

**PRINCIPLES OF  
EVIDENCE  
Sixth Edition**

# LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

---

**Paul Caron**

*Professor of Law*

Pepperdine University School of Law

*Herzog Summer Visiting Professor in Taxation*

University of San Diego School of Law

**Bridgette Carr**

*Clinical Professor of Law*

University of Michigan Law School

**Olympia Duhart**

*Professor of Law and Director of Lawyering Skills & Values Program*

Nova Southeastern University, Shepard Broad Law School

**Samuel Estreicher**

*Dwight D. Opperman Professor of Law*

*Director, Center for Labor and Employment Law*

NYU School of Law

**Steven I. Friedland**

*Professor of Law and Senior Scholar*

Elon University School of Law

**Carole Goldberg**

*Jonathan D. Varat Distinguished Professor of Law*

UCLA School of Law

**Oliver Goodenough**

*Professor of Law*

Vermont Law School

**Paul Marcus**

*Haynes Professor of Law*

William and Mary Law School

**John Sprankling**

*Distinguished Professor of Law*

McGeorge School of Law

# PRINCIPLES OF EVIDENCE

---

*SIXTH EDITION*

IRVING YOUNGER

1932–1988

MICHAEL GOLDSMITH

1951–2009

DAVID A. SONENSHEIN

Jack E. Feinberg Professor of Litigation  
Temple University Beasley School of Law

ANTHONY J. BOCCHINO

Professor of Law  
Temple University Beasley School of Law

ISBN: 978-0-7698-8193-5

Looseleaf ISBN: 978-0-7698-8194-2

eBook ISBN: 978-0-7698-8195-9

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

**Younger, Irving, author.**

**Principles of evidence / Irving Younger, 1932-1988; Michael Goldsmith, 1951-2009; David A. Sonenshei, Jack E. Feinberg Professor of Litigation, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Anthony J. Bocchino, Professor of Law, Temple University Beasley School of Law. -- Sixth edition.**

pages cm

Includes index.

ISBN 978-0-7698-8193-5 (hard cover)

I. Evidence (Law)--United States. I. Goldsmith, Michael, 1951-2009, author. II. Sonenshein, David A., author. III. Bocchino, Anthony J., author. IV. Title.

KF8935.Y68 2014

347.73'6--dc23

2014018126

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

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

Copyright © 2014 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

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

**NOTE TO USERS**

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

**Editorial Offices**

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

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

[www.lexisnexus.com](http://www.lexisnexus.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

## *Dedication*

---



IRVING YOUNGER  
1932–1988



# Preface

---

This casebook has its origins in one conceived by Irving Younger and published in 1980 as *Materials for the Basic Course in Evidence*.

Younger was already famous when his book came out. Indeed, he was about the closest thing to a rock star the legal profession has seen, having served as professor, prosecutor, judge, trial lawyer, and author. He had a unique ability to take the most difficult material and present it in an entertaining and understandable way. He appealed alike to law students and members of the profession. Younger's presentations, whether in class, in court, or in the lecture hall, were always crowded. They were exquisitely crafted, eloquent, and memorable. To his audiences they seemed effortless. They were, in fact, the result of very hard work. Younger's love of the law and his excitement about it came through to those he taught. He still teaches via his judicial opinions, many of which have been incorporated into evidence casebooks. His recordings are still best-sellers.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout his career and despite his celebrity Younger thought of himself as just another hard-working trial lawyer striving to do his best. That was the novelty and essential theme of his casebook. On the need for another casebook, Younger said:

There being no dearth of evidence casebooks, the appearance of yet another requires explanation.

Years of struggling with the course have left me with certain settled preferences. Since it is the basic course, the only course in evidence most students ever take, I prefer to present the subject matter as the doctrinal foundation for what trial lawyers do in court.

Thirty years after Younger's initial publication, this new edition of *Principles of Evidence* remains true to Younger's original. The authors have built on and enhanced it. They have added their own love of, and excitement about, the law to Younger's. The result is a casebook that not only updates cases and evidentiary rules but prepares students for the conduct of litigation in court.

---

<sup>1</sup> The complete and classic collections of Professor Irving Younger's lectures and speeches have been digitally re-mastered. They are available as DVDs, CDs, and MP3s exclusively from THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION GROUP ([www.proedgroup.com](http://www.proedgroup.com) 800.229.2531).





# *Acknowledgments*

---

The authors acknowledge and express their appreciation for outstanding research support provided by the following students: Blake Bertagna, Rob DeLong, Sophie Hayes, Trevor Hickey, Holly Hinckley, Lindy Langston, Brant Lillywhite, Charlene Martin, Pam Mazahari, Andrew Platt, Tyler Waltham, and Keith Willis. In addition, Professor Goldsmith thanks Carolyn Goldsmith for meticulously working overtime to proofread portions of the manuscript.



# *Evidence Challenge*

---

## *Get courtroom experience with Evidence Challenge!*

Want a higher score on your evidence exam? Throughout this publication, you will see notations at the end of chapters for further case challenges related to the evidence topic. To prepare you for exams and challenge your comprehension, go to [www.EvidenceChallenge.com](http://www.EvidenceChallenge.com) to purchase access to the website. This interactive problem- and role-based exam preparation tool is available as a companion study aid for this publication. The interface was developed by an education expert partnering with LexisNexis® product development teams. Evidence Challenge case problems give students the opportunity to repeatedly practice application of chapter-relevant rules and concepts while preparing for exams.

### *Here's how it works:*

- Launch a problem, and enter a virtual courtroom where you are one of the attorneys.
- Uncover all the information you need for the questions posed by clicking on the characters and exhibit icons in the courtroom.
- You may be prompted to review further resources including documents, images, audio or video.
- Each problem offers a variety of possible responses and a feedback loop that tells you where you need to focus your studies.
- Links to applicable case problems will appear at the end of chapters in this publication:



**EVIDENCE CHALLENGE:** Challenge yourself to learn more about this topic. Enter the following address into your browser to access Evidence Challenge and apply these concepts to realistic problems set in a virtual courtroom.  
<http://www.EvidenceChallenge.com>. Additional purchase required.

- Each problem will take 5 – 10 minutes to complete as you work through various decision points in the realistic courtroom scenario: read instructions, review testimony or other evidence, link to the Problem Study Resources on Lexis Advance® and choose how to proceed.
- At the conclusion of the problem, review your detailed results page, see how well you answered each question within the problem, and see your performance relative to how others scored.
- Depending on your score, you may be granted an achievement!
- Retry problems when recommended, or just play them again for practice and to improve your score.

**Evidence Challenge:** [www.EvidenceChallenge.com](http://www.EvidenceChallenge.com) Included with specially marked *enhanced* LexisNexis® law school eBooks or purchase access separately directly at the Evidence Challenge website.



**TABLE OF EVIDENTIARY FOUNDATIONS**

People v. Chambers . . . . .	55
O.J. Simpson Civil Trial . . . . .	277, 590
State v. Ramsey . . . . .	118
Trial of Alger Hiss . . . . .	327, 540, 579
Trial of Bernhard Goetz . . . . .	240
Trial of Bruno Richard Hauptmann . . . . .	245
Trial of Charles Manson . . . . .	437
Trial of Dr. Carl Coppolino . . . . .	165
Trial of Dr. Sam Sheppard . . . . .	305
Trial of Harrison A. Williams, Jr. . . . .	308, 410, 432, 483, 686
Trial of Henry Lazarus . . . . .	281
Trial of Herman Marion Sweatt . . . . .	304
Trial of Jeffrey Weissberg et al. . . . .	157
Trial of Jesse R. Davis . . . . .	284
Trial of John W. Jenrette, Jr. . . . .	75
Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg . . . . .	164, 238, 479, 542
Trial of Mary Harris . . . . .	559
Trial of Mumia Abu-Jamal . . . . .	268
Trial of Pete Seeger . . . . .	337
Trial of Richard Herrin . . . . .	218
Trial of Roland Burnham Molineux . . . . .	145
Trial of Sacco and Vanzetti . . . . .	70
Trial of Sirhan Sirhan . . . . .	30
Trial of Wayne Williams . . . . .	196, 372
Trial of Westbrook Pegler . . . . .	423
Trial of William “Duff” Armstrong . . . . .	12
Trial of Willie Riviello . . . . .	423
United States v. Spotted War Bonnet . . . . .	125



# *Summary Table of Contents*

<b>Chapter I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION: THE CONCEPT OF EVIDENCE . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
<hr/>		
<b>Chapter II</b>	<b>PRELIMINARY MATTERS . . . . .</b>	<b>5</b>
A.	ALTERNATIVES TO FORMAL PROOF . . . . .	5
B.	TYPES OF FORMAL PROOF . . . . .	22
C.	BASIC CONDITIONS OF ADMISSIBILITY . . . . .	25
D.	PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS OF FACT: THE ROLE OF JUDGE AND JURY . . . . .	83
E.	AUTHENTICATION OF DOCUMENTS — ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE . . . . .	88
<hr/>		
<b>Chapter III</b>	<b>THE EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES . . . . .</b>	<b>95</b>
A.	TESTIMONIAL COMPETENCE . . . . .	95
B.	INTERROGATION OF WITNESSES . . . . .	129
C.	RELIANCE ON INADMISSIBLE DATA . . . . .	215
D.	IMPEACHMENT, CROSS-EXAMINATION, AND RELATED PROBLEMS . . . . .	222
<hr/>		
<b>Chapter IV</b>	<b>RELEVANCY REFINED . . . . .</b>	<b>311</b>
A.	MATHEMATICAL PROOF . . . . .	311
B.	SUBSTANTIVE CHARACTER EVIDENCE . . . . .	322
C.	OTHER EXAMPLES OF LEGAL RELEVANCE . . . . .	391
<hr/>		
<b>Chapter V</b>	<b>THE HEARSAY RULES . . . . .</b>	<b>403</b>
A.	THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY . . . . .	403
B.	RATIONALE FOR THE RULE . . . . .	404
C.	DEFINING HEARSAY — BASIC CONCEPTS . . . . .	411
D.	THE APPLICATION OF BASIC CONCEPTS . . . . .	414
E.	CONDUCT AND IMPLIED STATEMENTS . . . . .	435
F.	DEFINING THE HEARSAY DECLARANT . . . . .	439
G.	NON-HEARSAY STATEMENTS ADMISSIBLE FOR THEIR TRUTH . . . . .	452
H.	EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY . . . . .	486
I.	CONFRONTATION AND HEARSAY . . . . .	623

<b>Chapter VI</b>	<b>PRIVILEGES</b> .....	<b>645</b>
A.	INTRODUCTION .....	645
B.	THE EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGES .....	655
C.	THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE .....	664
D.	THE PRIVILEGE FOR MARITAL COMMUNICATIONS .....	695
E.	THE PHYSICIAN-PATIENT PRIVILEGE .....	702
F.	THE PRIEST-PENITENT PRIVILEGE .....	709
G.	THE NEWSGATHER’S PRIVILEGE .....	710
<b>Chapter VII</b>	<b>BURDENS AND PRESUMPTIONS</b> .....	<b>721</b>
<b>TABLE OF CASES</b> .....		<b>TC-1</b>
<b>TABLE OF STATUTES</b> .....		<b>TS-1</b>
<b>INDEX</b> .....		<b>I-1</b>



# Table of Contents

<b>Chapter I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION: THE CONCEPT OF EVIDENCE . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, 1 EVIDENCE § 1 . . . . .	1
	JAMES B. THAYER, A PRELIMINARY TREATISE ON EVIDENCE AT THE COMMON LAW . . . . .	2
	SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND . . . . .	2
	Jerome Michael & Mortimer J. Adler, <i>Real Proof</i> . . . . .	2
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	3
<b>Chapter II</b>	<b>PRELIMINARY MATTERS . . . . .</b>	<b>5</b>
A.	ALTERNATIVES TO FORMAL PROOF . . . . .	5
1.	Judicial Notice . . . . .	5
a.	Introduction . . . . .	5
	JAMES B. THAYER, A PRELIMINARY TREATISE ON EVIDENCE AT THE COMMON LAW . . . . .	5
b.	Adjudicative Facts . . . . .	5
	<i>Varcoe v. Lee</i> . . . . .	5
	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Judicial Notice</i> . . . . .	9
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	10
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, 9 EVIDENCE § 2579 . . . . .	10
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	11
	CHARLES T. MCCORMICK, HANDBOOK OF THE LAW OF EVIDENCE § 330 . . . . .	12
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of William “Duff” Armstrong . .	12
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	13
c.	Law . . . . .	14
	JOHN MAGUIRE, EVIDENCE: COMMON SENSE AND COMMON LAW .	14
d.	Legislative Facts . . . . .	15
	<i>Muller v. Oregon</i> . . . . .	15
	<i>Roe v. Wade</i> . . . . .	16
	Dean Alfange, Jr., <i>The Relevance of Legislative Facts in Constitutional Law</i> . . . . .	17
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	19
2.	Other Options . . . . .	20
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	21
B.	TYPES OF FORMAL PROOF . . . . .	22
1.	Real Evidence . . . . .	22
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, 1 EVIDENCE § 24 . . . . .	22
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	22

---

*Table of Contents*

2.	Demonstrative Evidence . . . . .	23
	<i>Uss v. Town of Oyster Bay</i> . . . . .	23
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	24
3.	Testimonial Evidence . . . . .	25
C.	BASIC CONDITIONS OF ADMISSIBILITY . . . . .	25
1.	Introduction . . . . .	25
	JAMES B. THAYER, A PRELIMINARY TREATISE ON EVIDENCE AT THE COMMON LAW . . . . .	25
	Note . . . . .	26
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	26
2.	Legal Relevance and Materiality . . . . .	27
	George F. James, <i>Relevancy, Probability and the Law</i> . . . . .	27
	<i>Barnett v. State</i> . . . . .	28
	<i>Lynch v. Rosenberger</i> . . . . .	28
	Questions . . . . .	28
	<i>United States v. Curtis</i> . . . . .	28
	Question . . . . .	30
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Sirhan Sirhan . . . . .	30
	Questions . . . . .	32
3.	Competence . . . . .	32
	CHARLES E. TORCIA, 1 WHARTON’S CRIMINAL EVIDENCE § 154 . . . . .	32
4.	Legal Relevance . . . . .	33
	Herman L. Trautman, <i>Logical or Legal Relevance — A Conflict     in Theory</i> . . . . .	33
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	33
	George F. James, <i>Relevancy, Probability and the Law</i> . . . . .	34
	Question . . . . .	35
	<i>Old Chief v. United States</i> . . . . .	36
	<i>United States v. McVeigh</i> . . . . .	43
	Notes . . . . .	55
5.	Evidentiary Foundations . . . . .	56
	<i>Evidentiary Foundation: People v. Chambers</i> . . . . .	56
	Mason Ladd, <i>Objections, Motions and Foundation Testimony</i> . . . . .	58
	JAMES W. MCELHANEY, TRIAL NOTEBOOK . . . . .	58
	Question . . . . .	62
	<i>United States v. Reilly</i> . . . . .	63
	<i>United States v. Dumeisi</i> . . . . .	64
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	69
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Sacco and Vanzetti . . . . .	70
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of John W. Jenrette, Jr. . . . .	75
D.	PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS OF FACT: THE ROLE OF JUDGE AND JURY . . . . .	83

---

*Table of Contents*

	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Functions of Judge and Jury in the Determination of Preliminary Questions of Fact</i> . . . . .	83
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	86
E.	AUTHENTICATION OF DOCUMENTS — ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE . . . . .	88
	<i>United States v. Safavian</i> . . . . .	88
	<i>State v. Thompson</i> . . . . .	91
<b>Chapter III</b>	<b>THE EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES</b> . . . . .	<b>95</b>
A.	TESTIMONIAL COMPETENCE . . . . .	95
1.	Introduction . . . . .	95
	3 THE COLLECTED WORKS OF AMBROSE BIERCE 415 (1910) . . . . .	95
	Scott Rowley, <i>The Competency of Witnesses</i> . . . . .	95
2.	Incompetence by Reason of Status: Traditional Limitations . . . . .	97
a.	Spousal Incompetence . . . . .	97
	Robert M. Hutchins & Donald Slesinger, <i>Some Observations on the Law of Evidence: Family Relations</i> . . . . .	97
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	97
	<i>State v. Lee</i> . . . . .	99
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	100
b.	Dead Person’s Statutes . . . . .	100
	Roy R. Ray, <i>Dead Man’s Statutes</i> . . . . .	100
c.	Infamous Crimes . . . . .	104
	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 5922 (2005) . . . . .	104
	Vt. Stat. Ann., Title 12, § 1608 (2006) . . . . .	104
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	104
d.	Jurors . . . . .	104
	<i>Hoffman v. City of St. Paul</i> . . . . .	104
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	106
	<i>United States v. Stewart</i> . . . . .	106
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	111
3.	The Elements of Modern Competence . . . . .	112
	Robert M. Hutchins & Donald Slesinger, <i>Some Observations on the Law of Evidence — The Competency of Witnesses</i> . . . . .	112
	Note . . . . .	112
	<i>Schneiderman v. Interstate Transit Lines</i> . . . . .	113
	Questions . . . . .	117
	Evidentiary Foundation: <i>State v. Ramsey</i> . . . . .	118
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	120
	<i>Rock v. Arkansas</i> . . . . .	121
	<i>Kaelin v. State</i> . . . . .	123

---

*Table of Contents*

	Evidentiary Foundation: U.S. v. Spotted War Bonnet . . . . .	125
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	126
	<i>People v. Walker</i> . . . . .	126
B.	INTERROGATION OF WITNESSES . . . . .	129
	CHARLES A. WRIGHT & KENNETH W. GRAHAM, 21 FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE, EVIDENCE § 5036 . . . . .	129
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	130
1.	The Rule Against Leading Questions . . . . .	130
	BARON BRAMPTON, 1 THE REMINISCENCES OF SIR HENRY HAWKINS 30 , . . . . .	130
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	131
	<i>Stahl v. Sun Microsystems, Inc.</i> . . . . .	132
2.	Assisting the Forgetful Witness . . . . .	133
	<i>United States v. Riccardi</i> . . . . .	133
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	139
	<i>Sporck v. Peil</i> . . . . .	139
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Roland Burnham Molineux . .	145
3.	The Original Document Rule . . . . .	146
	JOHN MAGUIRE, EVIDENCE: COMMON SENSE AND COMMON LAW . .	146
	ANTHONY J. BOCCHINO & DAVID A. SONENSHEIN, A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO FEDERAL EVIDENCE . . . . .	147
	CHARLES T. MCCORMICK, HANDBOOK OF THE LAW OF EVIDENCE §§ 231, 233 . . . . .	147
	<i>Sirico v. Cotto Et Al.</i> . . . . .	149
	Note . . . . .	150
	<i>Meyers v. United States</i> . . . . .	150
	<i>United States v. Gonzales-Benitez</i> . . . . .	154
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	156
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Jeffrey Weissberg Et Al. . . . .	157
4.	Rules Limiting Opinion Testimony . . . . .	159
a.	The Non-Opinion Rule . . . . .	159
	<i>Carter v. Boehm</i> . . . . .	159
	Mason Ladd, <i>Expert Testimony</i> . . . . .	159
b.	The Lay Witness Exception . . . . .	160
	<i>United States v. Leroy</i> . . . . .	160
	<i>United States v. Cox</i> . . . . .	162
	Note . . . . .	163
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg .	164
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Dr. Carl Coppolino . . . . .	165
c.	The Expert Witness Exception to the Non-Opinion Rule . . . . .	166
	Mason Ladd, <i>Expert Testimony</i> . . . . .	166
	<i>Een v. Consolidated Freightways, Inc.</i> . . . . .	167

---

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Stafford v. Mussers Potato Chips, Inc.</i> . . . . .	169
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	169
	<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> . . . . .	170
	Question . . . . .	179
	<i>Kumho Tire Co., Ltd. v. Carmichael</i> . . . . .	179
	<i>United States v. Locascio</i> . . . . .	186
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	190
	Mason Ladd, <i>Expert Testimony</i> . . . . .	191
	Question . . . . .	191
	<i>United States v. Figueroa-Lopez</i> . . . . .	192
	Note . . . . .	196
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Wayne Williams . . . . .	196
	<i>United States v. Leeson</i> . . . . .	199
	Mason Ladd, <i>Expert Testimony</i> . . . . .	204
	<i>United States v. Scavo</i> . . . . .	205
	<i>Berry v. City of Detroit</i> . . . . .	206
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	210
	Charles T. McCormick, <i>Some Observations Upon the Opinion</i> <i>Rule and Expert Testimony</i> . . . . .	212
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, 2 EVIDENCE § 686 . . . . .	213
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	214
C.	RELIANCE ON INADMISSIBLE DATA . . . . .	215
	<i>McClellan v. Morrison</i> . . . . .	215
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	217
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Richard Herrin . . . . .	218
D.	IMPEACHMENT, CROSS-EXAMINATION, AND RELATED PROBLEMS . . . . .	222
1.	Impeachment by Cross-Examination . . . . .	222
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, A POCKET CODE OF THE RULES OF EVIDENCE IN TRIALS AT LAW 137 (1910) . . . . .	222
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, 5 EVIDENCE § 1367 . . . . .	222
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	223
2.	Impeaching Your Own Witness: The Vouching Rule . . . . .	224
	Colledge’s Trial . . . . .	224
	Note, <i>Impeaching One’s Own Witness</i> . . . . .	224
	<i>Johnson v. Baltimore &amp; O.R. Co.</i> . . . . .	225
3.	The Scope of Cross-Examination . . . . .	228
	CHARLES T. MCCORMICK, HANDBOOK OF THE LAW OF EVIDENCE § 21 . . . . .	228
	DAVID W. LOUISELL & CHRISTOPHER B. MUELLER, 3 FEDERAL EVIDENCE § 332 . . . . .	229
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	230

---

*Table of Contents*

4.	Impeachment Modes . . . . .	231
a.	Pursuing the Competence Factors . . . . .	231
	IRVING YOUNGER, THE ART OF CROSS-EXAMINATION . . . . .	231
	<i>United States v. Sampol</i> . . . . .	236
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg . . . . .	238
b.	Pursuing the Credibility Factors . . . . .	239
1)	Bias, Interest, Prejudice, and Corruption . . . . .	239
	William G. Hale, <i>Bias as Affecting Credibility</i> . . . . .	239
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Bernhard Goetz . . . . .	240
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	240
	<i>United States v. Abel</i> . . . . .	241
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	245
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Bruno Richard Hauptmann . . . . .	245
2)	Prior Crimes . . . . .	246
	Mason Ladd, <i>Credibility Tests — Current Trends</i> . . . . .	246
	Question . . . . .	247
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	248
	<i>United States v. Mahone</i> . . . . .	249
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	251
	<i>Luce v. United States</i> . . . . .	252
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	254
	<i>United States v. Smith</i> . . . . .	254
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	261
	<i>United States v. Tse</i> . . . . .	262
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Mumia Abu-Jamal . . . . .	268
	Question . . . . .	271
3)	Prior Bad Acts . . . . .	271
	William G. Hale, <i>Specific Acts and Related Matters as Affecting     Credibility</i> . . . . .	271
	<i>United States v. Provoo</i> . . . . .	273
	Evidentiary Foundation: The O.J. Simpson Civil Trial . . . . .	277
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	277
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Henry Lazarus . . . . .	281
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Jesse R. Davis . . . . .	284
4)	Prior Inconsistent Statements . . . . .	289
	CHARLES T. MCCORMICK, HANDBOOK OF THE LAW OF EVIDENCE § 28 . . . . .	289
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	291
5)	The Character Witness for Veracity . . . . .	293
	Mason Ladd, <i>Credibility Tests — Current Trends</i> . . . . .	293

---

*Table of Contents*

	Questions . . . . .	294
	<i>United States v. Mandel</i> . . . . .	295
	Mason Ladd, <i>Techniques and Theory of Character Testimony</i> . . . . .	296
6)	Special Procedures for Experts . . . . .	301
	<i>Ruth v. Fenchel</i> . . . . .	301
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	304
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Herman Marion Sweatt . . . . .	304
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Dr. Sam Sheppard . . . . .	305
7)	Rehabilitation After Impeachment . . . . .	306
	<i>People v. Singer</i> . . . . .	306
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	308
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Harrison A. Williams, Jr. . . . .	308
<b>Chapter IV RELEVANCY REFINED . . . . .</b>		<b>311</b>
A.	MATHEMATICAL PROOF . . . . .	311
	Laurence H. Tribe, <i>Trial By Mathematics:</i> . . . . .	311
	<i>State v. Garrison</i> . . . . .	314
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	319
	<i>Smith v. Rapid Transit</i> . . . . .	320
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	321
B.	SUBSTANTIVE CHARACTER EVIDENCE . . . . .	322
1.	A Critical Distinction . . . . .	322
	Note . . . . .	323
2.	Types of Substantive Character Evidence . . . . .	323
	GRAHAM C. LILLY, AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LAW OF EVIDENCE . . . . .	323
3.	Character Evidence in a Civil Context . . . . .	324
	<i>Mutual Life Ins. Co. of Baltimore v. Kelly</i> . . . . .	324
	Question . . . . .	326
4.	Character Evidence in a Criminal Context . . . . .	327
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Alger Hiss . . . . .	327
	Questions . . . . .	328
	<i>Michelson v. United States</i> . . . . .	328
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Pete Seeger . . . . .	337
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	343
5.	Special Rules for Evidence of Other Wrongs . . . . .	345
	<i>Rex v. Smith</i> . . . . .	345
	<i>United States v. Beechum</i> . . . . .	345
	<i>United States v. Woods</i> . . . . .	364
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	368
	<i>United States v. Hearst</i> . . . . .	369
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Wayne Williams . . . . .	372

---

*Table of Contents*

6.	Special Rules for Cases Alleging Sexual Assaults . . . . .	380
	J. Alexander Tanford & Anthony J. Bocchino, <i>Rape Victim Shield Laws and the Sixth Amendment</i> . . . . .	381
	David J. Karp, <i>Evidence of Propensity and</i> . . . . .	384
	Louis M. Natali, Jr & R. Stephen Stigall, “ <i>Are You Going to Arraign His Whole Life?</i> ”: <i>How Sexual Propensity Evidence Violates the Due Process Clause</i> . . . . .	390
C.	OTHER EXAMPLES OF LEGAL RELEVANCE . . . . .	391
1.	Habit and Custom . . . . .	391
	M.C. Slough, <i>Relevancy Unraveled, Part II</i> . . . . .	391
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	393
2.	Subsequent Remedial Measures . . . . .	394
	M.C. Slough, <i>Relevancy Unraveled, Part III</i> . . . . .	394
	<i>Flaminio v. Honda Motor Co.</i> . . . . .	396
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	398
3.	Compromise Offers and Settlements . . . . .	399
	M.C. Slough, <i>Relevancy Unraveled, Part III</i> . . . . .	399
4.	Liability Insurance . . . . .	400
	M.C. Slough, <i>Relevancy Unraveled, Part III</i> . . . . .	400
<b>Chapter V THE HEARSAY RULES . . . . .</b>		<b>403</b>
A.	THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY . . . . .	403
	Notes . . . . .	403
B.	RATIONALE FOR THE RULE . . . . .	404
	Carl C. Wheaton, <i>What is Hearsay?</i> . . . . .	404
	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Hearsay Dangers and the Application of the Hearsay Concept</i> . . . . .	405
	<i>Queen v. Hepburn</i> . . . . .	407
	Questions . . . . .	409
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Harrison A. Williams, Jr. . . . .	410
C.	DEFINING HEARSAY — BASIC CONCEPTS . . . . .	411
	Carl C. Wheaton, <i>What is Hearsay?</i> . . . . .	411
	Roger C. Park, <i>McCormick on Evidence and the Concept of Hearsay: A Critical Analysis Followed by Suggestions to Law Teachers</i> . . . . .	412
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	412
	<i>Anderson v. United States</i> . . . . .	412
	Questions . . . . .	414
D.	THE APPLICATION OF BASIC CONCEPTS . . . . .	414
	Charles T. McCormick, <i>The Borderland of Hearsay</i> . . . . .	414
	Carl C. Wheaton, <i>What is Hearsay?</i> . . . . .	414
	<i>Creaghe v. Iowa Home Mutual Casualty Co.</i> . . . . .	416



---

*Table of Contents*

	<i>United States v. Jones</i> . . . . .	418
	<i>United States v. Devinent</i> . . . . .	419
	<i>Betts v. Betts</i> . . . . .	421
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	422
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Westbrook Pegler . . . . .	423
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Willie Riviello . . . . .	423
	Notes . . . . .	425
	<i>United States v. McLennan</i> . . . . .	425
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	429
	<i>People v. Barnhart</i> . . . . .	430
	Questions . . . . .	432
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Harrison A. Williams, Jr. . . . .	432
	Question . . . . .	434
E.	CONDUCT AND IMPLIED STATEMENTS . . . . .	435
	<i>Park v. Huff</i> . . . . .	435
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	437
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Charles Manson . . . . .	437
	<i>Silver v. New York Central R.R. Co.</i> . . . . .	438
	Question . . . . .	439
F.	DEFINING THE HEARSAY DECLARANT . . . . .	439
	<i>People v. Centolella</i> . . . . .	439
	Charles T. McCormick, <i>The Turncoat Witness: Previous Statements as Substantive Evidence</i> . . . . .	441
	<i>United States v. Desisto</i> . . . . .	443
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	446
	<i>Tome v. United States</i> . . . . .	447
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	452
G.	NON-HEARSAY STATEMENTS ADMISSIBLE FOR THEIR TRUTH . . . . .	452
1.	Introduction . . . . .	452
	Judson F. Falknor, <i>The Hearsay Rule and its Exceptions</i> . . . . .	453
	Jack B. Weinstein, <i>The Probative Force of Hearsay</i> . . . . .	454
2.	Admissions . . . . .	455
a.	Rationale . . . . .	455
	James L. Hetland, <i>Admissions in the Uniform Rules: Are They Necessary?</i> . . . . .	455
	Question . . . . .	456
	<i>State v. Johnson</i> . . . . .	456
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	459
	<i>Bill v. Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co.</i> . . . . .	460
	Note and Questions . . . . .	462
b.	Adoptive Admissions . . . . .	462

---

*Table of Contents*

	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Admissions</i> . . . . .	462
	<i>Ollert v. Ziebell</i> . . . . .	463
	<i>United States v. Flecha</i> . . . . .	464
	<i>United States v. Kilbourne</i> . . . . .	466
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	467
c.	Vicarious Admissions . . . . .	468
	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>The Rationale of Vicarious Admissions</i> . . . .	468
	<i>Martin v. Savage Truck Line, Inc.</i> . . . . .	469
	Note . . . . .	470
	<i>Mahlandt v. Wild Canid Survival and Research Center, Inc.</i> . . . .	471
d.	Co-Conspirator Declarations . . . . .	475
	Joseph H. Levie, <i>Hearsay and Conspiracy: A Reexamination of the</i> <i>Co-Conspirators' Exception to the Hearsay Rule</i> . . . . .	475
	<i>United States v. Haldeman</i> . . . . .	476
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	479
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg .	479
	<i>Bourjaily v. United States</i> . . . . .	480
	Notes . . . . .	483
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Harrison A. Williams, Jr. . .	483
H.	EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY . . . . .	486
1.	Exceptions Requiring Declarant Unavailability . . . . .	486
a.	Introduction: The Concept of Unavailability . . . . .	486
	Comment, <i>Hearsay Under the Proposed Federal Rules: A</i> <i>Discretionary Approach</i> . . . . .	486
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	488
b.	Declarations Against Interest . . . . .	489
	Bernard S. Jefferson, <i>Declarations Against Interest: An Exception to</i> <i>the Hearsay Rule</i> . . . . .	489
	Questions . . . . .	490
	<i>United States v. MacDonald</i> . . . . .	490
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	496
	<i>United States v. Lang</i> . . . . .	497
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	502
	<i>Williamson v. United States</i> . . . . .	502
	Note . . . . .	505
c.	Former Testimony . . . . .	505
	Note, <i>Affidavits, Depositions, and Prior Testimony</i> . . . . .	505
	<i>United States v. Dinapoli</i> . . . . .	506
	Questions . . . . .	511
	<i>United States v. Koon</i> . . . . .	512
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	517

---

*Table of Contents*

d.	Statements Made in the Belief of Impending Death (Dying Declarations) . . . . .	517
	Charles W. Quick, <i>Some Reflections on Dying Declarations</i> . . . .	517
	<i>Shepard v. United States</i> . . . . .	519
	<i>State v. Adamson</i> . . . . .	521
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	524
2.	Exceptions Not Requiring Declarant Unavailability . . . . .	524
a.	Business Records . . . . .	524
	John E. Tracy, <i>The Introduction of Documentary Evidence</i> . . . . .	524
	<i>Johnson v. Lutz</i> . . . . .	525
	<i>Kelly v. Wasserman</i> . . . . .	528
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	530
	<i>Palmer v. Hoffman</i> . . . . .	531
	<i>Melton v. St. Louis Public Service Co.</i> . . . . .	534
	<i>Williams v. Alexander</i> . . . . .	536
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	540
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Alger Hiss . . . . .	540
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg .	542
b.	Public Records . . . . .	545
	Comment, <i>Hearsay Under the Proposed Federal Rules: A     Discretionary Approach</i> . . . . .	545
	<i>Beech Aircraft Corporation v. Rainey</i> . . . . .	547
	Note . . . . .	555
c.	Excited Utterances and Present Sense Impressions . . . . .	556
	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Basic Problems of Evidence</i> . . . . .	556
	<i>Nager Electric Co. v. Charles Benjamin, Inc.</i> . . . . .	557
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Mary Harris . . . . .	559
	<i>Houston Oxygen Co. v. Davis</i> . . . . .	560
	<i>United States v. Narcisco</i> . . . . .	561
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	564
d.	Declarations of Physical Condition . . . . .	566
	Roy R. Ray, <i>Restrictions on Doctor’s Testimony in Personal Injury     Cases</i> . . . . .	566
	<i>Dewitt v. Johnson</i> . . . . .	567
	Questions . . . . .	569
	<i>Meaney v. United States</i> . . . . .	569
	<i>United States v. Tome</i> . . . . .	571
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	576
e.	Declarations of State of Mind . . . . .	577
	<i>Adoption of Harvey</i> . . . . .	577
	Questions . . . . .	579

---

*Table of Contents*

	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Alger Hiss . . . . .	579
	<i>Zippo Manufacturing Co. v. Rogers Imports, Inc.</i> . . . . .	580
	<i>Mutual Life Insurance Co. v. Hillmon</i> . . . . .	583
	John M. Maguire, <i>The Hillmon Case — Thirty-Three Years After</i> . . . . .	585
	<i>Shepard v. United States</i> . . . . .	588
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	589
	Evidentiary Foundation: The O.J. Simpson Civil Trial . . . . .	590
	Question . . . . .	591
	<i>United States v. Layton</i> . . . . .	592
	Questions . . . . .	596
3.	The Residual Exception — Flexibility for the Future . . . . .	597
	Jack B. Weinstein, <i>The Probative Force of Hearsay</i> . . . . .	597
	Note . . . . .	598
	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Foreword to the Model Code of Evidence</i> . . . . .	598
	Questions . . . . .	603
	<i>Dallas County v. Commercial Union Assurance Co.</i> . . . . .	603
	<i>Huff v. White Motor Corp.</i> . . . . .	609
	<i>United States v. Bailey</i> . . . . .	614
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	620
	David A. Sonenshein, <i>The Residual Exceptions to the Federal Hearsay Rule: Two Exceptions in Search of a Rule</i> . . . . .	620
	David Sonenshein, <i>Impeaching the Hearsay Declarant</i> . . . . .	622
I.	CONFRONTATION AND HEARSAY . . . . .	623
	<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> . . . . .	623
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	633
	<i>Michigan v. Bryant</i> . . . . .	634
	<b>Chapter VI PRIVILEGES . . . . .</b>	<b>645</b>
A.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	645
1.	The Basis for Privileges . . . . .	645
	JOHN H. WIGMORE, 8 EVIDENCE § 2285 . . . . .	645
2.	The Federal Perspective . . . . .	646
	James W. Moore & Helen I. Bendex, <i>Congress, Evidence, and Rulemaking</i> . . . . .	646
	<i>Jaffee v. Redmond</i> . . . . .	648
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	654
B.	THE EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGES . . . . .	655
	Archibald Cox, <i>Executive Privilege</i> . . . . .	655
	<i>United States v. Nixon</i> . . . . .	657
C.	THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE . . . . .	664
	Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., <i>An Historical Perspective on the Attorney-Client</i>	

---

*Table of Contents*

	<i>Privilege</i> . . . . .	664
	<i>In re Bonanno</i> . . . . .	666
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	670
	<i>Upjohn v. United States</i> . . . . .	671
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	678
	<i>People v. Meredith</i> . . . . .	680
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	686
	Evidentiary Foundation: The Trial of Harrison A. Williams, Jr. . . . .	686
	<i>In re Bruce R. Lindsey (Grand Jury Testimony)</i> . . . . .	691
	Note . . . . .	694
D.	<b>THE PRIVILEGE FOR MARITAL COMMUNICATIONS</b> . . . . .	695
	Comment, <i>The Husband-Wife Privilege of Testimonial</i>	
	<i>Non-Disclosure</i> . . . . .	695
	<i>Trammel v. United States</i> . . . . .	695
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	701
E.	<b>THE PHYSICIAN-PATIENT PRIVILEGE</b> . . . . .	702
	<i>United States ex rel. Edney v. Smith</i> . . . . .	702
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	708
F.	<b>THE PRIEST-PENITENT PRIVILEGE</b> . . . . .	709
	Donna Oneta Reese, <i>Confidential Communications to the Clergy</i> . . . . .	709
G.	<b>THE NEWSGATHER’S PRIVILEGE</b> . . . . .	710
	<i>United States v. Criden</i> . . . . .	710
	Notes . . . . .	719
<b>Chapter VII      BURDENS AND PRESUMPTIONS</b> . . . . .		<b>721</b>
	Fleming James, <i>Burdens of Proof</i> . . . . .	721
	CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION, A STUDY RELATING TO THE	
	UNIFORM RULES OF EVIDENCE — BURDEN OF PRODUCING EVIDENCE,	
	BURDEN OF PROOF, AND PRESUMPTIONS . . . . .	725
	Notes . . . . .	726
	David W. Louisell, <i>Construing Rule 301: Instructing the Jury on</i>	
	<i>Presumptions in Civil Actions and Proceedings</i> . . . . .	727
	CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION, A STUDY RELATING TO THE	
	UNIFORM RULES OF EVIDENCE — BURDEN OF PRODUCING EVIDENCE,	
	BURDEN OF PROOF, AND PRESUMPTIONS . . . . .	728
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	734
	<i>Estate of McGowan</i> . . . . .	734
	<i>Texas Department of Community Affairs v. Burdine</i> . . . . .	737
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	742
	Ronald J. Allen, <i>Structuring Jury Decisionmaking in Criminal Cases: A</i>	
	<i>Unified Constitutional Approach to Evidentiary Devices</i> . . . . .	743
	<i>Farrell v. Czarnetzky</i> . . . . .	744
	Notes and Questions . . . . .	747
	<i>Ulster County Court v. Allen</i> . . . . .	747

---

*Table of Contents*

Notes and Questions .....	759
TABLE OF CASES .....	TC-1
TABLE OF STATUTES .....	TS-1
INDEX .....	I-1