exchange of a large amount of money and a substantial quantity of drugs” and also that the defendant was visibly wary of the situation.
Records, Certificates, Etc.

Reports on forensic testing by law enforcement are testimonial: *Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts*, 557 U.S. 305 (2009): In a drug case, the trial court admitted three "certificates of analysis" showing the results of the forensic tests performed on the seized substances. The certificates stated that “the substance was found to contain: Cocaine.” The certificates were sworn to before a notary public by analysts at the State Laboratory Institute of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. The Court, in a highly contentious 5-4 case, held that these certificates were “testimonial” under *Crawford* and therefore admitting them without a live witness violated the defendant’s right to confrontation. The majority noted that affidavits prepared for litigation are within the core definition of “testimonial” statements. The majority also noted that the only reason the certificates were prepared was for use in litigation. It stated that “[w]e can safely assume that the analysts were aware of the affidavits’ evidentiary purpose, since that purpose --- as stated in the relevant state-law provision --- was reprinted on the affidavits themselves.”

The implications of *Melendez-Diaz* --- beyond requiring a live witness to testify to the results of forensic tests conducted primarily for litigation --- are found in the parts of the majority opinion that address the dissent’s arguments that the decision will lead to substantial practical difficulties. These implications are discussed in turn:

1. In a footnote, the majority declared in dictum that “documents prepared in the regular course of equipment maintenance may well qualify as nontestimonial records.” Apparently these are more like traditional business records than records prepared primarily for litigation, though the question is close --- the reason these records are maintained, with respect to forensic testing equipment, is so that the tests conducted can be admitted as reliable. At any rate, the footnote shows some flexibility, in that not every record involved in the forensic testing process will necessarily be found testimonial.

2. The dissent argued that forensic testers are not “accusatory” witnesses in the sense of preparing factual affidavits about the crime itself. But the majority rejected this distinction, declaring that the text of the Sixth Amendment “contemplates two classes of witnesses: those against the defendant and those in his favor. The prosecution *must* produce the former; the defendant *may* call the latter. Contrary to respondent’s assertion, there is not a third category of witnesses, helpful to the prosecution, but somehow immune from confrontation.” This statement raises questions about the reasoning of some lower courts that have admitted autopsy reports and other certificates after *Crawford*. These cases are discussed below.

3. Relatedly, the defendant argued that the affidavits at issue were nothing like the affidavits found problematic in the case of Sir Walter Raleigh. The Raleigh affidavits were a substitute for a witness testifying to critical historical facts about the crime. But the majority responded that while the ex parte affidavits in the Raleigh case were the paradigmatic confrontation concern, “the paradigmatic
case identifies the core of the right to confrontation, not its limits. The right to confrontation was not invented in response to the use of the ex parte examinations in Raleigh’s Case.”

4. The majority noted that cross-examining a forensic analyst may be necessary because “[a]t least some of that methodology requires the exercise of judgment and presents a risk of error that might be explored on cross-examination.” This implies that if the evidence is nothing but a machine print-out, it will not run afoul of the Confrontation Clause. As discussed earlier in this Outline, a number of courts have held that machine printouts are not hearsay at all because a machine can’t make a “statement,” and have also held that a machine’s output is not “testimony” within the meaning of the Confrontation Clause. This case law appears to survive the Court’s analysis in *Melendez-Diaz* and the later cases of *Bullcoming* and *Williams* do not touch the question of machine evidence.

5. The majority does approve the basic analysis of Federal courts after *Crawford* with respect to business and public records, i.e., that if the record is admissible under FRE 803(6) or 803(8) it is, for that reason, non-testimonial under *Crawford*. For business records, this is because, to be admissible under Rule 803(6), it cannot be prepared primarily for litigation. For public records, this is because law enforcement reports prepared for a specific litigation are excluded under Rule 803(8)(A)(ii) and (A)(iii).

6. In response to an argument of the dissent, the majority states that certificates that merely authenticate proffered documents are not testimonial. As seen below, this probably means that certificates of authenticity prepared under Rules 902(11), (13) and (14) may be admitted without violating the Confrontation Clause.

7. As counterpoint to the argument about prior practice allowing certificates authenticating records, the *Melendez-Diaz* majority cited a line of cases about affidavits offered to prove the absence of a public record:

Far more probative here are those cases in which the prosecution sought to admit into evidence a clerk’s certificate attesting to the fact that the clerk had searched for a particular relevant record and failed to find it. Like the testimony of the analysts in this case, the clerk’s statement would serve as substantive evidence against the defendant whose guilt depended on the nonexistence of the record for which the clerk searched. Although the clerk’s certificate would qualify as an official record under respondent’s definition --- it was prepared by a public officer in the regular course of his official duties --- and although the clerk was certainly not a “conventional witness” under the dissent’s approach, the clerk was nonetheless subject to confrontation. See People v. Bromwich, 200 N. Y. 385, 388-389, 93 N. E. 933, 934 (1911).

This passage should probably be read to mean that any use of a certificate of absence of a public record in a criminal case is prohibited. But the Court did find that a notice-and-demand provision would satisfy the Confrontation Clause because if, after notice, the defendant made no demand to produce, a waiver could properly be found. Accordingly, the Committee proposed an amendment to Rule 803(10) that added a notice-and-demand provision. That amendment was approved by the Judicial Conference and became effective December 1, 2013.
It should be noted that the continuing viability of *Melendez-Diaz* has been placed into some doubt by the death of Justice Scalia, who wrote the majority opinion.

**Admission of a testimonial forensic certificate through the testimony of a witness with no personal knowledge of the testing violates the Confrontation Clause under Melendez-Diaz:** *Bullcoming v. New Mexico*, 564 U.S. 647 (2011): The Court reaffirmed the holding in *Melendez-Diaz* that certificates of forensic testing prepared for trial are testimonial, and held further that the Confrontation Clause was not satisfied when such a certificate was entered into evidence through the testimony of a person who was not involved with, and had no personal knowledge of, the testing procedure. Justice Ginsburg, writing for the Court, declared as follows:

The question presented is whether the Confrontation Clause permits the prosecution to introduce a forensic laboratory report containing a testimonial certification --- made for the purpose of proving a particular fact --- through the in-court testimony of a scientist who did not sign the certification or perform or observe the test reported in the certification. We hold that surrogate testimony of that order does not meet the constitutional requirement. The accused's right is to be confronted with the analyst who made the certification, unless that analyst is unavailable at trial, and the accused had an opportunity, pretrial, to cross-examine that particular scientist.
Lower Court Cases on Records and Certificates Decided Before Melendez-Diaz

Certification of business records under Rule 902(11) is not testimonial: *United States v. Adefehinti*, 519 F.3d 319 (D.C. Cir. 2007): The court held that a certification of business records under Rule 902(11) was not testimonial even though it was prepared for purposes of litigation. The court reasoned that because the underlying business records were not testimonial, it would make no sense to find the authenticating certificate testimonial. It also noted that Rule 902(11) provided a procedural device for challenging the trustworthiness of the underlying records: the proponent must give advance notice that it plans to offer evidence under Rule 902(11), in order to provide the opponent with a fair opportunity to challenge the certification and the underlying records. The court stated that in an appropriate case, “the challenge could presumably take the form of calling a certificate’s signatory to the stand. So hedged, the Rule 902(11) process seems a far cry from the threat of *ex parte* testimony that *Crawford* saw as underlying, and in part defining, the Confrontation Clause.” In this case, the Rule 902(11) certificates were used only to admit documents that were acceptable as business records under Rule 803(6), so there was no error in the certificate process.

Warrant of deportation is not testimonial: *United States v. Garcia*, 452 F.3d 36 (1st Cir. 2006): In an illegal reentry case, the defendant argued that his confrontation rights were violated by the admission of a warrant of deportation. The court disagreed, finding that the warrant was not testimonial under *Crawford*. The court noted that every circuit considering the matter has held “that defendants have no right to confront and cross-examine the agents who routinely record warrants of deportation” because such officers have no motivation to do anything other than “mechanically register an unambiguous factual matter.”

*Note: Other circuits before Melendez-Diaz reached the same result on warrants of deportation. See, e.g., United States v. Valdez-Matos*, 443 F.3d 910 (5th Cir. 2006) (warrant of deportation is non-testimonial because “the official preparing the warrant had no motivation other than mechanically register an unambiguous factual matter”); *United States v. Torres-Villalobos*, 487 F.3d 607 (8th Cir. 2007) (noting that warrants of deportation “are produced under circumstances objectively indicating that their primary purpose is to maintain records concerning the movements of aliens and to ensure compliance with orders of deportation, not to prove facts for use in future criminal prosecutions.”); *United States v. Bahena-Cardenas*, 411 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir. 2005) (a warrant of deportation is non-testimonial "because it was not made in anticipation of litigation, and because it is simply a routine, objective, cataloging of an unambiguous factual matter."); *United States v. Cantellano*, 430 F.3d 1142 (11th Cir. 2005) (noting that a warrant of deportation “is recorded routinely and not in preparation for a criminal trial”).  
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Note: Warrants of deportation still satisfy the Confrontation Clause after Melendez-Diaz. Unlike the forensic analysis in that case, a warrant of deportation is prepared for regulatory purposes and is clearly not prepared for the illegal reentry litigation, because by definition that crime has not been committed at the time the certificate is prepared. As seen below, post-Melendez-Diaz courts have found warrants of deportation to be non-testimonial. See also United States v. Lopez, 747 F.3d 1141 (9th Cir. 2014) (adhering to pre-Melendez-Diaz case law holding that deportation documents in an A-file are not testimonial when admitted in illegal re-entry cases).

Proof of absence of business records is not testimonial: United States v. Munoz-Franco, 487 F.3d 25 (1st Cir. 2007): In a prosecution for bank fraud and conspiracy, the trial court admitted the minutes of the Board and Executive Committee of the Bank. The defendants did not challenge the admissibility of the minutes as business records, but argued that it was constitutional error to allow the government to rely on the absence of certain information in the minutes to prove that the Board was not informed about such matters. The court rejected the defendants’ confrontation argument in the following passage:

The Court in Crawford plainly characterizes business records as “statements that by their nature [are] not testimonial.” 541 U.S. at 56. If business records are nontestimonial, it follows that the absence of information from those records must also be nontestimonial.

Note: This analysis appears unaffected by Melendez-Diaz, as no certificate or affidavit is involved and the record itself was not prepared for litigation purposes.

Business records are not testimonial: United States v. Jamieson, 427 F.3d 394 (6th Cir. 2005): In a prosecution involving fraudulent sale of insurance policies, the government admitted summary evidence under Rule 1006. The underlying records were business records. The court found that admitting the summaries did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation. The underlying records were not testimonial under Crawford because they did not “resemble the formal statement or solemn declaration identified as testimony by the Supreme Court.” See also United States v. Baker, 458 F.3d 513 (6th Cir. 2006) (“The government correctly points out that business records are not testimonial and therefore do not implicate the Confrontation Clause concerns of Crawford.”).
Note: The court’s analysis of business records appears unaffected by *Melendez-Diaz*, because the records were not prepared primarily for litigation and no certificate or affidavit was prepared for use in the litigation.

**Post office box records are not testimonial:** *United States v. Vasilakos*, 508 F.3d 401 (6th Cir. 2007): The defendants were convicted of defrauding their employer, an insurance company, by setting up fictitious accounts into which they directed unearned commissions. The checks for the commissions were sent to post office boxes maintained by the defendants. The defendants argued that admitting the post office box records at trial violated their right to confrontation. But the court held that the government established proper foundation for the records through the testimony of a postal inspector, and that the records were therefore admissible as business records; the court noted that “the Supreme Court specifically characterizes business records as non-testimonial.”

Note: The court’s analysis of business records is unaffected by *Melendez-Diaz*.

**Drug test prepared by a hospital with knowledge of possible use in litigation is not testimonial; certification of that business record under Rule 902(11) is not testimonial:** *United States v. Ellis*, 460 F.3d 920 (7th Cir. 2006): In a trial for felon gun possession, the trial court admitted the results of a drug test conducted on the defendant’s blood and urine after he was arrested. The test was conducted by a hospital employee, and indicated a positive result for methamphetamine. At trial, the hospital record was admitted without a qualifying witness; instead, a qualified witness prepared a certification of authenticity under Rule 902(11). The court held that neither the hospital record nor the certification were testimonial within the meaning of *Crawford* and *Davis* --- despite the fact that both records were prepared with the knowledge that they would be used in a prosecution. As to the medical reports, the *Ellis* court concluded as follows:

While the medical professionals in this case might have thought their observations would end up as evidence in a criminal prosecution, the objective circumstances of this case indicate that their observations and statements introduced at trial were made in nothing else but the ordinary course of business. * * * They were employees simply recording observations which, because they were made in the ordinary course of business, are "statements that by their nature were not testimonial." *Crawford*, 541 U.S. at 56.

**Note:** *Ellis* is cited by the dissent in *Melendez-Diaz* (not a good thing for its continued viability), and the circumstances of preparing the toxic screen in *Ellis* are somewhat similar to those in *Melendez-Diaz*. That said, toxicology tests conducted by private organizations may be found nontestimonial if it can be shown that law enforcement was not involved in or
managing the testing. The Melendez-Diaz majority emphasized that the forensic analyst knew that the test was being done for a prosecution, as that information was right on the form. Essentially, after Melendez-Diaz, the less the tester knows about the use of the test, and the less involvement by the government, the better for admissibility. Primary motive for use in a prosecution is obviously less likely to be found if the tester is a private organization.

Note that the Seventh Circuit, in a case after Melendez-Diaz, adhered fully to its ruling in Ellis that business records are not testimonial. United States v. Brown, 822 F.3d 966 (7th Cir. 2016) (relying on Ellis to find that Western Union records of wire transfers were not testimonial: “Logically, if they are made in the ordinary course of business, then they are not made for the purpose of later prosecution.”).

As to the certification of business record, prepared under Rule 902(11) specifically to qualify the medical records in this prosecution, the Ellis court similarly found that it was not testimonial because the records that were certified were prepared in the ordinary course, and the certifications were essentially ministerial. The court explained as follows:

The certification at issue in this case is nothing more than the custodian of records at the local hospital attesting that the submitted documents are actually records kept in the ordinary course of business at the hospital. The statements do not purport to convey information about Ellis, but merely establish the existence of the procedures necessary to create a business record. They are made by the custodian of records, an employee of the business, as part of her job. As such, we hold that written certification entered into evidence pursuant to Rule 902(11) is nontestimonial just as the underlying business records are. Both of these pieces of evidence are too far removed from the "principal evil at which the Confrontation Clause was directed" to be considered testimonial.

Note: Many circuits have held that the reasoning of Ellis remains sound after Melendez-Diaz, and that 902(11) certificates are not testimonial. See United States v. Yeley-Davis, 632 F.3d 673 (10th Cir. 2011), United States v. Johnson, 688 F.3d 494 (8th Cir. 2012), United States v. Ayelotan, 917 F.3d 394 (5th Cir. 2019), and United States v. Anekwu, 695 F.3d 967 (9th Cir. 2012) all infra. See also Washington v. Griffin, 876 F.3d 395 (2nd Cir. 2017) (noting that a certification of a business record “does not transform the underlying notations of the lab analysts into formalized testimonial materials” and relying on the passage from Melendez-Diaz which stated that a clerk’s authenticating affidavit authenticating an otherwise admissible record does not violate the Confrontation Clause). See also, United States v. Farrad, 895 F.3d 859, 876 (6th Cir. 2018)(holding that the defendant forfeited his argument that a 902(11) certificate violated his confrontation rights; but even if not forfeited, “it is unlikely that it would have been a winning argument * * * in light of the Supreme Court’s discussion of the ‘narrowly circumscribed’
exception at common law that allowed a clerk to present a certification authenticating an official record.

Odometer statements, prepared before any crime of odometer-tampering occurred, are not testimonial: *United States v. Gilbertson*, 435 F.3d 790 (7th Cir. 2006): In a prosecution for odometer-tampering, the government proved its case by introducing the odometer statements prepared when the cars were sold to the defendant, and then calling the buyers to testify that the mileage on the odometers when they bought their cars was substantially less than the mileage set forth on the odometer statements. The defendant argued that introducing the odometer statements violated *Crawford*. He contended that the odometer statements were essentially formal affidavits, the very kind of evidence that most concerned the Court in *Crawford*. But the court held that the concern in *Crawford* was limited to affidavits prepared for trial as a testimonial substitute. This concern did not apply to the odometer statements. The court explained as follows:

The odometer statements in the instant case are not testimonial because they were not made with the respective declarants having an eye towards criminal prosecution. The statements were not initiated by the government in the hope of later using them against Gilbertson (or anyone else), nor could the declarants (or any reasonable person) have had such a belief. The reason is simple: each declaration was made prior to Gilbertson even engaging in the crime. Therefore, there is no way for the sellers to anticipate that their statements regarding the mileage on the individual cars would be used as evidence against Gilbertson for a crime he commits in the future.

Note: this result is unaffected by *Melendez-Diaz* as the records clearly were not prepared for purposes of litigation --- the crime had not occurred at the time the records were prepared.

Tax returns are business records and so not testimonial: *United States v. Garth*, 540 F.3d 766 (8th Cir. 2008): The defendant was accused of assisting tax filers to file false claims. The defendant argued that her right to confrontation was violated when the trial court admitted some tax returns of the filers. But the court found no error. The tax returns were business records, and the defendant made no argument that they were prepared for litigation, “as is expected of testimonial evidence.”

Note: this result is unaffected by *Melendez-Diaz*. 
Certificate of a record of a conviction found not testimonial: *United States v. Weiland*, 420 F.3d 1062 (9th Cir. 2006): The court held that a certificate of a record of conviction prepared by a public official was not testimonial under *Crawford*: “Not only are such certifications a ‘routine cataloguing of an unambiguous factual matter,’ but requiring the records custodians and other officials from the various states and municipalities to make themselves available for cross-examination in the countless criminal cases heard each day in our country would present a serious logistical challenge without any apparent gain in the truth-seeking process. We decline to so extend *Crawford*, or to interpret it to apply so broadly.”

*Note*: The reliance on burdens in countless criminal cases is precisely the argument that was rejected in *Melendez-Diaz*. Nonetheless, certificates of conviction are quite probably non-testimonial, because the *Melendez-Diaz* majority states that a certificate is not testimonial if it does nothing more than authenticate another document --- and specifically uses as an example a certificate of conviction.

In *United States v. Albino-Loe*, 747 F.3d 1206 (9th Cir. 2014), the court adhered to its ruling in *Weiland*, declaring that a routine certification of authenticity of a record (in that case documents in an A-file) are not testimonial in nature, because they “did not accomplish anything other than authenticating the A-file documents to which they were attached.”

Absence of records in database is not testimonial; and drug ledger is not testimonial: *United States v. Mendez*, 514 F.3d 1035 (10th Cir. 2008): In an illegal entry case, an agent testified that he searched the ICE database for information indicating that the defendant entered the country legally, and found no such information. The ICE database is “a nation-wide database of information which archives records of entry documents, such as permanent resident cards, border crossing cards, or certificates of naturalization.” The defendant argued that the entries into the database (or the asserted lack of entries in this case) were testimonial. But the court disagreed, because the records “are not prepared for litigation or prosecution, but rather administrative and regulatory purposes.” The court also observed that Rule 803(8) tracked *Crawford* exactly: a public record is admissible under Rule 803(8) unless it is prepared with an eye toward litigation or prosecution; and under *Crawford*, “the very same characteristics that preclude a statement from being classified as a public record are likely to render the statement testimonial.”

*Mendez* also involved drug charges, and the defendant argued that admitting a drug ledger with his name on it violated his right to confrontation under *Crawford*. The court also rejected this argument. It stated first that the entries in the ledger were not hearsay at all, because they were offered to show that the book was a drug ledger and thus a “tool of the trade.” As the entries were not offered for truth, their admission could not violate the Confrontation Clause. But the court
further held that even if the entries were offered for truth, they were not testimonial, because “[a]t
no point did the author keep the drug ledger for the primary purpose of aiding police in a criminal
investigation, the focus of the Davis inquiry.” (emphasis the court’s). The court noted that it was
not enough that the statements were relevant to a criminal prosecution, otherwise “any piece of
evidence which aids the prosecution would be testimonial.”

Note: Both holdings in the above case survive Melendez-Diaz. The first holding is about the
absence of public records, where the records themselves were not prepared in testimonial
circumstances. If that absence had been proved by a certificate, then the Confrontation
Clause, after Melendez-Diaz, would have been violated. But the absence was proved by a
testifying agent. The second holding states the accepted proposition that business records
admissible under Rule 803(6) are, for that reason, non-testimonial. Drug ledgers in
particular are absolutely not prepared for purposes of litigation.
Letter describing results of a search of court records is testimonial after *Melendez-Diaz*: *United States v. Smith*, 640 F.3d 358 (D.C. Cir. 2011): To prove a felony in a felon firearm case, the government admitted a letter from a court clerk stating that “it appears from an examination of the files in this office” that Smith had been convicted of a felony. Each letter had a seal and a signature by a court clerk. The court found that the letters were testimonial. The clerk did not merely authenticate a record, rather he created a record of the search he conducted. The letters were clearly prepared in anticipation of litigation --- they “respond[ed] to a prosecutor’s question with an answer.”

Note: The analysis in *Smith* provides more indication that certificates of the absence of a record are testimonial after *Melendez-Diaz*. The clerk’s letters in *Smith* are exactly like a CNR; the only difference is that they report on the presence of a record rather than an absence.

Autopsy reports generated through law enforcement involvement found testimonial after *Melendez-Diaz*: *United States v. Moore*, 651 F.3d 30 (D.C. Cir. 2011): The court found autopsy reports to be testimonial. The court emphasized the involvement of law enforcement in the generation of the autopsy reports admitted in this case:

The Office of the Medical Examiner is required by D.C.Code 5-1405(b)(11) to investigate “[d]eaths for which the Metropolitan Police Department [“MPD”], or other law enforcement agency, or the United States Attorney's Office requests, or a court orders investigation.” The autopsy reports do not indicate whether such requests were made in the instant case but the record shows that MPD homicide detectives and officers from the Mobile Crimes Unit were present at several autopsies. Another autopsy report was supplemented with diagrams containing the notation: “Mobile crime diagram (not [Medical Examiner] --- use for info only).” Still another report included a “Supervisor's Review Record” from the MPD Criminal Investigations Division commenting: “Should have indictment re John Raynor for this murder.” Law enforcement officers thus not only observed the autopsies, a fact that would have signaled to the medical examiner that the autopsy might bear on a criminal investigation, they participated in the creation of reports. Furthermore, the autopsy reports were formalized in signed documents titled “reports.” These factors, combined with the fact that each autopsy found the manner of death to be a homicide caused by gunshot wounds, are “circumstances which would lead an objective witness reasonably
to believe that the statement would be available for use at a later trial.” *Melendez-Diaz*, 129 S.Ct. at 2532 (citation and quotation marks omitted).

In a footnote, the court emphasized that it was not holding that all autopsy reports are testimonial:

Certain duties imposed by the D.C.Code on the Office of the Medical Examiner demonstrate, the government suggests, that autopsy reports are business records not made for the purpose of litigation. It is unnecessary to decide as a categorical matter whether autopsy reports are testimonial, and, in any event, it is doubtful that such an approach would comport with Supreme Court precedent.

Finally, the court rejected the government’s argument that there was no error because the expert witness simply relied on the autopsy reports in giving independent testimony. In this case, the autopsy reports were clearly entered into evidence. *See also United States v. McGill*, 815 F.3d 846 (D.C.Cir. 2016) (relying on *Moore* to find a Confrontation violation where drug analysis reports and autopsy reports were admitted through testimony from witnesses other than the reports’ authors).

**State court did not unreasonably apply federal law in admitting autopsy report as non-testimonial: Nardi v. Pepe**, 662 F.3d 107 (1st Cir. 2011): The court affirmed the denial of a habeas petition, concluding that the state court did not unreasonably apply federal law in admitting an autopsy report as non-testimonial. The court reasoned as follows:

Abstractly, an autopsy report can be distinguished from, or assimilated to, the sworn documents in *Melendez-Diaz* and *Bulcoming*, and it is uncertain how the Court would resolve the question. We treated such reports as not covered by the Confrontation Clause, *United States v. De La Cruz*, 514 F.3d 121, 133-34 (1st Cir.2008), but the law has continued to evolve and no one can be certain just what the Supreme Court would say about that issue today. However, our concern here is with “clearly established” law when the SJC acted. * * * That close decisions in the later Supreme Court cases extended *Crawford* to new situations hardly shows the outcomes were clearly preordained. And, even now it is uncertain whether, under its primary purpose test, the Supreme Court would classify autopsy reports as testimonial.

**Immigration interview form was not testimonial: United States v. Phoeun Lang**, 672 F.3d 17 (1st Cir. 2012): The defendant was convicted of making false statements and unlawfully applying for and obtaining a certificate of naturalization. The defendant argued that his right to confrontation was violated because the immigration form (N-445) on which he purportedly lied contained verification checkmarks next to his false responses. Thus the contention was that the verification
checkmarks were testimonial hearsay of the immigration agent who conducted the interview. But
the court found no error. The court concluded that the form was not “primarily to be used in court
proceedings.” Rather it was a record prepared as “a matter of administrative routine, for the
primary purpose of determining Lang’s eligibility for naturalization.” For essentially the same
reasons, the court held that the form was admissible under Rule 803(8)(A)(ii) despite the fact that
the rule appears to exclude law enforcement reports. The court distinguished between “documents
produced in an adversarial setting and those produced in a routine non-adversarial setting for
purposes of Rule 803(8)(A)(ii).” The court relied on the passage in Melendez-Diaz which declared
that the test for admissibility or inadmissibility under Rule 803(8) was the same as the test of
testimonialilty under the Confrontation Clause, i.e., whether the primary motive for preparing the
record was for use in a criminal prosecution.

Note: This case was decided before Williams, but it would appear to satisfy both the Alito
and the Kagan version of the “primary motive” test. Both tests agree that a statement cannot
be testimonial unless the primary motive for making it is to have it used in a criminal
prosecution. The difference is that Justice Alito provides another qualification --- the
statement is testimonial only if it was made to be used in the defendant’s criminal
prosecution. In Phoeun Lang the first premise was not met --- the statements were made
for administrative purposes, and not primarily for use in any criminal prosecution.

Expert’s reliance on standard samples for comparison does not violate the Confrontation
Clause because any communications regarding the preparation of those samples was not
testimonial: United States v. Razo, 782 F.3d 31 (1st Cir. 2015). A chemist testified about the lab
analysis she performed on a substance seized from the defendant’s coconspirator. The crime lab
used a “known standard” methamphetamine sample to create a reference point for comparison
with seized evidence. That sample was received from a chemical company. The chemist testified
that in comparing the seized sample with the known standard sample, she relied on the
manufacturer’s assurance that the known standard sample was 100% pure. The court found no
confrontation violation because the known standard sample --- and the manufacturer’s assurance
about it --- were not testimonial. Any statements regarding the known standard sample were not
made with the primary motivation that they would be used at a criminal trial, because the sample
was prepared for general use by the laboratory. The court noted that the chemist’s conclusions
about the seized sample would raise confrontation questions, but the government produced the
chemist to be cross-examined about those conclusions. As to the standard sample, it was prepared
“prior to and without regard to any particular investigation, let alone any particular prosecution.”
Note: In reaching its result, the Razo court provided a good interpretation of Williams. The court saw support in the fact that the Alito plurality would find any communications regarding the known standard sample to be non-testimonial because that sample was “not prepared for the primary purpose of accusing a targeted individual.” And the fifth vote of support would come from Justice Thomas, because nothing about the known standard sample was in the nature of a formalized statement.

Certain records of internet activity sent to law enforcement found testimonial: United States v. Cameron, 699 F.3d 621 (1st Cir. 2012): In a child pornography prosecution, the court held that admission of certain records about suspicious internet activity violated the defendant’s right to Confrontation Clause. The evidence principally at issue related to accounts with Yahoo. Yahoo received an anonymous report that child pornography images were contained in a Yahoo account. Yahoo sent a report --- called a “CP Report”--- to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), listing the images being sent with the report, attaching the images, and listing the date and time at which the image was uploaded and the IP Address from which it was uploaded. NCMEC in turn sent a report of child pornography to the Maine State Police Internet Crimes Against Children Unit (ICAC), which obtained a search warrant for the defendant’s computers. The government introduced testimony of a Yahoo employee as to how certain records were kept and maintained by the company, but the government did not introduce the Image Upload Data indicating the date and time each image was uploaded to the Internet. The government also introduced testimony by a NCMEC employee explaining how NCMEC handled tips regarding child pornography. The court held that admission of various data collected by Yahoo and Google automatically in order to further their business purposes was proper, because the data was contained in business records and was not testimonial for Sixth Amendment purposes. But the court held, 2-1, that the reports Yahoo prepared and sent to NCMEC were different and were testimonial because the primary purpose for the reports was to record past events that were potentially relevant to a criminal prosecution. The court relied on the following considerations to conclude that the CP Reports were testimonial: 1) they referred to a “suspect” screen name, email address, and IP address --- and Yahoo did not treat its customers as “suspects” in the ordinary course of its business; 2) before a CP Report is created, someone in the legal department at Yahoo has to determine that an account contained child pornography images; 3) Yahoo did not simply keep the reports but sent them to NCMEC, which was under the circumstances an agent of law enforcement, because it received a government grant to accept reports of child pornography and forward them to law enforcement. The government argued that Confrontation was not at issue because the CP Reports contained business records that were unquestionably nontestimonial, such as records of users’ IP addresses. But the court responded that the CP Reports were themselves statements. The court noted that “[i]f the CP Reports simply consisted of the raw underlying
records, or perhaps underlying records arranged and formatted in a reasonable way for presentation purposes, the Reports might well have been admissible.”

The government also argued that the CP Reports were not testimonial under the Alito definition of primary motive in *Williams*. Like the DNA reports in *Williams*, the CP Reports were prepared at a time when the perpetrator was unknown and so they were not targeted toward a particular individual. The court distinguished *Williams* by relying on a statement in the Alito opinion that at the time of the DNA report, the technicians had “no way of knowing whether it will turn out to be incriminating or exonerating.” In contrast, when the CP Reports were prepared, Yahoo personnel knew that they were incriminating: “Yahoo’s employees may not have known whom a given CP Report might incriminate, but they almost certainly were aware that a Report would incriminate somebody.”

Finally, the court held that the NCMEC reports sent to the police were testimonial, because they were statements independent of the CP Reports, and they were sent to law enforcement for the primary purpose of using them in a criminal prosecution. One judge, dissenting in part, argued that the connection between an identified user name, the associated IP address, and the digital images archived from that user’s account all existed well before Yahoo got the anonymous tip, were an essential part of the service that Yahoo provided, and thus were ordinary business records that were not testimonial.

**Note:** *Cameron* cannot be read to hold that business records admissible under Rule 803(6) can be testimonial under *Crawford*. The court notes that under *Palmer v. Hoffman*, 318 U.S. 109 (1943), records are not admissible as business records when they are calculated for use in court. *Palmer* is still good law under Rule 803(6), as the Court recognized in *Melendez-Diaz*. The *Cameron* court noted that the Yahoo reports were subject to the same infirmity as the records found inadmissible in *Hoffman*: they were not made for business purposes, but rather for purposes of litigation. Thus according to the court, the Yahoo reports were probably not admissible as business records anyway.

**Airline records of passengers on a plane are not testimonial:** *Tran v. Roden*, 847 F.3d 44 (1st Cir. 2017): On habeas review of a murder conviction, the court reviewed whether the admission of a manifest prepared by United Airlines violated the defendants’ right to confrontation. The manifest showed that two people with the same names as the defendants were on a flight out of the country. This was evidence of consciousness of guilt. The court found that the manifest was a business record prepared by United, outside the context of litigation, and therefore it was not testimonial. The defendants argued that the record was testimonial because it was delivered by United to the prosecution. But the court found this irrelevant, because the question under the Confrontation Clause is whether a document was prepared with the primary
motive of use in a criminal prosecution. The defendants relied on Cameron, immediately above, but the court distinguished Cameron by noting that the Yahoo records in that case were prepared by Yahoo with the intent to send them to the government in order to investigate and prosecute child pornography.

Telephone records are not testimonial: United States v. Burgos-Montes, 786 F.3d 92 (1st Cir. 2015): The government introduced phone records of a conspirator. They were accompanied by a certification made under Rule 902(11). The defendant argued that the phone records were testimonial but the court disagreed. The defendant argued that the records were produced by the phone company in response to a demand from the government, but the court found this irrelevant. The records were gathered and maintained by the phone company in the routine course of business. “The fact that the print-out of this data in this particular format was requested for litigation does not turn the data contained in the print-out into information created for litigation.”

Routine autopsy report was not testimonial: United States v. James, 712 F.3d 79 (2nd Cir. 2013): The court considered whether its pre-Melendez-Diaz case law --- stating that autopsy reports were not testimonial --- was still valid. The court adhered to its view that “routine” autopsy reports were not testimonial because they are not prepared with the primary motivation that they will be used in a criminal trial. Applying the test of “routine” to the facts presented, the court found as follows:

Somaipersaud's autopsy was nothing other than routine --- there is no suggestion that Jindrak or anyone else involved in this autopsy process suspected that Somaipersaud had been murdered and that the medical examiner's report would be used at a criminal trial. [A government expert] testified that causes of death are often undetermined in cases like this because it could have been a recreational drug overdose or a suicide. The autopsy report itself refers to the cause of death as "undetermined" and attributes it both to "acute mixed intoxication with alcohol and chlorpromazine" combined with "hypertensive and arteriosclerotic cardiovascular disease."

The autopsy was completed on January 24, 1998, and the report was signed June 16, 1998, substantially before any criminal investigation into Somaipersaud's death had begun. [N]either the government nor defense counsel elicited any information suggesting that law enforcement was ever notified that Somaipersaud's death was suspicious, or that any medical examiner expected a criminal investigation to result from it. Indeed, there is reason to believe that none is pursued in the case of most autopsies.

The court noted that “something in the order of ten percent of deaths investigated by the OCME lead to criminal investigations.” It distinguished the 11th Circuit’s opinion --- discussed below ---
which found an autopsy report to be testimonial, noting that “the decision was based in part on the fact that the Florida Medical Examiner's Office was created and exists within the Department of Law Enforcement. Here, the OCME is a wholly independent office.” Thus, an autopsy report prepared outside the auspices of a criminal investigation is very unlikely to be found testimonial under the Second Circuit’s view.

Note: In considering the effect of Williams, the court found that in fact there was no lesson at all to be derived from Williams, as there was no rationale on which five members of the Court could agree. Thus, the Court found that Williams controlled only cases exactly like it.

Business records are not testimonial: United States v. Bansal, 663 F.3d 634 (3rd Cir. 2011): In a prosecution related to a controlled substance distribution operation, the trial court admitted records kept by domestic and foreign businesses of various transactions. The court rejected the claim that the records were testimonial, stating that “the statements in the records here were made for the purpose of documenting business activity, like car sales and account balances, and not for providing evidence to law enforcement or a jury.”

Admission of credit card company’s records identifying customer accounts that had been compromised did not violate the right to confrontation: United States v. Keita, 742 F.3d 184 (4th Cir. 2014): In a prosecution for credit card fraud, the trial court admitted “common point of purchase” records prepared by American Express. These were internal documents revealing which accounts have been compromised. American Express creates the reports daily as part of regular business practice, and they are used by security analysts to determine whether to contact law enforcement or to investigate the matter internally in the first instance. The court held that the records were not testimonial (even though they could possibly be used for criminal prosecution), relying on the language in Melendez-Diaz stating that “business records are generally admissible absent confrontation.” The court concluded that the records were primarily prepared for the administration of Amex’s regularly conducted business.

Warrant of removal, offered in an illegal reentry prosecution, is non-testimonial: United States v. Garcia, 887 F.3d 205 (5th Cir. 2018): In an illegal re-entry prosecution, to prove that the defendant had been deported, the government offered the warrant of removal that was entered just after the defendant was removed. The defendant argued that the warrant was testimonial under Melendez-Diaz, but the court disagreed. The court stated that the problem with the forensic certificates in Melendez-Diaz was that they were produced specifically for purposes of trial. In contrast, warrants of removal are prepared “to memorialize an alien’s departure --- not specifically or primarily to prove facts in a hypothetical future criminal prosecution.”
Certifications by Google and Yahoo of email traffic were not testimonial: *United States v. Ayelotan*, 917 F.3d 394 (5th Cir. 2019): In a fraud scheme involving emails, the trial court admitted the emails, including transmittal data, that were accompanied by certificates from Google and Yahoo. The certificate authenticated the business records of the providers, stating that these providers recorded the transmittal data as part of the regular practice of a regularly conducted business activity. The court found that the transmittal certificates were not testimonial, because the providers “didn’t create the records to prove a particular fact at a particular trial --- let alone this trial.”

Admission of purported drug ledgers violated the defendant’s confrontation rights where the proof of authenticity was the fact that they were produced by an accomplice at a proffer session: *United States v. Jackson*, 625 F.3d 875 (5th Cir. 2010), amended 636 F.3d 687 (5th Cir. 2011): In a drug prosecution, purported drug ledgers were offered to prove the defendant’s participation in drug transactions. An officer sought to authenticate the ledgers as business records but the court found that he was not a “qualified witness” under Rule 803(6) because he had no knowledge that the ledgers came from any drug operation associated with the defendant. The court found that the only adequate basis of authentication was the fact that the defendant’s accomplice had produced the ledgers at a proffer session with the government. But because the production at the proffer session was unquestionably a testimonial statement --- and because the accomplice was not produced to testify --- admission of the ledger against the defendant violated his right to confrontation under *Crawford*.

*Note: The Jackson court does not hold that business records are testimonial. The reasoning is muddled, but the best way to understand it is that the evidence used to authenticate the business record --- the cohort’s production of the records at a proffer session --- was testimonial.*

Pseudoephedrine logs are not testimonial: *United States v. Towns*, 718 F.3d 404 (5th Cir. 2013): In a methamphetamine prosecution, the agent testified to patterns of purchasing pseudoephedrine at various pharmacies. This testimony was based on logs kept by the pharmacies of pseudoephedrine purchases. The court found that the logs --- and the certifications to the logs provided by the pharmacies --- were properly admitted as business records. It further held that the records were not testimonial. As to the Rule 803(6) question, the court found irrelevant the fact that the records were required by statute to be kept and were pertinent to law enforcement. The court stated that “the regularly conducted activity here is selling pills containing pseudoephedrine; the purchase logs are kept in the course of that activity. Why they are kept is irrelevant at this stage.” As to the certifications from the records custodians of the pharmacies, the court found
them proper under Rule 803(6) and 902(11) ---the certifications tracked the language of Rule 803(6) and there was no requirement that the custodians do anything more, such as explain the process of record keeping. As to the Confrontation Clause, the court noted that the Supreme Court in Melendez-Diaz had declared that business records are ordinarily non-testimonial. Moreover, the logs were not prepared solely with an eye toward trial. The court concluded as follows:

The pharmacies created these purchase logs ex ante to comply with state regulatory measures, not in response to an active prosecution. Additionally, requiring a driver’s license for purchases of pseudoephedrine deters crime. The state thus has a clear interest in businesses creating these logs that extends beyond their evidentiary value. Because the purchase logs were not prepared specifically and solely for use at trial, they are not testimonial and do not violate the Confrontation Clause.

**Court rejects the “targeted individual” test in reviewing an affidavit pertaining to illegal immigration:** United States v. Duron-Caldera, 737 F.3d 988 (5th Cir. 2013): The defendant was charged with illegal reentry. The dispute was over whether he was in fact an alien. He claimed he was a citizen because his mother, prior to his birth, was physically present in the U.S. for at least ten years, at least five of which were before she was 14. To prove that this was not the case, the government offered an affidavit from the defendant’s grandmother, prepared 40 years before the instant case. The affidavit was prepared in connection with an investigation into document fraud, including the alleged filing of fraudulent birth certificates by the defendant’s parents and grandmother. The affidavit accused others of document fraud, and stated that the defendant’s mother did not reside in the United States for an extended period of time. The trial court admitted the affidavit but the court of appeals held that it was testimonial and reversed. The government argued that the affidavit was a business record because it was found in regularly kept immigration records. But the court noted that it could not qualify as a business record because the grandmother was not acting in the ordinary course of regularly conducted activity.

The court found that the government had not shown that the affidavit was prepared outside the context of a criminal investigation, and therefore the affidavit was testimonial under the primary motive test. The government relied on the Alito opinion in Williams, under which the affidavit would not be testimonial, because it clearly was not targeted toward the defendant, as he was only a child when it was prepared. But the court rejected the targeted individual test. It noted first that five members of the court in Williams had rejected the test. It also stated that the targeted individual limitation could not be found in any of the Crawford line of cases before Williams: noting, for example, that in Crawford the Court defined testimonial statements as those one would expect to be used “at a later trial.” Finally, the court contended that the targeted individual test was
inconsistent with the terms of the Confrontation Clause, which provide a right of the accused to be confronted with the “witnesses against him.” In this case, the grandmother, by way of affidavit, was a witness against the defendant.

Reporter’s Note: The court’s construction of the Confrontation Clause could come out the other way. The reference to “witnesses against him” in the Sixth Amendment could be interpreted as at the time the statement was made, it was being directed at the defendant. The Duron-Caldera court reads “witnesses” as of the time the statement is being introduced. But at that time, the witness is not there. All the “witnessing” is done at the time the statement is made; and if the witness is not targeting the individual at the time the statement is made, it could well be argued that the witness is not testifying “against him.”

Another note from Duron-Caldera: The court notes that there is no rule to be taken from Williams under the Marks test --- under which you take the narrowest view on which the plurality and the concurrence can agree. In Williams, there is nothing on which the plurality and Justice Thomas agreed.

Pseudoephedrine purchase records are not testimonial: United States v. Collins, 799 F.3d 554 (6th Cir. 2015): Relying on the Fifth Circuit’s decision in United States v. Towns, supra, the court held that pharmaceutical records of pseudoephedrine purchases were not testimonial. The court noted that while law enforcement officers use the records to track purchases, the “system is designed to prevent customers from purchasing illegal quantities of pseudoephedrine by indicating to the pharmacy employee whether the customer has exceeded federal or state purchasing restrictions” and accordingly was not primarily motivated to generate evidence for a prosecution.

Pseudoephedrine logs are not testimonial: United States v. Lynn, 851 F.3d 78 (7th Cir. 2017): Affirming convictions for methamphetamine manufacturing and related offenses, the court found no error in admitting logs of pseudoephedrine purchases prepared by pharmacies. These logs indicated that the defendant and associates had purchased pseudoephedrine, a necessary ingredient of methamphetamine. The defendant argued that introducing the logs violated his right to confrontation because they were prepared in anticipation of a prosecution and so were testimonial. But the court disagreed. It stated that “regulatory bodies may have legitimate interests in maintaining these records that far exceed their evidentiary value in a given case. For example, requiring identification for each pseudoephedrine purchase may deter misuse or pseudoephedrine-related drug offenses.” The logs were therefore not testimonial.
Preparing an exhibit for trial is not testimonial: *United States v. Vitrano*, 747 F.3d 922 (7th Cir. 2014): In a prosecution for fraud and perjury, the government offered records of phone calls made by the defendant. The defendant argued that there was a confrontation violation because the technician who prepared the phone calls as an exhibit did not testify. The court found that the confrontation argument was properly rejected, because no statements of the technician were admitted at trial. The court declared that “[p]reparing an exhibit for trial is not itself testimonial.”

Records of wire transfers are not testimonial: *United States v. Brown*, 822 F.3d 966 (7th Cir. 2016): In a drug prosecution, the government offered records of Western Union wire transfers. The court found that the records were not testimonial, noting that “[l]ogically, if they are made in the ordinary course of business, then they are not made for the purpose of later prosecution.” It concluded that the records were “routine and prepared in the ordinary course of business, not in anticipation of prosecution.”

Note: The Western Union records in *Brown* were proven up by way of certificates offered under Rule 902(11). The court did not even mention any possible concern that those certifications would themselves be testimonial. It focused only on the testimoniality of the underlying records.

Records of sales at a pharmacy are business records and not testimonial under *Melendez-Diaz*: *United States v. Mashek*, 606 F.3d 922 (8th Cir. 2010): The defendant was convicted of attempt to manufacture methamphetamine. At trial the court admitted logbooks from local pharmacies to prove that the defendant made frequent purchases of pseudoephedrine. The defendant argued that the logbooks were testimonial under *Melendez-Diaz*, but the court disagreed and affirmed his conviction. The court first noted that the defendant probably waived his confrontation argument because at trial he objected only on the evidentiary grounds of hearsay and Rule 403. But even assuming the defendant preserved his confrontation argument, “*Melendez-Diaz* does not provide him any relief. The pseudoephedrine logs were kept in the ordinary course of business pursuant to Iowa law and are business records under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(6). Business records under Rule 803(6) are not testimonial statements; see *Melendez-Diaz*, 129 S.Ct. At 2539-40 (explaining that business records are typically not testimonial).” *Accord, United States v. Ali*, 616 F.3d 745 (8th Cir. 2010) (business records prepared by financial services company, offered as proof that tax returns were false, were not testimonial, as “*Melendez-Diaz* does not apply to the HSBC records that were kept in the ordinary course of business.”); *United States v. Wells*, 706 F.3d 908 (8th Cir. 2013) (*Melendez-Diaz* did not preclude the admission of pseudoephedrine logs, because they constitute non-testimonial business records under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(6)).
Rule 902(11) authentication was not testimonial: *United States v. Thompson*, 686 F.3d 575 (8th Cir. 2012): To prove unexplained wealth in a drug case, the government offered and the court admitted a record from the Iowa Workforce Development Agency showing no reported wages for Thompson's social security number during 2009 and 2010. The record was admitted through an affidavit of self-authentication offered pursuant to Rule 902(11). The court found that the earnings records themselves were non-testimonial because they were prepared for administrative purposes. As to the exhibit, the court stated that “[b]ecause the IWDA record itself was not created for the purpose of establishing or proving some fact at trial, admission of a certified copy of that record did not violate Thompson's Confrontation Clause rights.” The court emphasized that “[b]oth the majority and dissenting opinions in *Melendez-Diaz* noted that a clerk's certificate authenticating a record --- or a copy thereof --- for use as evidence was traditionally admissible even though the certificate itself was testimonial, having been prepared for use at trial.” It concluded that “[t]o the extent Thompson contends that a copy of an existing record or a printout of an electronic record constitutes a testimonial statement that is distinguishable from the non-testimonial statement inherent in the original business record itself, we reject this argument.” See also *United States v. Johnson*, 688 F.3d 494 (8th Cir. 2012) (certificates of authenticity presented under Rule 902(11) are not testimonial, and the notations on the lab report by the technician indicating when she checked the samples into and out of the lab did not raise a confrontation question because they were offered only to establish a chain of custody and not to prove the truth of any matter asserted).

GPS tracking reports were properly admitted as non-testimonial business records: *United States v. Brooks*, 715 F.3d 1069 (8th Cir. 2013): Affirming bank robbery and related convictions, the court rejected the defendant’s argument that admission at trial of GPS tracking reports violated his right to confrontation. The reports recorded the tracking of a GPS device that was hidden by a teller in the money taken from the bank. The court held that the records were properly admitted as business records under Rule 803(6), and they were not testimonial. The court reasoned that the primary purpose of the tracking reports was to track the perpetrator in an ongoing pursuit --- not for use at trial. The court stated that “[a]lthough the reports ultimately were used to link him to the bank robbery, they were not created . . . to establish some fact at trial. Instead, the GPS evidence was generated by the credit union’s security company for the purpose of locating a robber and recovering stolen money.”

Certificates attesting to Indian blood are not testimonial: *United States v. Rainbow*, 813 F.3d 1097 (8th Cir. 2016): To prove a jurisdictional element of a charge that the defendants committed an assault within Indian Country, the government offered certificates of degree of Indian blood. The certificates certified that the respective defendants possessed the requisite degree of Indian
blood. The defendants argued that, because the certificates were formalized and prepared for litigation, they were testimonial and so admitting them violated their right to confrontation. The certificates were prepared by a clerk of an officer of the BIA, and introduced at trial by the assistant supervisor of that office. The certificates reflected information about what was in records regularly kept by the BIA. The court found that the certificates were not testimonial. It explained as follows:

Although Archambault [the assistant supervisor] testified that he had these particular certificates prepared for his testimony, BIA officials regularly certify blood quantum for the purpose of establishing eligibility for federal programs available only to Indians. Archambault explained that his office maintained the records of tribal enrollment and of each member's blood quantum. He could look up an individual's enrollment status and blood quantum at any time—that information existed regardless of whether any crime was committed. Unlike the analysts in Melendez–Diaz and Bullcoming, the enrollment clerk here did not complete forensic testing on evidence seized during a police investigation, but instead performed the ministerial duty of preparing certificates based on information that was kept in the ordinary course of business. An objective witness would not necessarily know that the certificates would be used at a later trial, because certificates of degree of Indian blood are regularly used in the administration of the BIA's affairs. Simply put, the enrollment clerk prepared certificates using records maintained in the ordinary course of business by the Standing Rock Agency, and the BIA routinely issues certificates in the administration of its affairs. Thus, the certificates were admissible as non-testimonial business records.

Prior conviction in which the defendant did not have the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses cannot be used in a subsequent trial to prove the facts underlying the conviction: United States v. Causevic, 636 F.3d 998 (8th Cir. 2011): The defendant was charged with making materially false statements in an immigration matter --- specifically that he lied about committing a murder in Bosnia. To prove the lie at trial, the government offered a Bosnian judgment indicating that the defendant was convicted in absentia of the murder. The court held that the judgment was testimonial to prove the underlying facts, and there was no showing that the defendant had the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses in the Bosnian court. The court distinguished proof of the fact of a conviction being entered (such as in a felon-firearm prosecution), as in that situation the public record is prepared for recordkeeping and not for a trial. In contrast the factual findings supporting the judgment were obviously generated for purposes of a criminal prosecution.

Note: The statements of facts underlying the prior conviction are testimonial under both versions of the primary motive test contested in Williams. They meet the Kagan test because they were obviously prepared for purpose of --- indeed as part of --- a criminal prosecution.
And they meet the Alito proviso because they targeted the specific defendant against whom they were used at trial.

**Affidavit that birth certificate existed was testimonial:** *United States v. Bustamante*, 687 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2012): The defendant was charged with illegal entry and the dispute was whether he was a United States citizen. The government contended that he was a citizen of the Philippines but could not produce a birth certificate, as the records had been degraded and were poorly kept. Instead it produced an affidavit from an official who searched birth records in the Philippines as part of the investigation into the defendant’s citizenship by the Air Force 30 years earlier. The affidavit stated that birth records indicated that the defendant was born in the Philippines, and the affidavit purported to transcribe the information from the records. The court held that the affidavit was testimonial under *Melendez-Diaz* and reversed the conviction. The court distinguished this case from cases finding that birth records and certificates of authentication are not testimonial:

Our holding today does not question the general proposition that birth certificates, and official duplicates of them, are ordinary public records “created for the administration of an entity's affairs and not for the purpose of establishing or proving some fact at trial.” *Melendez-Diaz*, 129 S.Ct. at 2539-40. But Exhibit 1 is not a copy or duplicate of a birth certificate. Like the certificates of analysis at issue in *Melendez-Diaz*, despite being labeled a copy of the certificate, Exhibit 1 is “quite plainly” an affidavit. It is a typewritten document in which Salupisa testifies that he has gone to the birth records of the City of Bacolod, looked up the information on Napoleon Bustamante, and summarized that information at the request of the U.S. government for the purpose of its investigation into Bustamante’s citizenship. Rather than simply authenticating an existing non-testimonial record, Salupisa created a new record for the purpose of providing evidence against Bustamante. The admission of Exhibit 1 without an opportunity for cross examination therefore violated the Sixth Amendment.

**Filed statement of registered car owner, made after impoundment, that he sold the car to the defendant, was testimonial:** *United States v. Esparza*, 791 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir. 2015): The defendant was arrested entering the United States with marijuana hidden in the gas tank and dashboard; the fact in dispute was the defendant’s knowledge, and specifically whether he owned the car he was driving. At the time of arrest, the registered owner was Donna Hernandez. The government relied on two hearsay statements made in records filed with the DMV by Hernandez that she had sold the car to the defendant six days before the defendant’s arrest. But these records were filed *after* the defendant was arrested and Hernandez had received a notice indicating that the car had been seized because it was used to smuggle marijuana into the country. Under the
circumstances, the court found that the post-hoc records filed by Hernandez with the DMV were testimonial. The court noted that Hernandez did not create the record “for the routine administration of the DMV’s affairs.” Nor was Hernandez merely “a private citizen who, in the course of a routine sale, simply notified the DMV of the transfer of her car. Instead, her car had already been seized for serious criminal violations, and she sent the transfer form to the DMV only after receiving a notice of seizure from [Customs and Border Protection].”

Note: This is an interesting case in which a statement was found testimonial in the absence of significant law enforcement involvement in the generation of the statement. As the Court has noted in Bryant and Clark, law enforcement involvement is critical to finding a statement testimonial, because a statement not made to or with law enforcement is unlikely to be sufficiently formal, and unlikely to be primarily motivated for use in a criminal trial. But at least it can be said that there is formality here --- Hernandez filed formal statements claiming that the ownership was transferred. And there was involvement of the state both in spurring her interest in filing (by sending her the notice) and in receiving her filing.

Government concedes a Melendez-Diaz error in admitting affidavit on the absence of a public record: United States v. Norwood, 603 F.3d 1063 (9th Cir. 2010): In a drug case, the government sought to prove that the defendant had no legal source for the large amounts of cash found in his car. The trial court admitted an affidavit of an employee of the Washington Department of Employment Security, which certified that a diligent search failed to disclose any record of wages reported for the defendant in a three-month period before the crime. On appeal, the government conceded that the affidavit was erroneously admitted in light of the intervening decision in Melendez-Diaz. (The court found the error to be harmless).

CNR is testimonial but a warrant of deportation is not: United States v. Orozco-Acosta, 607 F.3d 1156 (9th Cir. 2010): In an illegal reentry case, the government proved removal by introducing a warrant of deportation under Rule 803(8), and it proved unpermitted reentry by introducing a certificate of non-existence of permission to reenter (CNR) under Rule 803(10). The trial was conducted and the defendant convicted before Melendez-Diaz. On appeal, the government conceded that introducing the CNR violated the defendant’s right to confrontation because under Melendez-Diaz that record is testimonial. The court in a footnote agreed with the government’s concession, stating that its previous cases holding that CNRs were not testimonial were “clearly inconsistent with Melendez-Diaz” because like the certificates in that case, a CNR is prepared solely for purposes of litigation, after the crime has been committed. In contrast, however, the court found that the warrant of deportation was properly admitted even under Melendez-Diaz. The court reasoned that “neither a warrant of removal’s sole purpose nor even its primary purpose is
use at trial.” It explained that a warrant of removal must be prepared in every case resulting in a final order of removal, and only a “small fraction of these warrants are used in immigration prosecutions.” The court concluded that “Melendez-Diaz cannot be read to establish that the mere possibility that a warrant of removal --- or, for that matter, any business or public record --- could be used in a later criminal prosecution renders it testimonial under Crawford.” The court found that the error in admitting the CNR was harmless and affirmed the conviction. See also United States v. Rojas-Pedroza, 716 F.3d 1253 (9th Cir. 2013) (adhering to Orozco-Acosta in response to the defendant’s argument that it had been undermined by Bullcoming and Bryant; holding that a Notice of Intent in the defendant’s A-File --- which apprises the alien of the determination that he is removable --- was non-testimonial because its “primary purpose is to effect removals, not to prove facts at a criminal trial.”); United States v. Lopez, 762 F.3d 852 (9th Cir. 2014) (verification of removal, recording the physical removal of an alien across the border, is not testimonial; like a warrant of removal, it is made for administrative purposes and not primarily designed to be admitted as evidence at a trial; the only difference from a warrant of removal “is that a verification of removal is used to record the removal of aliens pursuant to expedited removal procedures, while the warrant of removal records the removal of aliens following a hearing before an immigration judge”; also holding that, for the same reasons, the verification of removal was admissible as a public record under Rule 803(8)(A)(ii), despite the Rule’s apparent exclusion of law enforcement reports); United States v. Albino-Loe, 747 F.3d 1206 (9th Cir. 2014) (statements concerning the defendant’s alienage in a notice of removal --- which is the charging document for deportation --- are not testimonial in an illegal entry case; the primary purpose of a notice of removal “is simply to effect removals, not to prove facts at a criminal trial”); United States v. Torralba-Mendia, 784 F.3d 652 (9th Cir. 2015) (I-213 Forms, offered to show that passengers detained during an investigation were deported, were admissible under the public records hearsay exception and were not testimonial: “The admitted record of a deportable alien contains the same information as a verification of removal: The alien’s name, photograph, fingerprints, as well as the date, port and method of departure . . . .[T]he admitted forms are a ministerial, objective observation [and] Agents complete I-213 forms regardless of whether the government decides to prosecute anyone criminally.”).

Documents in alien registration file not testimonial: United States v. Valdovinos-Mendez, 641 F.3d 1031 (9th Cir. 2011): In an illegal re-entry prosecution, the defendant argued that admission of documents from his A-file violated his right to Confrontation. The court held that the challenged documents a --- Warrant of Removal, a Warning to Alien ordered Deported, and the Order from the Immigration Judge --- were not testimonial. They were not prepared with the primary motive of use in a criminal prosecution, because at the time they were prepared the crime of illegal reentry had not occurred.
Forms prepared by border patrol agents interdicting aliens found not testimonial: *United States v. Morales*, 720 F.3d 1194 (9th Cir. 2013): In a prosecution for illegally transporting aliens, the trial court admitted Field 826 forms, prepared by Border Patrol agents who interviewed the aliens. The Field 826 form records the date and location of arrest, the funds found in the alien’s possession, and basic biographical data about the alien, and also provides the alien options, including the making of a concession that the alien is illegally in the country and wishes to return home. The court of appeals rejected the defendant’s argument that these forms were testimonial. It stated that “a Border Patrol agent uses the form in the field to document basic information, to notify the aliens of their administrative rights, and to give the aliens a chance to request their preferred disposition. The Field 826s are completed whether or not the government decides to prosecute the aliens or anyone else criminally. The nature and use of the Field 826 makes clear that its primary purpose is administrative, not for use as evidence at a future criminal trial. Even though statements within the form may become relevant to later criminal prosecution, this potential future use does not automatically place the statements within the ambit of ‘testimonial.’” The court did find that the part of the report that contained information from the aliens was improperly admitted in violation of the hearsay rule. The Field 826 is a public record but information coming from the alien is not information coming from a public official. The court found the violation of the hearsay rule to be harmless error. (The court appears wrong about the hearsay rule because statements coming from the alien would be admissible as party-opponent statements in a public record.)

Return of Service, offered to prove that the Defendant had been provided with notice of a hearing on a domestic violence protection order, was not testimonial: *United States v. Fryberg*, 854 F.3d 1126 (9th Cir. 2017): The defendant was convicted for possession of a firearm by a prohibited person. The prohibition was that he was subject to a domestic violence protection order. Critical to the validity of that order was that the defendant was served with notice of a hearing on a permanent protection order. As proof of that the defendant was served with that notice, the government offered the return of service by a law enforcement officer, completed on the day that service was purportedly made. The court held that the return of service was admissible over a hearsay exception as a public record; it was not barred by the law enforcement prohibition of Rule 803(8) because it was a ministerial, non-adversarial record, proving only that service was made. The court further held that the return of service was admissible over a confrontation objection, because it was not testimonial. The court likened the return of service to the certificate of deportation upheld in *Orozco-Acosta, supra*. The court stated that the primary purpose for preparing the return of service was not to have it used as evidence in a prosecution but rather to inform the court “that the defendant had been served with notice of the hearing on the protection
order, which enabled the hearing to proceed.” At the time the notice was filed, no crime had yet occurred and so the return of service was not primarily prepared for the purpose of a criminal prosecution.

**Social Security application was not testimonial as it was not prepared under adversarial circumstances: United States v. Berry, 683 F.3d 1015 (9th Cir. 2012):** The court affirmed the defendant’s conviction for social security fraud for taking money paid for maintenance of his son while the defendant was a representative payee. The trial judge admitted routine Social Security Administration records showing that the defendant applied for benefits on behalf of the son. The defendant argued that an SSA application was tantamount to a police report and therefore the record was inadmissible under Rule 803(8), and also that its admission violated his right to confrontation. The court disagreed, reasoning that “a SSA interviewer completes the application as part of a routine administrative process” and such a record is prepared for each and every request for benefits. “No affidavit was executed in conjunction with preparation of the documents, and there was no anticipation that the documents would become part of a criminal proceeding. Rather, every expectation was that Berry would use the funds for their intended purpose.” The court quoted Melendez-Diaz for the proposition that “[b]usiness and public records are generally admissible absent confrontation not because they qualify under an exception to the hearsay rules, but because --- having been created for the administration of an entity’s affairs and not for the purpose of establishing or proving some fact at trial --- they are not testimonial.” The court concluded as follows:

[N]o reasonable argument can be made that the agency documents in this case were created solely for evidentiary purposes and/or to aid in a police investigation. Importantly, no police investigation even existed when the documents were created. *** Because the evidence at trial established that the SSA application was part of a routine, administrative procedure unrelated to a police investigation or litigation, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by admitting the application under Fed.R.Evid. 803(8), and no constitutional violation occurred.

**Affidavit seeking to amend a birth certificate, prepared by border patrol agents for use at trial, was testimonial: United States v. Macias, 789 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2015):** The defendant was arrested for illegal reentry but claimed that he had a California birth certificate and was a U.S. citizen. He was charged with illegal reentry and making a false claim of citizenship. During his trial he introduced a “delayed registration of birth” document issued by the State of California, and the jury deadlocked. After the trial, border patrol agents conducted an investigation into the defendant’s place of birth, interviewing family members and reviewing family documents, and determined that he had been born in Mexico. They then attempted to correct the birthplace on the
California document; pursuant to California law, they submitted sworn affidavits in an application to amend the California document. At the second trial, the government introduced the delayed registration as well as the amending affidavit. On appeal, the defendant argued that the amending affidavit was testimonial and its admission violated his right to confrontation. The court reviewed this claim for plain error because at trial the defendant’s objection was on hearsay grounds only. The court found that the amending affidavit was clearly testimonial, as its sole purpose was to create evidence for the defendant’s second trial. However, the court found that the plain error did not affect the defendant’s substantial rights, because the government at trial introduced the defendant’s Mexican birth certificate, as well as testimony from family members that the defendant was born in Mexico.

**Affidavits authenticating business records and foreign public records are not testimonial:** *United States v. Anekwu,* 695 F.3d 967 (9th Cir. 2012): In a fraud case, the government authenticated foreign public records and business records by submitting certificates of knowledgeable witnesses. This is permitted by 18 U.S.C. § 3505 for foreign records in criminal cases. The court found that the district court did not commit plain error in finding that the certificates were not testimonial. The certificates were not themselves substantive evidence but rather a means to authenticate records. The court relied on the 10th Circuit’s decision in *Yeley-Davis,* immediately below, and on the statement in *Melendez-Diaz* that certificates that do no more than authenticate other records are not testimonial.

**Records of cellphone calls kept by provider as business records are not testimonial, and Rule 902(11) affidavit authenticating the records is not testimonial:** *United States v. Yeley-Davis,* 632 F.3d 673 (10th Cir. 2011): In a drug case the trial court admitted cellphone records indicating that the defendant placed calls to coconspirators. The foundation for the records was provided by an affidavit of the records custodian that complied with Rule 902(11). The defendant argued that both the cellphone records and the affidavit were testimonial. The court rejected both arguments and affirmed the conviction. As to the records, the court found that they were not prepared “simply for litigation.” Rather, the records were kept for Verizon’s business purposes, and accordingly were not testimonial. As to the certificate, the court relied on pre-*Melendez-Diaz* cases such as *United States v. Ellis,* supra, which found that authenticating certificates were not the kind of affidavits that the Confrontation Clause was intended to cover. The defendant responded that cases such as *Ellis* had been abrogated by *Melendez-Diaz,* but the court disagreed:

If anything, the Supreme Court's recent opinion supports the conclusion in *Ellis.* * * * Justice Scalia expressly described the difference between an affidavit created to provide evidence against a defendant and an affidavit created to authenticate an admissible record: “A clerk could by
affidavit authenticate or provide a copy of an otherwise admissible record, but could not do what the analysts did here: create a record for the sole purpose of providing evidence against a defendant.” Id. at 2539. In addition, Justice Scalia rejected the dissent’s concern that the majority’s holding would disrupt the long-accepted practice of authenticating documents under Rule 902(11) and would call into question the holding in Ellis. See Melendez-Diaz, 129 S.Ct. at 2532 n. 1 (“Contrary to the dissent’s suggestion, ... we do not hold, and it is not the case, that anyone whose testimony may be relevant in establishing the ... authenticity of the sample ... must appear in person as part of the prosecution's case.”); see also id. at 2547 (Kennedy, J., dissenting) (expressing concern about the implications for evidence admitted pursuant to Rule 902(11) and future of Ellis). The Court’s ruling in Melendez-Diaz does not change our holding that Rule 902(11) certifications of authenticity are not testimonial.

The court found Yeley-Davis “dispositive” in United States v. Brinson, 772 F.3d 1314 (10th Cir. 2014), in which the court admitted a certificate of authenticity of credit card records. The court again distinguished Melendez-Diaz as a case concerned with affidavits showing the results of a forensic analysis --- whereas the certificate of authenticity “does not contain any ‘analysis’ that would constitute out-of-court testimony. Without that analysis, the certificate is simply a non-testimonial statement of authenticity.” See also United States v. Keck, 643 F.3d 789 (10th Cir. 2011): Records of wire-transfer transactions were not testimonial because they “were created for the administration of Moneygram’s affairs and not the purpose of establishing or proving some fact at trial. And since the wire-transfer data are not testimonial, the records custodian’s actions in preparing the exhibits [by cutting and pasting the data] do not constitute a Confrontation Clause violation.”

Notation on a fax attaching documents sent to law enforcement was not testimonial: United States v. Stegman, 873 F.3d 1215 (10th Cir. 2017): In a tax fraud prosecution, the government introduced the defendant’s records, as sent by the defendant’s accountant. The defendant objected that the fax cover sheet transmitting the document contained a notation made by the accountant that was potentially incriminating. The court found that the notation was not testimonial. It explained that the accountant’s notation was “cooperative and informal in nature and there is no indication that [the accountant] would have reasonably expected the notation to be used prosecutorially.”

Immigration forms containing biographical data, country of origin, etc. are not testimonial: United States v. Caraballo, 595 F.3d 1214 (11th Cir. 2010): In an alien smuggling case, the trial court admitted I-213 forms prepared by an officer who found aliens crammed into a small room in a boat near the shore of the United States. The forms contained basic biographical information,
and were used at trial to prove that the persons were aliens and not admitable. The defendant argued that the forms were inadmissible hearsay and also testimonial. The court of appeals found no error. On the hearsay question, the court held that the forms were properly admitted as public records --- the exclusion of law enforcement records in Rule 803(8) did not apply because the forms were routine and nonadversarial documents requested from every alien entering the United States. Nor were the forms testimonial, even after Melendez-Diaz. The court distinguished Melendez-Diaz in the following passage:

Like a Warrant of Deportation * * * (and unlike the certificates of analysis in Melendez-Diaz), the basic biographical information recorded on the I-213 form is routinely requested from every alien entering the United States, and the form itself is filled out for anyone entering the United States without proper immigration papers. * * * Rose gathered that biographical information from the aliens in the normal course of administrative processing at the Pembroke Pines Border Patrol Station in Pembroke Pines, Florida. * * *

The I-213 form is primarily used as a record by the INS for the purpose of tracking the entry of aliens into the United States. This routine, objective cataloging of unambiguous biographical matters becomes a permanent part of every deportable/inadmissible alien's A-File. It is of little moment that an incidental or secondary use of the interviews underlying the I-213 forms actually furthered a prosecution. The Supreme Court has instructed us to look only at the primary purpose of the law enforcement officer's questioning in determining whether the information elicited is testimonial. The district court properly ruled that the primary purpose of Rose's questioning of the aliens was to elicit routine biographical information that is required of every foreign entrant for the proper administration of our immigration laws and policies. The district court did not violate Caraballo's constitutional rights in admitting the smuggled aliens's redacted I-213 forms.
Summary charts of admitted business records is not testimonial: *United States v. Naranjo*, 634 F.3d 1198 (11th Cir. 2011): In a prosecution for concealing money laundering, the defendant argued that his confrontation rights were violated when the government presented summary charts of business records. The court found no error. The bank records and checks that were the subject of the summary were business records and “[b]usiness records are not testimonial.” And “[s]ummary evidence also is not testimonial if the evidence underlying the summary is not testimonial.”

Autopsy reports prepared as part of law enforcement are found testimonial under *Melendez-Diaz*: *United States v. Ignasiak*, 667 F.3d 1217 (11th Cir. 2012): In a prosecution against a doctor for health care fraud and illegally dispensing controlled substances, the court held that autopsy reports of the defendant’s former patients were testimonial under *Melendez-Diaz*. The court relied heavily on the fact that the autopsy reports were filed by an arm of law enforcement. The court reasoned as follows:

We think the autopsy records presented in this case were prepared “for use at trial.” Under Florida law, the Medical Examiners Commission was created and exists within the Department of Law Enforcement. Fla. Stat. 406.02. Further, the Medical Examiners Commission itself must include one member who is a state attorney, one member who is a public defender, one member who is sheriff, and one member who is the attorney general or his designee, in addition to five other non-criminal justice members. Id. The medical examiner for each district “shall determine the cause of death” in a variety of circumstances and shall, for that purpose, make or have performed such examinations, investigations, and autopsies as he or she shall deem necessary or as shall be requested by the state attorney.” Fla. Stat. 406.11(1). Further, any person who becomes aware of a person dying under circumstances described in section 406.11 has a duty to report the death to the medical examiner. Failure to do so is a first degree misdemeanor.

* * *

In light of this statutory framework, and the testimony of Dr. Minyard, the autopsy reports in this case were testimonial: “made under circumstances which would lead an objective witness reasonably to believe that the statement would be available for use at a later trial.” As such, even though not all Florida autopsy reports will be used in criminal trials, the reports in this case are testimonial and subject to the Confrontation Clause.

Note: The Court’s test for testimoniality is broader than that used by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court finds statements to be testimonial only when they are *primarily motivated*
to be used in a criminal prosecution. The 11th Circuit’s “reasonable anticipation” test would cover many more statements, and accordingly the court’s decision in *Ignasiak* is subject to question.
State of Mind Statements

Statement admissible under the state of mind exception is not testimonial: *Horton v. Allen*, 370 F.3d 75 (1st Cir. 2004): Horton was convicted of drug-related murders. At his state trial, the government offered hearsay statements from Christian, Horton’s accomplice. Christian had told a friend that he was broke; that he had asked a drug supplier to front him some drugs; that the drug supplier declined; and that he thought the drug supplier had a large amount of cash on him. These statements were offered under the state of mind exception to show the intent to murder and the motivation for murdering the drug supplier. The court held that Christian’s statements were not “testimonial” within the meaning of *Crawford*. The court explained that the statements “were not ex parte in-court testimony or its equivalent; were not contained in formalized documents such as affidavits, depositions, or prior testimony transcripts; and were not made as part of a confession resulting from custodial examination. . . . In short, Christian did not make the statements under circumstances in which an objective person would reasonably believe that the statement would be available for use at a later trial.”
Testifying Declarant

Cross-examination sufficient to admit prior statements of the witness that were testimonial: *United States v. Acosta*, 475 F.3d 677 (5th Cir. 2007): The defendant’s accomplice testified at his trial, after informing the court that he did not want to testify, apparently because of threats from the defendant. After answering questions about his own involvement in the crime, he refused on direct examination to answer several questions about the defendant’s direct participation in the crime. At that point the government referenced statements made by the accomplice in his guilty plea. On cross-examination, the accomplice answered all questions; the questioning was designed to impeach the accomplice by showing that he had a motive to lie so that he could receive a more lenient sentence. The government then moved to admit the accomplice’s statements made to qualify for a safety valve sentence reduction — those statements directly implicated the defendant in the crime. The court found that statements made pursuant to a guilty plea and to obtain a safety valve reduction were clearly testimonial. However, the court found no error in admitting these statements, because the accomplice was at trial subject to cross-examination. The court noted that the accomplice admitted making the prior statements, and answered every question he was asked on cross-examination. While the cross-examination did not probe into the underlying facts of the crime or the accomplice’s previous statements implicating the defendant, the court noted that “Acosta could have probed either of these subjects on cross-examination.” The accomplice was therefore found sufficiently subject to cross-examination to satisfy the Confrontation Clause. See also, *United States v. Smith*, 822 F.3d 755 (5th Cir. 2016) (defendant’s accomplice gave testimonial statements to a police officer, but admission of those statements did not violate the right to confrontation because the accomplice testified at trial subject to cross-examination).

*Crawford* inapplicable where hearsay statements are made by a declarant who testifies at trial: *United States v. Kappell*, 418 F.3d 550 (6th Cir. 2005): In a child sex abuse prosecution, the victims testified and the trial court admitted a number of hearsay statements the victims made to social workers and others. The defendant claimed that the admission of hearsay violated his right to confrontation under *Crawford*. But the court held that *Crawford* by its terms is inapplicable if the hearsay declarant is subject to cross-examination at trial. The defendant complained that the victims were unresponsive or inarticulate at some points in their testimony, and therefore they were not subject to effective cross-examination. But the court found this claim foreclosed by *United States v. Owens*, 484 U.S. 554 (1988). Under *Owens*, the Constitution requires only an opportunity for cross-examination, not cross-examination in whatever way the defendant might wish. The defendant’s complaint was that his cross-examination would have been more effective
if the victims had been older. “Under Owens, however, that is not enough to establish a Confrontation Clause violation.”

**Admission of testimonial statements does not violate the Confrontation Clause because declarant testified at trial --- even though the declarant did not recall making the statements:** *Cookson v. Schwartz*, 556 F.3d 647 (7th Cir. 2009): In a child sex abuse prosecution, the trial court admitted the victim’s hearsay statements accusing the defendant. These statements were testimonial. The victim then testified at trial, describing some incidents perpetrated by the defendant. But the victim could not remember making any of the hearsay statements that had previously been admitted into evidence. The court found no error in admitting the victim’s testimonial hearsay, because the victim had been subjected to cross-examination at trial. The defendant argued that the victim was in effect unavailable because she lacked memory about the statements. But the court found this argument was foreclosed by *United States v. Owens*, 484 U.S. 554 (1988). The court noted that the defendant in this case was better off than the defendant in *Owens* because the victim in this case “could remember the underlying events described in the hearsay statements.” *See also United States v. Al-Alawi*, 873 F.3d 592 (7th Cir. 2017) (admission of the victim’s videotaped statement to police, accusing the defendant of sexual abuse, did not violate the Confrontation Clause, because the victim testified at trial: “When the declarant appears for cross-examination at trial, the Confrontation Clause places no constraints at all on the use of his prior testimonial statements.”).

**Witness’s reference to statements made by a victim in a forensic report did not violate the Confrontation Clause because the declarant testified at trial:** *United States v. Charbonneau*, 613 F.3d 860 (8th Cir. 2010): Appealing from child-sex-abuse convictions, the defendant argued that it was error for the trial court to allow the case agent to testify that he had conducted a forensic interview with one of the victims and that the victim identified the perpetrator. The court recognized that the statements by the victim may have been testimonial. But in this case the victim testified at trial. The court declared that “Crawford did not alter the principle that the Confrontation Clause is satisfied when the hearsay declarant, here the child victim, actually appears in court and testifies in person.”

**Statements of interpreter do not violate the right to confrontation where the interpreter testified at trial:** *United States v. Romo-Chavez*, 681 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 2012): The court held that even if the translator of the defendant’s statements could be thought to have served as a witness against the defendant, there was no confrontation violation because the translator testified at trial.
“He may not have remembered the interview, but the Confrontation Clause includes no guarantee that every witness called by the prosecution will refrain from giving testimony that is marred by forgetfulness, confusion, or evasion. All the Confrontation Clause requires is the ability to cross-examine the witness about his faulty recollections.”

Statements to police officers implicating the defendant in the conspiracy are testimonial, but no confrontation violation because the declarant testified: *United States v. Allen*, 425 F.3d 1231 (9th Cir. 2005): The court held that a statement made by a former coconspirator to a police officer, after he was arrested, identifying the defendant as a person recruited for the conspiracy, was testimonial. There was no error in admitting this statement, however, because the declarant testified at trial and was cross-examined. *See also United States v. Lindsey*, 634 F.3d 541 (9th Cir. 2011) (“Although Gibson’s statements to Agent Arbuthnot qualify as testimonial statements, they do not offend the Confrontation Clause because Gibson himself testified at trial and was cross-examined by Lindsey’s counsel.”).

Admitting hearsay accusation did not violate the right to confrontation where the declarant testified and was subject to cross-examination about the statement: *United States v. Pursley*, 577 F.3d 1204 (10th Cir. 2009): A victim of a beating identified the defendant as his assailant to a federal marshal. That accusation was admitted at trial as an excited utterance. The victim testified at trial to the underlying event, and he also testified that he made the accusation, but he did not testify on either direct or cross-examination about the statement. The defendant argued that admitting the hearsay statement violated his right to confrontation. The court assumed arguendo that the accusation was testimonial --- even though it had been admitted as an excited utterance. But even if it was testimonial hearsay, the defendant’s confrontation rights were not violated because he had a full opportunity to cross-examine the victim about the statement. The court stated that the defendant’s “failure to seize this opportunity demolishes his Sixth Amendment claim.” The court observed that the defendant had a better opportunity to confront the victim “than defendants have had when testifying declarants have indicated that they cannot remember their out-of-court statements. Yet, courts have found no Confrontation Clause violation in that situation.”

Statement to police admissible as past recollection recorded is testimonial but admission does not violate the right to confrontation: *United States v. Jones*, 601 F.3d 1247 (11th Cir. 2010): Affirming firearms convictions, the court held that the trial judge did not abuse discretion in
admitting as past recollection recorded a videotaped police interview of a 16-year-old witness who sold a gun to the defendant and rode with him to an area out of town where she witnessed the defendant shoot a man. The court also rejected a Confrontation Clause challenge. Even though the videotaped statement was testimonial, the declarant testified at trial --- as is necessary to qualify a record under Rule 803(5) --- and was subject to unrestricted cross-examination.
Unavailability

Admitting deposition testimony violated the defendant’s right to confrontation because the government did not sufficiently establish unavailability: United States v. Foster, 910 F.2d 813 (5th Cir. 2018): Reversing a conviction for transporting aliens, the court found that admitting the videotaped depositions of the deported aliens violated the defendant’s right to confrontation. Had the defendant’s been unavailable, there would have been no confrontation violation, but the court found that the government had not made a “good faith and reasonable” effort to procure their presence for trial. The government deported the aliens, and while that may nevertheless consistent with good faith, the government “made no attempt to verify or confirm the authenticity or workability of the witnesses’ contact information, or offer the option of remaining in the United States pending Foster’s trial.” More importantly “the government made no attempt to remain in contact with either witness.”

Admitting deposition testimony did not violate the defendant’s right to confrontation where the declarant was properly found unavailable: United States v. Porter, 886 F.3d 562 (6th Cir. 2018): The defendant objected to the trial court’s decision to allow a witness to be deposed. He argued that the witness was available to testify at trial. The court found that the trial court did not err in finding that the witness would not be available to testify at trial. The witness had stage IV cancer and was unable to get out of bed. The court noted that the doctor’s letter to the court “was specific as to the nature of Miller’s illness and very clearly opined that Miller’s health would be jeopardized if she were required to testify at trial.” The court concluded that “because Porter was able to, and did, cross-examine Miller at her deposition, and because the government sufficiently demonstrated he unavailability to testify at trial, no Confrontation Clause violation occurred.”
Waiver

Waiver found where defense counsel’s cross-examination opened the door for testimonial hearsay: United States v. Lopez-Medina, 596 F.3d 716 (10th Cir. 2010): In a drug trial, an officer testified about the investigation that led to the defendant. On cross-examination, defense counsel inquired into the information that the officer received from an informant --- presumably to discredit the basis for the police having targeted the defendant. The trial court then on redirect allowed the government to question the officer and elicit some of the accusations about the defendant that the informant’s had made to the officer. The court found no error. It recognized that “a confidential informant’s statements to a law enforcement officer are clearly testimonial.” But the court concluded that the defendant “opened the door to further questioning of Officer Johnson regarding the information he received from the confidential informant. Where, as here, defense counsel purposefully and explicitly opens the door on a particular (and otherwise inadmissible) line of questioning, such conduct operates as a limited waiver allowing the government to introduce further evidence on that same topic.” The court observed that a waiver would not be found if there was any indication that the defendant had disagreed with defense counsel’s decision to open the door. But there was no indication of dissent in this case. Accord, United States v. Acosta, 475 F.3d 677 (5th Cir. 2007) (waiver found where defense counsel opened the door to testimonial hearsay). Contra, and undoubtedly wrong, United States v. Cromer, 389 F.3d 662, 679 (6th Cir. 2004) (“the mere fact that Cromer may have opened the door to the testimonial, out-of-court statement that violated his confrontation right is not sufficient to erase that violation”).