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1 Professor of Law (Emeritus) UCLA Law School
Index: The letter indicates the author section; the number indicates the item number within that section.

Rule 102: Theory and Interpretation:
Interpretation: N-11; S-40; S-41; C-144: I-94; I-161; J-30; J-39; L-60.

Erie & Choice of Law: F-123; H-100; M-72; M-117; V-13; W-71; W-92.

Theory: A-2 (The Principles of Evidence); A-34(proposal for evidence rules); A-35 (the complexity of legal knowledge); A-43(the Narrative Fallacy); A-46 (judicial management of factual uncertainty) ; A-49 (the myth of the law-fact distinction) ; A-50(naturalized epistemology); A-52(common sense, rationality, and the legal process); A-54(two aspects of law and theory); A-55 (truth and its rivals); A-57 (factual ambiguity and a theory of evidence); A-61(the nature of juridical proof); A-66 (reconceptualization of civil trials); A-77(analyzing codifications); A-78(doctrine and rationality in the Supreme Court) ; A-79(the process of proof); A-80(rationality, mythology, and the acceptance of jury verdicts); A-81(theory of the right to jury trial); A-83 (state of mind needed for juridical verdicts); A-89(rules, logic, and judgment); A-90(probability and proof); B-89; (oral versus textual reasoning): B-134(the modern trial and evidence law); B-136 (why evidence law lacks credibility); B-139 (ethics, evidence, and the modern adversary system); B-202 (Catholic legal thought and legal realism); B-206 (an empirical study of the psychology of the rules of evidence); B-254 (learning the wrong lessons from An American Tragedy); C-91(detection and correction of case publication bias); C-100 (forensics, meteorites, and chicken soup); C-129(the Nuremberg trials, American jurisprudence, legal realism, and natural law); E-13 (unnecessary problems of proof); F-87(the nature of legal evidence) ; G-87 (the three commandments of amending the Federal Rules of Evidence); G-147 (What's the matter with evidence); H-108(It will be pleasanter to tell you a story); I-34 (how to read the Federal Rules of Evidence); I-73(the search for substantive accuracy); I-103 (the relativity of reliability); I-186 (the Worst Evidence Principle); J-31(biased evidence rules); J-35(making the law matter); L-1(relationship between evidentiary principles and the problem of proof); L-28(are the Federal Rules of evidence dynamite?); L-29 (the rules of evidence and the jury); L-31(the reconceptualization of evidence law); L-34(the decline of the adversary system
and the rules of evidence); L-76 The New Evidence Scholarship); L-78 (comparative study of Austrian and New York law); L-97 (presuppositions of evidence law); M-142 (tools or obstacles?); M-151 (beyond the Rules); M-160 (mapping rules); M-180 (basic concepts); M-193 (and Rationality); M-197 (choice of law); M-201 (the jury and the rules); M-252 (popular justice); N-5 (epistemology); N-26 (acceptability of verdicts); N-40 (juries and evidence); N-44 (epistemology); N-46 (theory); P-10 (perspectives on evidence); P-14 (an outsider’s view); P-87 (and language); R-12 (Innocence and rationality); R-33 (rationality and rationalism); R-84 (rationality and reform); R-125 (Critical Race Theory of evidence); S-36 (amending the Rules); S-38 (evidence as pragmatic rhetoric); S-42 (and legal rhetoric); S-47 (jury as cause of rules); S-85 (Erie); S-110 (economic analysis); S-217 (Erie); S-222 (The New Doctrinalism); S-223 (refoundation of); S-256 (and the decline of jury trial); S-264 (and extra-legal materials); S-268 (truth and proof); S-273; S-289 (aspirational optimism); S-290 (rival claims to truth); S-292 (does it matter who runs evidence law?); T-15 (and feminism); T-50 (sports and war metaphors matter); T-53 (and intellectual history); T-57 (and new theories of mind); W-139 (invasion of the jury); W-142 (practical evidence); W-144 (the future);

**Rule 103 Objections and Offers of Proof:** A-118; B-28; B-153; B-154; B-157; B-261; C-2; C-88; C-89; C-106; C-109; C-110; C-148; C-155; D-20; D-45; E-35; G-3; G-9; G-64; G-90; G-140; G-145; H-62; H-127; I-62; I-80; I-121; I-149; I-151; J-5; J-23; L-6; L-15; L-16; L-22; L-95; M-10; M-13; M-52; M-89; M-277; N-35; P-46; P-74; P-80; R-81; R-150; S-19; S-26; S-138; S-203; T-67; V-12; W-19; W-66; W-86; W-111; W-137; W-141;

**Rule 104: Preliminary Facts:** A-60; B-18; B-32; C-7; E-15; F-31; G-22; I-91; I-145; I-227; L-52; M-6; M-7; M-13; M-199; N-8; S-22; S-93; T-33; W-16; W-17;

**Rule 105: Limited Admissibility:** B-145; C-12; G-12; G-29; G-33; H-2; H-3; I-216; M-13; M-22; M-140;

**Rule 106: Completeness:** C-183; M-13; N-6; N-7;

**Comment & Summing Up:** F-96; F-48; L-100; L-172;

**Rule 201: Judicial Notice:** A-107; B-63; B-273; C-201; C-181; C-224; D-17; D-24; D-26; D-27; D-28; D-53; E-16; F-46; F-100; G-38; G-148; H-50; H-53; H-69; I-249; J-20; L-42; L-54; L-107; M-11; M-12; M-15; M-62; M-107; M-121; M-150; M-153; M-155; M-207; N-47; N-48; O-17; P-47; R-100; R-105; R-108; R-109; R-171; S-67; S-68; S-73; S-109; S-168; S-265; T-36; T-83; W-1; W-28; W-44; W-65; W-133; Y-6;

**Rule 301: Burden of Proof and Presumptions:** A-1; A-3; A-28; A-36; A-45; A-48; A-51; A-53; A-74; A-86; A-92; A-120; A-124; B-17; B-33; B-39; B-40; B-67; B-85; B-108; B-127; B-160; B-201; B-212; B-216; B-218; B-222; C-53; C-82; C-92; C-93; C-99; C-101; C-138; C-153; C-182; D-46; D-95; D-104; E-10; F-20; F-42; F-43; F-50; F-71; F-88; F-146; G-28; G-31; G-32; G-40; G-152; G-173; H-8; H-9; H-24; H-39; H-49;
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H-66; H-76; H-118; H-129; H-148; J-8; J-11; J-19; J-20. L-5; L-35; L-41; L-53; L-55; L-61; L-96; L-104; L-126; L-150; L-160; M-30; M-59; M-60; M-61; M-65; M-79; M-85; M-106; M-140; M-189; M-190; M-200; M-203; M-204; M-205; M-206; M-210; M-213; M-215; M-217; M-264; N-4; N-9; N-32; N-43; O-31; O-36; O-37; P-4; P-36; P-88; R-27; R-29; R-31; R-96; R-107; R-148; R-162; S-10; S-49; S-108; S-131; S-133; S-136; S-168; S-180; S-188; S-231; S-239; S-253; S-276; S-278; S-280; T-5; T-34; T-35; T-77; U-6; W-14; W-15; W-97; W-102; W-108;

Rule 303*: Criminal Presumptions: A-12; A-29; A-44; A-68; A-71; A-72; A-75; A-82; B-99; C-73; C-74; C-124; D-103; F-98; F-131; G-21; G-150; H-44; H-88; H-126; H-143; I-112; L-169; L-171; M-44; M-102; M-281; N-27; N-28; N-31; O-42; O-47; P-73; R-19; R-90; R-98; S-7; S-58; S-69; S-117; S-187; S-192; T-47; T-85; U-5; W-5; W-40; W-121; Y-14;

Rule 401: Relevance: A-62(evidence, inference, and rules in constitutional adjudication); A-95 (beyond King Solomon’s harlots; misogyny in relevance); A-102 (evidence, inference, and rules in constitutional adjudication); B-152 (narrative relevance); B-189 (Mississippi law); B-237; C-6 (negative evidence); C-13 (undisputed evidence); C-57; C-214 (irrelevant evidence); F-105 (relevance theory); F-116 (relevance theory); G-96 (inferential error); G-168 (generally); H-73 (and cognitive psychology); H-84 (Texas law); H-99 (in labor arbitration); H-138 (meaning of “evidence”); J-12 (and probability); L-11 (how determined); L-44 (stories v. Theories); O-34 (in federal common law); R-14 (subjectivity of); S-55 (As a dual concept); S-156 (unraveled); S-178 (Financial Privacy Act); S-246 (and probability); T-68 (logical or legal?); T-69 (how determined); W-91 (ritual and relevance); and

Absence of Evidence: I-59; N-10; S-16; T-44;

Accident Reconstruction Testimony: I-146;

Animal Behavior: I-8;

Arson Cases: I-182; I-185;

Bite-mark evidence: C-114; I-6;

Blood Tests: E-22; I-30; I-61;

Blood Spatter Evidence: I-123;

Bullet Lead Identification: F-55; I-107;

Circumstantial Evidence: S-114; W-124; Z-5;

Comparison Evidence in Obscenity Trials: L-79;

Computers: G-5; H-80; I-13; I-24; I-31; I-41; J-15; J-23; M-120;
CSI syndrome: I-54;

Customary Political Practices: I-192;

Demeanor Evidence: I-220; S-6; W-64;

Demonstrative evidence: B-59; B-60; B-61; B-164; B-188; C-2; D-70; E-24; F-147; G-107; G-127; H-38; H-68; M-97; M-157; M-183; P-42; S-106; S-195; T-1; T-56;

Dog Evidence: G-30; O-49; T-21;

Double Counting: M-244;

DNA evidence: A-7; C-86; C-102; C-112; C-113; I-119; I-124; L-177; R-146; W-82; W-117;

Dreams: S-163;

Drug Evidence: I-72; I-215; I-223;

Etiology: I-99;

Explosives: I-22;

Extrapolation Testimony in DUI cases: I-141;

Eye-witness Identification: M-105;

Fingerprints: C-114; C-158, C-160; C-161; E-34; I-50; I-67; I-81; I-82; J-40; J-44; L-177; M-55;

Forensic Entomology: I-69;

Forensic Pathology: I-94 (cause of death);

Glass evidence: I-102;

Government Evidence: M-235;

Hair Analysis: I-193; I-230;

Handwriting Comparison: I-137; I-243; R-95;
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High-tech evidence: A-126;

Hypnotism: A-31; B-22; B-228; D-9; D-57; H-86; L-18; L-105; L-116; S-196; T-25; T-28; W-24;

Intoxication tests: I-52; T-30; W-27;

Judicial admissions: W-9;

“Junk Science”: H-114; I-97;

Jury Views: H-33; H-34; W-78;

Law Enforcement Sponsored Research: R-82;

Lie detectors: A-4; A-10; A-114; B-29; B-46; B-66; B-174; B-184; B-193; B-225; B-236; B-241; C-3; C-66; C-177; C-221; D-1; D-52; F-10; F-45; F-85; F-86; F-148; G-57; G-171; H-35; H-40; H-43; H-97; H-134; H-135; H-136; I-106; I-148; I-240; I-241; I-242; L-24; L-63; L-92; L-114; M-80; M-130; O-6; P-39; P-56; R-1; R-22; R-44; R-49; R-149; S-8; S-46; S-98; S-103; S-132; S-149; S-183; S-229; S-238; S-281; T-13; T-75; W-107; W-114;

Math & statistics: A-42; A-91; B-31; B-54; B-87; B-190; B-211; B-224; C-79; C-155; C-225; D-29; E-9; E-29; F-8; F-53; H-15; I-74; J-4; L-127; M-71; S-54; S-209; S-271; T-73; W-116; W-136;

Medical Imaging Technology: J-9;

Non-Expert Scientific Testimony: I-159;

Other Incidents: F-117; H-36; H-37; I-207; S-2;

Paint Evidence: I-138;

Paternity Tests: J-6; L-44; I-75;

Palynology: I-89;

Persuasion Science: S-212;

Photographs: M-164;

Plant and Water Analysis: I-95;

Profiles and Syndrome Evidence: M-75; M-182; M-252; P-77;
PSA evidence: I-71;

Punitive damages: C-213;

Real Proof: G-151; I-51; I-90; I-238; L-62; M-136;

Safety History: M-222;

Scanning Electron Microscopy: I-172;

Scientific evidence: B-74; B-107; B-116; B-128; B-178; B-245; B-258; B-259; B-262; B-264; B-269; C-47; C-84; C-94; C-96; C-98; C-103; C-104; C-105; C-107; C-108; C-111; C-117; D-47; D-48; F-6; F-29; F-51; F-59; G-52; G-56; G-59; G-60; G-62; G-122; H-27; H-29; H-31; H-41; H-114; I-3; I-4; I-5; I-11; I-15; I-23; I-42; I-44; I-46; I-77; I-79; I-125; I-157; I-180; I-203; I-209; I-211; I-213; I-229; I-232; J-2; L-2; L-58; L-144; M-42; M-47; M-77; M-165; M-170; M-273; O-38; R-99; R-122; R-173; S-217; S-275; T-6; T-17; W-105;

Shaken baby syndrome: I-58;

Spoliation: D-8; G-181; H-65; H-79; I-96; M-9; S-189; W-79;

Sports violence prosecutions: L-93;

Stipulations: I-228; M-64.

Survey Evidence: Z-9;

Suspect categories: C-189 (wealth or poverty);

Thermography: P-48;

Third-party perpetrator evidence: I-14; M-68;

Tort claim “racket”: M-175;

Toxicology: I-173 (poisons);

Time of Death Determinations: I-174;

Voiceprints: D-40; W-60;

Rule 402: Constitutional, statutory, or exceptions found in other rules: Compulsory Process: H-113; W-87; W-88.
Due Process; A-16; A-58; A-67A-69; A-70; A-96
Double Jeopardy: A-84.
Fifth Amendment: B-1; B-2; B-232; C-130; G-27; H-70;
Separation of Powers: B-111 (in rule-making);
Sixth Amendment: C-132; C-147; I-195; I-201; I-202; I-237;
Right to Public Trial: R-2.
California’s “Truth-in-Evidence” Constitutional Amendment: F-111;
The Uniform Commercial Code: A-67;
Conditional regulation of forensic evidence: G-25;
Administrative Law: G-82.
Constitutional Limits on Privileges: S-167:
Uncodified rules:L-27.
Corporate Personality: R-3

Rule 403: Discretionary Exclusion: A-76; A-129; B-20; C-125; C-203; D-15; F-80; G-91; G-94; G-95; G-97; G-98; G-136; H-82; H-96; H-149; I-196; I-212; J-3; L-85; L-87; M-41; M-73; M-129; N-37; O-25; P-54; R-71; R-129; R-169; S-9; S-62; S-107; T-7; T-27; W-6; W-18; W-37;

Rule 404: Character:: A-105; B-11; B-38; B-133; B-165; B-170; B-195; C-46; C-83; C-123; C-154; C-194; C-215; D-14; D-37; E-11; F-115; G-71; G-78; G-118; G-141; H-7; H-109; H-150; I-64; I-75; I-87; I-108; I-192; I-204; L-8; L-64; L-84; L-86; L-89; M-20; M-116; M-126; M-128; M-139; M-219; N-36; O-33; P-3; P-12; P-21; P-32; P-37; P-85; P-90; R-36; R-37; R-41; R-58; R-60; R-83; R-87; R-128; R-139; S-24; S-27; S-82; T-11; T-19; T-44; U-8; W-57; W-59; W-115;

Rule 404(b): Uncharged Misconduct: A-39; B-122; B-178; B-192; B-205; B-230; C-55; C-121; C-163; C-205; C-211; D-38; D-49; E-21; F-22; F-27; F-101; G-88; G-114; G-119; G-129; G-133; G-169; H-85; H-117; I-2; I-12; I-56; I-126; I-163; I-171; I-179; I-189; I-200; I-208; I-217; I-219; I-222; I-224; I-225; I-226; L-3; L-48; L-81; L-83; M-99; M-159; M-220; M-269; M-285; O-6; O-19; P-22; P-31; R-38; R-39; R-40; R-54; R-79; R-147; S-65; S-113; S-147; S-155; S-157; S-158; S-172; S-255; T-9; T-26; T-43; W-113; Z-12;

Rule 405: Character Procedure: C-223; F-14; G-2; I-221; M-50; O-7;

Quasi-Privileges:

Rule 406: Habit and Routine Practice; F-12; G-75; G-139; L-116; M-35; S-66;
Rule 407: Subsequent Remedial Measures: A-103; B-182; C-58; C-190; D-19; G-8; H-5; H-78; L-130; L-149; M-4; M-92; M-169; R-61; R-167; S-78; S-232; T-86; W-38;

Rule 408: Compromise Offers: B-58; B-194; C-165; C-180; C-184; E-31; H-47; L-130; R-18; V-10; W-21;

Rule 409: Humanitarian Gestures: G-144;

Rule 410: Guilty Pleas: B-6; B-275; C-36; F-28; G-137; G-138; L-80; M-149; O-32; S-84; W-30; W-75;

Rule 411: Insurance: A-32; B-56; F-23; G-161; N-20; P-59; R-24; S-88; W-8; W-123;

Rule 412: Rape Victims: A-19; A-24; A-100; B-21; B-70; B-81; B-163; B-176; B-210; B-229; B-244; C-62; C-64; C-65; C-77; C-219; E-19; E-33; F-26; F-35; F-36; F-52; F-69; G-6; G-12; G-35; G-49; G-100; G-134; H-87; H-95; I-9; I-156; I-245; L-73; L-153; M-86; M-158; O-11; O-15; O-20; O-24; P-68; P-86; R-128; R-164; S-51; S-71; S-79; S-199; S-227; T-8; T-58; T-78; U-4; W-25; W-33; W-131; W-135; Y-15;

Rule 413-415: Other Crimes in Sex Cases: A-22; A-23; A-88; A-128; B-48; B-115; B-162; B-233; D-34; E-1; F-38; F-54; H-125; H-156; I-136; I-165; I-174; I-184; L-128; L-147; N-15; O-26; P-33; S-116;

Rule 501: Privileges Generally and Novel Privileges: A-110 (Sexual Assault Counsellor); A-133 (lie detector privilege); B-26 (proposed in New York); B-30 (in the Uniform Rules); B-69 (corporate privilege); B-169 (common law privileges before Congress); B-226 (pharmacist-patient privilege); a C-133 (Canadian privileges); D-77 (privacy and privilege); F-81 (Louisiana privileges); F-104 (plea for fewer privileges); F-109 (computers & privileges); G-160 (mediation privilege); G-170 (tenure committee privilege); G-183 (theory); H-13 (labor union privilege); H-20 (comparative law); H-102 (and fair trial); I-21 (and e-mails); I-47 (meaning of “confidentiality”); I-86 (alienability of privileges); I-100 (psychological critique); I-101 (Wigmore’s behavioral assumptions); I-111 (Wigmore’s foundations); I-114 (instrumentalist v. Humanism); I-175 (Hegelian analysis); I-248 (Ombudsman Privilege); L-1 (patent agent privilege); L-20 (under the F.R.E.); L-82 (Federal privileges); L-113 (and friendship); M-100 (confidential communications); M-119 (privacy against self-incrimination); M-171 (and administrative judges); M-228 (in international arbitration); M-241 (fruits of breached privileges); M-245 (differing notions of confidentiality); N-1 (two-faced privileges); N-14 (and immunity); P-34 (why?); R-28 (Texas law); R-35 (compulsory disclosure to Alcoholics Anonymous); R-43 (conflict of laws); R-63 (do not codify); R-131 (and juvenile offenders); R-132 (on a collateral matter); R-133 (and perjury); S-92 (choice of law); S-118 (and defamation cases); S-226 (privacy privilege); S-234 (choice of law); S-236 (battered women intake papers privilege); W-42 (choice of law); W-83 (and fair trial);

Generally: D-99; G-142; L-158; L-159; S-74;
Faculty Articles

_Erie_ and _Choice of Law_: A-104; B-85; D-96; E-25;

_Academic Privilege_: M-168; O-14;

_Accountants’ Privilege_: C-150; C-172; F-4; J-17; L-43; R-111;

_Banker and Brokers’ Privilege_: L-134;

_Environmental Audit Privilege_: E-20; F-49; L-155; M-232; O-41; S-279;

_Mediation Privilege_: S-37;

_Peer Review Privilege_: B-276; B-277; F-141; G-102; H-12; H-122; L-23;

_Rape Victim Counsellor Privilege_: R-110;

_Reporters’ Privilege_: B-34; B-43; B-50; B-80; B-103; B-104; B-105; B-126; B-173; C-1; C-10; C-40 (Mississippi); C-56; C-61; D-2; D-4; D-50; D-65; D-66; E-5; E-6; E-7; E-17; F-25; F-106; G-4; G-68; G-104; G-109; G-110; G-125; G-185; H-51; H-72; L-25; L-69; L-70; L-108; L-122; L-123; M-23; M-113; M-161; M-176; M-273; N-23; O-42; P-50; P-77; R-51; R-121; R-123; R-134; R-163; S-4; S-59; S-100; S-134; S-179; S-201; S-242; S-249; T-24; T-84; U-2; V-5; W-26; W-53; W-74; Y-2; Y-8;

_Research Privilege_: C-199; H-77; N-21; O-13; W-109;

_School Guidance Counsellor Privilege_: R-112;

_Self-Critical Analysis Privilege_: B-4; F-75; L-88; M-275; P-71; V-1;

_Social Worker Privilege_: L-152;

_Tax Practitioner-Client Privilege_: G-70;

_Tax Return Privilege_: B-47; B-68;

_Rule 502_: Privilege Waiver: B-80; B-103; B-223; C-34; C-90; D-10; I-39; I-55; I-93; M-21; M-135; N-46; T-64;

_Rule 503*: Attorney-Client Privilege_: A-6; A-11; A-15; A-20; A-27; A-64; A-65; A-73; A-97; A-130; A-131; B-15; B-23; B-35; B-53; B-72; B-77; B-96; B-118; B-148; B-149; B-149; B-150; B-158; B-172; B-197; B-198; B-200; B-208; B-213; B-220; B-227; B-240; B-242; B-243; B-271; C-8; C-21; C-49; C-52; C-76; C-87; C-119; C-126; C-151; C-154; C-162; C-164; C-185; C-198; C-200; C-207; C-216; C-217; D-3; D-10; D-54; D-58; D-69; D-98; E-3; E-8; E-18; E-30; F-24; F-30; F-33; F-37; F-64; F-65; F-83;
Rule 504*: Therapist-Patient Privilege: A-9; A-94; A-109; A-11; A-112; A-123; A-132; B-3; B-14; B-15; B-76; B-129; B-130; B-131; B-147; B-183; B-221; C-70; C-72; C-145; C-164; C-187; C-206; C-220; D-39; D-55; D-60; D-101; E-27; F-57; F-67; F-68; F-76; F-77; F-93; F-95; F-97; F-119; G-15; G-16; G-17; G-18; G-19; G-20; G-103; G-117; G-179; G-184; G-187; H-55; H-58; H-74; H-112; H-120; I-142; I-147; J-21; J-41; L-37; L-141; L-154; L-162; L-163; L-164; M-16; M-36; M-48; M-53; M-94; M-98; M-110; M-177; M-276; N-22; O-9; O-16; P-29; P-43; P-44; P-45; P-52; P-96; Q-5; R-20; R-21; R-46; R-104; R-115; R-116; R-141; R-161; R-168; S-25; S-35; S-121; S-122; S-123; S-124; S-125; S-126; S-150; S-162; S-163; S-164; S-165; S-169; S-174; S-177; S-206; S-240; S-244; S-251; T-2; T-12; T-48; W-36; W-51; W-52; W-62; W-95; W-96; W-103; W-125; W-126; W-127; Z-6;

Rule 505*: Family Privileges:

Husband and wife: B-42; B-185; B-215; B-272; C-60; C-175; D-94; G-83; G-123; G-149; G-182; H-26; H-104; H-145; H-152; L-77; M-16; M-112; M-227; O-30; P-40; P-91; R-45; R-55; R-57; R-155; S-105; S-259; W-50;

— Parent-Child: B-42; C-149; R-138; S-53; S-214; W-29;

Rule 506*: Priest-Penitent Privilege: A-101; B-121; B-199; C-4; C-59; C-75; C-165; D-5; D-63; G-34; H-119; L-145; M-16; M-54; M-156; M-163; O-1; P-7; P-70; R-42; R-69; S-120; S-211; S-261; W-13; W-106; Y-4;

Rule 507*: Voters Privilege: N-49;

Asterisks indicate that there privileges were not included in the Federal Rules of Evidence, though some states adopted them.
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Rule 508*: Trade Secrets Privilege: A-14; A-93; A-115; B-19; B-37; B-191; B-238; B-270; C-85; C-173; C-218; C-218; D-68; D-93; D-100; F-9; F-79; G-10; H-57; H-83; L-39; L-109; M-40; M-91; P-38; P-57; P-84; R-113; R-124; R-159; S-70; S-219; S-223; S-283; V-6; V-7; V-16;

Rule 509*: Government Privilege: A-5; A-13; A-26; A-121; B-13; B-45; B-57; B-82; B-84; B-89; B-112; B-159; B-166; B-186; B-187; C-18; C-51; C-63; C-67; C-120; C-135; C-159; C-169; C-195; C-196; C-201; D-18; D-30; D-32; D-79; D-82; D-91; E-2; E-14; E-23; E-26; E-36; E-37; F-21; F-48; F-119; F-124; F-144; F-145; G-13; G-131; G-177; H-11; H-16; H-32; H-59; H-81; H-130; H-540; H-542; H-144; H-147; I-10; I-25; I-247; J-7; L-39; L-67; L-102; L-111; L-131; L-142; L-146; L-174; M-26; M-28; M-37; M-51; M-57; M-63; M-95; M-162; M-174; M-188; M-230; N-2; N-11; N-18; N-30; O-3; O-12; O-18; O-21; O-48; P-26; P-28; P-62; R-47; R-52; R-119; R-157; R-160; S-1; S-3; S-23; S-32; S-76; S-77; S-81; S-111; S-127; S-135; S-170; S-175; S-184; S-185; S-215; S-222; S-248; S-250; S-254; S-267; S-269; S-277; S-298; T-22; T-29; T-52; T-59; T-60; T-82; V-11; W-31; W-32; W-61; W-73; W-89; W-92; W-104; W-130; Y-1; Y-11; Z-2;

Rule 510*: Informer's Privilege: B-27; B-196; C-208; F-1; F-70; G-186; H-54; H-60; M-34; M-38; M-247; N-3; N-16; O-43; Q-3; R-9; R-14; R-23; R-145; S-252;

Rule 511*: Privilege Waiver: G-72; O-4; R-25; S-193;

Article VI: Witnesses

Rule 601: Competency: A-21; B-25; D-31; G-92; H-154; I-140; L-21; L-33; M-177; T-41; W-35;

Rule 602: Personal Knowledge: B-171; B-268; F-56; F-58; R-17; S-228;

Rule 606: Competency of Jurors: H-146;

Rule 607: Who May Impeach: G-153; G-154; L-12; S-64;

Rule 608: Character Impeachment: B-73; B-113; C-176; C-222; F-13; G-74; I-18; I-143; J-43; J-48; L-61; L-74; M-27; M-231; R-117; R-151; S-45; S-132; S-164; T-28; T-76; U-7; Y-10;

Rule 609: Prior Convictions to Impeach: C-152; D-67; D-80; G-80; G-89; L-94; L-169; M-96; R-62; R-101; R-102; R-103; S-197; S-200;

Rule 611: Form and Mode of Interrogation: C-45; D-41; F-102; H-75; M-25; R-97;

Rule 612: Writing Used to Refresh: B-65; D-9; D-51; D-57; F-91; H-56; H-86; H-153; L-105; L-116; M-202; S-198; T-25;
Rule 613: Prior Statements of Witnesses: L-14;

Rule 614: Calling and Interrogating Witnesses by The Judge: S-21;

Article VII: Opinions and Experts.

Rule 701: Lay opinions: B-9; F-63; I-16; I-17; L-9; M-81; M-186; P-25; S-32; S-166; S-205; T-87;

Rule 702: Expert opinions: A-47; A-56; A-85; B-75; B-235; B-252; B-257; B-263; C-42; C-50; C-115; C-146; C-179; C-192; C-197; D-49; D-56; D-71; D-90; E-4; F-3; F-5; F-78; F-84; F-94; F-103; F-126; F-140; G-48; G-54; G-108; G-159; G-178; G-189; H-25; I-1; I-29; I-32; I-49; I-53; I-60; I-70; I-76; I-92; I-105; I-109; I-127; I-168; I-176; I-187; J-33; L-13; L-161; L-177; M-32; M-55; M-83; M-84; M-163; M-165; M-185; M-191; M-211; M-224; M-225; M-255; O-5; O-39; O-40; P-23; P-41; P-63; P-79; R-64; R-89; R-93; R-114; R-127; S-30; S-34; S-80; S-151; S-153; S-154; S-171; S-297; S-299; T-16; V-6; Y-13;

Rule 703: Daubert and bases of opinion: A-40; A-87; B-36; B-55; B-83; B-97; B-98; B-109; B-135; B-137; B-140; B-144; B-248; B-249; B-250; B-251; B-253; B-255; B-256; B-264; B-265; B-266; B-267; C-38; C-43; C-93; C-97; C-118; C-212; D-6; D-36; D-62; F-2; F-40; F-99; F-137; G-51; G-53; G-55; G-58; G-67; G-124; G-126; G-146; G-180; H-1; I-22; I-33; I-35; I-37; I-65; I-84; I-110; I-113; I-129; I-130; I-131; I-132; I-133; I-134; I-139; I-150; I-153; I-158; I-160; I-164; I-166; I-167; I-169; I-177; I-181; I-183; I-188; I-197; I-198; J-29; J-45; M-76; M-90; M-272; R-59; R-85; R-86; R-88; R-91; R-92; R-94; R-172; S-28; S-29; S-63; S-87; S-152; S-176; T-18; T-60; T-62; V-15; V-18;

Rule 704: Opinion on Ultimate Issue: S-245;

Rule 705: Disclosure of Basis of Expert Opinion: C-186; M-8; is

Rule 706: Court-Appointed Experts: B-102; B-207; C-78; C-116; F-82; G-172; G-188; I-206; L-115; M-286; P-72; S-95; S-141; S-225; T-70; V-3; Z-8.

Article VIII: Hearsay Evidence

Rule 801: Hearsay defined: A-8 (hearsay and accused terrorists); A-25(self-exculpatory statements); A-33 (as a rule of admission): A-59(evolution of rule); B-16(conduct as hearsay); B-62(electronic Hearsay); B-90(ambiguity as a hearsay danger); B-92 (substantive influences on exceptions); B-124 (Oklahoma Evidence Code); B-151 (public opinion polls); B-167 (public opinion polls); B-168 (history); C-9 (and cognition); C-19 (electronic communications); C-137 (U.K. Law); D-22 (in court trials); D-78 (generally); D-81 (hearsay hazards); F-15 (in the Federal Rules); F-16 (conduct as hearsay); F-17 (“indirect” hearsay); F-41 (generally); F-61 (implied assertions); G-23 (and relevance); G-66 (generally); G-35 (simplified); H-21
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Rule 801(d): Generally: B-91; C-14; C-24; L-19; M-196; M-221; S-257; S-263;

Rule 801(d)(1)(A): Prior Inconsistent Statement: B-93; B-132; C-41; D-33; G-128; M-270; R-54; S-13; T-65;

Rule 801(d)(1)(B): Prior Consistent Statement: F-135; L-119; M-66;

Rule 801(d)(1)(C): Prior Identification: M-49;

Rule 801(d)(2): Statement by Party Opponent: H-52; H-91; U-1;

Rule 801(d)(2)(A): Party Admission: C-32; C-134; I-176; P-17;

Rule 801(d)(2)(C): Authorized Admission: B-180; F-18;

Rule 801(d)(2)(D): Vicarious Admission: I-218; L-98; M-209;

Rule 801(d)(2)(E): Co-conspirators: G-24; L-103; M-265;

Rule 803: Exceptions: declarant need not be unavailable:

Generally: A-113 (801(b)(6)); A-117; (marital discord exception); R-75 (proposal to modify).

Rule 803(1): Present Sense Impression: C-27; F-92; H-151; I-7; I-63; L-51; M-194; W-20;

Rule 803(3): Exited Utterances: M-142; O-27; Q-1; S-157; S-286; S-287; S.288; T-37; W-56 W-81; W-112;
Rule 803(4): Statements for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment: C-16; M-184; M-242; M-254; M-258; T-39; W-80;

Rule 803(5): Recorded Recollection: S-243;

Rule 803(6): Business Records: B-24; C-174; E-27; F-143; G-167; H-14; L-56; L-68; M-17; P-2; R-8;

Rule 803(8): Government Records: I-19; I-66; J-13; M-78; M-111; M-278; R-8; W-11;

Rule 803(16): Ancient Documents: C-26;

Rule 803(17) Market Reports: B-246;

Rule 803(18): Learned Treatises: I-45; I-131; R-165;

Rule 803(22): Prior Convictions: C-193; H-105; M-262;

Rule 804: Exceptions: declarant unavailable:

Rule 804(b)(1): Former Testimony: M-43; W-119;

Rule 804(b)(2): Dying Declaration: C-68; L-124; L-125; W-12;

Rule 804(b)(3): Statements Against Interest: C-17; C-20; C-33; C-202; I-68; I-162; M-198; T-3;

Rule 804(b)(4): Personal or Family History:

Rule 804(b)(6): Forfeiture by Wrongdoing: C-169; F-73; F-74;

Rule 806: Attacking Credibility of Declarant: C-188; G-74; G-99; H-131;

Rule 807: Residual exception: C-22; D-35; L-234; J-36; M-101; M-108; S-148; Y-3;

Confrontation: A-41; A-98; A-99; B-5; B-7; B-8; B-10; B-12; B-51; B-64; B-71; B-101; B-105; B-181; B-239; B-274; C-25; C-31; C-37; C-44; C-80; C-81; C-127; C-128; C-171; C-191; D-7; D-11; D-12; D-13; D-61; D-72; D-73; D-74; D-75; D-84; D-85; D-86; D-87; D-88; D-89; D-92; D-105; E-31; E-32; F-34; F-39; F-60; F-66; F-72; F-107; F-112; F-113; F-114; F-127; F-128; F-129; F-130; F-132; F-133; F-134; F-136; F-142; G-50; G-61; G-73; G-76; G-105; G-115; G-120; G-121; G-130; G-132; G-153; G-158; G-174; G-176; H-4; H-22; H-28; H-30; H-45; H-110; H-123; H-124; H-155; I-190; I-233; I-239; J-14; J-22; J-24; J-25; J-26; J-27; J-32; J-34; J-37; J-38; L-40; L-49; L-101; L-112; L-121; L-132; L-135; L-136; L-137; L-138; L-157; L-166; L-167; L-173; M-3; M-19;
Article X: Contents of Writings, Recordings, and Photographs

Rule 901: Authentication: A-108; B-110; B-146; B-219; C-23; H-103; J-47; R-174; S-273; T-66; W-28; W-69;

Rule 1001: The Best Evidence Rule: B-95; B-278; C-143; I-98; R-120; W-68;

Rule 1006: Summaries: I-43;

Article XI: Miscellaneous Rules

Rule 1101: Scope and Applicability of Rules: B-231 (workers’ compensation); C-5; D-21 (court trials); F-7 (capital sentencing); G-7 (statutory rules v. Evidence Rules); G-36 (class actions); I-191 (pretrial); L-106 (court trials); L-165 (court trials); P-61 (administrative agencies); R-13 (same rules for civil and criminal cases); R-55 (labor arbitration); R-170 (bankruptcy); S-230 (administrative agencies);

History of and Subsequent Developments of Rules:

Generally: A-30 (Roscoe Pound’s speech that launched Progressive Proceduralism); B-106 (bibliography of legal history articles); B-155 (history of hearsay reform) ; B-247 (remaining issues in evidence law); B-260 (the breast implant fiasco); D-76 (the role of rules of evidence) ; D-97 (law, war, and history); G-113 (changing approaches to the law of evidence); H-46 (evidence and inference in law) ; N-38 (codification in common law countries); R-175 (can the states adapt the Federal Rules?); T-38 (Thayer’s Observations on the law of evidence);

International Law: H-67;

United States: A-37; A-38; A-106; A-116; B-44; B-88; B-131; B-138; B-143; B-209; C-30; C-71; C-140; C-141; C-178; D-43; F-11; G-162; H-121; H-137; H-139; I-36; I-118; I-120; I-199; L-32; L-66; M-208; M-212; M-218; P-89; R-50; R-143; R-154; S-232; S-285; W-138;

Federal Rules of Evidence: A-127; B-52; B-79; B-100; B-119; B-217; C-28; C-29; C-35; C-39; C-142; D-44; D-64; F-90; G-93; G-101; G-164; G-165; G-156; I-40; I-85;
Faculty Articles

I-120; L-7; L-17; M-88; M-109; M-187; O-28; O-29; P-6; P-49; P-82; R-32; R-65; R-142; R-156; S-17; S-39; S-57; S-75; S-91; S-101; S-115; S-194; S-213; S-272; T-31; T-61; W-43; W-47; W-48; W-54; W-55; W-90;

Fifth Circuit: A-22;

Seventh Circuit: C-172;

Eleventh Circuit: B-41;

Military Rules of Evidence: G-163; I-236; M-154; S-50; W-132; Z-10;

Model Code of Evidence: M-212; M-214;

The Uniform Rules: B-49; F-19; G-14; M-82; M-280; Q-2; R-11; S-258; W-143;

Administrative Law; D-23; D-25;

Evidentiary Scholarship: P-18; T-55; W-41;

United Kingdom: B-94; B-204; C-204; L-30; L-36; M-226;

Medieval Proof: H-111; U-3;

Australia: H-93;

Canada: B-214; C-122; J-18;

Israel: L-148;

Italy: H-19;

Alabama: H-10; H-115;

Arkansas: F-47;

California: C-69; G-1; G-116; G156; M-87; M-122; M-123; M-124; M-125;

Colorado: Q-4;

Connecticut: T-4;

Florida: E-12;

Idaho: C-136;
Faculty Articles

**Illinois**: B-203; C-209; C-210;

**Indiana**: B-156; D-102; S-284;

**Georgia**: M-141; T-72;

**Hawaii**: B-175;

**Illinois**: R-165;

**Kansas**: D-116;

**Kentucky**: D-83;

**Louisiana**: A-125; R-26;

**Maryland**: H-132;

**Massachusetts**: H-64;

**Michigan**: L-59; M-114; M-115; S-54; S-60;

**Missouri**: C-48;

**New York**: B-78; C-11; F-62; L-175; L-176; M-39; M-74; M-134;

**North Carolina**: M-238; M-243;

**North Dakota**: B-234;

**Ohio**: B-120; B-123; G-63; M-145; W-7; W-49;

**Oklahoma**: B-125;

**Oregon**: J-42; L-4;

**South Dakota**: A-17; A-18;

**Texas**: B-114; B-117; C-15; G-112; M-229; W-10; W-76; W-77; Z-3; Z-4;

**Utah**: B-177;

**Washington**: A-119; O-35;
Wyoming: M-266;

A
[1] Abbott, Degree of Proof, and Burdens of Proof. 2 Univ.L.Rev. 59 (1894) [F.R.Ev. 301]


[26] Albert & Simon, Enforcing Subpoenas Against The President: The Question of Mr. Jaworski’s Authority, 74 Colum.L.Rev. 545 (1974) [F.R.Ev. 509]


[28] Alexander, Presumptions: Their Use And Abuse, 17 Miss.L.J. 1 (1945) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[29] Alexander, Presumptions in Criminal Cases, 17 Miss.L.J. 45 (1945) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[31] Allen, Hypnotism and Its Legal Import, 12 Can.B.Rev. 22 (1934) [F.R.Ev.612]


[37] Allen, American Exclusionary Rule(s), 20 Evidence Science 112 (2012) [History]


[41] Allen, From The Enlightenment to Crawford to Holmes, 34 Seton Hall L.Rev. 1 (2009).[Confrontation]


Faculty Articles


Faculty Articles


Faculty Articles


[120] Arsenault, Start With The Presumption She Doesn’t Want To Be Dead: Fatal Flaws in Guardianships of Individuals with Intellectual Disability, 35 Law & Ineq. 21 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 301]


B


Faculty Articles


Faculty Articles


[32] Barnhart, The Determination of Facts Preliminary to The Admission of Evidence in Arkansas Court, 2 Ark.L.Rev. 1 (1949) [F.R.Ev. 104]

[33] Barnhart, Use of Presumptions in Arkansas, 4 Ark.L.Rev. 128 (1950) [F.R.Ev. 301]


[38] Bates, Psychiatric Evidence of Character, 5 Anglo-Amr.L.Rev. 99 (1976) [F.R.Ev. 404]


Faculty Articles


[58] Bell, Admissions Arising Out of Compromise—-Are They Irrelevant? 31 Texas L.Rev. 239 (1953) [F.R.Ev. 408]

[59] Belli, An Introduction to Demonstrative Evidence, 8 J.Foren.Sci. 355 (1963) [F.R.Ev. 401]


[81] Berger, Man’s Trial, Women’s Tribulation: Rape Cases in The Courtroom, 77 Colum.L.Rev. 1 (1977) [F.R.Ev. 412]


Faculty Articles

[101] Best, To Be Or Not To Be Testimonial?: That is The Question: 2004 Developments in The Sixth Amendment, 2005 Army Law. 65. [Confrontation]

[102] Beuscher, The Use of Experts By The Courts, 54 Harv.LRev. 1105 (1941) [F.R.Ev. 706]


Faculty Articles


[153] Blume, Problem of Preserving Excluded Evidence in The Appellate Record, 13 Minn.L.Rev. 169 (1929) [F.R.Ev. 103]


Faculty Articles


[174] Bottoms, The Use of A Lie Detector in Marriage Trials. 16 The Jurist 242 (1956) [F.R.Ev. 401]
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[178] Boyce, Evidence of Other Crimes or Wrongdoing, 5 Utah B.J. 31 (1973) [F.R.Ev. 504(b)]


[180] Boyce, Rule 63(a) of Uniform Rules of Evidence—-A Vector Analysis, 5 Utah L.Rev. 311 (1957) [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(c)]


Brazy, Character Evidence; Habit and Custom; Reputation as To Character, 1945 Wis.L.Rev. 392. [F.R.Ev. 404]


Bridge, Presumptions and Burdens, 12 Mod.L.Rev. 273 (1949) [F.R.Ev. 301]


[228] Bryan, Hypnosis And Hypnotic Techniques, 1967 Trial and Tort Trends 207. [F.R.Ev. 401]


Faculty Articles


[255] The Daubert Trilogy in the States, 44 Jurimetrics J. 351 (Spring 2004) (with Jeffrey Jackson) [F.R.Ev. 703]


[257] Bernstein, Improving the Qualifications of Experts in Medical Malpractice Cases, 1 Law, Probability & Risk (2002) [F.R.Ev. 702]


Faculty Articles


C


Faculty Articles


Faculty Articles


[74] Chamberlain, Presumptions As First Aid to The District Attorney, 14 A.B.A.J. 287 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 303]


Faculty Articles


[121] Chesnutt, The Admissibility of Other Crimes in Texas, 50 Texas L.Rev. 1409 (1972) [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]


Faculty Articles


[141] Cleary, Evidence As a Problem of Communication, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 277 (1952) [History]


[164] Cole & Harold, On The Road to Recognition: Extending The Attorney-Client
[F.R.Ev. 503]

[165] Coleman, “Shrinking” The Clergyperson Exemption to Florida’s Mandatory Child

[F.R.Ev. 504]

408(B), 40 Creighton L.Rev. 679 (2007). [F.R.Ev 408]

[168] Collins, The Power of Congressional Committees of Investigation to Obtain
Information From The Executive Branch, 39 Geo.L.J. 563 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[169] Comparet-Cassini, Crawford and The Forfeiture by Wrongdoing Exception, 42
San Diego L.Rev. 1185 (2005) [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(6)]

[170] Comparet-Cassini, Balancing The Anonymity of Threatened Witnesses Versus A
Defendant’s Right of Confrontation: The Waiver Doctrine After Alvarado, 39 San Diego
L.Rev. 1165 (2002). [Confrontation]

[171] Conklin, Production or Privilege: Income Tax Returns and The Federal Rules, 26

[172] Conlon & O’Connor, Evidence: Recent Developments in The Seventh Circuit, 58
Chi.-Kent L.Rev. 417 (1982). [History]

[173] Connelly, Secrets and Smokescreens: A Legal and Economic Analysis of
Government Disclosures of Business Data, 1981 Wis.L.Rev. 207. [F.R.Ev. 508]

[174] Connery & Levy, Computer Evidence in Federal Courts, 84 Comm’l L.Rev. 266
(1979). [F.R.E. 803(6)]

[175] Connor, The Qualification of Defendant’s Spouse As a Witness in Criminal Cases,
9 Notre Dame Law. 272 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 505]

[176] Conrad, Mental Examination of Witnesses, 11 Syr.L.Rev.149 (1960) [F.R.Ev. 608]


[179] Cook, Speed Calculations and The Expert Witness, 42 Neb.L.Rev. 100 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 702]


[186] Corboy, Use of Written Authorities in Cross-Examination of Expert Witnesses, 10 Trial L. Guide 57 (1966) [F.R.Ev. 705]
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