

FACT INVESTIGATION

FROM HYPOTHESIS TO PROOF

David A. Binder
Paul Bergman

American Casebook Series®

THOMSON

WEST

FACT INVESTIGATION

FROM HYPOTHESIS TO PROOF

By

David A. Binder

*Professor of Law
University of California, Los Angeles*

and

Paul Bergman

*Professor of Law
University of California, Los Angeles*

AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES



WEST GROUP

Bancroft Whiney • Clark Boardman Collaghan
Lawyers Cooperative Publishing • WESTLAW® • West Publishing

American Casebook Series, and the West Group symbol
are registered trademarks used herein under license.

COPYRIGHT © 1984 By WEST PUBLISHING CO.

610 Opperman Drive
P.O. Box 64526
St. Paul, MN 55164-0526
1-800-328-9352

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Binder, David A.

Fact investigation.

(American casebook series)

1. Evidence (Law)—United States. I. Bergman, Paul,

1943— II. Title. III. Series.

KF8935.B5 1984 347.73'6 84-3676
347.3076

ISBN 0-314-81258-X



TEXT IS PRINTED ON 10% POST
CONSUMER RECYCLED PAPER



5th Reprint — 2001

To Andrea

*

Preface

This book attempts to fill a few gaps of long standing in legal education. At trial, the substantive rules of law invoked depend upon what facts the factfinder believes have been proven. Yet, to our knowledge, law school courses and scholarly texts have never systematically considered the process by which litigators gather, analyze and use evidence to prove facts.

In substantive law courses, facts are given and doctrinal discussions follow. True, through hypotheticals an instructor may change the facts, but these changes are designed merely to facilitate doctrinal analysis. Like their predecessors, the new facts too are a given. Law school evidence courses are no exception. Despite fleeting reference to the concept of relevance, evidence courses focus almost exclusively upon rules that exclude relevant evidence and the policies that underlie such rules. Finally, even clinical courses such as trial advocacy and interviewing pay little attention to a conceptual analysis of how facts are proved. Most trial advocacy courses emphasize effective presentation of evidence found in witness statements. As in substantive law courses, the information with which the students work is a given. In interviewing courses, the focus is typically not on the evidentiary significance of the questions asked, but rather is upon the forms of questions and the interpersonal skills useful in motivating clients and witnesses to reveal information. Thus, many students may be excused for graduating from law school thinking that facts are like starving trout, ready to be reeled in at the drop of a question or two.

Experienced litigators, by contrast, tend to have far fewer misconceptions about the ease of gathering evidence to prove facts. For one thing, they understand that no one can reel in facts. At most, one can gather evidence from which facts can be proved. Second, they recognize that, far from lurking near the surface, items of evidence tend to lay on the murky bottom, hidden beneath layers of abstract legal principles, uncertain memory, people's desires to remain silent and competition fostered by the adversary system. As a result, litigators spend most of their time trying to peel away layers to gather evidence which might prove favorable facts.

Given the distance between litigators' activities and the coverage of legal education, gaps in the wall of legal education are apparent.

To fill those gaps, we offer a limited but we think important kind of mortar. We focus on disputes that are litigated in a formal set-

ting in which the parties are at odds with respect to past happenings. In so doing, we recognize that one may have great difficulty gathering evidence unless one has a basic understanding of how facts are proved. To build such an understanding, we endeavor to provide a conceptual description of the thought processes which people use, whether consciously or subconsciously, in deciding disputed questions of fact.

The book is a blend of the theoretical and the practical. No less than the law of evidence or the law of torts, the processes by which people think about evidence are complex and demand close conceptual analysis. At the same time, for us theory cannot be divorced from practice. Since lawyers play a major role in resolving and litigating disputes, a theoretical understanding of the proof of facts is not sufficient. Lawyers must also understand how people describe events and how the use of interpersonal skills may affect those descriptions. Similarly, lawyers must analyze abstract legal issues in factual terms, marshal evidence according to those issues and record information in some meaningful way. In writing this book, our attention has never been far from these "practical" skills. We hope that our use of numerous examples and sample dialogues, as well as the hypothetical case of *Phillips v. Landview* which unfolds through many chapters, underlines our concern for both practical and intellectual understanding.

We hope too that our book stimulates among both law teachers and practicing litigators greater study of the proof of facts.

DAVID A. BINDER
PAUL BERGMAN
LOS ANGELES, CA

February, 1984

Acknowledgments

There were those who insisted that this book could not be written. Unfortunately, they were wrong. We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of many scholars, colleagues and students, whose ideas and phrases we have shamelessly incorporated. To the extent we have been able to, their contributions are memorialized either in footnotes or in the names of characters who populate the many examples scattered through the text. To those whose contributions are unnoted, especially students with whom we have discussed many of our ideas, we assure you that you are not unremembered, but perhaps just lucky.

Among those who read drafts of various chapters, we especially want to thank Patrick Patterson, Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Al Moore, Susan Gillig, Gary Palm, Sue Bryant, Michael Wolfson, Marsha Die-drich, Jerry Lopez, Ken Graham, Steve Yeazell and Melinda Binder. While, and even after he was our colleague, Paul Boland contributed many useful ideas. Over a period of three or four years we were assisted by excellent student research assistants, including Dorothy Shubin, Sara Deubner, Steve Ellis, Mary Royce and Allison Graves. Kim Bobby and Pat Truscello labored long and magnificently in the absence of word processors. We used many of the same words that were used earlier by William Shakespeare and William Faulkner, though of course we used the words in different order. While we accept ultimate responsibility for the entire book, readers who find errors may want to keep the above names in mind should they ever contemplate publication.

We wish also to thank our publisher, which stoutly supported us and refused suggestions of some readers to publish the book only in Swedish.

Finally, what can one say about Kenny Hegland?

*

Table of Contents

	Page
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii

PART I. INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1. THE IMPORTANCE OF FACT INVESTIGATION	2
1. Introduction	2
2. Central Role of Fact Investigation	3
3. Historical Facts	4
4. Truth and the Adversary System	5
5. Normative Facts and Legislative Facts	6
6. Our Objective	8
CHAPTER 2. INVESTIGATORY OBJECTIVES	9
1. Why Trials Occur	10
2. Presentation of Evidence in Story Form	11
3. Evidence Supporting the Client's Case and Challenging the Adversary's Case: Affirmative and Rebuttal Evidence ..	13
4. Emotional Evidence	28
5. Investigatory Objectives	29

PART II. ANALYZING THE EVIDENCE ON HAND

CHAPTER 3. ANALYSIS: THE PREREQUISITE TO INQUIRY	34
1. The Need to Analyze Evidence on Hand and Evidence to Be Developed	34
2. The Need to Record the Analysis	36
3. A System to Record the Analysis: An Overview	39
a. Story Outline	40
b. Outline of Client's Existing Affirmative Evidence	40
c. Outline of Adversary's Existing Affirmative Evidence	40
d. Outline of Client's Potential Affirmative Evidence	40
e. Outline of Client's Potential Rebuttal Evidence	40
4. Some Perspectives on the Outline System	41
5. A Hypothetical Problem	42
CHAPTER 4. STORY OUTLINES	44
1. Introduction	44
2. Brief Description of Story Outlines	44
3. Purposes of Story Outlines	45
4. Initial Preparation of Story Outlines	46

	Page
CHAPTER 4. STORY OUTLINES—Cont'd	
5. The Events Column	50
a. Non-Events	52
b. Sources	54
6. The Gaps Column	54
7. The Conflicts Column	55
8. Flexibility	56
9. Story Outline Exercise	57
CHAPTER 5. THE SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE FOR THE EVIDENCE-MARSHALLING OUTLINES	58
1. Introduction	58
2. Focus on the Elements of the Applicable Legal Theories ..	60
3. State Each Theory Separately	62
4. State Theories of Relief in Factual Terms	63
a. Convert Elements to Factual Terms	64
b. Identify Possible Alternative Factual Hypotheses	66
c. State Theories from Opposing Perspectives	67
d. Stating a Defendant's Perspective: An Aside	69
e. An "Aside" to Plaintiff's Counsel	71
5. Beginning the Substantive Structure	71
a. Additional Data Re Phillips v. Landview	71
b. Initial Preparation of Substantive Structure	73
6. Substantive Structure Exercises	75
a. Prepare a Structure	75
b. Questions for Discussion	75
CHAPTER 6. ANALYSIS OF EXISTING AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE: USING GENERALIZATIONS	77
1. Direct and Circumstantial Evidence	77
2. Generalizations: The Link Between Circumstantial Evidence and Elements	82
3. Analyzing the Probative Value of Existing Affirmative Evidence	89
a. Introduction	89
b. Articulate Generalizations	92
c. Analyze the Probative Value of Evidence In Terms of the Strength of the Generalization	94
d. Getting Experience	97
4. Outlining Existing Affirmative Evidence	98
a. Additional Data re Phillips v. Landview	98
b. Initial Preparation of Outline of Existing Affirmative Evidence	102
5. Emotional Evidence	105
6. Existing Affirmative Evidence Outline Exercise	109

	Page
CHAPTER 7. ANALYSIS OF REBUTTAL EVIDENCE	110
1. Introduction	110
2. Categories of Rebuttal as an Aid to Investigation	111
a. Rebuttal to Adversary's Affirmative Evidence	111
b. Adversary's Rebuttal to Client's Affirmative Evidence	115
3. Rebuttal by Explanation	116
4. Rebuttal by Denial	118
5. Rebuttal by Argument	120
a. Adopting a Different Premise	120
b. Arguing the Premise's Weakness	121
1. Denial Through Attack on Credibility	121
2. Explanation	122
3. Denial by Contradictory Evidence	122
c. Weakness of Rebuttal By Argument	122
6. Diagram Summary	123
7. Learning An Adversary's Rebuttal: A Mandate for Disclosure of Evidence?	123
8. Outlining Existing Rebuttal Evidence	126
a. Additional Data re Phillips v. Landview	126
1. Lade Deposition Summary—Representations about Suitability of Lots for Building	127
2. Statement of Lou Purvisor	128
3. Investigative Report of Mike Hidden to Florence Darrow	128
b. Initial Preparation of Landview's Outline of Existing Affirmative Evidence, Including Phillipses' Rebuttal	129
c. Affirmative Evidence-Rebuttal Exercises	132
CHAPTER 8. CREDIBILITY	133
1. Introduction	133
2. Factors Affecting the Credibility of a Story	136
a. Story Plausibility in General	136
Story 1	136
Story 2	137
b. Story Consistency	138
c. Explanation	140
d. Adequacy of Detail	141
e. Emotional Content	143
f. Socio-Political Content of Story	143
3. Credibility of the Source	145
a. Expertise	145
b. Motive	146
c. Status	150

	Page
CHAPTER 8. CREDIBILITY—Cont'd	
d. Similarity	151
e. Physical Appearance; Demeanor	152
4. Lack of Credibility: Mistake or Fabrication?	153
5. Outlining Credibility Evidence	154
a. Introduction	154
b. Additional Data Re <i>Phillips v. Landview</i>	156
Investigative Report	156
With Respect to Lade	156
With Regard to Purvisor	157
c. Making the Outlines	157
Item of Evidence # 1	157
Item of Evidence # 2	158
(i) Outline of Landview's Existing Evidence	159
(ii) Outline of the Phillips' Existing Evidence	159
d. Credibility Evidence Exercises	159

PART III. IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER 9. IDENTIFYING LEGAL AND FACTUAL THEORIES	162
1. Introduction	162
2. Why Theory Development Typically Precedes Fact Investigation	163
3. Building Hypotheses for Affirmative Stories	165
a. Identify Alternative Legal Theories	165
b. Identify Alternative Factual Theories	169
c. Using Experts	172
d. Using Intuition	174
e. Defense Factual Hypotheses	174
f. Explanatory Theories	177
g. Emotional and Socio-Political Themes in Theories	178
h. Selecting Among Hypotheses	181
i. Building Hypotheses: The Joy of New Worlds	183
j. Theory of the Case	184
4. Building Theories Regarding Rebuttal Evidence	184
5. Hypotheses of an Adversary	187
6. Theory Development Exercises	187
a. The Role of Expertise	187
b. Explanatory Hypotheses	188
c. Additional Legal Theories	189
d. Rebuttal Theories	189

Page

CHAPTER 10. ADORNING HYPOTHESES: IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE	190
1. Introduction	190
2. A Thought Process: Historical Reconstruction	190
3. Before, During and After	191
4. Using Historical Reconstruction	195
5. The Role of Experts	197
6. The "Especially When" Approach	198
7. Other Approaches to Identifying Potential Evidence	198
8. Using Historical Reconstruction in Rebuttal	200
9. Outlining Potential Evidence	201
10. Outlining Considerations Revisited	205
11. Potential Evidence Exercises	207

PART IV. UNEARTHING EVIDENCE

CHAPTER 11. PLANNING FOR INTERVIEWS	211
1. Introduction	211
2. Overall Planning Strategies	212
a. General Decision-Making Strategy	212
b. Preliminary Investigatory Considerations	214
(i) Connect Potential Evidence With Witnesses and/or Documents	214
(ii) Consider Whether Potential Witnesses Are Likely to be "Friendly" or "Adverse"	215
3. Conclusion	215
4. Am I Ready to Talk to the Witness?	216
a. How Important Is It to Talk to the Witness?	216
b. Do I Need More Familiarity With Scenes of Events and Tangible Evidence?	216
c. Do I Need to Gather Any Documents First?	217
d. Are There Other Witnesses I Should Talk to First?	218
e. Should I Use an Investigator?	218
5. I Am Ready!	220
CHAPTER 12. MOTIVATING WITNESSES	221
1. Introduction	221
2. Why People Withhold Information	222
a. Loss of Self-Esteem	222
b. Breaching Role Expectations	224
c. Etiquette Barrier	224
d. Trauma	225
e. Loss of Time and Money	225
f. Perceived Irrelevancy	226

	Page
CHAPTER 12. MOTIVATING WITNESSES—Cont'd	
g. Greater Need.....	226
h. A Hypothetical Case.....	227
3. What Motivates People to Talk.....	227
a. Empathy	227
b. Providing Recognition	229
c. Appeals to Justice	229
d. Expectation	230
e. Concrete Rewards	230
4. Approaches for Motivating Witnesses	230
a. Be Continually Empathetic	231
(i) In General	231
(ii) Active Listening.....	231
(iii) Responding to Expressed Feelings.....	232
(iv) Responding to Non-Expressed Feelings	234
(v) Phrasing Responses	235
(vi) Conclusion	236
b. Show Personal Interest in Witness.....	236
c. Provide Recognition	238
d. Expect Replies	238
e. Provide Information	239
f. Respond to Reluctance	240
g. A Few Final Words	243
CHAPTER 13. COMMENCING INTERVIEWS.....	244
1. Introduction	244
2. Commencing Informal Interviews	245
3. Commencing Depositions	250
4. Getting a Foot in the Door.....	257
CHAPTER 14. OBTAINING A CHRONOLOGICAL TIME LINE	263
1. Introduction	263
2. The Importance of Beginning With Time Lines	265
a. Identifying Events	265
b. Sequential Order	266
c. Learning Complete Stories.....	267
3. Time Lines in Context	268
4. Adaptability of Time Lines	268
5. Time Line Questioning Techniques	269
a. Minimize Specific Questions	269
b. Ask Open Questions.....	271
6. Probing for Elaboration.....	278
7. Expanding Time Lines By Disclosing Signposts	280
8. Divisible Time Lines	282
9. Note-Taking	283

	Page
CHAPTER 14. OBTAINING A CHRONOLOGICAL TIME LINE—Cont'd	
10. Time Lines Meet the Reality Monster	285
11. Limited Story Interviews	286
CHAPTER 15. THE THEORY DEVELOPMENT AND CON- CLUDING STAGES	287
1. Introduction	287
2. Preparing for Interviews	287
3. Expanding Stories by Uncovering Additional Events	289
4. Probing Stories for Detail	290
a. Areas to Probe	291
b. Risks of Probing	292
5. Techniques for Expanding Stories	293
a. Techniques for Uncovering Additional Events	294
b. Techniques for Eliciting Details: T-Funnels	295
c. Techniques for Piercing Conclusions	299
6. Testing Credibility	301
7. Probing for Rebuttal	303
8. Taking Notes	304
9. From Theories to Details	305
a. Uncovering Additional Events	308
b. Eliciting Details	309
c. Probing Clumped Events	310
d. Probing Conditions Over Time	312
e. Testing Credibility	313
f. Probing for Rebuttal	315
10. Concluding Stage	315
CHAPTER 16. EXPERT WITNESSES	317
1. Introduction	317
2. Selecting Experts	317
a. What Kind of Expertise Is Needed	317
b. Which Expert Will Wear the Glass Slipper?	319
3. Talking to Experts During Investigation	321
a. Organizational Considerations	321
b. Discussing Existing Evidence	323
c. Discussing Hypotheses and Potential Evidence	324
CHAPTER 17. WRITTEN INTERROGATORIES	326
1. Introduction	326
2. Uses of Interrogatories	326
a. Identifying and Locating Documents	327
b. Identifying Witnesses	327

	Page
CHAPTER 17. WRITTEN INTERROGATORIES—Cont'd	
c. Learning Organizational Hierarchy	328
d. Learning a Witness' Background	328
3. Learning an Adversary's Story	329
a. Adversary's Overall Story	329
b. Stories Regarding Discrete Events	330
c. Learning Details	332
d. Conclusion	333
4. Learning an Adversary's Theories and Affirmative Evidence	333
5. Learning One's Own Affirmative Evidence	337
6. Learning Rebuttal Evidence	338
7. Drafting Considerations	341
a. Minimizing Evasion	342
b. Obtaining Complete Information	344
8. Concluding Thoughts About Interrogatories	345
INDEX	347

Table of Cases

References are to pages.

Bell v. Belkota, 285	Patrick, People v., 285
Brawner, United States v., 322	People v. _____ (see opposing party)
Cushing v. Jolles, 106, 108	Rothschild v. Federal Trade Commission, 219
G., In re Robert, 167	Shirley, People v., 293
Greyhound Corp. v. Superior Court, 123	Smith v. Anchor Building Corp., 219
Henry, United States v., 219	United States v. _____ (see opposing party)
Hickman v. Taylor, 4, 330	
In re (see name of party)	

*

FACT INVESTIGATION

FROM HYPOTHESIS TO PROOF

*