

BASIC EVIDENCE PROCEDURES

Thomas K Maher
Rudolf Maher Widenhouse & Fialko
312 West Franklin Street
Chapel Hill, N.C.

A. He Who Hesitates Is Lost, or at Least Overruled.

Judges are required to make rulings on the admissibility of scores of items of evidence during the course of every trial. They are making these rulings without the factual knowledge of the case that the trial lawyers possess, and not every judge was elevated to the bench based upon their knowledge of the rules of evidence. As a result, some judges look to the lawyers for input on evidentiary rulings. Lawyers who can quickly, and confidently, state the basis for the admissibility of a piece of evidence are more likely to prevail on a contested point than a lawyer who seems hesitant or unsure about the admissibility of their evidence. A lawyer who has demonstrated that they are prepared on both the law and the facts will be more likely to prevail than a lawyer who is not, and this is true regardless of the actual merits of the contested evidence.

This boils down to two simple, but important, points. Be prepared and act as if you know what you are doing. The second is easier to accomplish if you have done the first. Doing the first requires knowing the facts of your case before trial starts, and giving some serious thought to the evidentiary issues that may arise. You need to anticipate the evidence that will be offered by the other side, and determine what legitimate evidentiary

objections you want to make. The harder part is analyzing your own evidence and determining what objections will be made by the prosecution, and being prepared to defend the introduction of your evidence. When you have the luxury of properly preparing your case, you should have a written outline of every witness you expect to testify, and in the margins you should cite the Rule of Evidence that supports your position, or case, for every issue in which there is likely to be a contest of admissibility. You should also make sure you have written down the foundation questions for areas - such as character evidence or contested hearsay - that you intend to introduce. Do not rely solely on your memory. Finally, if you have a case that actually supports your position, make copies and be prepared to hand them up to the judge. State trial judges do not have law clerks, and most truly appreciate getting the legal basis for your position.

Acting as if you know what you are doing is important. Many judges gauge the merits of your argument in part by how strongly you appear to believe what you are saying. An objection that begins :”For the record, I would like to object.....” might as well be phrased “I know I am wrong, but to preserve every possible appellate issue I am moving my lips...” A firm objection, followed by a citation to a rule, is much more likely to be taken seriously. Finally, do not talk yourself into having strategic reasons for not arguing evidentiary points; if you do not object, you will never hear the lovely word “sustained,” and if you do not offer your evidence, you will never experience the joy of getting in evidence over objection.

B. The Often Overlooked Rule 1101(b)(1)

One of the Rules of Evidence that is often overlooked is Rule 1101(b)(1), which provides that the Rules of Evidence do not apply to: “The determination of questions of fact preliminary to the admissibility of evidence when the issue is to be determined by the court under Rule 104(a).” Rule 104(a) repeats the admonition that the Rules of Evidence do not apply to the court’s consideration of facts relied upon in determining the admissibility of evidence, with the exception of rules relating to privilege. So, in offering evidence, or contesting evidence, the preliminary facts that you are relying upon to make your point need not be proved by admissible evidence. Obviously, the more reliable your facts, the more persuasive they will be, but you are not constrained by the Rules of Evidence.

C. Getting to “Sustained”; objecting to the State’s Evidence.

Let’s face facts, we are not Perry Mason and we seldom win cases through our presentation of irrefutable evidence of our client’s innocence. We win cases by raising a reasonable doubt about the State’s case, and by ensuring that the State’s case does not contain unreliable or unfairly inflammatory evidence. Evidence that may lead an officer to arrest, or your friends and neighbors to assume your client is guilty after reading a news account, is not necessarily admissible at trial. It is your job to keep the jury from hearing that evidence. The purpose of this paper is not to discuss the substantive law governing the admissibility of evidence, but rather the procedures by which you raise

evidentiary issues.¹

The discussion is geared principally toward jury trials in superior court. District courts, at least nominally, follow the Rules of Evidence. However, there is seldom a good reason for using tools such as a motion in limine in a district court trial, and in cases in which you have a right to a jury trial in superior court in the unlikely event that you lose, there is no need to worry about preserving evidentiary issues for later review. Rules governing the making of objections during trial still apply, although with less formality.

I. Pre-Trial: The Motion in Limine

Serious evidentiary issues can be raised prior to trial by way of a pre-trial motion in limine. A motion in limine is typically aimed at excluding evidence, although nothing prevents a motion being filed seeking a ruling prior to trial that certain evidence is admissible. There is no magic form to a motion in limine, nor is there any requirement that a motion be filed to preserve your right to object to the evidence at trial.²

There are benefits and risks to filing in limine motions. The principal benefits are that you are likely to get a more educated ruling from the trial court, and that you can adjust your trial strategy to fit the ruling. The principal risk is that you are likely to get a more educated response from the prosecution, and they can adjust their trial strategy to fit

¹ A useful book that gives coverage of most issues relating to the admissibility of most evidence is *Admissibility of Evidence in North Carolina*, by Adrienne Fox.

² In this regard, I am limiting myself to motions based upon the Rules of Evidence, and not upon violations of your client's constitutional rights. Motions to suppress must be filed according to the rules governing those issues.

the ruling.

In determining whether to file a motion in limine you should consider whether the contested evidence is such that the parties truly need a pre-trial ruling in order to adjust their opening statements and trial preparation. Not every contested item of evidence merits a pre-trial hearing.

Having chosen to litigate the issue prior to trial, your job is to draft a motion and be prepared to argue the point in a manner that educates the court as to the significant facts and law that govern the admissibility of the evidence. A motion that simply states what the evidence is that you wish to exclude, and which cites a Rule, but which contains no analysis is not likely to get you very far. Be prepared, either in the motion or in the hearing, to lay out the relevant factual background and legal basis for your argument. One of the significant benefits of a pre-trial hearing is a more considered ruling, but this will only happen if you take the time to educate the court. In addition, should the issue go up on appeal, a detailed and educated motion that is overruled is likely to get a more considered review than a boilerplate motion.

A final caution about motions in limine. Do not rely upon a pre-trial ruling to preserve your issue for appeal. First, should there be additional grounds for objection that come to light at trial, you need to assert them to preserve them. For example, a Rule 403 objection that is denied pre-trial cannot preserve a hearsay objection to the same evidence that should have been made at trial. Second, unlike the federal rules, the Rules of Evidence in North Carolina do not count a pre-trial ruling as sufficient to preserve an

objection for appeal.³ To preserve the issue for appeal, you must renew your objection at trial, and if the pre-trial ruling was one that excluded evidence, you must renew your offer of the evidence. If you are going to rely on the trial court granting you a continuing objection to a line of questions, make sure that you are abundantly clear the scope of your objection. Second, make sure that when the same issue arises in the testimony of another witness, or even another portion of that witness's testimony, that you renew your objection. The appellate courts are quick to point out when an objection to improperly admitted evidence is waived by failure to object to the same evidence from another source.

II. At Trial: Convincing the Court and Preserving The Appeal

The first rule is to object when the question is asked or evidence offered. The second rule is to move to strike when the answer is inadmissible, even when the question was proper. Silence will not convince a trial court on its own to exclude evidence, particularly the State's evidence, and will make winning the point on appeal near impossible.

The applicable Rules are 103 and 105. Rule 103(a)(1) states that an erroneous ruling may not be grounds for relief unless a "timely objection or motion to strike appears of record, stating the specific ground of objection, if the specific ground was not apparent

³ Rule 103 of the Federal Rules specifically includes definitive rules prior to trial as sufficient to preserve the issue for appeal.

from the context.” Rule 105 provides that: “When evidence which is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the court, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.”

The best objection is one that contains the specific ground for the objection, such as “Objection, hearsay.” If, in fact, the evidence is inadmissible hearsay, you have properly made the objection. The next best is a simple “objection,” as one can always argue on appeal that the basis of the objection was apparent from the context. The worst is the objection that assigns the wrong reason for the objection, as the trial court will rule based upon that ground and the appellate court will generally review only whether the trial court improperly ruled on the reason that was given. If there is more than one ground for your objection, state all of them.

When the objection legitimately requires some explanation or argument, request to approach the bench so that you can fully explain the context of your objection. If this request is denied, make sure you nonetheless state the basis for your objection with sufficient clarity that it can be reviewed if there is a conviction.

Rule 105 requires that a jury be instructed on the limited use of evidence when an appropriate objection is made. So, if you believe that evidence is admissible, but only for a limited purpose, you should object and request a limiting instruction. If you fail to make the objection, in the belief that the jury will not understand the instruction or the belief that everyone will inherently understand the proper purpose of the evidence, you

will have transformed evidence with limited value into evidence that is admissible for all purposes.

When the trial court is faced with an objection to your evidence, you should make clear the basis for admissibility; for example, if evidence of an out-of-court statement is being offered for a non-hearsay purpose, identify that purpose. The biggest stumbling block in reviewing the erroneous exclusion of evidence is the failure to make an adequate offer of proof. Rule 103(a)(2) requires that “the substance of the evidence was made known to the court by offer or was apparent from the context within which the questions were asked.” The most appropriate time for making an offer of proof is while the witness from whom the testimony is sought is on the stand, and can be questioned out of the hearing of the jury. Do not delay making an offer of proof until after the witness has left unless the court has given you permission to do so while the witness is available.

III. Laying Foundation

There are categories of evidence that require foundation to be laid before they become admissible. For example, physical evidence and photographs, diagrams and other visual means of conveying information to a jury must have some foundation laid before they are admissible. There is no magic incantation that needs to be recited; rather, you need to show that the item is what it purports to be and that it is relevant. In the case of substantive exhibits - meaning anything that is not merely illustrative - you need to establish that the item is what it purports to be and that it is relevant. This last point

usually means establishing that the item has not changed in any significant way. For example, a knife that is relevant due to the size and shape of the blade would be admissible even if cleaned since it was used, while a knife that is relevant because of the location of blood stains would only be admissible if the stains were still in the same condition as they were at the time of the events. Illustrative evidence need only be shown to be a fair and accurate illustration of the item in question, and to be relevant.

The principal Rule governing foundation issues for physical evidence is Rule 901, which simply states that “[t]he requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in question is what its proponent claims.” The Rule then, helpfully, provides 10 non-exclusive examples, including “[t]estimony that a matter is what it is claimed to be.”

There is no exhaustive list of the items that need to be authenticated, or the means of authentication that should work. However, several types of evidence come up with sufficient frequency that they merit some discussion.

Photographs: If the relevance depends upon the content of the photograph being a fair representation of a person or scene, then testimony from someone with knowledge sufficient to state that the photographs are a fair and accurate representation of the event or person. A “staged” photograph may still be admissible as illustrative, rather than substantive evidence. There is no need to call the photographer. Some photographs are relevant because they were found in a given location, such as a photograph of a

spouse in a compromising position that the State alleges was the motive for a murder. In such a case the issue is not the accuracy of what the photograph depicts, but rather whether the defendant in fact saw the photograph.

Handwriting: Obviously an expert can be used to identify handwriting as belonging to a given person, but so can anyone with familiarity with the person's handwriting. In addition, the jury can be allowed to make their own comparison if there is a known sample of the person's handwriting.

Identity of Person on Telephone: It is enough for one party to identify the other's voice; it is also enough if the caller identifies themselves or discusses fact that would only be known to a given person. Other circumstantial facts may also be used to identify a caller.

Tape recordings: It is enough that someone involved in conversation that is recorded testify that they have listened to the tape and that it accurately recorded the conversation. The witness must be able to testify that there have been no changes, additions or deletions. To authenticate a transcript the witness must also testify that they have compared the transcript to the tape and that it is accurate.

Diagrams etc: Diagrams, other pieces of evidence that have been created for the purpose of illustrating a place or event, need testimony that they fairly and accurately portray the place or event. This would include police sketches or composite drawings of a suspect. Generally, issues as to the degree to which an exhibit is a fair and accurate depiction of a subject goes to its weight and not its admissibility.

Rule 1001 requires that the “original” of a writing, recording or photograph be used. An original of a writing or recording is the writing or recording itself or any counterpart intended to have the same effect. Printouts from a computer are considered originals. Any print made from a negative is an original of a photograph. Under Rule 1003 duplicates are also admissible unless genuine issue is raised as to the authenticity of the original or the circumstances render it unfair to admit the duplicate in lieu of the original.

There are situations in which a witness’s live testimony must also be supported by some manner of foundation. Experts must be shown to be experts, character witnesses must be shown to have sufficient knowledge of the reputation or character of the person. In laying the foundation, as the proponent of the evidence, the foundation should be built into the direct testimony. You want the jury to understand the expert’s education, experience etc, and you want the jury to give some weight to the character testimony.

In cases in which you are the opponent of the physical evidence, or live testimony, that you believe is not supported by adequate foundation, you should object before the evidence is admitted, and if need be ask to voir dire the witness. If your voir dire is one that you do not wish the jury to hear, you should ask to conduct the voir dire outside the presence of the jury. When given the chance to voir dire the witness who is being used to lay the foundation, use your time wisely. Questions directed to the adequacy of the foundation will not try the patience of the court, questions that appear to be a fishing expedition may result in your voir being cut short.

