



---

**2018 / 2019**  
**Mock Trial**  
**Middle and High School**  
**Competition Handbook**

---

**MODIFIED RULES OF EVIDENCE**

**(Section 2 of 4)**

**A PROJECT OF THE  
SOUTH CAROLINA BAR  
LAW RELATED EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
AND THE MOCK TRIAL SUB-COMMITTEE**

**2018/19 SC BAR PRESIDENT**

M. Dawes Cooke, Jr., Esquire

**LRE COMMITTEE CHAIR**

Margaret “Peg” M. Fox

**MOCK TRIAL SUB-COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS**

Andrew N. Cole, Esquire

Thomas McRoy Shelley, III, Esquire

**SC BAR LRE DIVISION STAFF**

Cynthia H. Cothran, LRE Director

Donald N. Lanier, LRE Manager

Marian J. Kirk, LRE Coordinator II



Mock Trial is made possible with the support of the  
[South Carolina Bar Foundation's IOLTA grant](#) and the [South Carolina Bar](#).

## MIDDLE SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL PAST STATE CHAMPIONS

2002 – Sneed Middle	2011 – Johnsonville Middle
2003 – Myrtle Beach Middle .....(Coastal Region)	2012 – Forestbrook Middle
2003 – Lady’s Island Middle ..... (Midlands Region)	2013 – Forestbrook Middle ..... (BOC Champions)
2003 – Riverside Middle ..... (Piedmont Region)	2014 – Forestbrook Middle ..... (BOC Champions)
2004 – Johnsonville Middle	2015 – Moultrie Middle ..... (Charleston Region)
2005 – Johnsonville Middle	2015 – Forestbrook Middle.....(Conway Region)
2006 – Hand Middle	2015 – Merriwether Middle ..... (Greenville Region)
2007 – Springfield Middle	2015 – Dent Middle.....(Lexington Region)
2008 – Springfield Middle	2016 – Moultrie Middle
2009 – Forestbrook Middle	2017 – Fort Mill Middle
2010 – Forestbrook Middle	



**2017 State Middle School Mock Trial Champions  
Fort Mill Middle School**

## HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL PAST STATE CHAMPIONS

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1982 – Dreher High                             | 2001 – Bob Jones Academy                                    |
| 1983 – Conway High                             | 2002 – Berkeley High  |
| 1984 – Strom Thurmond High                     | 2003 – Bob Jones Academy                                    |
| 1985 – Strom Thurmond High                     | 2004 – Bob Jones Academy.....(National Champions)           |
| 1986 – Myrtle Beach High                       | 2005 – Berkeley High  |
| 1987 – Strom Thurmond High                     | 2006 – Berkeley High  |
| 1988 – Socastee High .....(National Champions) | 2007 – Fort Mill High                                       |
| 1989 – Berkeley High                           | 2008 – Berkeley High  |
| 1990 – Irmo High                               | 2009 – Fort Mill High                                       |
| 1991 – Berkeley High                           | 2010 – Bob Jones Academy                                    |
| 1992 – Irmo High                               | 2011 – North Myrtle Beach High                              |
| 1993 – Berkeley High                           | 2012 – Strom Thurmond High                                  |
| 1994 – Middleton High                          | 2013 – North Myrtle Beach High                              |
| 1995 – Bob Jones Academy                       | 2014 – North Myrtle Beach High..(Nationals – 1st Runner Up) |
| 1996 – Socastee High                           | 2015 – Strom Thurmond High                                  |
| 1997 – Socastee High                           | 2016 – Fort Mill High School                                |
| 1998 – Socastee High                           | 2017 – Strom Thurmond High                                  |
| 1999 – Socastee High                           | 2018 – Heathwood Hall Episcopal School                      |
| 2000 – Berkeley High                           |   |



**2018 State High School Mock Trial Champions  
Heathwood Hall Episcopal School**

## PROFESSIONALISM AND CIVILITY AWARD WINNERS

The first Professionalism and Civility Awards were presented to one Middle School and High School team at their state competition. The competing state teams nominated a team the demonstrated inside and outside the courtroom the following qualities:

- A professional demeanor
- Civility
- Integrity
- Honesty
- Fair play
- Respect for the competition
- Respect for fellow competitors
- Respect for volunteers and all associated with the program inside and outside the courtroom throughout the competition
- Respect for courthouse staff and their facilities

### MIDDLE SCHOOL

2016 – Heathwood Hall Episcopal School ... (State)  
 2017 – Ben Lippen School ..... (Regional)  
 2017 – Bob Jones Academy ..... (Regional)  
 2017 – Longleaf Middle ..... (Regional)  
 2017 – Philip Simmons Middle ..... (Regional)  
 2017 – Ten Oaks Middle ..... (Regional)  
 2017 – Buist Academy..... (State)

### HIGH SCHOOL

2017 – Chapin ..... (State)  
 2018 – Dorman..... (Regional)  
 2018 – Gov. Sch. for Science & Math. (Regional)  
 2018 – Indian Land..... (Regional)  
 2018 – Kingstree Sr. High ..... (Regional)  
 2018 – Spring Hill ..... (Regional)  
 2018 – Wilson..... (State)



HIGH SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL  
COURTROOM ARTIST AND JOURNALIST STATE WINNERS

COURTROOM ARTIST

- 2011 – Jane Xu, Dreher High
- 2012 – Megan Greer, Montessori Sch. of Anderson
- 2013 – Elissa Na, Bob Jones Academy
- 2014 – Ezekiel King, Wade Hampton High
- 2015 – Ezekiel King, Wade Hampton High
- 2016 – Natalie Fanello, Mon. Sch. of Anderson
- 2017 – Marina Ataalla, Carolina Forest High
- 2018 – Ruby Dozier, Manning High

COURTROOM JOURNALIST

- 2011 – Caylyn Bird, Spring Valley High
- 2012 – Kayla Fenstermaker, Bob Jones Academy
- 2013 – Ya Fang, Governor's School for Science and Mathematics
- 2014 – Ana Kate Barker, Bob Jones Academy
- 2015 – Jacqueline Tobin, Governor's School for Science and Mathematics
- 2016 – Kristal L. Herrin, Strom Thurmond High
- 2017 – Rachel Black, York Preparatory Academy
- 2018 – Maggie May, Dorman High

Samples of previous sketch entries can be viewed online.  
([click here](#))



**2018 State Winner of Courtroom Artist Competition  
Ruby Dozier, Manning High School**

## INTRODUCTION TO THE MOCK TRIAL COMPETITION

The Mock Trial program is sponsored by the South Carolina Bar Law Related Education (LRE) Division. Public schools, private schools, and home schooled students throughout the state are invited to participate in this competitive program in one of the two categories; middle school or high school. Each participating school enters a team ideally composed of 15 - 17 students (and a minimum of 6 students middle school and 7 students high school) and requires a teacher coach sponsor. The SC Bar LRE Division assists in locating attorney coaches to help teams prepare the case and provides the team with the Case Materials, the Competition Handbook, and other competition materials on the LRE Web site at [www.sctbar.org/lre](http://www.sctbar.org/lre).

The Mock Trial competitions are divided into regional competitions with a culminating state competition at both the middle and high school levels. A total of twelve teams advance from the Middle School Mock Trial regional competitions and twelve teams advance from the High School Mock Trial regional competitions to participate in their level of state competition using the case assigned to their level. For high school, the state champion represents South Carolina in the National High School Mock Trial competition using a new national case.

Teams are officially assigned to a region after the drop date assigned for each level. Once a team is assigned to a region, the team cannot switch regions without the approval of the State Mock Trial Coordinator. *(Regions are subject to be split based on courthouse capacity.)*

### Middle School Mock Trial Competition Schedule

- Regionals .....Saturday, November 10, 2018  
(Conway, Georgetown, Greenville and Lexington)
- State ..... Friday – Saturday, November 30 and December 1, 2018  
(Columbia)

### High School Mock Trial Competition Schedule

- Regionals ..... Saturday, February 23, 2019  
(Columbia, Conway, Georgetown, Greenville, and Lexington)
- State ..... Friday – Saturday, March 8 and 9, 2019  
(Columbia)
- Nationals..... Thursday – Sunday, May 16 – 19, 2019  
(Athens, Georgia)

## GOALS

The goals of this program are, first and foremost, to educate students about the basis of our American judicial system and the mechanics of litigation. The program also serves to build bridges of mutual cooperation, respect and support between the community and the legal profession. Through participation in the Mock Trial program students increase important skills such as listening, speaking, writing, reading, and analyzing. All participants are encouraged to keep in mind the goal of the Mock Trial program is not to win for the sake of winning, but to learn and understand the meaning of good citizenship in a democratic republic through participation in our system of law and justice. All who participate in the Mock Trial program are winners in this sense.

**Students** – Through participation you will experience what it is like to prepare for and present a case before a presiding judge and scoring judges. Working with your team and coaches, you will learn to evaluate information and respond quickly. As you prepare, you will sharpen public speaking and presentation skills. The greatest benefit is the opportunity to learn how the legal system works. By studying and understanding courtroom procedure, you should become more comfortable with federal and state laws as part of the legal system. Your interaction with some of South Carolina’s finest attorneys and judges will give you a glimpse of the different interpretations of trial procedure and different approaches of individual members in the legal arena.

**Teacher Coaches, Attorney Coaches, and/or Judges** – We strongly encourage you to focus on the goal of student participation rather than an emphasis on winning while preparing for the competition. Your contribution of time and talent make many experiential educational opportunities available annually to South Carolina students. Your participation is a key element to the success of this program. You can be proud of the impact you will make on the lives of these students.

### CASE RELEASE INFORMATION

The case is available on the Internet in the LRE section of the South Carolina Bar’s Web site, located at [www.sctbar.org/lre](http://www.sctbar.org/lre) and by clicking on either the Middle or High School Mock Trial logo. The Middle School Case Materials will be released August 31, 2018. The High School Case Materials will be released October 31, 2018. Both cases are released no later than 5pm.

### DISCUSSION FORUM

The Mock Trial discussion forum is a place to post questions concerning the content of the Case Materials, the Competition Rules, and the competition. The discussion forum is located on the LRE website.

[Click Here for the Middle School Discussion Forum](#)

[Click Here for the High School Discussion Forum](#)

The links above take you to a registration page for the discussion forum. It can take up to 48 hours to gain access to the discussion forum once registered. The discussion forum should be checked often for postings. Responses posted to the questions could change Competition Rules, the Case Materials, and/or competition specifics that apply on competition day. The discussion forum closes ten business days prior to a competition.

### HAVE MOCK TRIAL QUESTIONS?

Attorney Coach Needed .....	<a href="#">Donald Lanier</a>
Case .....	Ask on <a href="#">Forum Discussion</a>
Competition .....	Ask on <a href="#">Forum Discussion</a> or Contact <a href="#">Cynthia H. Cothran</a>
Concerns.....	<a href="#">Cynthia H. Cothran</a>
Credit Card Payment.....	<a href="#">Donald Lanier</a>
Downloading Materials .....	<a href="#">Donald Lanier</a>
Forms.....	<a href="#">Marian Kirk</a>
Forum Registration.....	<a href="#">Donald Lanier</a>
General Questions .....	<a href="#">Cynthia H. Cothran</a>
Purchase Orders .....	<a href="#">Marian Kirk</a>

Registration.....Marian Kirk  
Training.....Marian Kirk  
Webinar Registration.....Donald Lanier

LAW RELATED EDUCATION DIVISION ..... (803) 252-5139  
Cynthia H. Cothran, LRE Director.....[ccothran@scbar.org](mailto:ccothran@scbar.org)  
Marian Kirk, LRE Coordinator II.....[mkirk@scbar.org](mailto:mkirk@scbar.org)  
Donald Lanier, LRE Manager .....[dlanier@scbar.org](mailto:dlanier@scbar.org)

**2018 / 2019  
MODIFIED RULES OF EVIDENCE**

**(Section 2 of 4)**

# MODIFIED RULES OF EVIDENCE:

Overview of the Updates to the 2018/19 Modified Rules of Evidence.....	<b>52</b>
<b>ARTICLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS.....</b>	<b>53</b>
Scope .....	53
Purpose and Construction.....	53
Conditional Admission.....	54
Limited Admissibility.....	54
Remainder of Related Writings or Recorded Statements .....	54
<b>ARTICLE II. JUDICIAL NOTICE .....</b>	<b>54</b>
Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts .....	54
<b>ARTICLE III. PRESUMPTIONS IN CIVIL ACTIONS &amp; PROCEEDINGS .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>ARTICLE IV. RELEVANCY AND ITS LIMITS .....</b>	<b>55</b>
Test for Relevant Evidence .....	55
General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence .....	55
Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons .....	55
Character Evidence; Crimes or Other Acts.....	55
Character Evidence .....	55
Prohibited Uses .....	55
Exceptions for a Defendant or Victim in a Criminal Case .....	55
Exceptions for a Witness .....	56
Crimes, Wrongs, or Other Acts .....	56
Prohibited Uses .....	56
Permitted Uses.....	56
Methods of Proving Character.....	57
Reputation or Opinion.....	57
Specific Instances of Conduct.....	57
Habit, Routine Practice .....	57
Subsequent Remedial Measures .....	57
Compromise and Offers to Compromise .....	57
Prohibited Uses .....	57
Exceptions.....	58
Offers to Pay Medical and Similar Expenses.....	55
Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements .....	55
Prohibited Uses .....	55
Exceptions.....	55
Liability Insurance .....	58
<b>ARTICLE V. PRIVILEGES .....</b>	<b>59</b>
General Rule.....	59
<b>ARTICLE VI. WITNESSES .....</b>	<b>59</b>
General Rule of Witness Competency .....	59
Need for Personal Knowledge.....	59
Oath or Affirmation.....	59

<i>Video Link: Bailiff Opening Court</i> .....	59
Who May Impeach .....	60
<i>Video Link: Impeaching Examples</i> .....	60
A Witness's Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness .....	60
Reputation or Opinion Evidence .....	60
Specific Instances of Conduct .....	60
Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction .....	60
General Rule .....	60
Limit on Using the Evidence after 10 Years .....	61
Effect of a Pardon, Annulment, or Certificate of Rehabilitation .....	61
Juvenile Adjudications .....	61
Pendency of an Appeal .....	61
Religious Beliefs or Opinions .....	61
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation .....	62
Control by Court; Purposes .....	62
Scope of Direct Examination .....	62
Scope of Cross-Examination .....	63
<i>Video Link: Cross-Examination Examples</i> .....	63
Leading Questions .....	63
Redirect / Recross .....	63
Permitted Motions .....	63
Writing Used to Refresh Memory .....	64
Witness's Prior Statement .....	64
Showing or Disclosing the Statement During Examination .....	64
Extrinsic Evidence of Prior Inconsistent Statement .....	64
<i>Video Link: Impeaching Examples</i> .....	65
ARTICLE VII. OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY .....	<b>65</b>
Opinion Testimony by Lay Witness .....	65
Testimony by Experts .....	65
Bases of an Expert's Opinion Testimony .....	66
Opinion on Ultimate Issue .....	66
In General – Not Automatically Objectionable .....	66
Exception .....	66
Disclosing the Facts or Data Underlying an Expert's Opinion .....	66
ARTICLE VIII. HEARSAY .....	<b>66</b>
Definitions .....	66
Statement .....	66
Declarant .....	66
Hearsay .....	66
Statements That Are Not Hearsay .....	67
A Declarant – Witness's Prior Statement .....	67
An Opposing Party's Statements .....	67
Hearsay Rule .....	68
Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay – Regardless of Whether the Declarant is Available as a Witness .....	68
<i>Video Link: Hearsay Exceptions</i> .....	68
Present Sense Impression .....	68
Excited Utterance .....	69
Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Condition .....	69

Examples of Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Conditions .....	69
Statements Made for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment .....	69
Recorded Recollection .....	69
Records of Regularly Conducted Activity .....	69
Absence of a Record of a Regularly Conducted Activity .....	70
Public Records and Reports .....	70
Records of Vital Statistics .....	70
Absence of a Public Record or Entry .....	70
Records of Religious Organizations .....	71
Family Records .....	71
Statements in Ancient Documents .....	71
Statements in Learned Treatises, Periodicals or Pamphlets .....	71
Reputation Concerning Personal or Family History .....	71
Reputation Concerning Character .....	71
Judgment of a Previous Conviction .....	71
Hearsay Exceptions; Declarant Unavailable .....	72
Criteria for Being Unavailable .....	72
The Exceptions .....	72
Former Testimony .....	72
Statement Under the Belief of Imminent Death .....	73
Statement Against Interest .....	73
Statement of Personal or Family History .....	73
Statement Offered Against a Party that Wrongfully Caused the Declarant's Unavailability .....	73
Hearsay within Hearsay .....	73
Title .....	73
ARTICLE IX. IMPROPER FORM OF QUESTION .....	74
Assuming Facts Not in Evidence .....	74
Argumentative Questions .....	74
Ambiguous Questions .....	74
Lack of Proper Foundation .....	74
Procedures for Objections .....	75

## INDEX FOR MODIFIED RULES OF EVIDENCE



# Overview of the Updates to the Modified Rules of Evidence for **2018/2019**

**For the 2018/19 competition season, the Modified Rules of Evidence were modified, clarified and/or condensed. An overview of the changes are noted below as information only. The ENTIRE rule can be found in the Competition Rules section.**

Rule #	Rule Name	Action Taken
611	Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation	Added new examples of a direct question. Added new example of a leading question. Added further explanation of a direct examination.

## 2018 / 2019 MODIFIED RULES OF EVIDENCE <sup>1</sup>

In a trial, 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 presiding judge. The presiding 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 presiding judge will probably allow the evidence. The burden is on the team to know the rules and to be able to use them to protect their client and to limit the actions of opposing counsel and their witnesses (for example, to exclude hearsay and prevent unfair extrapolation).

The Mock Trial Rules of Evidence are a modified version of the Federal Rules of Evidence. If there is any conflict between the Mock Trial Rules of Evidence and the Federal or South Carolina Rules of Evidence, the Mock Trial Rules of Evidence will control.

Formal Rules of Evidence are quite complicated and differ depending on the court where the trial occurs. For purposes of the Mock Trial competition, the Rules of Evidence have been modified and simplified below. Not all presiding judges 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 you think proper. **No matter which way the presiding judge rules, accept the ruling with grace and courtesy.**

***Rules of Evidence for use of the Middle and High School Mock Trial Competitions are included below and overrule any prior Rules of Evidence.***

***Anything outlined in a light grey box is something that South Carolina is providing as additional information.***

### ARTICLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Rule 101     Scope

These rules govern proceedings in the South Carolina Mock Trial program.

Rule 102     Purpose and Construction

These rules shall be construed so as to administer every proceeding fairly, eliminate unjustifiable expense and delay, and ascertain the truth and secure a just determination.

Rule 103     Reserved

---

<sup>1</sup> The applicable rules of evidence have been streamlined for the High School Mock Trial Competition.

Rule 104 Conditional Admission

- (a) Reserved
- (b) The court may admit proposed evidence on the condition that the proof necessary for admission be introduced later.

Rule 105 Limited Admissibility

Evidence that is admissible to one party or for one purpose can be restricted at the discretion of the presiding judge, if requested by the opposing party. If the restriction is approved, the scoring jury is instructed accordingly.

Rule 106 Remainder of Related Writings or Recorded Statements

When a party introduces a writing or a recorded statement, the opposing party may require the introduction of additional writings or recorded statements that shall be considered at the same time to ensure fairness.

## ARTICLE II. JUDICIAL NOTICE

Rule 201 Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts

- (a) This rule governs judicial notice of an adjudicative fact only, not a legislative fact; and
- (b) The court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it is a matter of mathematical or scientific certainty. For example, the court could take judicial notice that  $10 \times 10 = 100$  or that there are 5280 feet in a mile.
- (c) The court must take judicial notice if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the necessary information.
- (d) The court may take judicial notice at any stage in the proceeding.
- (e) A party is entitled to be heard on the propriety of taking judicial notice and the nature of the fact to be noticed.
- (f) In a civil case, the court must instruct the jury to accept the noticed fact as conclusive. In a criminal case, the court must instruct the jury that it may or may not accept the noticed fact as conclusive.

## ARTICLE III. PRESUMPTIONS IN CIVIL ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS

No Federal Rules of Evidence under Article III apply to the Mock Trial program.

## ARTICLE IV. RELEVANCY AND ITS LIMITS

### Rule 401 Test for Relevant Evidence

Evidence is relevant if:

- (a) It has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and
- (b) The fact is of consequence in determining the action.

### Rule 402 General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence

Relevant evidence is admissible unless these rules provide otherwise. Irrelevant evidence is not admissible.

### Rule 403 Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons

The court may exclude relevant evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of one or more of the following: unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

### Rule 404 Character Evidence; Crimes or Other Acts

#### (a) Character Evidence:

- (1) **Prohibited Uses:** Evidence of a person's character or character trait is not admissible to prove that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character or trait.

**Official Comment:**

*In other words, mention of a person's typical behavior is not admissible when trying to prove that the person behaved in a way that matches the behavior discussed in the current case.*

- (2) **Exceptions for a Defendant or Victim in a Criminal Case:** The following exceptions apply in a criminal case:

- (A) A defendant may offer evidence of the defendant's pertinent trait, and if the evidence is admitted, the prosecutor may offer evidence to rebut it;

**Official Comment:**

*In other words, once the character evidence is provided by the Defendant, the Prosecution/Plaintiff can attack these statements with character evidence that would normally be excluded as improper character evidence.*

- (B) A defendant may offer evidence of an alleged victim's pertinent trait, and if the evidence is admitted, the prosecutor may:

- (i) Offer evidence to rebut it;
- (ii) Offer evidence of the defendant's same trait; and

**Official Comment:**

*In other words, the accused in a criminal case can point out important and related character traits of the victim, such as aggressiveness, to defend him/herself. The Prosecution can then argue that the victim exhibited traits of peacefulness in the past. The Prosecution may also then argue that the defendant him/herself has exhibited aggressiveness in the past.*

- (C) In a homicide case, the prosecutor may offer evidence of the alleged victim's trait of peacefulness to rebut evidence that the victim was the first aggressor.

**Official Comment:**

*In other words, if the charge against the Defendant is murder and the Defendant raises self-defense or otherwise alleges that the victim started the fight, then the Prosecutor may offer evidence that the victim was a peaceful person.*

- (3) **Exceptions for a Witness:** Evidence of a witness's character may be admitted under

[Rule 607 Who May Impeach](#),  
and

[Rule 608 A Witness's Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness](#),  
and

[Rule 609 Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction](#).

**(b) Crimes, Wrongs, or Other Acts:**

- (1) **Prohibited Uses:** Evidence of a crime, wrong, or other act is not admissible to prove a person's character in order to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character.
- (2) **Permitted Uses:** This evidence may be admissible for another purpose, such as proving motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident.

**Official Comment:**

*In other words, mention of a person's prior crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove that the person acted in conformity with the prior bad acts. However, such evidence may be admissible to show motive, identity, common scheme or plan, intent, or absence of mistake or accident.*

## Rule 405 Methods of Proving Character

### (a) **Reputation or Opinion:**

When evidence of a person's character or character trait is admissible, it may be proved by testimony about the person's reputation or by testimony in the form of an opinion. On cross-examination of the character witness, the court may allow an inquiry into relevant specific instances of the person's conduct.

### (b) **Specific Instances of Conduct:**

When a person's character or character trait is an essential element of a charge, claim, or defense, the character or trait may also be proved by relevant specific instances of the person's conduct.

## Rule 406 Habit, Routine Practice

Evidence of a person's habit or an organization's routine practice may be admitted to prove that on a particular occasion the person or organization acted in accordance with the habit or routine practice. The court may admit this evidence regardless of whether it is corroborated or whether there was an eyewitness.

## Rule 407 Subsequent Remedial Measures

When measures are taken that would have made an earlier injury or harm less likely to occur, evidence of the subsequent measures is not admissible to prove:

- Negligence;
- Culpable conduct;
- A defect in a product or its design; or
- A need for a warning or instruction.

But the court may admit this evidence for another purpose, such as impeachment or — if disputed — proving ownership, control, or the feasibility of precautionary measures.

## Rule 408 Compromise and Offers to Compromise (*Civil Case Only*)

### (a) **Prohibited Uses:**

Evidence of the following is not admissible — on behalf of any party — either to prove or disprove the validity or amount of a disputed claim or to impeach by a prior inconsistent statement or a contradiction:

- (1) Furnishing, promising, or offering — or accepting, promising to accept, or offering to accept — a valuable consideration in compromising or attempting to compromise the claim; and
- (2) Conduct or a statement made during compromise negotiations about the claim — except when offered in a criminal case and when the negotiations related to a claim by a public office in the exercise of its regulatory, investigative, or enforcement authority.

(b) **Exceptions:**

The court may admit this evidence for another purpose, such as proving a witness's bias or prejudice, negating a contention of undue delay, or proving an effort to obstruct a criminal investigation or prosecution.

Rule 409 Offers to Pay Medical and Similar Expenses (*Civil Case Only*)

Evidence of furnishing, promising to pay, or offering to pay medical, hospital, or similar expenses resulting from an injury is not admissible to prove liability for the injury.

Rule 410 Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements

(a) **Prohibited Uses:**

In a civil or criminal case, evidence of the following is not admissible against the defendant who made the plea or participated in the plea discussions:

- (1) A guilty plea that was later withdrawn;
- (2) A nolo contendere plea;
- (3) A statement made during a proceeding on either of those pleas under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11 or a comparable state procedure; or
- (4) A statement made during plea discussions with an attorney for the prosecuting authority if the discussions did not result in a guilty plea or they resulted in a later-withdrawn guilty plea.

(b) **Exceptions:**

The court may admit a statement described in [Rule 410\(a\) Prohibited Uses \(3\) or \(4\)](#):

- (1) In any proceeding in which another statement made during the same plea or plea discussions has been introduced, if in fairness the statements ought to be considered together; or
- (2) In a criminal proceeding for perjury or false statement, if the defendant made the statement under oath, on the record, and with counsel present.

Rule 411 Liability Insurance (*Civil Case Only*)

Evidence that a person was or was not insured against liability is not admissible to prove whether the person acted negligently or otherwise wrongfully. But the court may admit this evidence for another purpose, such as proving a witness's bias or proving agency, ownership, or control.

## ARTICLE V. PRIVILEGES

### Rule 501 General Rule

There are certain admissions and communications excluded from evidence on grounds of public policy. Among these are:

- (1) Communications between husband and wife,
- (2) Communications between attorney and client,
- (3) Communications among grand jurors,
- (4) Secrets of state, and
- (5) Communications between psychiatrist and patient.

## ARTICLE VI. WITNESSES

### Rule 601 General Rule of Witness Competency

Every person is competent to be a witness.

### Rule 602 Need for Personal Knowledge

A witness may testify to a matter only if evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter. Evidence to prove personal knowledge may consist of the witness's own testimony. This rule does not apply to a witness's expert testimony under [Rule 703 Bases of Opinion Testimony by Experts](#). (Also see [Rule 2.2 – Witnesses Bound by Statements](#).)

### Rule 603 Oath or Affirmation

Before testifying, every witness is required to declare that the witness will testify truthfully, by oath or affirmation, by the oath provided in these materials. The bailiff swears in all witnesses at one time before opening statements as follows:

“Do you promise the testimony you are about to give will faithfully and truthfully conform to the facts and rules of the Mock Trial competition?”

**A video link showing the [bailiff opening court](#) can be viewed.**

**Visit [www.sobar.org/lre](http://www.sobar.org/lre) and then click on the Middle School or High School Mock Trial logo on the main page. Go to *Videos for Coaches and Students* and then scroll through the video clips available.**

Rule 607 Who May Impeach

Any party, including the party that called the witness, may attack the witness's credibility.

**A video link showing [examples on how to impeach](#) can be viewed.**

Visit [www.scbare.org/lre](http://www.scbare.org/lre) and then click on the Middle School or High School Mock Trial logo on the main page. Go to *Videos for Coaches and Students* and then scroll through the video clips available.

Rule 608 A Witness's Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness

(a) **Reputation or Opinion Evidence:**

A witness's credibility may be attacked or supported by testimony about the witness's reputation for having a character for truthfulness or untruthfulness, or by testimony in the form of an opinion about that character. But evidence of truthful character is admissible only after the witness's character for truthfulness has been attacked.

(b) **Specific Instances of Conduct:**

Except for a criminal conviction under [Rule 609 Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction](#), extrinsic evidence is not admissible to prove specific instances of a witness's conduct in order to attack or support the witness's character for truthfulness. But the court may, on cross-examination, allow them to be inquired into if they are probative of the character for truthfulness or untruthfulness of:

- (1) The witness; or
- (2) Another witness whose character the witness being cross-examined has testified about.

By testifying on another matter, a witness does not waive any privilege against self-incrimination for testimony that relates only to the witness's character for truthfulness.

Rule 609 Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction  
*(this rule applies only to witnesses with prior convictions)*

(a) **In General:**

The following rules apply to attacking a witness's character for truthfulness by evidence of a criminal conviction:

- (1) For a crime that, in the convicting jurisdiction, was punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than one year, the evidence:
  - (A) Must be admitted, subject to [Rule 403 Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons](#), in a civil case or in a criminal case in which the witness is not a defendant; and

(B) Must be admitted in a criminal case in which the witness is a defendant, if the probative value of the evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect to that defendant; and

(2) For any crime regardless of the punishment, the evidence must be admitted if the court can readily determine that establishing the elements of the crime required proving — or the witness's admitting — a dishonest act or false statement.

**(b) Limit on Using the Evidence after 10 Years:**

This subdivision (b) applies if more than 10 years have passed since the witness's conviction or release from confinement for it, whichever is later. Evidence of the conviction is admissible only if its probative value, supported by specific facts and circumstances, substantially outweighs its prejudicial effect.

**(c) Effect of a Pardon, Annulment, or Certificate of Rehabilitation:**

Evidence of a conviction is not admissible if:

(1) The conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, certificate of rehabilitation, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding that the person has been rehabilitated, and the person has not been convicted of a later crime punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than one year; or

(2) The conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding of innocence.

**(d) Juvenile Adjudications:**

Evidence of a juvenile adjudication is admissible under this rule only if:

(1) It is offered in a criminal case;

(2) The adjudication was of a witness other than the defendant;

(3) An adult's conviction for that offense would be admissible to attack the adult's credibility; and

(4) Admitting the evidence is necessary to fairly determine guilt or innocence.

**(e) Pendency of an Appeal:**

A conviction that satisfies this rule is admissible even if an appeal is pending. Evidence of the pendency is also admissible.

**Rule 610 Religious Beliefs or Opinions**

Evidence of a witness's religious beliefs or opinions is not admissible to attack or support the witness's credibility.

Rule 611 Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation

(a) **Control by Court; Purposes:**

The Court should exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of examining witnesses and presenting evidence so as to:

- (1) Make those procedures effective for determining the truth;
- (2) Avoid wasting time; and
- (3) Protect witnesses from harassment or undue embarrassment.

**Scope of Direct Examination:** *Direct questions shall be phrased to evoke facts from the witness. Witnesses may not be asked leading questions by the attorney who calls them. 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:**

- (1) "Mr. Patterson, what did you do immediately after seeing Mr. Winstead run from the house?"
- (2) "Mr. Patterson, prior to today, have you ever met Mr. Winstead?" (Note: Although this is a "Yes" or "No" question, it is NOT a leading question because it does not suggest what the questioner wants the answer to be.)

**Example of a Leading Question:**

"Mr. Patterson, is it not true that you knew Mr. Winstead prior to today?" (This conveys the intent of the question for the witness to answer "Yes" and is therefore improper for direct.)

**Example of a Question which calls for a Narrative (improper for direct):**

"Mr. Patterson, tell us everything you know about Mr. Winstead."

*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, but it is rare for an attorney on direct to ask a question (such as the example here) that is obviously too broad. Often, the issue does not arise until the witness goes clearly beyond what is necessary to answer the question. If that occurs, opposing counsel can object that "the witness is giving a narrative answer" (i.e., beyond what is necessary to answer the question.)*

(b) **Scope of Cross-Examination:**

The scope of the cross-examination shall not be limited to the scope of the direct examination, but may inquire into any relevant facts or matters contained in the witness' statement, **including** all reasonable inferences that can be drawn from those facts and matters, and may inquire into any omissions from the witness' statement that are otherwise material and admissible.

*Cross-examination is the questioning of a witness by an attorney from the opposing side of the case. Cross-examination is not limited to direct questioning.*

- (1) **Form of Questions:** *An attorney may ask leading questions when cross-examining the opponent's witnesses. Questions tending to evoke a narrative answer shall be avoided. Example of a leading question: "Mrs. Winstead, isn't it true that your son chose of his own free will to join the army?"*
- (2) **Scope of Witness Examination:** *In the Mock Trial competition, attorneys are allowed unlimited range on cross-examination of witnesses as long as questions are relevant to the case. Witnesses must be called by their own team and may not be recalled by either side. All desired questioning of a particular witness must be done by both sides in a single appearance on the witness stand.*

A video link showing [cross-examination examples](#) can be viewed.

Visit [www.scbart.org/lre](http://www.scbart.org/lre) and click on the Middle School or High School Mock Trial logo on the main page. Go to **Videos for Coaches and Students** and then scroll through the video clips available.

(c) **Leading Questions:**

Leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness' testimony. Ordinarily, the court should allow leading questions:

- (1) On cross-examination; and
- (2) When a party calls a hostile witness, an adverse party, or a witness identified with an adverse party.

(d) **Redirect / Recross:**

After cross-examination, additional questions may be asked by the direct examining attorney, but questions must be limited to matters raised by the attorney on cross-examination. Likewise, additional questions may be asked by the cross-examining attorney on recross, but such questions must be limited to matters raised on redirect examinations and should avoid repetition.

(e) **Permitted Motions:**

The only motion permissible is one requesting the presiding judge to strike testimony following a successful objection to its admission.

## Rule 612 Writing Used to Refresh Memory

If a written statement is used to refresh the memory of a witness either while testifying or before testifying, the Court shall determine that the adverse party is entitled to have the writing produced for inspection. The adverse party may cross-examine the witness on the material and introduce into evidence those portions, which relate to the testimony of the witness.

## Rule 613 Witness's Prior Statement

### (a) **Showing or Disclosing the Statement During Examination:**

When examining a witness about the witness's prior statement, a party need not show it or disclose its contents to the witness. But the party must, on request, show it or disclose its contents to an adverse party's attorney.

### (b) **Extrinsic Evidence of a Prior Inconsistent Statement:**

Extrinsic evidence of a witness's prior inconsistent statement is admissible only if the witness is given an opportunity to explain or deny the statement and an adverse party is given an opportunity to examine the witness about it, or if justice so requires. This subdivision (b) does not apply to an opposing party's statement under [Rule 801\(d\)\(2\) Definitions – Statements That Are Not Hearsay – An Opposing Party's Statement](#).

#### **Official Comment:**

*A cross-examining attorney may want to challenge the credibility of a witness by showing that the witness has testified in court in a way that is inconsistent with that witness' affidavit. This tactic is called "impeaching the witness." It may be executed by asking the witness whether s/he has ever given an affidavit inconsistent with the witness' testimony. If the witness maintains that s/he has not testified inconsistently, or states s/he does not remember making the statement, the cross-examining attorney may choose to present the witness's affidavit to him/her to prove the inconsistency. The attorney should ask the presiding judge's permission to approach the witness to show him/her the affidavit (or ask if s/he has a copy on the witness stand already). If permission is granted, the attorney should direct the witness and the court to the page and line containing the inconsistency. The lawyer can read the part of the affidavit containing the inconsistency or ask that the witness do so.*

*As a general rule, the affidavit itself should not be admitted into evidence. One exception; however, would be where a witness testifies in a manner inconsistent with a statement made in that witness's affidavit and maintains the inconsistency even when shown the portion of the affidavit which the cross-examining attorney believes is inconsistent. Under those circumstances, the cross-examining attorney may ask to enter the affidavit into evidence to prove the contradiction to the jury. Either side can request redaction of other portions of the affidavit not relevant to the impeachment. (In Mock Trial, the presiding Judge can order that such portions "be considered redacted" without the need for actual physical redaction.)*

*Note, however, if a witness is impeached with an inconsistent statement in his/her affidavit and admits making the statement (either before or after being shown the affidavit), there is no need to introduce the affidavit (or any portion thereof) into evidence, and such should not be requested.*

*Therefore, if a witness is asked whether he or she made the statement “X” in his/her affidavit and admits it, the attorney asking the question should move on to the next question. If the witness denies making the statement or testified he/she cannot remember making the statement, the attorney may ask permission to have the witness refer to his/her affidavit. If, after having been shown his/her affidavit, the witness maintains s/he did not make that statement, the attorney may request that the affidavit be admitted into evidence.*

**A video link showing [how to impeach examples](#) can be viewed.**

**Visit [www.scbar.org/lre](http://www.scbar.org/lre) and the click on the Middle School or High School Mock Trial logo on the main page. Go to *Videos for Coaches and Students* and then scroll through the video clips available.**

## ARTICLE VII. OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

### Rule 701 Opinion Testimony by Lay Witness

If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an opinion is limited to one that is:

- (a) Rationally based on the witness's perception;
- (b) Helpful to clearly understanding the witness' testimony or to determining a fact in issue; and
- (c) Not based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of [Rule 702 Testimony by Experts](#).

### Rule 702 Testimony by Experts

If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise.

#### **Official Comment:**

*A witness cannot give expert opinions under [Rule 702 Testimony by Experts](#) until s/he has been tendered as an expert by the examining lawyer and recognized as such by the court. To have an expert witness admitted by the court, first ask the witness to testify as to his/her qualifications. Then ask the presiding judge that the expert witness be qualified as an expert in the field of \_\_\_\_\_. The presiding judge then asks opposing counsel if there are any objections to having the witness recognized as an expert. Either there are no objections or there is an argument as to why the witness is not qualified as an expert. The presiding judge then rules if as to whether the witness is qualified as an expert.*

*Prior to the court's admission of a witness as an expert, the witness cannot provide any opinions and the attorneys shall object to any attempts by an undesignated expert to render opinion testimony. Once the witness is qualified and admitted as an expert by the court, the witness can offer only opinions that are within the witness' recognized field of expertise.*

#### Rule 703 Bases of an Expert's Opinion Testimony

An expert may base an opinion on facts or data in the case that the expert has been made aware of or personally observed. If experts in the particular field would reasonably rely on those kinds of facts or data in forming an opinion on the subject, they need not be admissible for the opinion to be admitted. But if the facts or data would otherwise be inadmissible, the proponent of the opinion may disclose them to the jury only if their probative value in helping the jury evaluate the opinion substantially outweighs their prejudicial effect.

#### Rule 704 Opinion on Ultimate Issue

(a) **In General – Not Automatically Objectionable:**

An opinion is not objectionable just because it embraces an ultimate issue.

(b) **Exception:**

In a criminal case, an expert witness must not state an opinion about whether the defendant did or did not have a mental state or condition that constitutes an element of the crime charged or of a defense. Those matters are for the trier of fact alone.

#### Rule 705 Disclosing the Facts or Data Underlying An Expert's Opinion

Unless the court orders otherwise, an expert may state an opinion — and give the reasons for it — without first testifying to the underlying facts or data. But the expert may be required to disclose those facts or data on cross-examination.

## ARTICLE VIII. HEARSAY

#### Rule 801 Definitions

The following definitions apply under this article:

(a) **Statement:**

A "statement" means a person's oral assertion, written assertion, or nonverbal conduct, if the person intended it as an assertion.

(b) **Declarant:**

A "declarant" means the person who made the statement.

(c) **Hearsay:**

"Hearsay" means a statement that:

- (1) The declarant does not make while testifying at the current trial or hearing; and

- (2) A party offers in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted in the statement.

(d) **Statements That Are Not Hearsay:**

A statement that meets the following conditions is not hearsay:

(1) **A Declarant – Witness’s Prior Statement:**

The declarant testifies and is subject to cross-examination about a prior statement, and the statement:

- (A) Is inconsistent with the declarant's testimony and was given under penalty of perjury at a trial, hearing, or other proceeding or in a deposition;
- (B) Is consistent with the declarant's testimony and is offered to rebut an express or implied charge that the declarant recently fabricated it or acted from a recent improper influence or motive in so testifying; or
- (C) Identifies a person as someone the declarant perceived earlier.

(2) **An Opposing Party’s Statement:**

The statement is offered against a party and:

- (A) Was made by the party in an individual or representative capacity;
- (B) Is one the party manifested that it adopted or believed to be true;
- (C) Was made by a person whom the party authorized to make a statement on the subject;
- (D) Was made by the party’s agent or employee on a matter within the scope of that relationship and while it existed; or
- (E) Was made by the party’s coconspirator during and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

The statement must be considered but does not itself establish the declarant’s authority under (C); the existence or scope of the relationship under (D); or the existence of the conspiracy or participation in it under (E).

**Official Comment:**

*Hearsay generally has a three step analysis:*

- 1) *Is it an “out-of-court” statement?*
- 2) *If so, is it offered to prove the truth of the out-of-court statement?*
- 3) *If so, is there an exception that allows the out-of-court statement to be admitted despite the fact that it is hearsay?*

An example of hearsay would be a witness saying “I heard Bob Smith [who is not testifying in the case] say that he saw the Defendant kill the victim.” If this is offered to try to prove that the Defendant killed the victim, the Defendant’s attorney has no way of cross-examining Bob Smith about what he saw, or whether he has a bias against the Defendant, or whether there is any other reason to disbelieve the statement. Because we cannot test the credibility (truthfulness or untruthfulness) of the substance of Bob’s statement, it is untrustworthy and shall not be admitted.

An example that would not be hearsay: a witness testifies “I heard Bob Smith tell the Defendant that the Defendant’s child was at the hospital and was seriously injured.” If this is offered to show why the Defendant raced to the hospital, it is not a statement being offered “for the truth of the matter asserted” (i.e., it is not offered to show the child was actually injured, this is not the point), then it would NOT be hearsay. The statement is being admitted to show why someone took some action, not for the truth of the statement. (And it is irrelevant whether the statement is actually true or not.) In this instance, the issue is whether or not the statement was made (and the witness can be cross-examined on this point), not the truth of the statement.

An example that is hearsay, but which is likely an exception (and therefore might be admitted): a witness testifies “I was talking on the phone with the victim when he told me the Defendant was knocking at his door.” This is hearsay; however, it likely falls under exception [Rule 803\(1\) – Present Sense Impression](#).

For the purposes of the Mock Trial competition, the exceptions to the hearsay rule which are listed herein ([Rules 803 Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay – Regardless of Whether the Declarant is Available as a Witness](#) and [Rule 804 Hearsay Exceptions; Declarant Unavailable](#)) can be used.

## Rule 802 Hearsay Rule

Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these Modified Rules of Evidence.

## Rule 803 Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay – Regardless of Whether the Declarant is Available as a Witness

A video link showing the [hearsay exceptions](#) can be viewed.

Visit [www.sctbar.org/lre](http://www.sctbar.org/lre) and the click on the Middle School or High School Mock Trial logo on the main page. Go to *Videos for Coaches and Students* and then scroll through the video clips available.

The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule, regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness:

(1) **Present Sense Impression:**

A statement describing or explaining an event or condition, made while or immediately after the declarant perceived it.

(2) **Excited Utterance:**

A statement relating to a startling event or condition, made while the declarant was under the stress of excitement that it caused.

(3) **Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Condition:**

A statement of the declarant's then-existing state of mind (such as motive, intent, or plan) or emotional, sensory, or physical condition (such as mental feeling, pain, or bodily health), but not including a statement of memory or belief to prove the fact remembered or believed unless it relates to the validity or terms of the declarant's will.

**Examples of Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Conditions:**

**Emotional State:** *Bob said he was scared.*

**Physical State:** *Jim said he had a headache.*

**Mental State:** *He said he was going to take the car out and see how fast it would go.*

(4) **Statements Made for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment:**

A statement that:

- (A) Is made for — and is reasonably pertinent to — medical diagnosis or treatment; and
- (B) Describes medical history; past or present symptoms or sensations; their inception; or their general cause.

(5) **Recorded Recollection:**

A record that:

- (A) Is on a matter the witness once knew about but now cannot recall well enough to testify fully and accurately;
- (B) Was made or adopted by the witness when the matter was fresh in the witness's memory; and
- (C) Accurately reflects the witness's knowledge.

If admitted, the record may be read into evidence but may be received as an exhibit only if offered by an adverse party.

(6) **Records of a Regularly Conducted Activity:**

A record of an act, event, condition, opinion, or diagnosis if:

- (A) The record was made at or near the time by — or from information transmitted by — someone with knowledge;
- (B) The record was kept in the course of a regularly conducted activity of a business, organization, occupation, or calling, whether or not for profit;
- (C) Making the record was a regular practice of that activity;

- (D) All these conditions are shown by the testimony of the custodian or another qualified witness; and
  - (E) The opponent does not show that the source of information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.
- (7) **Absence of a Record of a Regularly Conducted Activity:**  
Evidence that a matter is not included in a record described in paragraph (6) if:
- (A) The evidence is admitted to prove that the matter did not occur or exist;
  - (B) A record was regularly kept for a matter of that kind; and
  - (C) The opponent does not show that the possible source of information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.
- (8) **Public Records and Reports:**  
A record or statement of a public office if:
- (A) It sets out:
    - (i) The office's activities;
    - (ii) A matter observed while under a legal duty to report, but not including, in a criminal case, a matter observed by law-enforcement personnel; or
    - (iii) In a civil case or against the government in a criminal case, factual findings from a legally authorized investigation; and
  - (B) The opponent does not show that the source of information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.

(9) **Records of Vital Statistics:**  
A record of a birth, death, or marriage, if reported to a public office in accordance with a legal duty.

- (10) **Absence of a Public Record or Entry:**  
Testimony that a diligent search failed to disclose a public record or statement if the testimony or certification is admitted to prove that:
- (A) The record or statement does not exist; or
  - (B) A matter did not occur or exist, if a public office regularly kept a record or statement for a matter of that kind.

(11) **Records of Religious Organizations:**

Statements of births, marriages, divorces, deaths, legitimacy, ancestry, relationship by blood or marriage, or other similar facts of personal or family history, contained in a regularly kept record of a religious organization.

(12) **Omitted**

(13) **Family Records:**

Statements of facts concerning personal or family history contained in family Bibles, genealogies, charts, engravings on rings, inscriptions of family portraits, engravings on urns, crypts, or tombstones, or the like.

(14) **Omitted**

(15) **Omitted**

(16) **Statements in Ancient Documents:**

A statement in a document that is at least 20 years old and whose authenticity is established.

(17) **Omitted**

(18) **Statements in Learned Treatises, Periodicals, or Pamphlets:**

A statement contained in a treatise, periodical, or pamphlet 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.

(19) **Reputation Concerning Personal or Family History:**

Reputation among members of a person's family by blood, adoption, or marriage, or among a person's associates, or in the community, concerning a person's birth, adoption, marriage, divorce, death, legitimacy, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, ancestry, or other similar fact of personal or family history.

(20) **Omitted**

(21) **Reputation Concerning Character:**

A reputation among a person's associates or in the community concerning the person's character.

(22) **Judgment of a Previous Conviction:**

Evidence of a final judgment of conviction if:

- (A) The judgment was entered after a trial or guilty plea, but not a nolo contendere plea;
- (B) The conviction was for a crime punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than a year;
- (C) The evidence is admitted to prove any fact essential to the judgment; and
- (D) When offered by the prosecutor in a criminal case for a purpose other than impeachment, the judgment was against the defendant.

The pendency of an appeal may be shown, but does not affect admissibility.

(23) **Omitted**

Rule 804 Hearsay Exceptions; Declarant Unavailable

a. **Criteria for Being Unavailable.**

A **declarant** is considered to be unavailable as a witness if the declarant:

- (1) Is exempted from testifying about the subject matter of the declarant's statement because the court rules that a privilege applies;
- (2) Refuses to testify about the subject matter despite a court order to do so;
- (3) Testifies to not remembering the subject matter;
- (4) Cannot be present or testify at the trial or hearing because of death or a then-existing infirmity, physical illness, or mental illness; or
- (5) Is absent from the trial or hearing and the statement's proponent has not been able, by process or other reasonable means, to procure:
  - (A) The declarant's attendance, in the case of a hearsay exception under Rule 804(b)(1) or (6): or
  - (B) The declarant's attendance or testimony, in the case of a hearsay exception under Rule 804 (b)(2), (3), or (4).

But this subdivision (a) does not apply if the statement's proponent procured or wrongfully caused the declarant's unavailability as a witness in order to prevent the declarant from attending or testifying.

b. **The Exceptions:**

The following are not excluded by the rule against hearsay if the declarant is unavailable as a witness:

(1) **Former Testimony:** Testimony that:

- (A) Was given as a witness at a trial, hearing, or lawful deposition, whether given during the current proceeding or a different one; and

- (B) Is now offered against a party who had — or, in a civil case, whose predecessor in interest had — an opportunity and similar motive to develop it by direct, cross-, or redirect examination.
- (2) **Statement Under the Belief of Imminent Death:**  
In a prosecution for homicide or in a civil case, a statement that the declarant, while believing the declarant's death to be imminent, made about its cause or circumstances.
- (3) **Statement Against Interest:** A statement that:
  - (A) A reasonable person in the declarant's position would have made only if the person believed it to be true because, when made, it was so contrary to the declarant's proprietary or pecuniary interest or had so great a tendency to invalidate the declarant's claim against someone else or to expose the declarant to civil or criminal liability; and
  - (B) Is supported by corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate its trustworthiness, if it is offered in a criminal case as one that tends to expose the declarant to criminal liability.
- (4) **Statement of Personal or Family History:** A statement about:
  - (A) The declarant's own birth, adoption, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, or similar facts of personal or family history, even though the declarant had no way of acquiring personal knowledge about that fact; or
  - (B) Another person concerning any of these facts, as well as death, if the declarant was related to the person by blood, adoption, or marriage or was so intimately associated with the person's family that the declarant's information is likely to be accurate.
- (5) **Not Applicable**
- (6) **Statement Offered Against a Party That Wrongfully Caused the Declarant's Unavailability:**  
A statement offered against a party that wrongfully caused — or acquiesced in wrongfully causing — the declarant's unavailability as a witness, and did so intending that result.

Rule 805 Hearsay within Hearsay

Hearsay included within hearsay is not excluded by the rule against hearsay if each part of the combined statements conforms with an exception to the rule.

Rule 1103 Title

These rules came from the National High School Mock Trial Federal Rules of Evidence.

## ARTICLE IX – IMPROPER FORM OF QUESTION

### Rule 901 Assuming Facts Not in Evidence

An attorney shall not ask a question that assumes unproven facts. However, an expert witness may be asked a question based upon stated assumptions, the truth of which is reasonably supported by the evidence.

### Rule 902 Argumentative Questions

An attorney shall not ask a question that asks the witness to agree to a conclusion drawn by the question without eliciting testimony as to new facts; provided, however, that the Court may in its discretion allow limited use of argumentative questions on cross-examination.

### Rule 903 Ambiguous Questions

An attorney shall not ask questions that are capable of being understood in two or more possible ways.

### Rule 904 Lack of Proper Foundation

Exhibits are not to be admitted into evidence until they have been identified and shown to be authentic (unless identification and/or authenticity have been stipulated). Even after a proper foundation has been laid, the exhibits may still be objectionable due to relevance, hearsay, etc. "Authentic" means only that a document is what it appears to be, not that the statements contained in the document are necessarily true.

## PROCEDURE FOR OBJECTIONS

A student attorney may object at any time to challenge a piece of evidence that goes against the Mock Trial Rules of Evidence. The student attorney wishing to make the objection shall stand, if able, state "Objection, Your Honor." and state the basis for the objection. *Example, "Objection, your Honor. Relevance."* Attorneys may not make speaking objections or provide explanation unless requested by the presiding judge. *Example of a speaking objection not permitted, "Objection, your Honor. The question about ABC is not relevant because we are here today to determine XYZ and ABC is not relevant to that."*

When an objection is made, the presiding judge asks the objecting attorney to defend his/her objection. Then the presiding judge ordinarily provides the opposing student attorney an opportunity to defend why the question is proper or the evidence is admissible. After the opposing counsel has responded, there is no more argument on that objection unless requested by the presiding judge.

The presiding judge then decides whether the objection is "**Overruled**" or "**Sustained**." If an objection is overruled (thereby allowing the question to be answered or the answer to remain in the trial record), the objecting student attorney cannot "Move to Strike" the evidence from the record. If an objection is sustained (thereby disallowing the question or the answer), the objecting student attorney should "Move to Strike" as a way to remove harmful testimony from the record. (See [Rule 4.7 \(A\) Motions](#).)

**REMEMBER:** Winning or losing the ruling on an objection is not what is important, but rather how knowledgeable of the Rules of Evidence the team is and how each team reacts to the decisions of the presiding judge. What is important is the presentation of the objection and the opponent's response (both verbally and strategically) to the objection and to the Court's ruling.

Only the student attorney "responsible" for the particular witness may object. For instance, the student attorney who directly examines a witness objects when that witness is being cross-examined, and the student attorney who crosses a witness objects when that witness is being directly examined.

Following are examples of standard forms of objection:

1. **IRRELEVANT EVIDENCE**

2. **LEADING QUESTION**

(NOTE: Remember that an attorney may ask leading questions when cross-examining the opponent's witnesses.)

3. **IMPROPER CHARACTER TESTIMONY**

4. **HEARSAY**

(NOTE: If the witness makes a hearsay statement, the attorney shall say, "The witness' answer is based on hearsay, and I ask that the statement be stricken from the record.") In responding to a hearsay objection, it may be appropriate for counsel to point out a specific exception, or to argue that the hearsay rule does not apply: "Your Honor, the testimony is not offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, but only to show. . . ."

5. **OPINION**



# Index for Modified Rules of Evidence

Absence of a Public Record or Entry – Hearsay Exception, 70  
Absence of a Record of a Regularly Conducted Activity – Hearsay Exception, 70  
Ambiguous Questions, 74  
Argumentative Questions, 74  
Article 1 – General Provisions, 53  
Article 2 – General Provisions, 54  
Article – Presumptions in Civil Actions & Proceedings, 54  
Article 4 – Relevancy and Its Limits, 55  
Article 5 – Privileges, 59  
Article 6 – Witnesses, 59  
Article 7 – Opinions and Expert Testimony, 65  
Article 8 – Hearsay, 66  
Article 9 – Improper Form of Question – 74  
Assuming Facts Not in Evidence, 74  
Bailiff Opening Court Video Link, 59  
Bases of an Expert’s Opinion Testimony, 66  
Character – Exceptions for a Witness, 56  
Character Evidence – Exceptions for a Defendant or Victim in a Criminal Case, 55  
Character Evidence – Prohibited Uses, 55  
Character Evidence, 55  
Character Evidence; Crimes or Other Acts, 55  
Compromise and Offers to Compromise, 57  
Compromise and Offers to Compromise, Exceptions, 58  
Compromise and Offers to Compromise, Prohibited Uses, 57  
Conditional Admission, 54  
Control by Court; Purposes, 62  
Crimes, Wrongs or Other Acts – Permitted Uses, 56  
Crimes, Wrongs or Other Acts – Prohibited Uses, 56  
Crimes, Wrongs, or Other Acts, 56  
Criteria for Declarant Being Unavailable, 72  
Cross-Examination, 63  
Declarant – Witness’s Prior Statement, 67  
Declarant Being Unavailable Exceptions – Hearsay Exception, 72  
Declarant Unavailable Criteria - Hearsay Exception, 72  
Declarant, 66  
Definitions for Hearsay, 66  
Direct Examination, 62  
Disclosing the Facts or Data Underlying an Expert’s Opinion, 66  
Effect of a Pardon, Annulment, or Certificate of Rehabilitation, 61  
Evidence – Test for Relevant Evidence, 55  
Exception for Opinion and Expert Testimony, 66

Exceptions Against Hearsay – Regardless of Whether the Declarant Is Available as a Witness, 68  
Exceptions for a Defendant or Victim in a Criminal Case under Character Evidence, 55  
Exceptions for a Witness under Character Evidence, 56  
Exceptions for Declarant Being Unavailable – Hearsay Exception, 72  
Exceptions under Compromise and Offers to Compromise, 58  
Exceptions under Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements, 55  
Excited Utterance – Hearsay Exception, 69  
Excluding Relevant Evidence, 55  
Extrinsic Evidence of Prior Inconsistent Statement, 64  
Family Records – Hearsay Exception, 71  
Former Testimony – Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable, 72  
General Admissibility – Relevant Evidence, 55  
General Rule – Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction, 60  
General Rule – Privileges, 59  
General Rule of Witness Competency, 59  
Habit, Routine Practice, 57  
Hearsay Exception – Records of Regularly Conducted Activity, 69  
Hearsay – Declarant, 66  
Hearsay – Definitions, 66  
Hearsay – Public Records and Reports, 70  
Hearsay – Records of Vital Statistics, 70  
Hearsay – Statement, 66  
Hearsay – Statements That Are Not Hearsay, 67  
Hearsay Exception – Absence of a Public Record or Entry, 70  
Hearsay Exception – Absence of a Record of a Regularly Conducted Activity, 70  
Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable – Former Testimony, 72  
Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable – Statement Against Interest, 73  
Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable – Statement of Personal or Family History, 73  
Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable – Statement Offered Against a Party that Wrongfully Caused the Declarant's Unavailability, 73  
Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable – Statement Under the Belief of Imminent Death, 73  
Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable, 72  
Hearsay Exception – Excited Utterance, 69  
Hearsay Exception – Judgment of a Previous Conviction, 71  
Hearsay Exception – Present Sense Impression, 68  
Hearsay Exception – Recorded Recollection, 69  
Hearsay Exception – Records of Religious Organizations, 71  
Hearsay Exception – Reputation Concerning Character, 71  
Hearsay Exception – Reputation Concerning Personal or Family History, 71  
Hearsay Exception – Statements in Ancient Documents, 71  
Hearsay Exception – Statements in Learned Treatises, Periodicals or Pamphlets, 71  
Hearsay Exception – Statements Made for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment, 69  
Hearsay Exception – Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Condition, 69

Hearsay Exception – Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Conditions – Examples, 69  
Hearsay Exception – Family Records, 71  
Hearsay Exceptions – Declarant Unavailable, 72  
Hearsay Exceptions – Video Link, 68  
Hearsay Rule, 68  
Hearsay within Hearsay, 73  
Hearsay, 66  
Impeaching Examples Video Link, 60  
Impeachment – Effect of a Pardon, Annulment, or Certificate of Rehabilitation, 61  
Impeachment – General Rule, 60  
Impeachment – Juvenile Adjudications, 61  
Impeachment – Limit on Using the Evidence after 10 Years, 61  
Impeachment – Pendency of an Appeal, 61  
Impeachment – Who May Impeach, 60  
Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction, 60  
Judgment of a Previous Conviction – Hearsay Exception, 71  
Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts, 54  
Juvenile Adjudications, 61  
Lack of Proper Foundation, 74  
Leading Questions, 63  
Liability Insurance, 58  
Limit on Using the Evidence after 10 Years, 61  
Limited Admissibility, 54  
Methods of Proving Character – Specific Instances of Conduct, 57  
Methods of Proving Character, 57  
Methods of Proving Character – Reputation or Opinion, 57  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation – Control by Court; Purposes, 62  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation – Leading Questions, 63  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation – Permitted Motions, 63  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation – Redirect / Recross, 63  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation – Scope of Cross-Examination, 63  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation – Scope of Direct Examination, 62  
Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation, 62  
Need for Personal Knowledge, 59  
Oath or Affirmation, 59  
Objection Procedures, 75  
Offers to Pay Medical and Similar Expenses, 55  
Opinion and Expert Testimony – Disclosing the Facts or Data Underlying an Expert’s Opinion, 66  
Opinion and Expert Testimony – Exception, 66  
Opinion on Ultimate Issue, 66  
Opinion Testimony by Lay Witness, 65  
Opinions and Expert Testimony – Opinion on Ultimate Issue, 66  
Opinions and Expert Testimony – Opinion Testimony by Lay Witness, 65  
Opinions and Expert Testimony – Bases of an Expert’s Opinion Testimony, 66  
Opinions and Expert Testimony – In General – Not Automatically Objectionable, 66

Opions and Expert Testimony – Testimony by Experts, 65  
Opposing Party’s Statements, 67  
Pendency of an Appeal, 61  
Permitted Motions, 63  
Permitted Uses under Crimes, Wrongs or Other Acts, 56  
Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements – Exceptions, 55  
Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements – Prohibited Uses, 55  
Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements, 55  
Present Sense Impression – Hearsay Exception, 68  
Priveleges – General Rule, 59  
Procedures for Objections, 75  
Prohibited Uses under Character Evidence, 55  
Prohibited Uses under Compromise and Offers to Compromise, 57  
Prohibited Uses under Crimes, Wrongs or Other Acts, 56  
Prohibited Uses under Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements, 55  
Public Records and Reports – Hearsay Exception, 70  
Purpose and Construction, 53  
Recorded Recollection – Hearsay Exception, 69  
Records of Regularly Conducted Activity – Hearsay Exception, 69  
Records of Religious Organizations – Hearsay Exception, 71  
Records of Vital Statistics – Hearsay Exception, 70  
Recross, 63  
Redirect / Recross, 63  
Redirect, 63  
Relevant Evidence – Exclusions, 55  
Relevant Evidence – General Admissibility, 55  
Relevant Evidence Test, 55  
Religious Beliefs or Opinions, 61  
Remainder of Related Writings or Recorded Statements, 54  
Reputation Concerning Character – Hearsay Exception, 71  
Reputation Concerning Personal or Family History – Hearsay Exception, 71  
Reputation or Opinion Evidence, 60  
Reputation or Opinion under Methods of Proving Character, 57  
Rules – New 2018/19, 52  
Scope of Cross-Examination, 63  
Scope of Direct Examination, 62  
Scope, 53  
Showing or Disclosing the Statement During Examination, 64  
Specific Instances of Conduct under Methods of Proving Character, 57  
Specific Instances of Conduct, 60  
Statement Against Interest – Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable, 73  
Statement of Personal or Family History – Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable, 73  
Statement Offered Against a Party that Wrongfully Caused the Declarant's Unavailability - Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable, 73

Statement Under the Belief of Imminent Death – Hearsay Exception – Exception to Declarant Being Unavailable, 73

Statements in Ancient Documents – Hearsay Exception, 71

Statements in Learned Treatises, Periodicals or Pamphlets – Hearsay Exception, 71

Statements Made for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment – Hearsay Exception, 69

Statements That Are Not Hearsay – A Declarant – Witness’s Prior Statement, 67

Statements That Are Not Hearsay – An Opposing Party’s Statements, 67

Statements That Are Not Hearsay, 67

Subsequent Remedial Measures, 57

Test for Relevant Evidence, 55

Testimony by Experts, 65

Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Condition – Hearsay Exception, 69

Then Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Conditions – Examples, 69

Title, 73

Video Link – Bailiff Opening Court, 59

Video Link – Hearsay Exceptions, 68

Video Link – Impeaching Examples, 60

Who May Impeach, 60

Witness’s Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness, 60

Witness’s Prior Statement, 64

Witness's Prior Statement – Extrinsic Evidence of Prior Inconsistent Statement, 64

Witness's Prior Statement – Showing or Disclosing the Statement During Examination, 64

Writing Used to Refresh Memory, 64

