

ASPEN CASEBOOK SERIES

SKLANSKY

EVIDENCE
Cases, Commentary, and Problems

*Fourth
Edition*



Wolters Kluwer

Evidence

CASES, COMMENTARY, AND PROBLEMS

Fourth Edition

David Alan Sklansky

*Stanley Morrison Professor of Law, Stanford Law School
Faculty Co-Director, Stanford Criminal Justice Center*



Wolters Kluwer

Copyright © 2016 CCH Incorporated.

Published by Wolters Kluwer in New York.

Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory Solutions U.S. serves customers worldwide with CCH, Aspen Publishers, and Kluwer Law International products. (www.WKLegaledu.com)

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or utilized by any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher. For information about permissions or to request permissions online, visit us at www.WKLegaledu.com, or a written request may be faxed to our permissions department at 212-771-0803.

To contact Customer Service, e-mail customer.service@wolterskluwer.com, call 1-800-234-1660, fax 1-800-901-9075, or mail correspondence to:

Wolters Kluwer
Attn: Order Department
PO Box 990
Frederick, MD 21705

Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

ISBN 978-1-4548-6827-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Sklansky, David A., 1959- author.

Title: Evidence : cases, commentary, and problems / David Alan Sklansky, Stanley Morrison Professor of Law, Stanford Law School Faculty

Co-Director, Stanford Criminal Justice Center.

Description: Fourth edition. | New York : Wolters Kluwer, 2015. | Series: Aspen casebook series | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015038228 | ISBN 9781454868279

Subjects: LCSH: Evidence (Law)—United States.

Classification: LCC KF8935 .S54 2015 | DDC 347.73/6—dc23

LC record available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2015038228>

EVIDENCE

EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Erwin Chemerinsky

Dean and Distinguished Professor of Law
Raymond Pryke Professor of First Amendment Law
University of California, Irvine School of Law

Richard A. Epstein

Laurence A. Tisch Professor of Law
New York University School of Law
Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow
The Hoover Institution
Senior Lecturer in Law
The University of Chicago

Ronald J. Gilson

Charles J. Meyers Professor of Law and Business
Stanford University
Marc and Eva Stern Professor of Law and Business
Columbia Law School

James E. Krier

Earl Warren DeLano Professor of Law
The University of Michigan Law School

Richard K. Neumann, Jr.

Professor of Law
Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University

Robert H. Sitkoff

John L. Gray Professor of Law
Harvard Law School

David Alan Sklansky

Stanley Morrison Professor of Law,
Stanford Law School
Faculty Co-Director,
Stanford Criminal Justice Center

About Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory Solutions U.S.

Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory Solutions U.S. delivers expert content and solutions in the areas of law, corporate compliance, health compliance, reimbursement, and legal education. Its practical solutions help customers successfully navigate the demands of a changing environment to drive their daily activities, enhance decision quality and inspire confident outcomes.

Serving customers worldwide, its legal and regulatory solutions portfolio includes products under the Aspen Publishers, CCH Incorporated, Kluwer Law International, ftwilliam.com and MediRegs names. They are regarded as exceptional and trusted resources for general legal and practice-specific knowledge, compliance and risk management, dynamic workflow solutions, and expert commentary.

To my father

PREFACE

Evidence law is steeped in the drama of trials. It is critically important for any lawyer who might ever set foot in a courtroom. And it is just plain fascinating. For all these reasons, I love teaching the subject, and most students seem to enjoy learning it.

But students also tend to find evidence law difficult. The rules of evidence are notoriously complicated and confusing. Much of evidence law makes sense only against the backdrop of Anglo-American trial procedure, with which law students typically have only limited familiarity. And students, along with lawyers and judges, often are puzzled by the very nature of evidence law. Is it statutory, judge-made, or a matter of applied logic?

I have tried in this book to capitalize on the inherent attractions of evidence law and to minimize its difficulty. Because actual cases are more interesting and more memorable than made-up problems, the book has more cases than problems. The cases have been selected to illustrate the central concepts and controversies of evidence law, not to provide encyclopedic coverage of the subject, and they have been edited tightly. Problems have been used selectively, sometimes to test students' understanding of the rules, sometimes to highlight ambiguities, and sometimes to encourage reflection on what the rules are trying to accomplish and how well they succeed. Many of the problems are drawn from real cases. Because the Federal Rules of Evidence provide a convenient and now pervasive framework for thinking about evidence law, the structure of the book tracks, wherever possible, the structure of the federal rules. The major exceptions to the ban on hearsay, for example, are addressed in the same order here as in the Federal Rules of Evidence. Because the legislative history of the federal rules, particularly the Advisory Committee's Notes, have proved so highly influential, the cases are accompanied by edited excerpts from the Advisory Committee Notes and, where relevant, congressional reports and floor debates. Because academic commentary has played such a large role in the development of evidence law—and because much of that commentary is so interesting—I have added excerpts from the writings of a wide range of scholars. Wigmore and Morgan are here, but so are Mirjan Damaška and Jennifer Mnookin. These excerpts, too, have been edited tightly, in part to allow room for multiple perspectives.

The book is designed so that it can be presented cover to cover in a four-unit course. The topics are arranged in the order that I address them

when I teach a semester-length course in evidence law, but other instructors may choose to vary the sequence. In view of the steadily increasing importance of scientific evidence, probabilistic proof, expert testimony, and demonstrative exhibits, I have included more materials on these topics than evidence casebooks typically contain. I also have included readings on certain other topics traditionally slighted in evidence courses, such as questioning by the judge and by the jury. I have found that students enjoy studying all of these issues, and I think they are sufficiently important to warrant the space I have given them. But instructors who disagree can easily skip those portions of the book or assign readings from them selectively.

The fourth edition contains a dozen or so new cases. To keep the book a manageable length, I have dropped some older material made redundant by the additions. The changes that will be most apparent to instructors who used earlier editions of the book come in the sections on confrontation and on the admissibility of testimony and affidavits from jurors. I have replaced the Supreme Court's confrontation decisions in *Davis v. Washington* and *Michigan v. Bryant* with the Court's 2015 decision in *Clark v. Ohio*, which discusses and summarizes the earlier cases. I have substituted the Court's 2012 decision in *Williams v. Illinois*, regarding confrontation and expert witnesses, for *State v. Lewis*, which it effectively supercedes. And *Warger v. Shauers*, the Court's 2014 decision applying Federal Rule of Evidence 606(b), has pushed aside *Tanner v. United States* and *People v. Fleiss*.

I owe thanks to many people. Paul Bergman, Ken Graham, Eleanor Swift, Jan Vetter, and John Wiley taught me much of what I know about evidence. Hundreds of law students at UCLA, Berkeley, Harvard and Stanford have sharpened my understanding of evidence law and made teaching the subject a joy. Several students, in particular, gave countless hours of their time to help me improve this book and its supporting materials: on the first edition, Carolyn Hoff, Christina Johnson, Hien Nguyn, Meghan Habersack, Robert Horton, and Jonathan Phillips; on the second edition, Katie Wozencroft; and on the fourth edition, Brandon Martinez. My editors at Aspen have been a pleasure to work with. Steven Clymer, Daniel Richman, and several anonymous reviewers criticized early drafts of the first edition of this book perceptively and constructively. Michael Beach graciously helped me with the "probability primer" in Chapter 9. A number of instructors who used earlier editions of the book have given me sound and valuable advice for revising it; I owe special thanks in this regard to George Bach, David Eggert, Tamara Lave, Anna Roberts, Avani Sood, James Tomkovicz, and the late Welsh White. Conversations with Scott Brewer, Erin Murphy, Andrea Roth, and Alex Whiting have also helped me significantly in revising the book over the years. And I have been blessed at UCLA, at Berkeley, at Harvard, and at Stanford with terrific librarians and strong clerical support.

I could never have written four editions of this book without the love, support, and forbearance of my wife, Deborah Lambe, and my son, Joseph Sklansky. My mother, Gloria Sklansky, was—among many other things—a

supremely gifted teacher and a joyful, endlessly inquisitive interlocutor. Any skills I have as an educator I owe first and foremost to her.

This book is dedicated to my father, Jack Sklansky, who is and will always be my role model for combining a life of the mind with steadfast devotion to family and friends.

David Alan Sklansky

January 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Excerpts from the following, copyrighted materials are reprinted with permission. Except where noted, the publication date is also the copyright date.

Mirko Bagaric & Kumar Amarasekara, *The Prejudice Against Similar Fact Evidence*, 5 Int'l J. Evid. & Proof 71 (2001). Reprinted with permission of Vathek Publishing.

Vaughn C. Ball, *The Myth of Conditional Relevance*, 14 Ga. L. Rev. 435 (1980). Reprinted with permission of the Georgia Law Review.

Benjamin H. Barton, *Do Judges Systematically Favor the Interests of the Legal Profession?*, 59 Alabama L. Rev. (2008). Reprinted with permission of the author and the Alabama Law Review.

Robert D. Brain & Daniel J. Broderick, *The Derivative Use of Demonstrative Evidence: Charting Its Proper Evidentiary Status*, copyright © 1992 by Robert D. Brain & Daniel J. Broderick; published in 25 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 957 (1992), copyright © 1992 by the Regents of the University of California. Reprinted with permission of the authors and the Regents of the University of California.

Kenneth S. Broun, ed., *McCormick on Evidence* (6th ed. 2006), published by West Group. Copyright © 1954, 1972, 1984, 1987, 1999 by West Publishing Co.; copyright © 2006 by West Group. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

Simon A Cole, *Suspect Identities: A History of Fingerprinting and Criminal Identification* (2001), published by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. Copyright © 2001 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Mirjan Damaška, *Evidence Law Adrift* (1997), published by Yale University Press. Copyright © 1997 by Yale University. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

James J. Duane, *The New Federal Rules of Evidence on Prior Acts of Accused Sex Offenders*, published by West Publishing Co. in 157 F.R.D. 95 (1994). Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

David L. Faigman, David H. Kaye, Michael J. Saks & Joseph Sanders, *How Good Is Good Enough? Expert Evidence Under Daubert and Kumbo*, 50 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 645 (2000). Reprinted with permission of the authors and Case Western Law Review.

G. Michael Fenner, *The Residual Exception to the Hearsay Rule*, 33 Creighton L. Rev. 265 (2000). Reprinted with permission of the author.

Richard D. Friedman, Character Impeachment Evidence: The Asymmetrical Interaction Between Personality and Situation, 43 Duke L.J. 826 (1994). Reprinted with permission of the author and Duke Law Journal.

Richard D. Friedman, "E" Is for Eclectic: Multiple Perspectives on Evidence, 87 Va. L. Rev. 2029 (2001). Reprinted with permission.

Victor Gold, Do the Federal Rules of Evidence Matter?, 25 Loyola L.A. L. Rev. 909 (1992). Reprinted with permission of the author and Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review.

Robert H. Hutchins & Donald Slesinger, Some Observations on the Law of Evidence. This article originally appeared at 28 Colum. L. Rev. 432 (1928). Reprinted with permission of Columbia Law Review.

Edward J. Imwinkelried, The Use of Evidence of an Accused's Uncharged Misconduct to Prove Mens Rea. Originally published in 51 Ohio St. L.J. 575 (1990). Reprinted with permission of the author and Ohio State Law Journal.

Jonathan J. Koehler, On Conveying the Probative Value of DNA Evidence: Frequencies, Likelihood Ratios, and Error Rates, 67 U. Colo. L. Rev. 859 (1996). Reprinted with permission of the author.

John H. Langbein, Historical Foundations of the Law of Evidence: A View from the Ryder Sources. This article originally appeared at 96 Colum. L. Rev. 1168 (1996). Reprinted with permission of the author and Columbia Law Review.

Joseph H. Levie, Hearsay and Conspiracy, 52 Mich. L. Rev. 1159 (1954). Reprinted with permission of the author and Michigan Law Review.

Graham C. Lilly, An Introduction to the Law of Evidence (3d ed. 1996), published by West Publishing Co. Copyright © 1996 by West Publishing Co. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

Kevin C. McMunigal & Calvin William Sharpe, Reforming Extrinsic Impeachment, 33 Conn. L. Rev. 363 (2001). Reprinted with permission of the authors and Connecticut Law Review.

Thomas M. Mengler, The Theory of Discretion in the Federal Rules of Evidence, 74 Iowa L. Rev. 413 (1989). Reprinted with permission of the author and Iowa Law Review.

Jennifer Mnookin, The Image of Truth: Photographic Evidence and the Power of Analogy, 10 Yale J.L. & Human. 1 (1998). Reprinted with permission of the author.

Jennifer L. Mnookin et al., The Need for a Research Culture in the Forensic Sciences, 58 UCLA L. Rev. 725 (2011). Reprinted with permission of the authors and the UCLA Law Review.

Edmund M. Morgan, Admissions, 1 UCLA L. Rev. 18 (1953). Reprinted with permission.

Edmund M. Morgan, Basic Problems of Evidence (1961), published by the Joint Committee on Continuing Legal Education of the American Law Institute and the American Bar Association. Copyright © 1954, 1957, 1961 by the American Law Institute. Reprinted with the permission of the American Law Institute–American Bar Association Committee on Continuing Professional Education.

Andrew J. Morris, Federal Rule of Evidence 404(B): The Fictitious Ban on Character Reasoning from Other Crime Evidence. Published originally in

17 Rev. Litig. 181 (1998). Copyright © 1998 by the University of Texas Law School Publications, Inc. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

Christopher B. Mueller & Laird C. Kirkpatrick, *Evidence* (2003). Copyright © 2003 by Aspen Publishers. Reprinted with permission.

Erin Murphy, *The New Forensics: Criminal Justice, False Certainty, and the Second Generation of Scientific Evidence*, 95 Cal. L. Rev. 721 (2007). Reprinted with permission of the author and California Law Review.

Dale A. Nance, *The Best Evidence Principle*, 73 Iowa L. Rev. 227 (1998). Reprinted with permission of the author and Iowa Law Review.

Aviva Orenstein, *No Bad Men: A Feminist Analysis of Character Evidence in Rape Trials*, 49 Hastings L.J. 663 (1998). Copyright © 1998 by the University of California, Hastings College of the Law. Reprinted with permission of the author and Hastings Law Journal.

Roger C. Park, *The Crime Bill of 1994 and the Law of Character Evidence: Congress Was Right About Consent Defense Cases*. This excerpt was originally published in the Fordham Urban Law Journal as Roger C. Park, *The Crime Bill of 1994 and the Law of Character Evidence: Congress Was Right About Consent Defense Cases*, 22 Fordham Urban L.J. 271 (1995). Reprinted with permission of the author and Fordham Urban Law Journal.

Roger C. Park, *Evidence Scholarship, Old and New*, 75 Minn. L. Rev. 849 (1991). Reprinted with permission of the author and Minnesota Law Review.

Roger C. Park, David P. Leonard & Steven H. Goldberg, *Evidence Law* (1998), published by West Group. Copyright © 1998 by West Group. Reprinted with permission of Thompson Reuters.

Merrill D. Peterson, *Lincoln in American Memory* (1994), published by Oxford University Press. Copyright © 1994 by Merrill Peterson. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc.

Daniel C. Richman, *Old Chief v. United States: Stipulating Away Prosecutorial Accountability?*, 83 Va. L. Rev. 939 (1997). Reprinted with permission of the author.

D. Michael Risinger, *Navigating Expert Reliability: Are Criminal Standards of Certainty Being Left on the Dock?*, 64 Albany L. Rev. 99 (2000). Reprinted with permission of the authors and Albany Law Review.

Andrea Roth, *Safety in Numbers?: Deciding When DNA Alone is Enough to Convict*, 85 NYU L. Rev. 1130 (2010). Reprinted with the permission of the author.

Paul F. Rothstein, *Intellectual Coherence in an Evidence Code*, 28 Loyola L.A. L. Rev. 1295 (1995). Reprinted with permission of the author and Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review.

Michael J. Saks, *Banishing Ipse Dixit: The Impact of *Kumho Tire* on Forensic Identification Science*, 57 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 879 (2000). Reprinted with permission of the author and Washington & Lee Law Review.

Steven A. Saltzberg, Michael M. Martin & Daniel J. Capra, *Federal Rules of Evidence Manual* (7th ed. 1998), published by Lexis Law Publishing. Copyright © 1998 by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

William H. Simon, *The Kaye Scholer Affair: The Lawyer's Duty of Candor and the Bar's Temptations of Evasion and Apology*, 23 Law & Soc.

Inquiry 243 (1998) by the University of Chicago Press. Copyright © 1998 by the American Bar Foundation. Reprinted with permission.

David A. Sklansky & Stephen C. Yeazell, *Comparative Law Without Leaving Home: What Civil Procedure Can Teach Criminal Procedure and Vice Versa*, 94 Geo. L.J. 683 (2006). Reprinted with permission the authors and Georgetown Law Review.

Christopher Slobogin, *Doubts About Daubert: Psychiatric Anecdotes as a Case Study*, 57 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 919 (2000). Reprinted with permission of the author and Washington & Lee Law Review.

Christopher Slobogin, *The Story of Rule 410 and United States v. Mezzanatto: Using Plea Statements at Trial in Evidence Stories* (2006), Foundation Press. Reprinted with permission of Foundation Press.

John W. Strong, *Consensual Modifications of the Rules of Evidence: The Limits of Party Autonomy in an Adversary System*, 80 Neb. L. Rev. 159 (2001). Reprinted with permission of Nebraska Law Review.

John W. Strong, ed., *McCormick on Evidence* (5th ed. 1999), published by West Group. Copyright © 1954, 1972, 1984, 1987 by West Publishing Co.; copyright © 1999 by West Group. Reprinted with permission of the publisher.

Eleanor Swift, *One Hundred Years of Evidence Law Reform: Thayer's Triumph*, 88 Cal. L. Rev. 2437 (2000). Copyright © 2000 by the California Law Review. Reprinted by permission of the author and the University of California, Berkeley.

Laurence H. Tribe, *Triangulating Hearsay*, 87 Harv. L. Rev. 957 (1974). Copyright © 1974 by the Harvard Law Review Association. Reprinted with permission of the author and the Harvard Law Review Association.

Jon R. Waltz, *The Present-Sense Impression Exception to the Rule Against Hearsay: Origins and Attributes*, 66 Iowa L. Rev. 869 (1981). Reprinted with permission of the author and Iowa Law Review.

Glen Weissenberger, *The Former Testimony Exception: A Study in Rulemaking, Judicial Revisionism, and the Separation of Powers*, 67 N.C. L. Rev. 295 (1989). Reprinted with permission of the author.

Glen Weissenberger & James J. Duane, *Federal Rules of Evidence* (5th ed. 2007). Reprinted with permission. Copyright 2007 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. All rights reserved.

John Shepard Wiley Jr., *Taming Patent: Six Steps for Surviving Scary Patent Cases*, UCLA L. Rev. 1413 (2002). Reprinted with permission of the author.

Charles Alan Wright & Kenneth W. Graham Jr., *Federal Practice and Procedure: Evidence* (1980), published by West Publishing Co. Copyright © 1980 by West Publishing Co. Reprinted with permission of West Publishing Co.

EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

<i>Contents</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xxix</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxxiii</i>
1 Introduction to Evidence Law	1
2 Relevance	17
3 Hearsay	45
4 Character Evidence	261
5 Other Forbidden Inferences	337
6 Trial Mechanics	365
7 Impeachment and Rehabilitation	391
8 Competence	457
9 Opinions, Experts, and Scientific Evidence	491
10 Privileges	619
11 Physical Evidence	699
12 Burdens, Presumptions, and Judicial Notice	741
<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>777</i>
<i>Table of Rules, Statutes, and Constitutional Provisions</i>	<i>787</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>793</i>

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	xxix
----------------	------

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxxiii
------------------------	--------

1	INTRODUCTION TO EVIDENCE LAW	1
	A. Good News and Bad News	2
	B. The Nature and Development of Evidence Law	5
	C. The Anglo-American Trial	8
	D. The Role of the Trial Judge	12
	1. The Trial Judge's Authority	12
	Advisory Committee Note to F.R.E. 104(a)	12
	2. The Trial Judge's Discretion	13
	Roger C. Park, David P. Leonard, Aviva Orenstein & Steven H. Goldberg, <i>Evidence Law</i>	13
	Stephen A. Saltzburg, Michael M. Martin & Daniel J. Capra, <i>Federal Rules of Evidence Manual</i>	13
	<i>United States v. Walton</i>	14
	<i>Bandera v. City of Quincy</i>	14
	Problems 1.1 & 1.2	16

2	RELEVANCE	17
	A. Relevance and Irrelevance	17
	Advisory Committee Note to F.R.E. 401	18
	Advisory Committee Note to F.R.E. 402	19
	<i>Knapp v. State</i>	19
	<i>United States v. Dominguez</i>	20
	<i>State v. Larson</i>	21
	Edmund M. Morgan, <i>Basic Problems of Evidence</i>	22
	Graham C. Lilly, <i>An Introduction to the Law of Evidence</i>	23