

CROSS-EXAMINATION SKILLS

Fred T. Friedman
Chief Public Defender
Sixth District
Minnesota
218/733-1027
218/733-1034 (fax)

CROSS-EXAMINATION PURPOSES

Cross-examination is the process of questioning an adverse party or witness. Cross-examination questions should be limited to those which reveal information necessary to support statements made in the closing argument. Cross-examination usually consists of narrow, leading questions calling for "yes" or "no" or specific answers. There are exceptions to this generalization which are most likely to occur during supportive cross-examination. Careful consideration must be given, however, before open-ended questions are asked on cross-examination.

Cross-examination serves two primary purposes:

Destructive Cross. Cross-examination can be used to discredit the testifying witness or another witness. This may be accomplished in several ways including attacking the credibility of the witness or testimony. Most of the questions asked on cross-examination will be designed to reduce the credibility or persuasive value of the opposition's evidence.

Supportive Cross. Cross-examination can be used to bolster evidence that supports the cross-examiner's theory of the case. Cross-examination may be used to independently develop favorable aspects of the case not developed on direct examination.

PREPARATION AND ORGANIZATION

A. Background. Full preparation, including knowledge of the facts, evidence, law opponent, and witness, will facilitate cross-examination. All available discovery and investigation techniques should be used to learn everything there is to know about the case.

B. Anticipation. Anticipation of the opponent's side of the case is essential. Considerations include what all the witnesses will testify to, how the other side will try the case,

how both sides of the case can be attacked, and what evidence can be kept out under the rules.

C. Scope of Cross-Examination. The scope of cross-examination is limited to questions involving the subject matter of the direct examination or the credibility of a witness. The outside limits of cross-examination fall within the discretion of the trial judge.

If an area of inquiry extends beyond the scope of direct and does not involve credibility, the cross-examiner has at least two options. The attorney can request the judge to permit a broader inquiry, or the attorney can call the witness to testify as an adverse or hostile witness during the presentation of the case in chief or during rebuttal.

D. Credibility. Factors involved in evaluating and attacking the credibility of a witness include bias, interest, association with the other side, motive, experience, accuracy, memory, demeanor, candor, style, manner of speaking, background, and intelligence. See Section 815.

The following areas should be considered when weighing the credibility of the testimony:

1. Is the testimony consistent with common sense?
2. Is the testimony consistent within itself?
3. Is the testimony consistent with other testimony presented in the case?
4. Is the testimony consistent with the established facts of the case?

E. Should there be a Cross-Examination? The most important decision in cross-examination is whether to cross-examine. The following should be weighed in making that determination:

1. Has the witness hurt the case?
2. Is the witness important to the other side?
3. Will the jury expect cross-examination?
4. Will it affect the case if no cross-examination is done?
5. Was the witness credible?
6. Did the witness leave something out on direct examination that might get in if there is cross-examination? Was the omission set up as a trap for the inexperienced cross-examiner?

7. Will cross-examination unavoidably bring out information that is harmful to the case?
8. Are questions being asked only for the sake of questions?
9. Does the witness know more than the attorney does about the case?
10. Will the witness be very difficult to control?
11. Has the witness been deposed or given statements?

F. Preparing Written Questions in Advance. Cross-examination is most effective when questions are prepared in advance. Most prepared questions will not be significantly altered during the trial, but an attorney must retain flexibility to adapt to new material or inconsistencies as they arise.

G. Structure. The areas selected for cross should be structured in a way that clearly shows their purpose and helps the fact-finder remember that point. The attorney should begin and end the cross with strong points.

H. Attention. Close attention to the witnesses on direct examination may reveal signs of deception, lack of assurance, or bluffing that can be explored on cross-examination. The attention shown by the jury or judge may also be a clue.

PRESENTATION AND DELIVERY

A. Confidence. A confident attitude will assist in making the cross-examination effective and persuasive.

B. Not Repeating Direct Examination. Generally, repetition of the direct examination only emphasizes the opponent's case. Repetition of any part of the direct that is supportive of the cross-examiner's case, however, may be effective and justify the use of an open-ended question.

C. Leading the Witness. Questions that suggest or contain the answer should be asked on cross. Questions that require "yes," "no," or short anticipated answers help control the witness, so the testimony develops as anticipated. The questions "why" and questions requiring explanations should be avoided because they call for uncontrolled open-ended answers.

D. Simple, Short Questions. Short, straightforward questions in simple, understandable language are most effective. Broad or

confused questions create problems of understanding for witnesses, attorneys, the jury, and the judge.

E. Factual Questions. Questions that seek an opinion or conclusory response may allow the witness to balk or explain an answer. Questions which include fact words and accurate information force the witness to admit the accuracy of the question.

F. Controlling the Witness. The most effective way to control a witness is to ask short factual questions. Some witnesses must be politely directed to respond; some witnesses may require the intervention and control of the judge.

G. Maintaining Composure. An attorney who displays a temper or argues with a witness may irritate the court and the jury, causing them to side with the witness or the opponent and may draw objections.

H. Adopting Appropriate Approach. Some witnesses may require righteous indignation, others may be attacked, but most need to be carefully and courteously led. A cross-examiner can be very effective by being politely assertive and persistent without having to attack a witness.

I. Stopping When Finished. When the planned questions are asked and the desired information is obtained, the attorney should stop. The case may be harmed more by asking too many questions than by not asking enough.

J. Good Faith Basis. An attorney cannot ask a question on cross unless the attorney has proof of the underlying facts. An attorney cannot fabricate innuendos or inferences on cross-examination. The attorney must have a good faith basis which includes some proof of such facts.

K. Witnesses Requiring Special Consideration. Certain witnesses require special consideration in both the formulation and delivery of questions. These witnesses include children, relatives, spouses, experienced witnesses, investigators, experts, the aged, the handicapped, and those with communication problems. Outside resources may be used to assist in developing tactics to deal with special witnesses.

EXPERT WITNESSES

Areas for cross-examination of experts parallel areas for lay witnesses and permit additional areas of inquiry regarding:

1. Their fees
2. The number of times they have testified before
3. Whether they routinely testify for the plaintiff or defendant
4. Their failure to conduct all possible tests
5. The biased source of their information
6. Their lack of information
7. The existence of other possible causes or opinions
8. The use of a treatise to impeach

The cross-examiner must develop absolute mastery of the expert's field before examining the expert in a specific area. A well-constructed concise hypothetical question may be effective if it elicits an opinion contrary to the testimony on direct examination.

IMPEACHMENT

A. Factors. Impeachment discredits the witness or the testimony. To evaluate whether impeachment is appropriate, the following should be considered:

1. How unfavorable is the testimony and how much did it hurt the case?
2. Will impeachment be successful?
3. Is there a sound basis for impeachment and can it be accomplished?
4. Is the impeachment material relevant to the facts or the credibility of the witness?
5. Is the impeachment material within the court's discretion and not too remote or collateral?

B. Sources of Impeachment. The credibility of a witness may be attacked in any number of ways. Many witnesses, however, will not have obvious or apparent weaknesses in their testimony. The following factors represent the more common and frequent matters employed to reduce the credibility of a witness.

1. *Misunderstanding of Oath.* The witness may not understand the oath or know the difference between telling the truth and telling a lie. This situation rarely arises.
2. *Lack of Perception.* The witness may not have actually observed the event, or the witness may have perceived something through the senses (sight, taste, hearing, smell or touch). It can be shown that conditions were not favorable to that perception.
3. *Lack of Memory.* The witness may not have a sound, independent memory of what was observed.
4. *Lack of Communication.* The witness may be unable to adequately communicate what was perceived.
5. *Bias, Prejudice, or Interest.* The witness may have a personal, financial, philosophical, or emotional stake in the trial.
6. *Prior Criminal Record.* The witness may have a prior criminal conviction which may be admissible. See Fed.R.Evid. 609. Local law and practice may limit the use of the information.
7. *Prior Bad Acts.* The testimony concerning a witness' prior bad conduct may sometimes be used to impeach a witness if it is probative of untruthfulness.
8. *Character Evidence.* A witness may be impeached by a character witness who is familiar with the reputation of the witness for truth and veracity or who has an opinion regarding the truthfulness of the witness. See Fed. R. Evid. 608(a).
9. *Prior Inconsistent Statements or Omissions.* The witness may have made former contradictory or inconsistent oral statements or may have omitted some facts during previous testimony or in a prior statement. If the witness denies these prior statements, a copy of the statement or another witness may be needed to prove them.

C. Extrinsic Evidence and Collateral Matters. An attorney may be able to introduce extrinsic evidence if a witness denies a cross-examination impeachment question. Extrinsic evidence is evidence introduced through a source other than the witness, such as another witness or document. Whether extrinsic evidence is admissible depends on whether the facts are "collateral" or "non-collateral" to the case. A matter is collateral and not admissible if it has no connection to the case. A matter is non-collateral and admissible if it has a relationship to the case.

D. Use of Inconsistent Statements for Impeachment. The statements must be inconsistent or contradictory to be used. The document referred to must be available to prove the

inconsistency. Federal Rule of Evidence 613 provides the option of not showing the prior statement to the witness, but this option may be altered by tactical considerations or by local rule or practice.

The introduction of prior inconsistent statements or omissions usually include three phases:

1. The cross-examiner commits the witness to the direct examination testimony. This may be done by having the witness repeat the testimony to reaffirm the evidence.

2. The cross-examiner next leads the witness through a series of questions describing the circumstances and setting of the prior inconsistent statement.

3. The cross-examiner then introduces the prior inconsistency. This may be done in several ways. The attorney may read from the prior statement or have the witness read it.

A fourth possible stage involves the attorney exploring both statements with the witness, but this may provide the witness with a chance to explain the discrepancy.

If the witness admits the prior statement, the impeachment process is concluded. If the witness denies the prior statement, the exhibit should be marked, identified, and offered as evidence. Proper foundation must be laid for its admission.

The opposing lawyer can request that other portions of the prior statement be introduced contemporaneously with the impeaching testimony to prevent a cross-examiner from introducing selective facts out of context. See Fed. R. Evid. 106. On redirect the opposing lawyer will usually have the witness explain or clarify any discrepancy or rehabilitate the witness with a prior consistent statement, if available. See Fed.R.Evid.801(d)(1)(B).

e. Cross-examination of Character Witness. Character witnesses may be impeached like any other witness. They may also be cross-examined regarding their knowledge of specific instances of bad conduct by the person whose character they praised. Some jurisdictions limit the specific acts of areas that are probative of the untruthfulness of the person. See Fed.R.Evid.608(b).

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS--THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Irving Younger's Ten Commandments for cross-examination are worth remembering:

1. Be brief
2. Ask short questions and use plain words

3. Never ask anything but a leading question
4. Ask only questions to which you already know the answers
5. Listen to the answer
6. Do not quarrel with the witness
7. Do not permit a witness on cross-examination to simply repeat what the witness said on direct examination
8. Never permit the witness to explain anything
9. Avoid one question too many
10. Save it for summation

These suggestions will not be applicable to all cases and all situations. The cross-examiner who has a legitimate reason for asking a question - whether or not that reason "violates" one of the ten commandments - will conduct an effective cross-examination.

AVOIDING MISTRIALS AND REVERSALS

A. Do Not Harass or Embarrass the Witness. Using accusatory questions to seek answers that would harass or embarrass witnesses, even though true, and which are irrelevant to the issues in the case is unethical. DR 7-106(C)(1),(2); Model Rule 3.4; see also Fed R.Evid.611(b). For example, in a motor vehicle accident case, defense counsel bringing out that the plaintiff's child is illegitimate is unethical.

B. Avoid Innuendoes Based on Untrue Facts. Since the lawyer is allowed to use leading questions during cross-examination, there is a great opportunity for abuse. Questions might be asked which discredit a witness before the witness even answers. This can be accomplished by sneers and innuendoes as well as by asking questions that the lawyer knows cannot be proved by any evidence.

C. Do Not Elicit Irrelevant and Prejudicial Responses. Other questioning may not be harassing or damaging to a particular witness, but may be irrelevant and so prejudicial as to warrant a new trial. For example, in a wrongful death action, it is unethical for the plaintiff's attorney to ask the defendant's expert witness if he didn't say to the plaintiff's attorney, off the record during the deposition, that plaintiff's attorney "had a good case and knew it."

