SIMPLIFIED RULES OF EVIDENCE AND PROCEDURE

In trials in the United States, elaborate rules are used to regulate the admission of proof (i.e., oral or physical evidence). These rules are designed to ensure that both parties receive a fair hearing and to exclude any evidence deemed irrelevant, incompetent, untrustworthy, or unduly prejudicial. If it appears that a rule of evidence is being violated, an attorney may raise an objection to the judge.

The judge then decides whether the rule has been violated and whether the evidence must be excluded from the record of the trial. In the absence of a properly made objection, however, the judge will probably allow the evidence. The burden is on the attorneys to know the rules of evidence and to be able to use them to protect their client and to limit the actions of opposing counsel and their witnesses.

Formal rules of evidence are quite complicated and differ depending on the court where the trial occurs. For purposes of this Mock Trial Tournament, the New York State rules of evidence have been modified and simplified. Not all judges will interpret the rules of evidence or procedure the same way, and you must be prepared to point out the specific rule (quoting it, if necessary) and to argue persuasively for the interpretation and application of the rule that you think is proper. No matter which way the judge rules, you should accept the ruling with grace and courtesy.

1. SCOPE

Rule 101: SCOPE. These rules govern all proceedings in the mock trial competition. The only rules of evidence in the competition are those included in these rules.

Rule 102: OBJECTIONS. The court shall not consider an objection that is not contained in these rules. If counsel makes an objection not contained in these rules, counsel responding to the objection must point out to the judge, citing Rule 102 that the objection is beyond the scope of the listed objections. However, if counsel responding to the objection does not point out to the judge the application of this rule, the court may exercise its discretion and consider such objection.

2. RELEVANCY

Rule 201: RELEVANCY. Only relevant testimony and evidence may be presented. This means that the only physical evidence and testimony allowed is that which tends to make a fact which is important to the case more or less probable than the fact would be without the evidence. However, if the probative value of the relevant evidence is substantially outweighed by the danger that the

evidence will cause unfair prejudice, confuse the issues, or result in undue delay or a waste of time, the court may exclude it. This may include testimony, physical evidence, and demonstrations that do not relate to time, event or person directly involved in the litigation.

Example:

Photographs present a classic problem of possible unfair prejudice. For instance, in a murder trial, the prosecution seeks to introduce graphic photographs of the bloodied victim. These photographs would be relevant because, among other reasons, they establish the victim's death and location of the wounds. At the same time, the photographs present a high danger of unfair prejudice, as they could cause the jurors to feel incredible anger and a desire to punish someone for the vile crime. In other words, the photographs could have an inflammatory effect on the jurors, causing them to substitute passion and anger for reasoned analysis. The defense therefore should object on the ground that any probative value of the photographs is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice to the defendant. Problems of unfair prejudice often can be resolved by offering the evidence in a matter that retains the probative value, while reducing the danger of unfair prejudice. In this example, the defense might stipulate to the location of the wounds and the cause of death. Therefore, the relevant aspects of the photographs would come in, without the unduly prejudicial effect.

Rule 202: CHARACTER. Evidence about the character of a party or witness may not be introduced unless the person's character is an issue in the case or unless the evidence is being offered to show the truthfulness or untruthfulness of the party or witness. Evidence of character to prove the person's propensity to act in a particular way is generally not admissible in a civil case.

In a criminal case, the general rule is that the prosecution cannot initiate evidence of the bad character of the defendant to show that he or she is more likely to have committed the crime. However, the defendant may introduce evidence of her good character to show that she is innocent, and the prosecution may offer evidence to rebut the defense's evidence of the defendant's character. With respect to the character of the victim, the general rule is that the prosecution cannot initiate evidence of the character of the victim. However, the defendant may introduce evidence of the victim's good or (more likely) bad character, and the prosecution may offer evidence to rebut the defense's evidence of the victim's character.

Examples:

A limousine driver is driving Ms. Daisy while he is intoxicated and gets into a car accident injuring Ms. Daisy. If Ms. Daisy sues the limousine company for negligently employing an alcoholic driver, then the driver's tendency to drink is at issue. Evidence of the driver's alcoholism is admissible because it is not offered to demonstrate that he was drunk on a particular occasion. The evidence is offered to demonstrate that the limousine company negligently trusted him to drive a limousine when it knew or should have known that the driver had a serious drinking problem.

Sally is fired and sues her employer for sexual harassment. The employer cannot introduce evidence that Sally experienced similar problems when she worked for other employers.

Evidence about Sally's character is not admissible to prove that she acted in conformity with her prior conduct, unless her character is at issue or it relates to truthfulness.

If an attorney is accused of stealing a client's money, he may introduce evidence to demonstrate that he is trustworthy. In this scenario, proof of his trustworthiness makes it less probable that he stole the money.

Richard is on trial for punching his coworker, Larry, during an argument. The prosecution wants to offer that Richard has, in the past, lost his temper and has neared physical altercations. This evidence constitutes character evidence within the meaning of the rule, because it is being offered to show that Richard has a propensity for losing his temper and that he may have acted in conformity with this character trait at the time he struck Larry.

Therefore, it would only be admissible if Richard, as the defendant, has decided to place his character at issue.

Rule 203: OTHER CRIMES, WRONGS, OR ACTS. Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person. Such evidence, however, may be admissible for purposes other than to prove character, such as to show motive, intent, preparation, knowledge, or identity.

Examples:

Harry is on trial for stealing from a heavy metal safe at an office. The prosecution seeks to offer evidence that, on an earlier date Harry opened the safe and stole some money from the safe. The evidence is not being offered to show character (in other words, it is not being offered to show that Harry is a thief), but rather it is being offered to show that Harry knew how to crack the safe. This evidence therefore places Harry among a very small number of people

who know how to crack safes and, in particular, this safe. The evidence therefore goes to identity and makes Harry somewhat more likely to be guilty.

William is on trial for murder after he killed someone during a fight. The prosecution seeks to offer evidence that a week earlier William and the victim had another physical altercation. In other words, the victim was not some new guy William has never met before; rather, William and the victim had a history of bad blood. The evidence of the past fight would be admissible because it is not being offered to show that William has bad character as someone who gets into fights, but rather to show that William may have had motive to harm his victim.

In the same trial, the evidence shows that the victim died after William struck him in the larynx. William's defense is that the death was completely accidental and that the fatal injury suffered by his victim was unintended and a fluke. The prosecution seeks to offer evidence that William has a black belt in martial arts, and therefore has knowledge of how to administer deadly strikes as well as the effect of such strikes. This evidence would be admissible to show the death was not an accident; rather, William was aware that the strike could cause death.

3. WITNESS EXAMINATION

a. Direct Examination (attorneys call and question witnesses)

Rule 301: FORM OF QUESTION. Witnesses should be asked direct questions and may not be asked leading questions on direct examination. Direct questions are phrased to evoke a set of facts from the witnesses. A leading question is one that suggests to the witness the answer desired by the examiner and often suggests a "yes" or "no" answer.

Example of a Direct Question: "*What is your current occupation*?"

Example of a Leading Question: "*Isn't it true that in your current position you are responsible for making important investment decisions*?"

Narration: While the purpose of direct examination is to get the witness to tell a story, the questions must ask for specific information. The questions must not be so broad that the witness is allowed to wander or "narrate" a whole story. Narrative questions are objectionable.

Example of a Narrative Question: "*Please describe how you were able to achieve your financial success." Or "Tell me everything that was said in the board room on that day.*"

Narrative Answers: At times, a direct question may be appropriate, but the witness's answer may go beyond the facts for which the question was asked. Such answers are subject to objection on the grounds of narration.

Objections:

"*Objection. Counsel is leading the witness." "Objection. Question asks for a narration." "Objection. Witness is narrating."*

Rule 302: SCOPE OF WITNESS EXAMINATION. Direct examination may cover all the facts relevant to the case of which the witness has first-hand knowledge. Any factual areas examined on direct examination may be subject to cross-examination.

Objection:

"Objection. The question requires information beyond the scope of the witness's knowledge."

Rule 303: REFRESHING RECOLLECTION. If a witness is unable to recall a statement made in an affidavit, the attorney on direct may show that portion of the affidavit that will help the witness to remember.

b. Cross-Examination (questioning the other side's witnesses)

Rule 304: FORM OF QUESTION. An attorney may ask leading questions when cross-examining the opponent's witnesses. Questions tending to evoke a narrative answer should be avoided.

Rule 305: SCOPE OF WITNESS EXAMINATION. Attorneys may only ask questions that relate to matters brought out by the other side on direct examination, or to matters relating to the credibility of the witness. This includes facts and statements made by the witness for the opposing party. Note that many judges allow a broad interpretation of this rule.

Objection:

"Objection. Counsel is asking the witness about matters that did not come up in direct examination."

Rule 306: IMPEACHMENT. An attorney may impeach the credibility of a witness (show that a witness should not be believed) in the following ways:

1. A witness may testify as to another witness's reputation for truthfulness, provided that an adequate foundation is established for the testifying witness's ability to testify about the other witness's reputation.

Example:

Ben testifies at trial. Jeannette then takes the stand and is familiar with Ben's reputation in the community as not being truthful. Jeannette therefore would be able to testify to Ben's reputation for truthfulness.

2. Counsel may ask questions demonstrating that the witness has made statements on other occasions that are inconsistent with the witness's present testimony. A foundation must be laid for the introduction of prior contradictory statements by asking the witness whether he or she made such statements.

Example:

If a witness previously stated that the car was black but at trial testified that the car was red, the witness could be questioned about this prior inconsistent statement for impeachment purposes.

3. An attorney may ask questions demonstrating the witness's bias in favor of the party on whose behalf the witness is testifying, or hostility toward the party against whom the witness is testifying or the witness's interest in the case.

Examples:

"Isn't it true that you are being paid to testify at this trial?" If the witness is paid to testify, he may have an incentive not to tell the truth while testifying.

Steve is on trial for bank robbery, and calls his father as a defense witness to testify that they were watching football at the time of the crime. On cross-examination, the prosecutor could attempt to demonstrate the father's bias that could cause him to fabricate an alibi for his son. Proper questions to impeach the father's credibility might include, "You love your son very much, don't you?" and "You don't want to see your son go to jail, do you?"

Rule 307: IMPEACHMENT BY EVIDENCE OF A CRIMINAL CONVICTION.

For the purpose of attacking the credibility of a witness, evidence that the witness has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted, but only if the crime was a felony or involved moral

turpitude, regardless of punishment, and the court determines that the value of this evidence as reliable proof outweighs its prejudicial effect to a party. Crimes of moral turpitude are crimes that involve dishonesty or false statements. These crimes involve the intent to deceive or defraud, such as forgery, perjury, counterfeiting and fraud.

Example:

"Have you ever been convicted of criminal possession of marijuana?"

Objections:

"Objection. The prejudicial effect of this evidence outweighs its usefulness."

"Objection. The prior conviction being testified to is not a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude."

c. Re-Direct Examination

Rule 308: LIMIT ON QUESTIONS. After cross-examination, up to three, but no more than three questions, may be asked by the attorney conducting the direct examination, but such questions are limited to matters raised by the attorney on cross-examination. The presiding judge has considerable discretion in deciding how to limit the scope of re-direct.

NOTE: If the credibility or reputation for truthfulness of the witness has been attacked on cross-examination, the attorney whose witness has been damaged may wish to ask several more questions. These questions should be limited to the damage the attorney thinks has been done and should be phrased so as to try to "save" the witness's truth-telling image in the eyes of the court. Re-direct examination is limited to issues raised by the attorney on cross-examination. Please note that at times it may be more appropriate not to engage in re- direct examination.

Objection:

"Objection. Counsel is asking the witness about matters that did not come up in cross- examination."

d. Re-Cross Examination

Rule 309: LIMIT ON QUESTIONS. Three additional questions, but no more than three, may be asked by the cross-examining attorney, but such questions are limited to matters on re-direct examination and should avoid repetition. The presiding judge has considerable discretion in

deciding how to limit the scope of re-cross. Like re-direct examination, at times it may be more appropriate not to engage in re-cross-examination.

Objection:

"Objection. Counsel is asking the witness about matters that did not come up on re-direct examination."

e. Argumentative Questions

Rule 310: Questions that are argumentative should be avoided and may be objected to by counsel. An argumentative question is one in which the cross-examiner challenges the witness about his or her inference from the facts, rather than seeking additional facts.

Example:

"*Why were you driving so carelessly*?"

Objection:

"Objection. "Your Honor, counsel is being argumentative."

f. Compound Questions

Rule 311: Questions that are compound in nature should be avoided and may be objected to by counsel. A compound question requires the witness to give one answer to a question, which contains two separate inquiries. Each inquiry in an otherwise compound question could be asked and answered separately.

Examples:

"Tony, didn't you get sued by the buyer of your company and get prosecuted by the IRS?"

"Did you see and feel the residue on the counter?"

Objection:

"Objection. "Your Honor, counsel is asking a compound question."

g. Asked And Answered Questions

Rule 312: A student-attorney may not ask a student-witness a question that the student-attorney has already asked that witness. Such a question is subject to objection, as having been asked and answered.

Objection:

"Objection. "Your Honor, the witness was asked and answered this question."

h. Speculation

Rule 313: Questions that ask a witness to speculate about matters not within his personal knowledge are not permitted, and are subject to an objection by opposing counsel.

Example:

"Do you think your friend Robert knew about the robbery in advance?"

Objection:

"Objection. Your Honor, the question asks the witness to speculate."

4. HEARSAY

Understanding and applying the Hearsay Rule (Rule 401), and its exceptions (Rules 402, 403, 404, and 405), is one of the more challenging aspects of the Mock Trial Tournament. We strongly suggest that teacher-coaches and students work closely with their attorney-advisors to better understand and more effectively apply these evidentiary rules.

Rule 401: HEARSAY. A statement made out of court (i.e., not made during the course of the trial in which it is offered) is hearsay if the statement is offered for the truth of the fact asserted in the statement. A judge may admit hearsay evidence if it was a prior out-of-court statement made by a party to the case and is being offered against that party. The party who made the prior out-of-court statement can hardly complain about not having had an opportunity to cross-examine himself regarding this statement. He said it, so he has to live with it. He can explain it on the witness stand. Essentially, the witness on the stand is repeating what she heard someone else say outside of the courtroom. The hearsay rule applies to both written as well as spoken statements. If a statement is

hearsay and no exceptions to the rule are applicable, then upon an appropriate objection by opposing counsel, the statement will be inadmissible.

REASONS FOR EXCLUDING HEARSAY: The reason for excluding hearsay evidence from a trial is that the opposing party was denied the opportunity to cross-examine the declarant about the statement. The declarant is the person who made the out-of-court statement. The opposing party had no chance to test the declarant's perception (how well did she observe the event she purported to describe), her memory (did she really remember the details she related to the court), her sincerity (was she deliberately falsifying), and her ability to relate (did she really mean to say what now appears to be the thrust of her statement).

The opportunity to cross-examine the witness on the stand who has repeated the statement is not enough because the judge or the jury is being asked to believe what the declarant said.

Example:

Peter is on trial for allegedly robbing a Seven-Eleven store on May 1. A witness who is testifying on Peter's behalf testifies in the trial, "I heard Joe say that he (Joe) went to the Seven-Eleven on May 1." Peter, the party offering the witness's testimony as evidence, is offering it to prove that Joe was in the Seven-Eleven on May 1, presumably to create a question as to whether it could have been Joe at the scene of the crime, rather than Peter. In this example, Joe is the declarant. The reason why the opposing party, in this case the prosecution, should object to this testimony is that the prosecution has no opportunity to cross-examine Joe to test his veracity (was he telling the truth or just trying to help his friend Peter out of a mess) or his memory (was Joe sure it was May 1 or could it have been May 2)?

5. EXCEPTIONS

Hearsay may be admissible if it fits into certain exceptions. The exceptions listed below are the only allowable exceptions for purposes of the Mock Trial Tournament.

Rule 402: ADMISSION OF A PARTY OPPONENT: A judge may admit hearsay evidence if it was a prior out-of-court statement made by a party to the case that amounts to an admission that is against that party's interest at trial. Essentially, the party's own out-of- court statement is being offered into evidence because it contains an admission of responsibility or an acknowledgment of fault. The party who made the prior out-of-court statement can hardly complain about not having

had the opportunity to cross-examine himself. He said it, so he has to live with it. He can explain it on the witness stand.

Example:

Pam is involved in a car accident. Wendy was at the scene of the crash. At Pam's trial, Wendy testifies that she heard Pam say, "I can't believe I missed that stop sign!" At the trial, Wendy's testimony of Pam's out-of-court statement, although hearsay, is likely to be admitted into evidence as an admission against a party's interest. In this example, Pam is on trial so she can testify about what happened in the accident and refute having made this statement or explain the circumstances of her statement.

Rule 403: STATE OF MIND: A judge may admit an out-of-court statement of the declarant's then existing state of mind, emotion, sensation, or physical condition (such as intent, plan, motive, design, mental feeling, pain, and bodily health). Such out-of-court statements of pain or intent do not present the usual concerns with the reliability of hearsay testimony. For instance, when a witness testifies as to a declarant's statement of intent, there are no memory problems with the declarant's statement of intent and there are no perception problems because a declarant cannot misperceive intent. When applying this exception, it is important to keep in mind that the reliability concerns of hearsay relate to the out-of-court declarant, not to the witness who is offering the statement in court.

Example:

Mike is on trial for a murder that occurred at the West End Restaurant. Mike's defense relies upon the theory that another person, Jane, committed the murder. The defense then calls a witness who testifies that on the night of the murder he heard Jane say that she intended to go to the West End Restaurant. This hearsay statement is admissible as proof of Jane's intent to go to the restaurant.

Rule 404: BUSINESS RECORDS. A judge may admit a memorandum, report, record, or data compilation concerning an event or act, provided that the record was made at or near the time of the act by a person with knowledge and that the record is kept in the regular course of business. The rationale for this exception is that this type of evidence is particularly reliable because of the regularity with which business records are kept, their use and importance in the business and the incentive of employees to keep accurate records or risk being reprimanded by the employer.

Example:

Diane is on trial for possession of an illegal weapon. The prosecution introduces a written inventory prepared by a police officer of items, including a switchblade knife, taken from Diane when she was arrested as evidence of Diane's guilt. The written inventory is admissible. In this example, the statement that is hearsay is the written inventory (hearsay can be oral or written), the declarant is the police officer who wrote the inventory and the inventory is being offered into evidence to prove that Diane had a switchblade knife in her possession. The reason that the written inventory is admissible is that it was a record made at the time of Diane's arrest by a police officer, whose job required her to prepare records of items taken from suspects at the time of arrest and it was the regular practice of the police department to prepare records of this type at the time of an arrest.

Rule 405: PRESENT SENSE IMPRESSION. A judge may admit an out-of- court statement of a declarant's statement describing or explaining an event or condition made while the declarant was perceiving the event or condition, or immediately thereafter. The rationale for this exception is that a declarant's description of an event as it is occurring is reliable because the declarant does not have the time to think up a lie.

Example:

James is witnessing a robbery and calls 911. While on the phone with the 911 operator, James describes the crime as it is occurring and provides a physical description of the robber. These hearsay statements are admissible because they are James's description or explanation of an event – the robbery – as James perceives that event.

Rule 406: STATEMENTS IN LEARNED TREATISES. A statement contained in a treatise, periodical, or pamphlet is admissible if:

(A) The statement is called to the attention of an expert witness on cross-examination or relied on by the expert on direct examination; and

(B) The publication is established as a reliable authority by the expert's admission or testimony, by another expert's testimony, or by judicial notice.

If admitted, the statement may be read into evidence but not received as an exhibit.

Example:

Dr. G, plaintiff's expert witness, is being cross-examined by defendant's counsel. During the cross-examination Dr. G is shown a volume of a treatise on cardiac surgery, which is the subject of Dr. G's testimony. Dr. G is asked if s/he recognizes the treatise as reliable on the subject of cardiac surgery. Dr. G acknowledges that the treatise is so recognized.

Portions of the treatise may then be read into evidence although the treatise is not to be received as an exhibit. If Dr. G does not recognize the treatise as authoritative, the treatise may still be read to the jury if another expert witness testifies as to the treatise's reliability or if the court by judicial notice recognizes the treatise as authoritative.

This new Rule was added 2-7-2017

Rule 407: STATEMENTS BY AN UNAVAILABLE DECLARANT. In a civil case, a statement made by a declarant unavailable to give testimony at trial is admissible if a reasonable person in the declarant's position would have made the statement only if the declarant believed it to be true because, when the statement was made, it was so contrary to the declarant's proprietary or pecuniary interest or had so great a tendency to expose the declarant to civil or criminal liability.

Example:

Mr. X, now deceased, previously gave a statement in which he said he ran a red light at an intersection, and thereby caused an accident that injured plaintiff P. Offered by defendant D to prove that D should not be held liable for the accident, the statement would be admissible as an exception to the exclusion of hearsay.

6. OPINION AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

Rule 501: OPINION TESTIMONY BY NON-EXPERTS. Witnesses who are not testifying as experts may give opinions which are based on what they saw or heard and are helpful in explaining their story. A witness may not testify to any matter of which the witness has no personal knowledge, nor may a witness give an opinion about how the case should be decided. In addition, a non-expert witness may not offer opinions as to any matters that would require specialized knowledge, training, or qualifications.

Example:

(General Opinion)

The attorney asks the non-expert witness, "Why is there so much conflict in the Middle East?" This question asks the witness to give his general opinion on the Middle East conflict.

Note: This question is objectionable because the witness lacks personal perceptions as to the conflict in the Middle East and any conclusions regarding this issue would require specialized knowledge.

Objection:

"Objection. Counsel is asking the witness to give an opinion."

Example:

(Lack of Personal Knowledge)

The attorney asks the witness, "Why do you think Abe skipped class?" This question requires the witness to speculate about Abe's reasons for skipping class.

Objection:

"*Objection. The witness has no personal knowledge that would enable him/her to answer this question."*

Example:

(Opinion on Outcome of Case)

The attorney asks the witness, "Do you think the defendant intended to commit the crime?" This question requires the witness to provide a conclusion that is directly at issue and relates to the outcome of the case.

Objection:

"Objection. The question asks the witness to give a conclusion that goes to the finding of the Court."

Rule 502: OPINION TESTIMONY BY EXPERTS. Only persons qualified as experts may give opinions on questions that require special knowledge or qualifications. An expert may be called as a witness to render an opinion based on professional experience. The attorney for the party for whom the expert is testifying must qualify the witness as an expert. This means that before the

expert witness can be asked for an expert opinion, the questioning attorney must bring out the expert's qualifications, education and/or experience.

Example:

The attorney asks the witness, an auto mechanic, "Do you think Luke's recurrent, severe migraine headaches could have caused him to crash his car into the side of George's house?"

Objection:

"Objection. Counsel is asking the witness to give an expert opinion for which the witness has not been qualified."

However, a doctor can provide an expert opinion on how migraine headaches affect eyesight.

7. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

Rule 601: INTRODUCTION OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE. Physical evidence may be introduced if it is relevant to the case. Physical evidence will not be admitted into evidence until it has been identified and shown to be authentic or its identification and/or authenticity have been stipulated to. That a document is "authentic" means only that it is what it appears to be, not that the statements in the document are necessarily true.

A prosecutor must authenticate a weapon by demonstrating that the weapon is the same weapon used in the crime. This shows that the evidence offered (the weapon) relates to the issue (the crime). If the weapon belonged to the prosecutor, it would not be relevant to the defendant's guilt. The evidence must be relevant to the issue to be admissible.

PROCEDURE FOR INTRODUCING EVIDENCE: Physical evidence need only be introduced once. The proper procedure to use when introducing a physical object or document for identification and/or use as evidence is:

Have exhibit marked for identification. *"Your Honor, please mark this as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 (or Defense Exhibit A) for identification."*

a. Ask witness to identify the exhibit. *"I now hand you what is marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 (or Defense Exhibit A).* Would you identify it, please?"

b. Ask witness questions about the exhibit, establishing its relevancy, and other pertinent questions.

c. Offer the exhibit into evidence. *"Your Honor, we offer Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 (or Defense Exhibit A) into evidence at this time."*

d. Show the exhibit to opposing counsel, who may make an objection to the offering.

e. The Judge will ask opposing counsel whether there is any objection, rule on any objection, admit or not admit the exhibit.

f. If an exhibit is a document, hand it to the judge.

NOTE: After an affidavit has been marked for identification, a witness may be asked questions about his or her affidavit without its introduction into evidence. In order to read directly from an affidavit or submit it to the judge, it must first be admitted into evidence.

Rule 602: REDACTION OF DOCUMENT. When a document sought to be introduced into evidence contains both admissible and inadmissible evidence, the judge may, at the request of the party objecting to the inadmissible portion of the document, redact the inadmissible portion of the document and allow the redacted document into evidence.

Objection:

"Objection. Your Honor, opposing counsel is offering into evidence a document that contains improper opinion evidence by the witness. The defense requests that the portion of the document setting forth the witness's opinion be redacted."

Rule 603: *VOIR DIRE* OF A WITNESS. When an item of physical evidence is sought to be introduced under a doctrine that normally excludes that type of evidence (e.g., a document which purports to fall under the business record exception to the Hearsay Rule), or when a witness is offered as an expert, an opponent may interrupt the direct examination to request the judge's permission to make limited inquiry of the witness, which is called "*voir dire*."

The opponent may use leading questions to conduct the *voir dire* but it must be remembered that the *voir dire's* limited purpose is to test the competency of the witness or evidence and the opponent is not entitled to conduct a general cross-examination on the merits of the case.

The *voir dire* must be limited to three questions. The clock will not be stopped for *voir dire*.

8. INVENTION OF FACTS (Special Rules for the Mock Trial Competition)

Rule 701: DIRECT EXAMINATION. On direct examination, the witness is limited to the facts given. Facts cannot be made up. If the witness goes beyond the facts given opposing counsel may object. If a witness testifies in contradiction of a fact given in the witness's statement, opposing counsel should impeach the witness during cross- examination.

Objection:

"*Objection. Your Honor, the witness is creating facts which are not in the record."*

Rule 702: CROSS-EXAMINATION. Questions on cross-examination should not seek to elicit information that is not contained in the fact pattern. If on cross-examination a witness is asked a question, the answer to which is not contained in the witness's statement or the direct examination, the witness may respond with any answer that does not materially alter the outcome of the trial. If a witness's response might materially alter the outcome of the trial, the attorney conducting the cross-examination may object.

Objection:

"Objection. The witness's answer is inventing facts that would materially alter the outcome of the case."

9. PROCEDURAL RULES

Rule 801: PROCEDURE FOR OBJECTIONS. An attorney may object any time the opposing attorneys have violated the "Simplified Rules of Evidence and Procedure." Each attorney is restricted to raising objections concerning witnesses, whom that attorney is responsible for examining, both on direct and cross-examinations.

NOTE: The attorney wishing to object (only one attorney may object at a time) should stand up and do so at the time of the violation. When an objection is made, the judge will ask the reason for it. Then the judge will turn to the attorney who asked the question and the attorney usually will have a chance to explain why the objection should not be accepted ("sustained") by the judge. The judge will then decide whether a question or answer must be discarded because it has violated a rule of evidence ("objection sustained"), or whether to allow the question or answer to remain on the trial record ("objection overruled").

Rule 802: MOTIONS TO DISMISS. Motions for directed verdict or dismissal are not permitted at any time during the plaintiff's or prosecution's case.

Rule 803: CLOSING ARGUMENTS. Closing arguments must be based on the evidence presented during the trial.

Rule 804: OBJECTIONS DURING OPENING STATEMENTS AND CLOSING ARGUMENTS. Objections during opening statements and closing arguments are **NOT** permitted.

Rule 901: PROSECUTION'S BURDEN OF PROOF (criminal cases).

Beyond a Reasonable Doubt: A defendant is presumed to be innocent. As such, the trier of fact (jury or judge) must find the defendant not guilty, unless, on the evidence presented at trial, the prosecution has proven the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Such proof precludes every reasonable theory except that which is consistent with the defendant's guilt. A reasonable doubt is an honest doubt of the defendant's guilt for which a reason exists based upon the nature and quality of the evidence. It is an actual doubt, not an imaginary one. It is a doubt that a reasonable person would be likely to entertain because of the evidence that was presented or because of the lack of convincing evidence. While the defendant may introduce evidence to prove his/her innocence, the burden of proof never shifts to the defendant. Moreover, the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime including that the defendant is the person who committed the crime charged. (Source: NY Criminal Jury Instructions).

Rule 902: PLAINTIFF'S BURDENS OF PROOF (civil cases).

902.1 Preponderance of the Evidence: The plaintiff must prove his/her claim by a fair preponderance of the credible evidence. The credible evidence is testimony or exhibits that the trier of fact (jury or judge) finds to be worthy to be believed. A preponderance of the evidence means the greater part of such evidence. It does not mean the greater number of witnesses or the greater length of time taken by either side. The phrase refers to the quality of the evidence, *i.e.*, its convincing quality, the weight and the effect that it has on the trier of fact. (Source: NY Pattern Jury Instructions, §1:23).

902.2 Clear and Convincing Evidence: (To be used in cases involving fraud, malice, mistake, incompetency, etc.) The burden is on the plaintiff to prove fraud, for instance, by clear and convincing evidence. This means evidence that satisfies the trier of fact that there is a high degree of probability that the ultimate issue to be decided, *e.g.,* fraud, was committed by the defendant. To decide for the plaintiff, it is not enough to find that the preponderance of the evidence is in the plaintiff's favor. A party who must prove his/her case by a preponderance of the evidence only needs to satisfy the trier of fact that the evidence supporting his/her case more nearly represents what actually happened than the evidence which is opposed to it. But a party who must establish his/her case by clear and convincing evidence must satisfy the trier of fact that the evidence makes it highly probable that what s/he claims is what actually happened. (Source: NY Pattern Jury Instructions, §1:64).

Rule 903: DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANIAL EVIDENCE

903.1 Direct evidence: Direct evidence is evidence of a fact based on a witness's personal knowledge or observation of that fact. A person's guilt of a charged crime may be proven by direct evidence if, standing alone, that evidence satisfies the fact-finder (a judge or a jury) beyond a reasonable doubt of the person's guilt of that crime. (Source: NY Criminal Jury Instructions).

903.2 Circumstantial evidence: Circumstantial evidence is direct evidence of a fact from which a person may reasonably infer the existence or non-existence of another fact. A person's guilt of a charged crime may be proven by circumstantial evidence, if that evidence, while not directly establishing guilt, gives rise to an inference of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. (Source: NY Criminal Jury Instructions).

NOTE: The law draws no distinction between circumstantial evidence and direct evidence in terms of weight or importance. Either type of evidence may be enough to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, depending on the facts of the case as the fact-finder (a judge or a jury) finds them to be. [Source: NY Criminal Jury Instructions].

This page intentionally left blank.