

# **Criminal Law Advocacy**



LexisNexis

22

# CRIMINAL LAW ADVOCACY

---

## *Witness Examination*

### VOLUME 5E

Original Authors

**PATRICK L. McCLOSKEY**

*Member of the New York and Federal Bars*

**RONALD L. SCHOENBERG**

*Member of the New York and Federal Bars*

*Updated by Alison Garfield*

2012



LexisNexis®

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:  
Gary Laurie, J.D. at ..... 1-800-252-9257 (Ext. 2509)  
Email: ..... Gary.A.Laurie@LexisNexis.com  
Kathryn Calista, J.D. at ..... 1-800-424-4200 (Ext. 3465)  
Email: ..... Kathryn.Calista@LexisNexis.com  
For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000  
Fax Number ..... (518) 487-3584  
For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call  
Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

Library of Congress Card Number: 82-70639  
ISBN: 978-0-8205-1198-6 (print)  
ISBN: 978-1-5791-1239-4 (eBook)

Cite this publication as:  
[Vol. no.] Kadish & Brofman, Criminal Law Advocacy § [sec. no.] (Matthew Bender)  
Example:  
1 Kadish & Brofman, Criminal Law Advocacy § 1.01A (Matthew Bender)

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 © 2012 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.  
Originally published in: 1982  
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.

Editorial Offices  
121 Channon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800  
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200  
www.lexisnexis.com

# DEDICATION

---

*To my Parents, for their guidance,  
To Chris and Lynn for their patience and understanding, and  
To Carol, for her love  
To my wife, Judith Ann, whose love gave me meaning,  
To my Parents, whose teaching gave me knowledge, and  
To my Grandmother, whose spirit gave me strength*

*P.L.M*

*R.L.S.*



# PREFACE

---

It has been said that knowledge is not power until it is employed. This volume seeks to provide the knowledge required for effective witness examination and the means by which that knowledge may be translated into the power of effective advocacy at trial. It is premised on the fact that evidence, virtually all of which is introduced by means of witness examination, is more significant to the outcome of a lawsuit than the most powerful of oratorical skills. In order for the trial lawyer to be successful, then, he must know how to shape testimony, demonstrate the significance of testimony and persuade the jury of the merit of his position with respect to testimony.

In writing this work, we sought to enable the trial lawyer to achieve this goal by demystifying the subject of witness examination by simplifying its complexities and by setting forth those principles required for effective advocacy by witness examination. The approach of the text is pragmatic. It was written for trial lawyers and for those who aspire to be trial lawyers. All theories are discussed within the reality of the trial framework; all techniques are illustrated with examples from actual practice; and all methods are analyzed with an eye toward trial strategy.

In this regard, the work seeks to provide an in-depth analysis of the critical issues that most often arise with respect to witness examination and the techniques and strategies that the trial attorney may utilize to address them. The step-by-step approach which is followed throughout serves to teach the novice how to examine witnesses, while at the same time providing important source material for the experienced trial lawyer. The text itself is supplemented by numerous practical examples that show the reader how to apply suggested techniques and how to conduct effective direct and cross-examination. After each example, a commentary is provided, highlighting the purpose of the examination, the techniques utilized to achieve that purpose and a critique of the merit of the examination. Extensive checklists are also provided, enabling the trial lawyer to gather essential information in summary fashion and to assist him or her in preparing for the examination of specific witnesses at trial.

Throughout the text we have attempted to provide a balanced approach that is relevant for defense attorneys and prosecutors alike. Many subjects are analyzed from the dual perspectives of defense and prosecution so that the trial attorney may see the entire picture as it relates to witness examination.

Although the text focuses on the criminal trial, it is not restricted to criminal practitioners. Many of the principles set forth can be followed and employed by the civil attorney as well. Indeed, the method of phrasing objection-proof questions on direct examination, provided in Chapter 5, and the methods of exposing mistaken or perjurious testimony on cross-examination, provided in Chapters 11 and 12, apply equally in civil and criminal cases.

While no text can ever substitute for actual experience, the practical information contained herein provides a basis of knowledge which, in our belief, will readily enable the trial lawyer to meet the challenges of witness examination.

In writing this work, we are thankful for the efforts of many who provided assistance. Specifically, we would like to thank Professor Abraham Ordovery of Emory Law School and Professor Lawrence Kessler of Hofstra Law School for their initial encouragement and faith in our ability to complete this project. We are grateful to Michael Eisenstein and Steve Allen from Matthew Bender, who helped us throughout the project and who offered us valuable

## PREFACE

suggestions as to the format of the finished project. We extend thanks to Kathy Donnelly, Margaret Fagan, Cheryl Indelicato, Diane Scarabino and Lynn Buckley, who types portions of the manuscript; and particularly to Susan Warren, who did so on both a regular and an emergency basis. Our deepest thanks are given to Lois Usher, who diligently typed the bulk of the manuscript and who at times literally worked through the night in furtherance of what grew to become a common goal.

P.L.M.

R.L.S.

# *Volume 5E Table of Contents*

A COMPLETE SYNOPSIS FOR EACH CHAPTER APPEARS AT  
THE BEGINNING OF THE CHAPTER

---

## **CHAPTER 10E-A    The Development of Effective Cross-Examination (Part 2)**

---

§ 10.04E-A	Constructing the Cross-Examination
§ 10.05E-A	Avoiding the Dangers of Cross-Examination
Appendix 10E-1-A	Bibliography
Appendix 10E-1-B	Cross-References to Other Criminal Law Advocacy Volumes

---

## **CHAPTER 11E        Exposing Mistaken Testimony on Cross-Examination**

---

§ 11.01E	Introduction
§ 11.02E	Exposing Mistaken Testimony
§ 11.03E	Attacking the Original Perception
§ 11.04E	Attacking the Recollection
§ 11.05E	Attacking Articulation
Appendix 11E-A	Bibliography
Appendix 11E-B	Cross-References to Other Criminal Law Advocacy Volumes

---

## **CHAPTER 12E        Exposing Perjurious Testimony on Cross-Examination**

---

§ 12.01E	Introduction
§ 12.02E	Attacking Internal Defects in the Witness
§ 12.03E	Attacking External Defects in the Witness
§ 12.04E	Attacking Internal Defects in the Testimony
§ 12.05E	Attacking External Defects in the Testimony
Appendix 12E-A	Bibliography
Appendix 12E-B	Cross-References to Other Criminal Law Advocacy Volumes

---

## **CHAPTER 13E        Cross-Examination of Specific Witnesses**

---

§ 13.01E	Introduction
§ 13.02E	The Prosecution Eyewitness
§ 13.03E	The Police Witness
§ 13.04E	Accomplices and Informants
§ 13.05E	The Victim
§ 13.06E	The Alibi Witness
§ 13.07E	The Defendant
§ 13.08E	The Expert Witness

---

## *Volume 5E Table of Contents*

---

### **CHAPTER 14E      Character Evidence**

---

§ 14.01E	The Nature of Character Evidence
§ 14.02E	Evidentiary Principles of Character Evidence
§ 14.03E	The Strength of Character Evidence
§ 14.04E	The Decision To Present Character Evidence
§ 14.05E	The Selection of Character Witnesses
§ 14.06E	The Preparation of the Character Witness
§ 14.07E	The Direct Examination of the Character Witness
§ 14.08E	Cross-Examination of the Character Witness
§ 14.09E	Rebuttal Proof of the Defendant's Bad Character
§ 14.10E	Cross-Examination of the Rebuttal Character Witness
§ 14.11E	Arguments Based upon Effective Examination of Character Witnesses
Appendix 14E-A	Bibliography
Appendix 14E-B	Cross-References to Other Criminal Law Advocacy Volumes

---

### **CHAPTER 15E      Objections During Witness Examination**

---

§ 15.01E	Introduction
§ 15.02E	Goals in Making Objections
§ 15.03E	Factors To Consider in Deciding Whether To Object
§ 15.04E	Making the Objection
§ 15.05E	Legal Remedies To Be Coupled With an Objection
§ 15.06E	Responding to Objections
§ 15.07E	Responding to an Adverse Ruling by the Court
§ 15.08E	Responding to a Favorable Ruling by the Court
§ 15.09E	Specific Types of Objections
Appendix 15E-A	Cross-References to Other Criminal Law Advocacy Volumes



# CHAPTER 10E-A

## The Development of Effective Cross-Examination (Part 2)

### SCOPE

No trial lawyer can succeed in court without an understanding of the component parts of effective cross-examination. This chapter dissects and explores those various parts with a view toward the attainment of excellence in the field. Principles of preparation are set forth (*See 1 Criminal Law Advocacy, Trial Preparation for a more detailed discussion of trial preparation*), as are the concepts necessary for the trial lawyer to decide whether to cross-examine in the first instance. The goals of cross-examination, clearly defined and attainable under the rules of evidence, are listed and discussed. Thereafter, the method of constructing the actual cross-examination is explained, including the various means by which the opposing witness may be reduced to the cross-examiner's control and the numerous techniques which are available to the cross-examiner to assure that his original goals are realized. Finally, the dangers of cross-examination are enumerated, so that the trial lawyer will avoid such pitfalls and end his cross-examination on a high note, with himself dominant and with his opponent defeated.

### SYNOPSIS

#### § 10.04E-A Constructing the Cross-Examination

##### [1] The Order of Cross-Examination

##### [a] Arranging Cross-Examination

- [i] Use of Headlines for Subjects
- [ii] Developing a Line of Inquiry

##### [b] Commencing Cross-Examination Effectively

- [i] Strong Point
- [ii] Key Point
- [iii] Attitude Toward the Witness
- [iv] Credibility Attack
- [v] Direct Testimony

- [vi] Discovery
- [c] Ending Cross-Examination
- [2] Controlling the Witness on Cross-Examination
  - [a] The Importance of Control
  - [b] The Methodology of Control
    - [i] State of Mind
    - [ii] Phrasing the Question
      - [A] Brevity
      - [B] Simplicity
      - [C] Clarity
    - [iii] The Leading Question
      - [A] Defensive Capabilities
      - [B] Offensive Capabilities
    - [iv] Tone of Voice
  - [c] Obtaining Responsive Answers
    - [i] Recognizing the Non-Responsive Answer
    - [ii] The Many Forms of the Non-Responsive Answer
    - [iii] Dealing With Non-Responsive Answers
      - [A] Category I—Answers Which are Totally Non-Responsive
      - [B] Category II—Answers Which are Questionably Non-Responsive
      - [C] Category III—Answers Which are Partially Responsive and Partially Non-Responsive
    - [iv] Signal Word Checklist for the Non-Responsive Answer
    - [v] Obtaining Responsive Answers
      - [A] The Request For a Responsive Answer
        - Example 10E-A-25 Obtaining a Responsive Answer—The Request
        - Example 10E-A-26 Obtaining a Responsive Answer—Teach Witness Rules of Trial Testimony
        - [B] The Demand For a Responsive Answer
          - Example 10E-A-27 Demanding a Responsive Answer—Emphasizing “Yes” or “No” Answers
          - [C] Repeating the Question
            - Example 10E-A-28 Obtaining a Responsive Answer—Repeating the Question
            - [D] The Readback of the Previous Question
              - Example 10E-A-29 Obtaining a Responsive Answer—Have Court Reporter Read Back Unanswered Question
              - [E] The Judge’s Assistance
                - Example 10E-A-30 Obtaining a Responsive Answer—Request for Judge’s Assistance
                - [F] The Interruption of the Witness
                - [G] The Motion to Strike Testimony
                  - Example 10E-A-31 Motion To Strike
                  - [H] Exposing Assertions of Failed Memory



**Example 10E-A-31.1** Assertion of Failed Memory

[vi] **Exposing the Evasive Witness**

**Example 10E-A-32** Obtaining Responsive Answers from Evasive Witness

**Example 10E-A-32.1** Taking Advantage of the Equivocal Response

**Example 10E-A-32.2** Highlighting Guesswork of the Opposing Witness

**[3] Techniques of Cross-Examination**

**[a] Beginning the Cross-Examination**

**[i] Securing Favorable Documents**

**Example 10E-A-33** Commencing Cross-Examination—Eliciting Favorable Documents from Witness

**[ii] Securing Favorable Responses—Cordiality**

**[iii] Disconcerting the Witness**

**[iv] Variations**

**[b] Commitment Before Impeachment**

**[i] The Use of Direct Questions to Commit a Witness to a Statement**

**Example 10E-A-34** Use of Direct Questions to Commit a Witness—Time

**Example 10E-A-35** Use of Direct Questions to Commit a Witness—Color

**Example 10E-A-36** Use of One Question to Commit a Witness

**[ii] Use of Indirect Questions to Commit a Witness to a Statement**

**Example 10E-A-37** Use of Indirect Questions to Commit a Witness

**Example 10E-A-38** Use of Indirect Questions To Commit a Witness—Variation

**[c] Impeachment**

**[i] Commit the Witness to the Vulnerable Testimony Before Impeaching**

**[ii] Do Not Impeach the Insignificant**

**[iii] Use Leading Questions Which Clearly Set Forth the Weakness in the Testimony**

**[iv] Use Leading Questions Which Permit Complete Control of the Witness During Impeachment**

**[v] Be Precise When Quoting the Testimony of the Opposing Witness**

**[vi] Attack, Rather Than Assist, the Witness**

**[vii] Know When Not To Attack on Cross-Examination**

**Example 10E-A-39** Proper Application of Commitment and Impeachment Techniques

**[d] Closing the Doors**

**Example 10E-A-40** Closing the Doors Before Asking the Ultimate Question

**Example 10E-A-41** Closing the Doors to Commit Witness to Prior Inconsistent Statement

**[e] Hide and Seek**

**Example 10E-A-42** Hide and Seek Technique

**[f] Maximizing Favorable Proof**

**[i] Cross-Examining in Frames of Reference**

**Example 10E-A-43** Maximizing Favorable Proof—Cross-Examining in Frames of Reference

**[ii] Hammering the Point Home****[A] The Equivocal Witness**

**Example 10E-A-44** Hammering the Point Home—The Equivocal Witness

**[B] The Vulnerable Witness**

**Example 10E-A-45** Hammering the Point Home—The Vulnerable Witness

**[C] Points Readily Capable of Expansion**

**Example 10E-A-46** Hammering the Point Home—Embellishing the False Statement

**[iii] Pressing the Advantage**

**Example 10E-A-47** Maximizing Favorable Proof—Pressing the Advantage—Time

**Example 10E-A-48** Maximizing Favorable Proof—Pressing the Advantage—Discrediting Eyewitness

**Example 10E-A-49** Maximizing Favorable Proof—Pressing the Advantage—Ascertaining Number of People at Crime Scene

**[iv] Set Him Up—Knock Him Down**

**Example 10E-A2-49.1** “Set Him Up—Knock Him Down” Technique Not Employed

**Example 10E-A2-49.2** “Set Him Up—Knock Him Down” Technique Employed

**Example 10E-2A-49.3** “Set Him Up—Knock Him Down” Technique Not Employed

**Example 10E-2A-49.4** “Set Him Up—Knock Him Down” Technique Employed

**[v] Omissions****[vi] Caveats****[g] Coloring the Facts**

**Example 10E-A-50** Coloring the Facts

**Example 10E-A-51** Coloring the Facts—Variation

**Example 10E-A-51.1** Coloring the Facts Without Attacking the Opposing Witness

**[h] The “Yes” Set**

**Example 10E-A-52** Application of the “Yes” Set Technique

**[i] Developing the Unreasonable Response**

**Example 10E-A-53** Developing the Unreasonable Response—Victim

**Example 10E-A-54** Developing the Unreasonable Response—Police Officer

**Example 10E-A-55** Developing the Unreasonable Response—Prosecutor Examining Larceny Defendant

**[j] Limited Risk Questions****[i] Limited Risk Areas**

**Example 10E-A-56** Limited Risk Questions—Defense Counsel

**Example 10E-A-57** Limited Risk Questions—Prosecutor

**[ii] Limited Risk Questions**

**[k] Meeting Alternative Responses**

**Example 10E-A-58** Meeting Alternative Responses—Alternate Theory

**Example 10E-A-59** Meeting Alternative Responses—Prior Inconsistent Statement

**Example 10E-A-59.1** Meeting Alternative Responses to Limited Risk Questions

**Example 10E-A-59.2** Meeting Alternative Responses with Limited Risk

**[l] The “No” Set**

**Example 10E-A-60** “No” Set Technique

**Example 10E-A-61** “No” Set Technique—Partial Denial

**Example 10E-A-61.1** Improper Use of the “No” Set

**[m] The Summary Question**

**Example 10E-A-62** The Summary Question—Demonstrating Limitations of Opposition Testimony

**Example 10E-A-63** The Summary Question—Highlighting Inconsistency

**Example 10E-A-64** The Summary Question—Brevity

**§ 10.05E-A Avoiding the Dangers of Cross-Examination**

**[1] Do Not Violate the Rules of Effective Cross-Examination**

**[a] Do Not Cross-Examine Unnecessarily**

**[b] Do Not Cross-Examine Without a Goal**

**[c] Do Not Ask Open-Ended Questions**

**[d] Do Not Allow the Opposing Witness To Give Non-Responsive Answers**

**[e] Do Not Impeach the Testimony of an Opposing Witness Until He Is Committed to That Testimony**

**[f] Do Not Telegraph Your Intentions**

**[2] Do Not Exhibit Unprofessionalism**

**[a] Do Not Argue Openly With the Judge**

**[b] Do Not Argue With the Witness**

**[c] Do Not Create Sympathy for the Witness**

**[d] Do Not Take Unfair Advantage of the Witness**

**[e] Do Not Fail To Secure and Comprehend All Prior Statements of the Opposing Witness**

**[3] Do Not Exhibit Unreasonable Behavior**

**[a] Do Not Attack Every Witness in the Same Way**

**[b] Do Not Nitpick**

**[c] Do Not Question the Witness in Bad Faith**

**[4] Do Not Improve Your Opponent’s Case**

**[a] Do Not Permit the Witness To Repeat His Direct Testimony**

**[b] Do Not Fill in the Holes in the Direct Testimony**

**[c] Do Not Introduce or Cause To Be Introduced Into Evidence Any Exhibit Which Favors the Opposition**

- [d] **Do Not Open the Door to Inadmissible Evidence Precluded From Direct Examination**
- [e] **Do Not Reveal That Damaging Evidence Has Hurt Your Cause**
- [5] **Do Not Ask One Question Too Many**
  - Example 10E-A-65** Asking One Question Too Many
  - [a] **Do Not Ask an Opposing Witness the Ultimate Question**
    - Example 10E-A-66** The Dangers of Asking the Ultimate Question
    - Example 10E-A-67** The Dangers of Asking the Ultimate Question
    - Example 10E-A-68** The Dangers of Asking the Ultimate Question
    - Example 10E-A-68.1** Achieving Goals Without Asking the Ultimate Question
    - Example 10E-A-68.2** The Danger of Asking Questions Without Knowing the Answers
  - [b] **Do Not Ask a Question to Which You Do Not Know the Answer**
    - Example 10E-A-68.2** The Danger of Asking Questions Without Knowing the Answers
    - Example 10E-A-69** The Dangers of One Question Too Many
    - Example 10E-A-70** Asking One Question Too Many—Unaware of Answers
  - [c] **Do Not Test the Opposing Witness Unless There Is Reason To Believe That the Witness Will Fail**
    - Example 10E-A-71** Dangers of Testing a Witness When You Are Not Sure He Will Fail
    - Example 10E-A-72** Dangers of Testing a Witness When You Are Not Sure He Will Fail
- [6] **Do Not Ask an Opposing Witness a “Why” Question**
  - [a] **The Dangers of the “Why” Question**
    - Example 10E-A-73** Dangers of Asking the “Why” Question
    - Example 10E-A-74** Effective Use of the “Why” Question on Summation
    - Example 10E-A-75** Dangers of Eliciting Inadmissible Evidence from a “Why” Question
  - [b] **The Many Forms of the “Why” Question**
    - Example 10E-A-76** Dangerous Forms of the “Why” Question Without Use of the Word “Why”
  - [c] **The “Why” Question and Redirect Examination**
    - Example 10E-A-77** The “Why” Question and Redirect Examination

#### Appendix E10-2-A Bibliography

#### Appendix E10-2-B Cross-References to Other Criminal Law Advocacy Volumes

### § 10.04E-A Constructing the Cross-Examination

It is generally the case that every witness can be cross-examined with at least some degree of success. At times, that successful cross-examination strategy is obvious and even a neophyte would succeed against the witness. More often, however, these strategies are not immediately apparent. They are not delivered to the cross-examiner, but must be shaped, fashioned and constructed from the store of knowledge possessed



by the advocate. If the cross-examiner fails to use the tools which are available to him, he may fail in his endeavor and defects in testimony which deserve to be exposed may escape unscathed. If the cross-examiner does recognize and understand the existence and use of the tools, however, he will be able to construct the proper cross-examination at the proper time and no witness who deserves to be attacked will escape his scrutiny. These tools, by which the trial lawyer may construct an effective cross-examination, are the subject of this section. They include an understanding of the logistics of cross-examination and the way in which it can be imposed upon cross-examination to assist the interrogator. They include an appreciation of the question and answer format which the law of evidence prescribes and the way in which it can, by the application of certain techniques, be turned to the cross-examiner's advantage. They include an awareness of the importance of witness control and the numerous ways to attain it. Finally, they include a full knowledge of the dangers of cross-examination, which will permit the successful trial attorney to determine exactly how far he may pursue cross-examination without himself being victimized.

### **[1] The Order of Cross-Examination**

The construction of effective cross-examination begins with a consideration of the logistics of cross-examination order. Since the cross-examiner directs the flow of cross-examination by questions of his own choosing, it follows that he may impose any order he sees fit. This ability is something which should be neither neglected nor underestimated.

In planning the order of his questioning, the cross-examiner should give thought to the purpose of cross-examination and how it differs from the purpose of direct examination. Clearly, one purpose is the antithesis of the other. What the direct examiner seeks to build, the cross-examiner seeks to destroy; what the direct examiner seeks to prove, the cross-examiner seeks to disprove; what the direct examiner seeks to credit, the cross-examiner seeks to discredit. Because the goals of direct and cross-examination are antagonistic, the means to reach these goals are different. While direct examination generally proceeds along chronological lines, in order to allow the witness to give a credible and complete account from beginning to end, such a line of questioning is generally unsuitable for cross-examination. Indeed, following chronological order on cross-examination only affords the opposing witness a second opportunity to repeat his direct testimony and solidify his position. The cross-examiner should, therefore, studiously avoid the step-by-step chronological approach that is a prominent hallmark of direct examination. Rather, he should devise a cross-examination order that is likely to create disarray in the mind of the opposing witness and doubt as to the validity of the direct testimony in the mind of the jury.

In preparing for successful cross-examination, the cross-examiner should decide upon an order of questions which he knows and the witness does not; his questions should proceed in an order that serves his needs and interests and not those of the witness; his questions should be structured in such a way as to give himself and not the witness, control over the cross-examination; and lastly, his questions should be positioned in a way that maximizes their effectiveness. The cross-examiner can prepare such a cross-examination by following a simple, three step process:

- The cross-examiner should list all of the major points with which he would like to confront the witness. He should do this after thorough preparation but before the opposing witness testifies on direct examination.<sup>1</sup>
- The cross-examiner should arrange these points out of chronological order, according to what he perceives to be their greatest impact upon the jury.
- The cross-examiner should conduct his interrogation by moving from point to point, until all points are covered and the desired impression is conveyed.

A cross-examination so structured will appear to the opposing witness to be disorderly, but to the advocate it is disorderly by design. Indeed, there are many disadvantages to “planned disorder”:

- It allows the cross-examiner to pick and choose his spots. He need not cross-examine the witness on every point covered in the direct testimony and his failure to do so may go unnoticed when his questions are put to the witness out of chronological sequence.
- It allows the cross-examiner to pry deeply into one area of inquiry and yet make a hasty retreat from another without adverse consequences.
- It lends itself to a strong cross-examination. By choosing to cross-examine on those points where a witness is weak or the cross-examiner is strong, it places the witness on the defensive and the cross-examiner on the offensive. This ability to select only the strong points for attack as well as the ability to position such points within the cross-examination enables the cross-examiner to build an effective cross-examination and create a favorable impression.
- It prevents the witness from repeating memorized testimony as opposed to relating independent recollections. A witness who has committed his testimony to memory is likely to have done so in chronological order. By using an “anti-chronological” technique, the witness is kept off balance. It is simply more difficult for the perjurious witness to remember a rehearsed script when he is questioned out of chronological sequence.
- It prevents the witness from anticipating the cross-examiner’s line of questioning. By moving from topic to topic on cross-examination, out of chronological order, the witness does not know what question to expect next and therefore has precious little time to think and formulate his answers. Under such circumstances, the cross-examiner is more likely to catch the witness off guard. This result is frequently obtained by concealing a critical question between several harmless ones.
- It puts the witness ill at ease. When a witness does not know what questions

---

<sup>1</sup> While it is clear that the cross-examiner cannot plan every question to be asked on cross-examination, it is equally clear that he should plan as much as he possibly can. By limiting the number of surprises, he will be better able to concentrate on and deal with those that arise during trial testimony. Likewise, by planning ahead, the cross-examiner can guarantee that proof critical to his case will be presented effectively to the jury.



he will be asked, he may become agitated and nervous. His poor demeanor may in fact lead the jury to a negative assessment of his credibility.

### **[a] Arranging Cross-Examination**

When the cross-examiner arranges the major points with which he would like to confront the witness, he should do so in a way which is consistent with his theory of the case and consistent with his skills of analysis and advocacy. A word of caution is in order, however, with respect to the concept of “planned disorder.” The cross-examiner should always endeavor to arrange his questions so that they will confound the witness but not the jury. In order to allow the jury to follow the cross-examiner’s line of questioning and avoid confusion, the cross-examiner must carefully delineate the key points that he will cover on his cross-examination. A sequence of questions should then be planned for each point the cross-examiner wishes to make. While the cross-examiner may jump around within a particular set of questions on a single point, he should generally not move from one main point to another until he exhausts all of his questions with respect to the first point. The cross-examiner should then and only then question the witness on the next topic and proceed, subject by subject and point by point until he concludes.

The following example from a robbery case illustrates how such an arrangement of cross-examination might proceed. In this case, the defense attorney, called upon to cross-examine the victim who has identified the defendant as her assailant, first listed the major points of his cross-examination, without regard to order, as follows:

- The robbery took only seconds.
- The victim was afraid.
- The victim wears glasses.
- The description originally given to the police differs from that of the defendant.
- The robber wore a hat covering part of his face.
- The robber took the witness by surprise.
- The robber approached from behind.
- The robber had a gun.
- The victim did not know her assailant.
- The robber ran away.

In order to proceed to the next step (arranging his points in their proper order for cross-examination), the cross-examiner first considered his theory of the case. In this case, the theory was that the witness was mistaken in her identification of the defendant. That having been established in his own mind, the cross-examiner determined what he would like to prove in order to demonstrate his theory to the jury. Given “mistake,” the cross-examiner sought to prove: (1) that the assailant was a total stranger; (2) that the victim had poor vision; (3) that the victim’s state of mind was not conducive to making a reliable identification; (4) that the circumstances of the robbery prevented the victim from getting a good look at her assailant; and (5) that, as a result