COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

LEE H. ROSENTHAL
CHAIR

PETER G. McCABE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CARL E. STEWART
APPELLATE RULES

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN
BANKRUPTCY RULES

MARK R. KRAVITZ
CIVIL RULES

RICHARD C. TALLMAN
CRIMINAL RULES

ROBERT L. HINKLE
EVIDENCE RULES

TO: **Honorable Lee H. Rosenthal, Chair**
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: **Robert L. Hinkle, Chair**
Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

DATE: **May 6, 2009**

RE: **Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules**

Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules met on April 23-24 in Washington, D.C. The meeting produced two action items for Standing Committee consideration at the June 2009 meeting.

First, as the Standing Committee knows, the Advisory Committee has been restyling the Evidence Rules. The Advisory Committee divided the rules into three groups for this purpose. At its last two meetings, the Standing Committee approved the first two groups but delayed publication until after all three groups had been approved. The Standing Committee did this with the understanding that at the end of the process there would be a top-to-bottom review of all the restyled rules for consistency and to address "global" issues that had been deferred during the initial restyling.

At the April 2009 meeting, the Advisory Committee completed its work on the restyling project. First, the Committee restyled the third (and last) group of

rules, consisting of Rules 801 to 1103. Second, the Committee undertook the promised top-to-bottom review of all the restyled rules. This resulted in limited changes to the first two groups of restyled rules. Third, the Committee approved a set of proposed committee notes to the restyled rules. The entire set of restyled rules is attached to this Report as Appendix A. The Committee now asks the Standing Committee to approve the entire set for release at this time for public comment.

The second action item involves Rule 804(b)(3), the hearsay exception for an unavailable declarant's statement against interest. As the Standing Committee will recall, a year ago the Advisory Committee proposed, and the Standing Committee approved, releasing for public comment a proposed amendment to this rule. The current rule requires a criminal-case defendant—but not the government—to show corroborating circumstances as a condition to admission of an unavailable declarant's statement against penal interest. The amendment would extend the corroborating-circumstances requirement to the government, as some courts have done anyway. The Justice Department does not oppose the amendment. The proposed amendment makes no change for civil cases or for statements against pecuniary interest.

At the April 2009 meeting, the Advisory Committee considered the few public comments received on the proposal. The comments were generally favorable. The Advisory Committee made no changes of substance to the proposal as released for public comment, but the Committee made stylistic changes consistent with some of the public comments and with the ongoing restyling project. The Advisory Committee now asks the Standing Committee to approve the proposed amendment to Rule 804(b)(3) for submission to the Judicial Conference. The text of the proposed rule in black-line form and a summary of the public comments are attached to this Report as Appendix B.

A complete discussion of these items is in the draft minutes attached to this Report as Appendix C.

I. Action Item — Restyled Evidence Rules 101–1103

Beginning in the early 1990s, Judge Robert Keeton, who was chair of the Standing Committee, and a committee member, University of Texas Professor

Charles Alan Wright, led an effort to adopt clear and consistent style conventions for all of the rules. Without consistent style conventions, there were differences from one set of rules to another, and even from one rule to another within the same set. Style varied because a committee seeking to amend a rule did not always consider how another rule expressed the same concept. Style varied based on the membership of a particular advisory committee. Style varied as the membership of a particular advisory committee changed over time. And style varied as the membership of the Standing Committee changed over time. Different rules expressed the same thought in different ways, leading to a risk that they would be interpreted differently. Different rules sometimes used the same word or phrase to mean different things, again leading to a risk of misinterpretation. And in other respects, too, rules drafters who were experts in the relevant substantive and procedural areas sometimes did not express themselves as clearly as they might have.

Judge Keeton appointed Professor Wright to chair a newly formed Style Subcommittee of the Standing Committee. At Professor Wright's suggestion, the Standing Committee retained a legal-writing authority, Bryan Garner, as its style consultant. Mr. Garner is the author of such books as *The Elements of Legal Style* and *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage*. These are generally regarded as the leading authorities on these subjects. Mr. Garner also is the current editor of *Black's Law Dictionary* and the co-author, with Justice Scalia, of *Making Your Case: The Art of Persuading Judges*.

In conjunction with his work for the Standing Committee, Mr. Garner wrote *Guidelines for Drafting and Editing Court Rules*. First published in 1996, the *Guidelines* manual is now in its fifth printing. It has guided all rules amendments since it was written—whether or not they related to a restyling project. And the *Guidelines* manual has guided successful restylings of the Federal Rules of Appellate, Criminal, and Civil Rules, which took effect in 1998, 2002, and 2007, respectively. For matters not addressed in the *Guidelines*, the restylings have followed Garner's *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage*. Professor Daniel R. Coquillette has been the Standing Committee's reporter through all of these projects.

Mr. Garner was himself the style consultant for the restyled Appellate and Criminal Rules. Professor Joseph Kimble took over near the end of the Criminal

Rules restyling project and was the style consultant as the Civil Rules project went forward. Professor Kimble is the editor in chief of *The Scribes Journal of Legal Writing* and the author of *Lifting the Fog of Legalese*, a book that compiles some of his many essays. He and Mr. Garner are co-authors of a forthcoming book, *The Elements of Legal Drafting*, which West Publishing Company will publish. Professor Kimble has taught legal writing at Thomas Cooley Law School for 25 years.

Despite some initial opposition, each of the restyling projects has proved enormously successful. Indeed, in recognition of their work in restyling the Civil Rules, Professor Kimble, the Standing Committee, and the Civil Rules Advisory Committee each received a Burton Award for Reform in Law. The Burton is probably the nation's most prestigious legal-drafting award. Judge Rosenthal, Judge Thrash (of the Style Subcommittee), and Professor Kimble accepted the awards at a black-tie dinner at the Library of Congress on June 4, 2007.

The division of responsibility on the restyling projects has conformed generally to the protocol the Standing Committee has adopted for addressing style issues for a proposed amendment to a rule outside the restyling process. For an amendment outside a restyling project, the relevant Advisory Committee must submit its proposed language to the Style Subcommittee. On style issues, the Style Subcommittee, not the Advisory Committee, has the last word. Thus when an Advisory Committee submits a proposed amendment to any rule to the full Standing Committee, the amendment already has gone through a style review, and style issues have been determined by the Style Subcommittee. The Standing Committee chairs have kept the Style Subcommittee small in order to promote consistency. Although the Standing Committee retains the ultimate authority, through the years it has followed the style decisions of the Style Subcommittee, thus ensuring a high level of consistency across all sets of rules.

With this background, the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules undertook its restyling project beginning in the Fall of 2007. The Committee established a step-by-step process for restyling that is substantially the same as that employed in the earlier restyling projects. Those steps are: 1) draft by Professor Kimble; 2) comments by the Reporter; 3) response by Professor Kimble and changes to the draft where necessary; 4) expedited review by Advisory Committee members and redraft by Professor Kimble if necessary; 5) review by

the Style Subcommittee of the Standing Committee; 6) review by the Advisory Committee; and 7) review by the Standing Committee to determine whether to release the restyled rules for public comment.

The Advisory Committee divided the Evidence Rules into three parts. The process described above thus was conducted in three stages. The Committee also agreed that the entire package of restyled rules should be submitted for public comment at one time.

The Advisory Committee established a working principle for whether a proposed change is one of "style" (in which event the decision is made by the Style Subcommittee) or one of "substance" (in which event the decision is for the Advisory Committee). A proposed change is "substantive" if:

1. Under the existing practice in any circuit, it could lead to a different result on a question of admissibility; or

2. Under the existing practice in any circuit, it could lead to a change in the procedure by which an admissibility decision is made; or

3. It changes the structure of a rule or method of analysis in a manner that fundamentally changes how courts and litigants have thought about, or argued about, the rule; or

4. It changes what Professor Kimble has referred to as a "sacred phrase"—"phrases that have become so familiar as to be fixed in cement."

At its Spring 2008 meeting the Advisory Committee approved the restyling of the first third of the rules (Rules 101–415). The Standing Committee, at its June 2008 meeting, approved these rules for release for public comment, with the understanding that there could be further changes and that publication would occur after the Standing Committee approved all of the rules.

At its Fall 2008 meeting, the Advisory Committee approved the restyling of the second third of the rules (Rules 501–706). The Standing Committee, at its January 2009 meeting, approved these rules for release for public comment, again with the understanding that there could be further changes and that publication

would occur after the Standing Committee approved all of the rules.

At its April 2009 meeting, the Advisory Committee approved the restyling of the final third of the rules (Rules 801–1103). The rules came to the Advisory Committee after the full process outlined above. The Committee addressed each rule separately. The Committee then doubled back to all of the prior rules to ensure consistency throughout the entire set and to address global issues such as how to refer to a writing in a manner that would include its electronic form and how to refer to a public office or agency. These and similar matters were handled through a new set of definitions in proposed Rule 101(b). Finally, the Committee approved proposed Committee Notes conforming to the template and general approach of the Committee Notes to the restyled Civil Rules. The Committee delegated to the Reporter, the Style Consultant, and the Chair the authority to compile and implement the Committee's many decisions and to ensure that no new inconsistencies were introduced. Two of the Style Committee's three members attended and participated fully in the Advisory Committee meeting.

The April 2009 minutes—which summarize but are by no means a transcript of the two-day meeting—run to 85 pages and are attached to this report. I have not attempted to summarize in this report the extensive discussions and many drafting decisions detailed in the minutes.

The entire set of proposed restyled Evidence Rules—consisting of Rules 101 to 1103—are attached to this Report as Appendix A, with Committee Notes at the end. The rules are presented in a "side-by-side" version, with the existing rule in the left column and the restyled rule in the right.

Recommendation: The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules recommends that the Standing Committee approve proposed restyled Evidence Rules 101–1103 for release for public comment.

II. Action Item — Proposed Amendment to Evidence Rule 804(b)(3)

As noted above in the introduction to this report, Rule 804(b)(3) now provides that in a criminal case, the defendant—but not the government—must show corroborating circumstances as a condition for admitting an unavailable declarant's statement against penal interest. The proposed amendment would

extend the corroborating-circumstances requirement to the government, as some courts have done anyway.

Nobody asked to speak at the scheduled public hearings on the proposed amendment. The hearings were canceled. A small number of written public comments were filed. They are summarized at the end of Appendix B to this report. No comment opposed requiring the government to show corroborating circumstances. Two comments suggested that although the government should be required to show corroborating circumstances, the defendant should not. The Advisory Committee rejected that suggestion. One comment suggested the rule should be amended further to overturn a controlling Supreme Court decision on another aspect of the rule. The Advisory Committee rejected that suggestion. Finally, several comments proposed stylistic changes. The Advisory Committee implemented those suggestions and sought to avoid successive changes by restyling the proposed Rule 804(b)(3) as will occur anyway as part of the restyling process. The Committee revised the proposed Committee Note to reflect this decision and in response to a further comment on the Note.

Appendix B to this report sets out the proposed amendment in black-line form. The appendix also includes the proposed Committee Note and summarizes the public comments.

Recommendation: The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules recommends that the Standing Committee approve the proposed amendment to Rule 804(b)(3) for submission to the Judicial Conference.

III. Minutes of the April 2009 Meeting

The Reporter's draft of the minutes of the Advisory Committee's April 2009 meeting is attached to this report as Appendix C. The minutes have not yet been approved by the Committee.

ARTICLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS[1] Rule 101. Scope	ARTICLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS Rule 101 — Scope; Definitions
These rules govern proceedings in the courts of the United States and before the United States bankruptcy judges and United States magistrate judges, to the extent and with the exceptions stated in rule 1101.	**(a) Scope.** These rules apply to proceedings before United States courts. The specific courts and proceedings to which the rules apply, along with exceptions, are set out in Rule 1101. **(b) Definitions.** In these rules: **(1)** "civil case" means a civil action or proceeding; **(2)** "criminal case" includes a criminal proceeding; **(3)** "public office" includes a public agency; **(4)** "record" includes a memorandum, report, or data compilation; **(5)** a "rule prescribed by the Supreme Court" means a rule adopted by the Supreme Court under statutory authority; and **(6)** a reference to any kind of written material includes electronically stored information.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 101 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Style Project

The Evidence Rules are the fourth set of national procedural rules to be restyled. The restyled Rules of Appellate Procedure took effect in 1998. The restyled rules of Criminal Procedure took effect in 2002. The restyled Rules of Civil Procedure took effect in 2007. The restyled Rules of Evidence apply the same general drafting guidelines and principles used in restyling the Appellate, Criminal and Civil Rules.

1. General Guidelines

Guidance in drafting, usage, and style was provided by Bryan Garner, *Guidelines for Drafting and Editing Court Rules,* Administrative Office of the Unites States Courts (1969) and Bryan Garner, *Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage* (2d ed. 1995). *See also* Joseph Kimble, *Guiding Principles for*

[1] Rules in effect on December 1, 2008.

Restyling the Civil Rules, in *Preliminary Draft of Proposed Style Revision of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,* at page x (Feb. 2005) (available at http://www.uscourts.gov/rules/Prelim_draft_proposed_pt1.pdf).

2. Formatting Changes

Many of the changes in the restyled Evidence Rules result from using format to achieve clearer presentations. The rules are broken down into constituent parts, using progressively indented subparagraphs with headings and substituting vertical for horizontal lists. "Hanging indents" are used throughout. These formatting changes make the structure of the rules graphic and make the restyled rules easier to read and understand even when the words are not changed. Rule 103 illustrates the benefits of formatting changes.

3. Changes to Reduce Inconsistent, Ambiguous, Redundant, Repetitive, or Archaic Words

The restyled rules reduce the use of inconsistent terms that say the same thing in different ways. Because different words are presumed to have different meanings, such inconsistencies can result in confusion. The restyled rules reduce inconsistencies by using the same words to express the same meaning. For example, consistent expression is achieved without affecting meaning by the changes from "accused" in many rules to "defendant in a criminal case" in all rules.

The restyled rules minimize the use of inherently ambiguous words. For example, the word "shall" can mean "must," "may," or something else, depending on context. The potential for confusion is exacerbated by the fact the word "shall" is no longer generally used in spoken or clearly written English. The restyled rules replace "shall" with "must," "may," or "should," depending on which one the context and established interpretation make correct in each rule.

The restyled rules minimize the use of redundant "intensifiers". These are expressions that attempt to add emphasis, but instead state the obvious and create negative implications for other rules. The absence of intensifiers in the restyled rule does not change their substantive meaning. *See, e.g.,* Rule 103 (changing "interests of justice" to "justice").

The restyled rules also remove words and concepts that are outdated or redundant.

4. Rule Numbers

The restyled rules keep the same numbers to minimize the effect on research. Subdivisions have been rearranged within some rules to achieve greater clarity and simplicity.

5. No Substantive Change

The Committee made special efforts to reject any purported style improvement that might result in a substantive change in the application of a rule. The Committee considered a change to be "substantive" if any of the following conditions were met:

a. Under the existing practice in any circuit, the change could lead to a different result on a question of admissibility (e.g., a change that requires a court to provide either a less or more stringent standard in evaluating the admissibility of particular evidence);

b. Under the existing practice in any circuit, it could lead to a change in the procedure by which an admissibility decision is made (e.g., a change in the time in which an objection must be made, or a change in whether a court must hold a hearing on an admissibility question);

c. It alters the structure of a rule in a way that may alter the approach that courts and litigants have used to think about, and argue about, questions of admissibility (e.g., merging Rules 104(a) and 104(b) into a single subdivision); or

d. It changes a "sacred phrase" — phrases that have become so familiar in practice that to alter them would be unduly disruptive. Examples in the Evidence Rules include "unfair prejudice" and "truth of the matter asserted."

Rule 102. Purpose and Construction	Rule 102 — Purpose
These rules shall be construed to secure fairness in administration, elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay, and promotion of growth and development of the law of evidence to the end that the truth may be ascertained and proceedings justly determined.	These rules should be construed so as to administer every proceeding fairly, eliminate unjustifiable expense and delay, and promote the development of evidence law, to the end of ascertaining the truth and securing a just determination.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 102 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 103. Rulings on Evidence	Rule 103 — Rulings on Evidence
(a) Effect of erroneous ruling. Error may not be predicated upon a ruling which admits or excludes evidence unless a substantial right of the party is affected, and **(1) Objection.** In case the ruling is one admitting evidence, a timely objection or motion to strike appears of record, stating the specific ground of objection, if the specific ground was not apparent from the context; or **(2) Offer of proof.** In case the ruling is one excluding evidence, the substance of the evidence was made known to the court by offer or was apparent from the context within which questions were asked. Once the court makes a definitive ruling on the record admitting or excluding evidence, either at or before trial, a party need not renew an objection or offer of proof to preserve a claim of error for appeal.	**(a) Preserving a Claim of Error.** A party may claim error in a ruling to admit or exclude evidence only if the error affects a substantial right of the party and: **(1)** if the ruling admits evidence, the party, on the record: **(A)** timely objects or moves to strike; and **(B)** states the specific ground, unless it was apparent from the context; or **(2)** if the ruling excludes evidence, the party informs the court of its substance by an offer of proof, unless the substance was apparent from the context. **(b) Not Needing to Renew an Objection or Offer of Proof.** Once the court rules definitively on the record — either before or at trial — a party need not renew an objection or offer of proof to preserve a claim of error for appeal.
(b) Record of offer and ruling. The court may add any other or further statement which shows the character of the evidence, the form in which it was offered, the objection made, and the ruling thereon. It may direct the making of an offer in question and answer form.	**(c) Court's Statement About the Ruling; Directing an Offer of Proof.** The court may make any statement about the character or form of the evidence, the objection made, and the ruling. The court may direct that an offer of proof be made in question-and-answer form.
(c) Hearing of jury. In jury cases, proceedings shall be conducted, to the extent practicable, so as to prevent inadmissible evidence from being suggested to the jury by any means, such as making statements or offers of proof or asking questions in the hearing of the jury.	**(d) Preventing the Jury from Hearing Inadmissible Evidence.** To the extent practicable, the court must conduct a jury trial so that inadmissible evidence is not suggested to the jury by any means.
(d) Plain error. Nothing in this rule precludes taking notice of plain errors affecting substantial rights although they were not brought to the attention of the court.	**(e) Taking Notice of Plain Error.** A court may take notice of a plain error affecting a substantial right, even if the claim of error was not properly preserved.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 103 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 104. Preliminary Questions	Rule 104 — Preliminary Questions
(a) Questions of admissibility generally. Preliminary questions concerning the qualification of a person to be a witness, the existence of a privilege, or the admissibility of evidence shall be determined by the court, subject to the provisions of subdivision (b). In making its determination it is not bound by the rules of evidence except those with respect to privileges.	**(a) In General.** The court must decide any preliminary question about whether a witness is qualified, a privilege exists, or evidence is admissible. In so deciding, the court is not bound by evidence rules, except those on privilege.
(b) Relevancy conditioned on fact. When the relevancy of evidence depends upon the fulfillment of a condition of fact, the court shall admit it upon, or subject to, the introduction of evidence sufficient to support a finding of the fulfillment of the condition.	**(b) Relevancy That Depends on a Fact.** When the relevancy of evidence depends on fulfilling a factual condition, the court may admit it on, or subject to, the introduction of evidence sufficient to support a finding that the condition is fulfilled.
(c) Hearing of jury. Hearings on the admissibility of confessions shall in all cases be conducted out of the hearing of the jury. Hearings on other preliminary matters shall be so conducted when the interests of justice require, or when an accused is a witness and so requests.	**(c) Matters That the Jury Must Not Hear.** A hearing on a preliminary question must be conducted outside the jury's hearing if: **(1)** the hearing involves the admissibility of a confession; **(2)** a defendant in a criminal case is a witness and requests that the jury not be present; or **(3)** justice so requires.
(d) Testimony by accused. The accused does not, by testifying upon a preliminary matter, become subject to cross-examination as to other issues in the case.	**(d) Testimony by a Defendant in a Criminal Case.** By testifying on a preliminary question, a defendant in a criminal case does not become subject to cross-examination on other issues in the case.
(e) Weight and credibility. This rule does not limit the right of a party to introduce before the jury evidence relevant to weight or credibility.	**(e) Evidence Relevant to Weight and Credibility.** This rule does not limit a party's right to introduce before the jury evidence that is relevant to the weight or credibility of other evidence.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 104 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 105. Limited Admissibility	Rule 105 — Limiting Evidence That Is Not Admissible Against Other Parties or for Other Purposes
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.	If the court admits evidence that is admissible against a party or for a purpose — but not against another party or for another purpose — the court, on request, must restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 105 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 106. Remainder of or Related Writings or Recorded Statements	Rule 106 — Rest of or Related Writings or Recorded Statements
When a writing or recorded statement or part thereof is introduced by a party, an adverse party may require the introduction at that time of any other part or any other writing or recorded statement which ought in fairness to be considered contemporaneously with it.	If a party introduces all or part of a writing or recorded statement, an adverse party may require the introduction, at that time, of any other part — or any other writing or recorded statement — that in fairness ought to be considered at the same time.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 106 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE II. JUDICIAL NOTICE Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts	ARTICLE II. JUDICIAL NOTICE Rule 201 — Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts
(a) Scope of rule. This rule governs only judicial notice of adjudicative facts.	**(a) Scope.** This rule governs judicial notice of an adjudicative fact only, not a legislative fact.
(b) Kinds of facts. A judicially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.	**(b) Kinds of Facts That May Be Judicially Noticed.** The court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it: **(1)** is generally known within the court's territorial jurisdiction; or **(2)** can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.
(c) When discretionary. A court may take judicial notice, whether requested or not. **(d) When mandatory.** A court shall take judicial notice if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information.	**(c) Taking Notice.** At any stage of the proceeding, the court: **(1)** may take judicial notice on its own; or **(2)** must take judicial notice if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the necessary information.
(e) Opportunity to be heard. A party is entitled upon timely request to an opportunity to be heard as to the propriety of taking judicial notice and the tenor of the matter noticed. In the absence of prior notification, the request may be made after judicial notice has been taken.	**(d) Opportunity to Be Heard.** On timely request, a party is entitled to be heard on the propriety of taking judicial notice and the nature of the noticed fact. If the court takes judicial notice before notifying a party, the party, on request, is still entitled to be heard.
(f) Time of taking notice. Judicial notice may be taken at any stage of the proceeding.	
(g) Instructing jury. In a civil action or proceeding, the court shall instruct the jury to accept as conclusive any fact judicially noticed. In a criminal case, the court shall instruct the jury that it may, but is not required to, accept as conclusive any fact judicially noticed.	**(e) Instructing the Jury.** 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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 201 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE III. PRESUMPTIONS IN CIVIL ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS Rule 301. Presumptions in General in Civil Actions and Proceedings	ARTICLE III. PRESUMPTIONS IN CIVIL CASES Rule 301 — Presumptions in a Civil Case Generally
In all civil actions and proceedings not otherwise provided for by Act of Congress or by these rules, a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption, but does not shift to such party the burden of proof in the sense of the risk of nonpersuasion, which remains throughout the trial upon the party on whom it was originally cast.	In a civil case, unless a federal statute or these rules provide otherwise, the party against whom a presumption is directed has the burden of going forward with evidence to rebut the presumption. But this rule does not shift the burden of proof in the sense of the risk of nonpersuasion; the burden of proof remains on the party who had it originally.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 301 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 302. Applicability of State Law in Civil Actions and Proceedings	Rule 302 — Effect of State Law on Presumptions in a Civil Case
In civil actions and proceedings, the effect of a presumption respecting a fact which is an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision is determined in accordance with State law.	In a civil case, state law governs the effect of a presumption with respect to a claim or defense for which state law supplies the rule of decision.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 302 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE IV. RELEVANCY AND ITS LIMITS Rule 401. Definition of ‘‘Relevant Evidence’’	ARTICLE IV. RELEVANCY AND ITS LIMITS Rule 401 — Test for Relevant Evidence
‘‘Relevant evidence’’ means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.	Evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make more or less probable the existence of a fact that is of consequence in determining the action.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 401 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 402. Relevant Evidence Generally Admissible; Irrelevant Evidence Inadmissible	Rule 402 — General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence
All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible.	Relevant evidence is admissible unless any of the following provides otherwise: • the United States Constitution; • a federal statute; • these rules; or • other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court. Irrelevant evidence is not admissible.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 402 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 403. Exclusion of Relevant Evidence on Grounds of Prejudice, Confusion, or Waste of Time	Rule 403 — Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons
Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.	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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 403 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 404. Character Evidence Not Admissible to Prove Conduct; Exceptions; Other Crimes	Rule 404 — Character Evidence; Crimes or Other Acts
(a) Character evidence generally. Evidence of a person's character or a trait of character is not admissible for the purpose of proving action in conformity therewith on a particular occasion, except: **(1) Character of accused.** In a criminal case, evidence of a pertinent trait of character offered by an accused, or by the prosecution to rebut the same, or if evidence of a trait of character of the alleged victim of the crime is offered by an accused and admitted under Rule 404(a)(2), evidence of the same trait of character of the accused offered by the prosecution; **(2) Character of alleged victim.** In a criminal case, and subject to the limitations imposed by Rule 412, evidence of a pertinent trait of character of the alleged victim of the crime offered by an accused, or by the prosecution to rebut the same, or evidence of a character trait of peacefulness of the alleged victim offered by the prosecution in a homicide case to rebut evidence that the alleged victim was the first aggressor; **(3) Character of witness.** Evidence of the character of a witness, as provided in Rules 607, 608, and 609.	**(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. **(2)** ***Exceptions 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; **(B)** subject to the limitations in Rule 412, a defendant may offer evidence of an alleged crime victim's pertinent trait, and if the evidence is admitted, the prosecutor may: **(i)** offer evidence to rebut it; and **(ii)** offer evidence of the defendant's same trait; and **(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. **(3)** ***Exceptions for a Witness*****.** Evidence of a witness's character may be admitted under Rules 607, 608, and 609.

(b) Other crimes, wrongs, or acts. Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show action in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident, provided that upon request by the accused, the prosecution in a criminal case shall provide reasonable notice in advance of trial, or during trial if the court excuses pretrial notice on good cause shown, of the general nature of any such evidence it intends to introduce at trial.	**(b) Crimes or Other Acts.** **(1)** ***Prohibited Uses.*** Evidence of a crime 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; Notice.*** 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. On request by a defendant in a criminal case, the prosecutor must: **(A)** provide reasonable notice of the general nature of any such evidence that the prosecutor intends to offer at trial; and **(B)** do so before trial — or during trial if the court, for good cause, excuses lack of pretrial notice.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 404 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 405. Methods of Proving Character	Rule 405 — Methods of Proving Character
(a) Reputation or opinion. In all cases in which evidence of character or a trait of character of a person is admissible, proof may be made by testimony as to reputation or by testimony in the form of an opinion. On cross-examination, inquiry is allowable into relevant specific instances of conduct.	**(a) By 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, the court may allow an inquiry into relevant specific instances of the person's conduct.
(b) Specific instances of conduct. In cases in which character or a trait of character of a person is an essential element of a charge, claim, or defense, proof may also be made of specific instances of that person's conduct.	**(b) By 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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 405 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 406. Habit; Routine Practice	Rule 406 — Habit; Routine Practice
Evidence of the habit of a person or of the routine practice of an organization, whether corroborated or not and regardless of the presence of eyewitnesses, is relevant to prove that the conduct of the person or organization on a particular occasion was in conformity with the habit or 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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 406 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 407. Subsequent Remedial Measures	Rule 407 — Subsequent Remedial Measures
When, after an injury or harm allegedly caused by an event, measures are taken that, if taken previously, would have made the 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, a defect in a product's design, or a need for a warning or instruction. This rule does not require the exclusion of evidence of subsequent measures when offered for another purpose, such as proving ownership, control, or feasibility of precautionary measures, if controverted, or impeachment.	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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 407 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 407 previously provided that evidence was not excluded if offered for a purpose not explicitly prohibited by the Rule. To improve the language of the Rule, it now provides that the court may admit evidence if offered for a permissible purpose. There is no intent to change the process for admitting evidence covered by the Rule. It remains the case that if offered for an impermissible purpose, it must be excluded, and if offered for a purpose not barred by the Rule, its admissibility remains governed by the general principles of Rules 402, 403, 801, etc.

Rule 408. Compromise and Offers to Compromise	Rule 408 — Compromise Offers and Negotiations
(a) Prohibited uses. Evidence of the following is not admissible on behalf of any party, when offered to prove liability for, invalidity of, or amount of a claim that was disputed as to validity or amount, or to impeach through a prior inconsistent statement or contradiction: **(1)** furnishing or offering or promising to furnish—or accepting or offering or promising to accept—a valuable consideration in compromising or attempting to compromise the claim; and **(2)** conduct or statements made in compromise negotiations regarding the claim, except when offered in a criminal case and the negotiations related to a claim by a public office or agency in the exercise of regulatory, investigative, or enforcement authority.	**(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 order 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) Permitted uses. This rule does not require exclusion if the evidence is offered for purposes not prohibited by subdivision (a). Examples of permissible purposes include proving a witness's bias or prejudice; negating a contention of undue delay; and proving an effort to obstruct a criminal investigation or prosecution.	**(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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 408 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 408 previously provided that evidence was not excluded if offered for a purpose not explicitly prohibited by the Rule. To improve the language of the Rule, it now provides that the court may admit evidence if offered for a permissible purpose. There is no intent to change the process for admitting evidence covered by the Rule. It remains the case that if offered for an impermissible purpose, it must be excluded, and if offered for a purpose not barred by the Rule, its admissibility remains governed by the general principles of Rules 402, 403, 801, etc.

Rule 409. Payment of Medical and Similar Expenses	Rule 409 — Offers to Pay Medical and Similar Expenses
Evidence of furnishing or offering or promising to pay medical, hospital, or similar expenses occasioned by an injury is not admissible to prove liability for the injury.	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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 409 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 410. Inadmissibility of Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements	Rule 410 — Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements
Except as otherwise provided in this rule, evidence of the following is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the defendant who made the plea or was a participant in the plea discussions: **(1)** a plea of guilty which was later withdrawn; **(2)** a plea of nolo contendere; **(3)** any statement made in the course of any proceedings under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or comparable state procedure regarding either of the foregoing pleas; or **(4)** any statement made in the course of plea discussions with an attorney for the prosecuting authority which do not result in a plea of guilty or which result in a plea of guilty later withdrawn. However, such a statement is admissible (i) in any proceeding wherein another statement made in the course of the same plea or plea discussions has been introduced and the statement ought in fairness be considered contemporaneously with it, or (ii) in a criminal proceeding for perjury or false statement if the statement was made by the defendant under oath, on the record and in the presence of counsel.	**(a) Prohibited Uses.** In any 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 about either of those pleas made during a proceeding 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)(3) or (4): **(1)** in any proceeding in which another statement made during the same plea or plea discussions has been introduced, if both statements should in fairness be considered at the same time; or **(2)** in a criminal proceeding for perjury or false statement, if the defendant made the statement under oath, on the record, and in the presence of counsel.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 410 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 411. Liability Insurance	Rule 411 — Liability Insurance
Evidence that a person was or was not insured against liability is not admissible upon the issue whether the person acted negligently or otherwise wrongfully. This rule does not require the exclusion of evidence of insurance against liability when offered for another purpose, such as proof of agency, ownership, or control, or bias or prejudice of a witness.	Evidence that a person did or did not have liability insurance is not admissible to prove that 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 prejudice or — if disputed — proving agency, ownership, or control.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 411 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 411 previously provided that evidence was not excluded if offered for a purpose not explicitly prohibited by the Rule. To improve the language of the Rule, it now provides that the court may admit evidence if offered for a permissible purpose. There is no intent to change the process for admitting evidence covered by the Rule. It remains the case that if offered for an impermissible purpose, it must be excluded, and if offered for a purpose not barred by the Rule, its admissibility remains governed by the general principles of Rules 402, 403, 801, etc.

Rule 412. Sex Offense Cases; Relevance of Alleged Victim's Past Sexual Behavior or Alleged Sexual Predisposition	Rule 412 — Sex-Offense Cases: The Victim's Sexual Behavior or Predisposition
(a) Evidence Generally Inadmissible. The following evidence is not admissible in any civil or criminal proceeding involving alleged sexual misconduct except as provided in subdivisions (b) and (c): **(1)** Evidence offered to prove that any alleged victim engaged in other sexual behavior. **(2)** Evidence offered to prove any alleged victim's sexual predisposition.	**(a) Prohibited Uses.** The following evidence is not admissible in a civil or criminal proceeding involving alleged sexual misconduct: **(1)** evidence offered to prove that a victim engaged in other sexual behavior; or **(2)** evidence offered to prove a victim's sexual predisposition.
(b) Exceptions. **(1)** In a criminal case, the following evidence is admissible, if otherwise admissible under these rules: **(A)** evidence of specific instances of sexual behavior by the alleged victim offered to prove that a person other than the accused was the source of semen, injury or other physical evidence; **(B)** evidence of specific instances of sexual behavior by the alleged victim with respect to the person accused of the sexual misconduct offered by the accused to prove consent or by the prosecution; and **(C)** evidence the exclusion of which would violate the constitutional rights of the defendant. **(2)** In a civil case, evidence offered to prove the sexual behavior or sexual predisposition of any alleged victim is admissible if it is otherwise admissible under these rules and its probative value substantially outweighs the danger of harm to any victim and of unfair prejudice to any party. Evidence of an alleged victim's reputation is admissible only if it has been placed in controversy by the alleged victim.	**(b) Exceptions.** **(1)** ***Criminal Cases.*** The court may admit the following evidence in a criminal case: **(A)** evidence of specific instances of a victim's sexual behavior, if offered to prove that someone other than the defendant was the source of semen, injury, or other physical evidence; **(B)** evidence of specific instances of a victim's sexual behavior toward the defendant, if offered by the prosecutor or if offered by the defendant to prove consent; and **(C)** evidence whose exclusion would violate the defendant's constitutional rights. **(2)** ***Civil Cases.*** In a civil case, the court may admit evidence offered to prove a victim's sexual behavior or sexual predisposition if its probative value substantially outweighs the danger of harm to any victim and of unfair prejudice to any party. The court may admit evidence of a victim's reputation only if the victim has placed it in controversy.

(c) Procedure To Determine Admissibility. **(1)** A party intending to offer evidence under subdivision (b) must— **(A)** file a written motion at least 14 days before trial specifically describing the evidence and stating the purpose for which it is offered unless the court, for good cause requires a different time for filing or permits filing during trial; and **(B)** serve the motion on all parties and notify the alleged victim or, when appropriate, the alleged victim's guardian or representative. **(2)** Before admitting evidence under this rule the court must conduct a hearing in camera and afford the victim and parties a right to attend and be heard. The motion, related papers, and the record of the hearing must be sealed and remain under seal unless the court orders otherwise.	**(c) Procedure to Determine Admissibility.** **(1)** ***Motion.*** If a party intends to offer evidence under Rule 412(b), the party must: **(A)** file a motion that specifically describes the evidence and states the purpose for which it is to be offered; **(B)** do so at least 14 days before trial unless the court, for good cause, sets a different time; **(C)** serve the motion on all parties; and **(D)** notify the victim or, when appropriate, the victim's guardian or representative. **(2)** ***Hearing*.** Before admitting evidence under this rule, the court must conduct an in-camera hearing and give the victim and parties a right to attend and be heard. Unless the court orders otherwise, the motion, related materials, and record of the hearing must be and remain sealed.
	(d) Definition of "Victim." In this rule, "victim" includes an alleged victim.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 412 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 413. Evidence of Similar Crimes in Sexual Assault Cases	Rule 413 — Similar Crimes in Sexual-Assault Cases
(a) In a criminal case in which the defendant is accused of an offense of sexual assault, evidence of the defendant's commission of another offense or offenses of sexual assault is admissible, and may be considered for its bearing on any matter to which it is relevant.	**(a) Permitted Uses.** In a criminal case in which a defendant is accused of a sexual assault, the court may admit evidence that the defendant committed any other sexual assault. The evidence may be considered on any matter to which it is relevant.
(b) In a case in which the Government intends to offer evidence under this rule, the attorney for the Government shall disclose the evidence to the defendant, including statements of witnesses or a summary of the substance of any testimony that is expected to be offered, at least fifteen days before the scheduled date of trial or at such later time as the court may allow for good cause.	**(b) Disclosure.** If the prosecutor intends to offer this evidence, the prosecutor must disclose it to the defendant, including witnesses' statements or a summary of the expected testimony. The prosecutor must do so at least 15 days before trial or at a later time that the court allows for good cause.
(c) This rule shall not be construed to limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.	**(c) Effect on Other Rules.** This rule does not limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.
(d) For purposes of this rule and Rule 415, ''offense of sexual assault'' means a crime under Federal law or the law of a State (as defined in section 513 of title 18, United States Code) that involved— **(1)** any conduct proscribed by chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code; **(2)** contact, without consent, between any part of the defendant's body or an object and the genitals or anus of another person; **(3)** contact, without consent, between the genitals or anus of the defendant and any part of another person's body; **(4)** deriving sexual pleasure or gratification from the infliction of death, bodily injury, or physical pain on another person; or **(5)** an attempt or conspiracy to engage in conduct described in paragraphs (1)–(4).	**(d) Definition of "Sexual Assault."** In this rule and Rule 415, "sexual assault" means a crime under federal law or under state law (as "state" is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 513) involving: **(1)** any conduct prohibited by 18 U.S.C. chapter 109A; **(2)** contact, without consent, between any part of the defendant's body — or an object — and another person's genitals or anus; **(3)** contact, without consent, between the defendant's genitals or anus and any part of another person's body; **(4)** deriving sexual pleasure or gratification from inflicting death, bodily injury, or physical pain on another person; or **(5)** an attempt or conspiracy to engage in conduct described in paragraphs (1)–(4).

Committee Note

The language of Rule 413 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 414. Evidence of Similar Crimes in Child Molestation Cases	Rule 414 — Similar Crimes in Child-Molestation Cases
(a) In a criminal case in which the defendant is accused of an offense of child molestation, evidence of the defendant's commission of another offense or offenses of child molestation is admissible, and may be considered for its bearing on any matter to which it is relevant.	**(a) Permitted Uses.** In a criminal case in which a defendant is accused of child molestation, the court may admit evidence that the defendant committed any other act of child molestation. The evidence may be considered on any matter to which it is relevant.
(b) In a case in which the Government intends to offer evidence under this rule, the attorney for the Government shall disclose the evidence to the defendant, including statements of witnesses or a summary of the substance of any testimony that is expected to be offered, at least fifteen days before the scheduled date of trial or at such later time as the court may allow for good cause.	**(b) Disclosure.** If the prosecutor intends to offer this evidence, the prosecutor must disclose it to the defendant, including witnesses' statements or a summary of the expected testimony. The prosecutor must do so at least 15 days before trial or at a later time that the court allows for good cause.
(c) This rule shall not be construed to limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.	**(c) Effect on Other Rules.** This rule does not limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.

(d) For purposes of this rule and Rule 415, ''child'' means a person below the age of fourteen, and ''offense of child molestation'' means a crime under Federal law or the law of a State (as defined in section 513 of title 18, United States Code) that involved— **(1)** any conduct proscribed by chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, that was committed in relation to a child; **(2)** any conduct proscribed by chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code; **(3)** contact between any part of the defendant's body or an object and the genitals or anus of a child; **(4)** contact between the genitals or anus of the defendant and any part of the body of a child; **(5)** deriving sexual pleasure or gratification from the infliction of death, bodily injury, or physical pain on a child; or **(6)** an attempt or conspiracy to engage in conduct described in paragraphs (1)–(5).	**(d) Definition of "Child" and "Child Molestation."** In this rule and Rule 415: **(1)** "child" means a person below the age of 14; and **(2)** "child molestation" means a crime under federal law or under state law (as "state" is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 513) involving: **(A)** any conduct prohibited by 18 U.S.C. chapter 109A and committed with a child; **(B)** any conduct prohibited by 18 U.S.C. chapter 110; **(C)** contact between any part of the defendant's body — or an object — and a child's genitals or anus; **(D)** contact between the defendant's genitals or anus and any part of a child's body; **(E)** deriving sexual pleasure or gratification from inflicting death, bodily injury, or physical pain on a child; or **(F)** an attempt or conspiracy to engage in conduct described in paragraphs (A)–(E).

Committee Note

The language of Rule 414 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 415. Evidence of Similar Acts in Civil Cases Concerning Sexual Assault or Child Molestation	Rule 415 — Similar Acts in Civil Cases Involving Sexual Assault or Child Molestation.
(a) In a civil case in which a claim for damages or other relief is predicated on a party's alleged commission of conduct constituting an offense of sexual assault or child molestation, evidence of that party's commission of another offense or offenses of sexual assault or child molestation is admissible and may be considered as provided in Rule 413 and Rule 414 of these rules.	**(a) Permitted Uses.** In a civil case involving a claim for relief based on a party's alleged sexual assault or child molestation, the court may admit evidence that the party committed any other sexual assault or act of child molestation. The evidence may be considered as provided in Rules 413 and 414.
(b) A party who intends to offer evidence under this Rule shall disclose the evidence to the party against whom it will be offered, including statements of witnesses or a summary of the substance of any testimony that is expected to be offered, at least fifteen days before the scheduled date of trial or at such later time as the court may allow for good cause.	**(b) Disclosure.** If a party intends to offer this evidence, the party must disclose it to the party against whom it will be offered, including witnesses' statements or a summary of the expected testimony. The party must do so at least 15 days before trial or at a later time that the court allows for good cause.
(c) This rule shall not be construed to limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.	**(c) Effect on Other Rules.** This rule does not limit the admission or consideration of evidence under any other rule.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 415 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE V. PRIVILEGES Rule 501. General Rule	ARTICLE V. PRIVILEGES Rule 501 — Privilege in General
Except as otherwise required by the Constitution of the United States or provided by Act of Congress or in rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority, the privilege of a witness, person, government, State, or political subdivision thereof shall be governed by the principles of the common law as they may be interpreted by the courts of the United States in the light of reason and experience. However, in civil actions and proceedings, with respect to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision, the privilege of a witness, person, government, State, or political subdivision thereof shall be determined in accordance with State law.	The common law — as interpreted by United States courts in the light of reason and experience — governs a claim of privilege unless any of the following provides otherwise: • the United States Constitution; • a federal statute; or • other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court. But in a civil case, state law governs a claim of privilege with respect to a claim or defense for which state law supplies the rule of decision.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 501 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 502 — Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product; Limitations on Waiver	Rule 502 — Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product; Limitations on Waiver
The following provisions apply, in the circumstances set out, to disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work-product protection.	The following provisions apply, in the circumstances set out, to disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work-product protection.
(a) Disclosure made in a Federal proceeding or to a Federal office or agency; scope of a waiver. When the disclosure is made in a Federal proceeding or to a Federal office or agency and waives the attorney-client privilege or work-product protection, the waiver extends to an undisclosed communication or information in a Federal or State proceeding only if: **(1)** the waiver is intentional; **(2)** the disclosed and undisclosed communications or information concern the same subject matter; and **(3)** they ought in fairness to be considered together.	**(a) Disclosure Made in a Federal Proceeding or to a Federal Office or Agency; Scope of a Waiver.** When the disclosure is made in a federal proceeding or to a federal office or agency and waives the attorney-client privilege or work-product protection, the waiver extends to an undisclosed communication or information in a federal or state proceeding only if: **(1)** the waiver is intentional; **(2)** the disclosed and undisclosed communications or information concern the same subject matter; and **(3)** they ought in fairness to be considered together.
(b) Inadvertent disclosure. When made in a Federal proceeding or to a Federal office or agency, the disclosure does not operate as a waiver in a Federal or State proceeding if: **(1)** the disclosure is inadvertent; **(2)** the holder of the privilege or protection took reasonable steps to prevent disclosure; and **(3)** the holder promptly took reasonable steps to rectify the error, including (if applicable) following Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5)(B).	**(b) Inadvertent Disclosure.** When made in a federal proceeding or to a federal office or agency, the disclosure does not operate as a waiver in a federal or state proceeding if: **(1)** the disclosure is inadvertent; **(2)** the holder of the privilege or protection took reasonable steps to prevent disclosure; and **(3)** the holder promptly took reasonable steps to rectify the error, including (if applicable) following Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5)(B).

(c) Disclosure made in a State proceeding. When the disclosure is made in a State proceeding and is not the subject of a State-court order concerning waiver, the disclosure does not operate as a waiver in a Federal proceeding if the disclosure: **(1)** would not be a waiver under this rule if it had been made in a Federal proceeding; or **(2)** is not a waiver under the law of the State where the disclosure occured.	**(c) Disclosure Made in a State Proceeding.** When the disclosure is made in a state proceeding and is not the subject of a state-court order concerning waiver, the disclosure does not operate as a waiver in a federal proceeding if the disclosure: **(1)** would not be a waiver under this rule if it had been made in a federal proceeding; or **(2)** is not a waiver under the law of the state where the disclosure occurred.
(d) Controlling effect of a court order. A Federal court may order that the privilege or protection is not waived by disclosure connected with the litigation pending before the court—in which event the disclosure is also not a waiver in any other Federal or State proceeding.	**(d) Controlling Effect of a Court Order.** A federal court may order that the privilege or protection is not waived by disclosure connected with the litigation pending before the court—in which event the disclosure is also not a waiver in any other federal or state proceeding.
(e) Controlling effect of a party agreement. An agreement on the effect of disclosure in a Federal proceeding is binding only on the parties to the agreement, unless it is incorporated into a court order.	**(e) Controlling Effect of a Party Agreement.** An agreement on the effect of disclosure in a federal proceeding is binding only on the parties to the agreement, unless it is incorporated into a court order.
(f) Controlling effect of this rule. Notwithstanding Rules 101 and 1101, this rule applies to State proceedings and to Federal court-annexed and Federal court-mandated arbitration proceedings, in the circumstances set out in the rule. And notwithstanding Rule 501, this rule applies even if State law provides the rule of decision.	**(f) Controlling Effect of this Rule.** Notwithstanding Rules 101 and 1101, this rule applies to state proceedings and to federal court-annexed and federal court-mandated arbitration proceedings, in the circumstances set out in the rule. And notwithstanding Rule 501, this rule applies even if state law provides the rule of decision.
(g) Definitions. In this rule: **(1)** ''attorney-client privilege'' means the protection that applicable law provides for confidential attorney-client communications; and **(2)** ''work-product protection'' means the protection that applicable law provides for tangible material (or its intangible equivalent) prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial.	**(g) Definitions.** In this rule: **(1)** "attorney-client privilege" means the protection that applicable law provides for confidential attorney-client communications; and **(2)** "work-product protection" means the protection that applicable law provides for tangible material (or its intangible equivalent) prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial.

Committee Note

Rule 502 has been amended by changing the initial letter of a few words from upper-case to lower-case as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE VI. WITNESSES Rule 601. General Rule of Competency	ARTICLE VI. WITNESSES Rule 601 — Competency to Testify in General
Every person is competent to be a witness except as otherwise provided in these rules. However, in civil actions and proceedings, with respect to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision, the competency of a witness shall be determined in accordance with State law.	Every person is competent to be a witness unless these rules provide otherwise. But in a civil case, state law governs the witness's competency with respect to a claim or defense for which state law supplies the rule of decision.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 601 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 602. Lack of Personal Knowledge	Rule 602 — Need for Personal Knowledge
A witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter. Evidence to prove personal knowledge may, but need not, consist of the witness' own testimony. This rule is subject to the provisions of rule 703, relating to opinion testimony by expert witnesses.	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 testimony by an expert witness under Rule 703.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 602 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 603. Oath or Affirmation	Rule 603 — Oath or Affirmation to Testify Truthfully
Before testifying, every witness shall be required to declare that the witness will testify truthfully, by oath or affirmation administered in a form calculated to awaken the witness' conscience and impress the witness' mind with the duty to do so.	Before testifying, a witness must give an oath or affirmation to testify truthfully. It must be in a form designed to impress that duty on the witness's conscience.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 603 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 604. Interpreters	Rule 604 — Interpreter
An interpreter is subject to the provisions of these rules relating to qualification as an expert and the administration of an oath or affirmation to make a true translation.	An interpreter must be qualified and must give an oath or affirmation to make a true translation.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 604 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 605. Competency of Judge as Witness	Rule 605 — Judge's Competency as a Witness
The judge presiding at the trial may not testify in that trial as a witness. No objection need be made in order to preserve the point.	The presiding judge may not testify as a witness at the trial. A party need not object to preserve the issue.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 605 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 606. Competency of Juror as Witness	Rule 606 — Juror's Competency as a Witness
(a) At the trial. A member of the jury may not testify as a witness before that jury in the trial of the case in which the juror is sitting. If the juror is called so to testify, the opposing party shall be afforded an opportunity to object out of the presence of the jury.	**(a) At the Trial.** A juror may not testify as a witness before the other jurors at the trial. If a juror is called to testify, the court must give an adverse party an opportunity to object outside the jury's presence.
(b) Inquiry into validity of verdict or indictment. Upon an inquiry into the validity of a verdict or indictment, a juror may not testify as to any matter or statement occurring during the course of the jury's deliberations or to the effect of anything upon that or any other juror's mind or emotions as influencing the juror to assent to or dissent from the verdict or indictment or concerning the juror's mental processes in connection therewith. But a juror may testify about (1) whether extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury's attention, (2) whether any outside influence was improperly brought to bear upon any juror, or (3) whether there was a mistake in entering the verdict onto the verdict form. A juror's affidavit or evidence of any statement by the juror may not be received on a matter about which the juror would be precluded from testifying.	**(b) During an Inquiry into the Validity of a Verdict or Indictment.** **(1)** ***Prohibited Testimony or Other Evidence.*** During an inquiry into the validity of a verdict or indictment, a juror may not testify about any statement made or incident that occurred during the jury's deliberations; the effect of anything on that juror's or another juror's vote; or any juror's mental processes concerning the verdict or indictment. The court may not receive a juror's affidavit or evidence of a juror's statement on these matters. **(2)** ***Exceptions.*** A juror may testify about whether: **(A)** extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury's attention; **(B)** an outside influence was improperly brought to bear on any juror; or **(C)** a mistake was made in entering the verdict on the verdict form.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 606 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 607. Who May Impeach	Rule 607 — Who May Impeach a Witness
The credibility of a witness may be attacked by any party, including the party calling the witness.	Any party, including the party that called the witness, may attack the witness's credibility.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 607 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 608. Evidence of Character and Conduct of Witness	Rule 608 — A Witness's Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness
(a) Opinion and reputation evidence of character. The credibility of a witness may be attacked or supported by evidence in the form of opinion or reputation, but subject to these limitations: (1) the evidence may refer only to character for truthfulness or untruthfulness, and (2) evidence of truthful character is admissible only after the character of the witness for truthfulness has been attacked by opinion or reputation evidence or otherwise.	**(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. Specific instances of the conduct of a witness, for the purpose of attacking or supporting the witness' character for truthfulness, other than conviction of crime as provided in rule 609, may not be proved by extrinsic evidence. They may, however, in the discretion of the court, if probative of truthfulness or untruthfulness, be inquired into on cross-examination of the witness (1) concerning the witness' character for truthfulness or untruthfulness, or (2) concerning the character for truthfulness or untruthfulness of another witness as to which character the witness being cross-examined has testified. The giving of testimony, whether by an accused or by any other witness, does not operate as a waiver of the accused's or the witness' privilege against self-incrimination when examined with respect to matters that relate only to character for truthfulness.	**(b) Specific Instances of Conduct.** Except for a criminal conviction under Rule 609, 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. **(c) Privilege Against Self-Incrimination.** A witness does not waive the privilege against self-incrimination by testifying about a matter that relates only to a character for truthfulness.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 608 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Committee is aware that the Rule's limitation of bad act impeachment to "cross-examination" is trumped by Rule 607, which allows a party to impeach witnesses on direct examination. Courts have not relied on the term "on cross-examination" to limit impeachment that would otherwise be permissible under Rules 607 and 608. The Committee therefore concluded that no change to the language of the Rule was necessary in the context of a restyling project.

Rule 609. Impeachment by Evidence of Conviction of Crime	Rule 609 — Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction
(a) General rule. For the purpose of attacking the character for truthfulness of a witness, **(1)** evidence that a witness other than an accused has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted, subject to Rule 403, if the crime was punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year under the law under which the witness was convicted, and evidence that an accused has been convicted of such a crime shall be admitted if the court determines that the probative value of admitting this evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect to the accused; and **(2)** evidence that any witness has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted regardless of the punishment, if it readily can be determined that establishing the elements of the crime required proof or admission of an act of dishonesty or false statement by the witness.	**(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, if the witness is not a defendant in a criminal case; and **(B)** must be admitted if the witness is a defendant in a criminal case and the probative value of the evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect; 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) Time limit. Evidence of a conviction under this rule is not admissible if a period of more than ten years has elapsed since the date of the conviction or of the release of the witness from the confinement imposed for that conviction, whichever is the later date, unless the court determines, in the interests of justice, that the probative value of the conviction supported by specific facts and circumstances substantially outweighs its prejudicial effect. However, evidence of a conviction more than 10 years old as calculated herein, is not admissible unless the proponent gives to the adverse party sufficient advance written notice of intent to use such evidence to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to contest the use of such evidence.	**(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 the conviction, whichever is later. Evidence of the conviction is admissible only if: **(1)** its probative value, supported by specific facts and circumstances, substantially outweighs its prejudicial effect; and **(2)** the proponent gives an adverse party reasonable written notice of the intent to use it so that the party has a fair opportunity to contest its use.

(c) Effect of pardon, annulment, or certificate of rehabilitation. Evidence of a conviction is not admissible under this rule if (1) the conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, certificate of rehabilitation, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding of the rehabilitation of the person convicted, and that person has not been convicted of a subsequent crime that was punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year, or (2) the conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding of innocence.	**(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 juvenile adjudications is generally not admissible under this rule. The court may, however, in a criminal case allow evidence of a juvenile adjudication of a witness other than the accused if conviction of the offense would be admissible to attack the credibility of an adult and the court is satisfied that admission in evidence is necessary for a fair determination of the issue of guilt or 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)** a conviction of an adult 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 appeal. The pendency of an appeal therefrom does not render evidence of a conviction inadmissible. Evidence of the pendency of an appeal is admissible.	**(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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 609 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 610. Religious Beliefs or Opinions	Rule 610 — Religious Beliefs or Opinions
Evidence of the beliefs or opinions of a witness on matters of religion is not admissible for the purpose of showing that by reason of their nature the witness' credibility is impaired or enhanced.	Evidence of a witness's religious beliefs or opinions is not admissible to attack or support the witness's credibility.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 610 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 611. Mode and Order of Interrogation and Presentation	Rule 611 — Mode and Order of Questioning Witnesses and Presenting Evidence
(a) Control by court. The court shall exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of interrogating witnesses and presenting evidence so as to (1) make the interrogation and presentation effective for the ascertainment of the truth, (2) avoid needless consumption of time, and (3) protect witnesses from harassment or undue embarrassment.	**(a) Control by the Court; Purposes.** The court should exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of questioning 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.
(b) Scope of cross-examination. Cross-examination should be limited to the subject matter of the direct examination and matters affecting the credibility of the witness. The court may, in the exercise of discretion, permit inquiry into additional matters as if on direct examination.	**(b) Scope of Cross-Examination**. Cross-examination should not go beyond the subject matter of the direct examination and matters affecting a witness's credibility. The court may allow inquiry into additional matters as if on direct examination.
(c) Leading questions. Leading questions should not be used on the direct examination of a witness except as may be necessary to develop the witness' testimony. Ordinarily leading questions should be permitted on cross-examination. When a party calls a hostile witness, an adverse party, or a witness identified with an adverse party, interrogation may be by leading questions.	**(c) Leading Questions.** Leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness's testimony. Ordinarily, the court should allow leading questions on cross-examination. And the court should allow leading questions when a party calls a hostile witness, an adverse party, or a witness identified with an adverse party.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 611 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 612. Writing Used to Refresh Memory	Rule 612 — Writing Used to Refresh a Witness's Memory
Except as otherwise provided in criminal proceedings by section 3500 of title 18, United States Code, if a witness uses a writing to refresh memory for the purpose of testifying, either— **(1)** while testifying, or **(2)** before testifying, if the court in its discretion determines it is necessary in the interests of justice, an adverse party is entitled to have the writing produced at the hearing, to inspect it, to cross-examine the witness thereon, and to introduce in evidence those portions which relate to the testimony of the witness. If it is claimed that the writing contains matters not related to the subject matter of the testimony the court shall examine the writing in camera, excise any portions not so related, and order delivery of the remainder to the party entitled thereto. Any portion withheld over objections shall be preserved and made available to the appellate court in the event of an appeal. If a writing is not produced or delivered pursuant to order under this rule, the court shall make any order justice requires, except that in criminal cases when the prosecution elects not to comply, the order shall be one striking the testimony or, if the court in its discretion determines that the interests of justice so require, declaring a mistrial.	**(a) Scope.** This rule gives an adverse party certain options when a witness uses a writing to refresh memory: **(1)** while testifying; or **(2)** before testifying, if the court decides that justice requires a party to have those options. **(b) Adverse Party's Options; Deleting Unrelated Matter.** Unless 18 U.S.C. § 3500 provides otherwise in a criminal case, an adverse party is entitled to have the writing produced at the hearing, to inspect it, to cross-examine the witness about it, and to introduce in evidence any portion that relates to the witness's testimony. If the producing party claims that the writing includes unrelated matter, the court must examine the writing in camera, delete any unrelated portion, and order that the rest be delivered to the adverse party. Any portion deleted over objection must be preserved for the record. **(c) Failure to Produce or Deliver.** If a writing is not produced or is not delivered as ordered, the court may issue any appropriate order. But if the prosecution does not comply in a criminal case, the court must strike the witness's testimony or — if justice so requires — declare a mistrial.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 612 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 613. Prior Statements of Witnesses	Rule 613 — Witness's Prior Statement
(a) Examining witness concerning prior statement. In examining a witness concerning a prior statement made by the witness, whether written or not, the statement need not be shown nor its contents disclosed to the witness at that time, but on request the same shall be shown or disclosed to opposing counsel.	**(a) Showing or Disclosing the Statement During Questioning.** When questioning a witness about the witness's prior statement, the 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 prior inconsistent statement of witness. Extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement by a witness is not admissible unless the witness is afforded an opportunity to explain or deny the same and the opposite party is afforded an opportunity to interrogate the witness thereon, or the interests of justice otherwise require. This provision does not apply to admissions of a party-opponent as defined in rule 801(d)(2).	**(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 question 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).

Committee Note

The language of Rule 613 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 614. Calling and Interrogation of Witnesses by Court	Rule 614 — Court's Calling or Questioning a Witness
(a) Calling by court. The court may, on its own motion or at the suggestion of a party, call witnesses, and all parties are entitled to cross-examine witnesses thus called.	**(a) Calling.** The court may call a witness on its own or at a party's suggestion. Each party is entitled to cross-examine the witness.
(b) Interrogation by court. The court may interrogate witnesses, whether called by itself or by a party.	**(b) Questioning.** The court may question a witness regardless of who calls the witness.
(c) Objections. Objections to the calling of witnesses by the court or to interrogation by it may be made at the time or at the next available opportunity when the jury is not present.	**(c) Objections.** A party may object to the court's calling or questioning a witness either at that time or at the next opportunity when the jury is not present.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 614 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 615. Exclusion of Witnesses	Rule 615 — Excluding Witnesses
At the request of a party the court shall order witnesses excluded so that they cannot hear the testimony of other witnesses, and it may make the order of its own motion. This rule does not authorize exclusion of (1) a party who is a natural person, or (2) an officer or employee of a party which is not a natural person designated as its representative by its attorney, or (3) a person whose presence is shown by a party to be essential to the presentation of the party's cause, or (4) a person authorized by statute to be present.	At a party's request, the court must order witnesses excluded so that they cannot hear other witnesses' testimony. Or the court may do so on its own. But this rule does not authorize excluding: **(a)** a party who is a natural person; **(b)** an officer or employee of a party that is not a natural person, after being designated as the party's representative by its attorney; **(c)** a person whose presence a party shows to be essential to presenting the party's claim or defense; or **(d)** a person authorized by statute to be present.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 615 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE VII. OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY Rule 701. Opinion Testimony by Lay Witnesses	ARTICLE VII. OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY Rule 701 — Opinion Testimony by Lay Witnesses
If the witness is not testifying as an expert, the witness' testimony in the form of opinions or inferences is limited to those opinions or inferences which are (a) rationally based on the perception of the witness, and (b) helpful to a clear understanding of the witness' testimony or the determination of a fact in issue, and (c) not based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of Rule 702.	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's 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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 701 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Committee deleted all reference to an "inference" on the grounds that the deletion made the Rule flow better and easier to read, and because any "inference" is covered by the broader term "opinion." Courts have not made substantive decisions on the basis of any distinction between an opinion and an inference. No change in current practice is intended.

Rule 702. Testimony by Experts	Rule 702 — Testimony by Expert Witnesses
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, if (1) the testimony is based upon sufficient facts or data, (2) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods, and (3) the witness has applied the principles and methods reliably to the facts of the case.	A witness who is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or otherwise if: **(a)** the expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue; **(b)** the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data; **(c)** the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and **(d)** the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 702 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 703. Bases of Opinion Testimony by Experts	Rule 703 — Bases of an Expert's Opinion Testimony
The facts or data in the particular case upon which an expert bases an opinion or inference may be those perceived by or made known to the expert at or before the hearing. If of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject, the facts or data need not be admissible in evidence in order for the opinion or inference to be admitted. Facts or data that are otherwise inadmissible shall not be disclosed to the jury by the proponent of the opinion or inference unless the court determines that their probative value in assisting the jury to evaluate the expert's opinion substantially outweighs their prejudicial effect.	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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 703 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Committee deleted all reference to an "inference" on the grounds that the deletion made the Rule flow better and easier to read, and because any "inference" is covered by the broader term "opinion." Courts have not made substantive decisions on the basis of any distinction between an opinion and an inference. No change in current practice is intended.

Rule 704. Opinion on Ultimate Issue	Rule 704 — Opinion on an Ultimate Issue
(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), testimony in the form of an opinion or inference otherwise admissible is not objectionable because it embraces an ultimate issue to be decided by the trier of fact.	**(a) In General — Not Automatically Objectionable.** An opinion is not objectionable just because it embraces an ultimate issue.
(b) No expert witness testifying with respect to the mental state or condition of a defendant in a criminal case may state an opinion or inference as to whether the defendant did or did not have the mental state or condition constituting an element of the crime charged or of a defense thereto. Such ultimate issues are matters for the trier of fact alone.	**(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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 704 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Committee deleted all reference to an "inference" on the grounds that the deletion made the Rule flow better and easier to read, and because any "inference" is covered by the broader term "opinion." Courts have not made substantive decisions on the basis of any distinction between an opinion and an inference. No change in current practice is intended.

Rule 705. Disclosure of Facts or Data Underlying Expert Opinion	Rule 705 — Disclosing the Facts or Data Underlying an Expert's Opinion
The expert may testify in terms of opinion or inference and give reasons therefor without first testifying to the underlying facts or data, unless the court requires otherwise. The expert may in any event be required to disclose the underlying facts or data on cross-examination.	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.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 705 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Committee deleted all reference to an "inference" on the grounds that the deletion made the Rule flow better and easier to read, and because any "inference" is covered by the broader term "opinion." Courts have not made substantive decisions on the basis of any distinction between an opinion and an inference. No change in current practice is intended.

Rule 706. Court Appointed Experts	Rule 706 — Court-Appointed Expert Witnesses
(a) Appointment. The court may on its own motion or on the motion of any party enter an order to show cause why expert witnesses should not be appointed, and may request the parties to submit nominations. The court may appoint any expert witnesses agreed upon by the parties, and may appoint expert witnesses of its own selection. An expert witness shall not be appointed by the court unless the witness consents to act. A witness so appointed shall be informed of the witness' duties by the court in writing, a copy of which shall be filed with the clerk, or at a conference in which the parties shall have opportunity to participate. A witness so appointed shall advise the parties of the witness' findings, if any; the witness' deposition may be taken by any party; and the witness may be called to testify by the court or any party. The witness shall be subject to cross-examination by each party, including a party calling the witness.	**(a) Appointment Process.** On a party's motion or on its own, the court may order the parties to show cause why expert witnesses should not be appointed and may ask the parties to submit nominations. The court may appoint any expert witness that the parties agree on and any of its own choosing. But the court may only appoint someone who consents to act. **(b) Expert's Role.** The court must inform the expert in writing of the expert's duties and have a copy filed with the clerk. Or the court may so inform the expert at a conference in which the parties have an opportunity to participate. The expert: **(1)** must advise the parties of any findings the expert makes; **(2)** may be deposed by any party; **(3)** may be called to testify by the court or any party; and **(4)** may be cross-examined by any party, including the party that called the expert.
(b) Compensation. Expert witnesses so appointed are entitled to reasonable compensation in whatever sum the court may allow. The compensation thus fixed is payable from funds which may be provided by law in criminal cases and civil actions and proceedings involving just compensation under the fifth amendment. In other civil actions and proceedings the compensation shall be paid by the parties in such proportion and at such time as the court directs, and thereafter charged in like manner as other costs.	**(c) Compensation.** The expert is entitled to whatever reasonable compensation the court allows. The compensation is payable as follows: **(1)** in a criminal case or in a civil case involving just compensation under the Fifth Amendment, from any funds that are provided by law; and **(2)** in any other civil case, by the parties in the proportion and at the time that the court directs — and the compensation is then charged like other costs.
(c) Disclosure of appointment. In the exercise of its discretion, the court may authorize disclosure to the jury of the fact that the court appointed the expert witness.	**(d) Disclosing the Appointment.** The court may authorize disclosure to the jury that the court appointed the expert.
(d) Parties' experts of own selection. Nothing in this rule limits the parties in calling expert witnesses of their own selection.	**(e) Parties' Choice of Their Own Experts.** This rule does not limit a party in calling its own experts.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 706 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE VIII. HEARSAY Rule 801. Definitions	ARTICLE VIII. HEARSAY Rule 801 — Definitions That Apply To This Article
The following definitions apply under this article: **(a) Statement.** A ''statement'' is (1) an oral or written assertion or (2) nonverbal conduct of a person, if it is intended by the person as an assertion.	**(a) Statement.** "Statement" means: **(1)** a person's oral or written assertion; or **(2)** a person's nonverbal conduct, if the person intended it as an assertion.
(b) Declarant. A ''declarant'' is a person who makes a statement.	**(b) Declarant.** "Declarant" means the person who made the statement.
(c) Hearsay. ''Hearsay'' is a statement, other than one made by the declarant while testifying at the trial or hearing, offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted.	**(c) Hearsay.** "Hearsay" means a prior statement — one the declarant does not make while testifying at the current trial or hearing — that a party offers in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted by the declarant.
(d) Statements which are not hearsay. A statement is not hearsay if— **(1) Prior statement by witness.** The declarant testifies at the trial or hearing and is subject to cross-examination concerning the statement, and the statement is (A) inconsistent with the declarant's testimony, and was given under oath subject to the penalty of perjury at a trial, hearing, or other proceeding, or in a deposition, or (B) consistent with the declarant's testimony and is offered to rebut an express or implied charge against the declarant of recent fabrication or improper influence or motive, or (C) one of identification of a person made after perceiving the person; or	**(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 the 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) Admission by party-opponent. The statement is offered against a party and is (A) the party's own statement, in either an individual or a representative capacity or (B) a statement of which the party has manifested an adoption or belief in its truth, or (C) a statement by a person authorized by the party to make a statement concerning the subject, or (D) a statement by the party's agent or servant concerning a matter within the scope of the agency or employment, made during the existence of the relationship, or (E) a statement by a coconspirator of a party during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy. The contents of the statement shall be considered but are not alone sufficient to establish the declarant's authority under subdivision (C), the agency or employment relationship and scope thereof under subdivision (D), or the existence of the conspiracy and the participation therein of the declarant and the party against whom the statement is offered under subdivision (E).	**(2)** ***An Opposing Party's Statement.*** The statement is offered against an opposing party and: **(A)** was made by the party in an individual or representative capacity; **(B)** is one that the party adopted or the party accepted as 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 co-conspirator during and in furtherance of the conspiracy. The statement must be considered but does not by 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).

Committee Note

The language of Rule 801 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Statements falling under the hearsay exemption provided by Rule 801(d)(2) are no longer referred to as "admissions" in the title to the subdivision. The term "admissions" is confusing because not all statements covered by the exemption are admissions in the colloquial sense — a statement can be within the exemption even it "admitted" nothing and was not against the party's interest when made. The term "admissions" also raises confusion in comparison with the Rule 804(b)(3) exception for declarations against interest. No change in application of the exemption is intended.

Rule 802. Hearsay Rule	Rule 802 — The Rule Against Hearsay
Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority or by Act of Congress.	Hearsay is not admissible unless any of the following provides otherwise: • a federal statute; • these rules; or • other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 802 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 803. Hearsay Exceptions; Availability of Declarant Immaterial	Rule 803 — Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay — Regardless of Whether the Declarant Is Available as a Witness
The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule, even though the declarant is available as a witness:	The following are not excluded by the rule against hearsay, 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 the declarant was perceiving the event or condition, or immediately thereafter.	**(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 caused by the event or condition.	**(2)** ***Excited Utterance.*** A statement relating to a startling event or condition, made while the declarant was under the stress or excitement that it caused.
(3) Then existing mental, emotional, or physical condition. A statement of the declarant's then existing state of mind, emotion, sensation, or physical condition (such as intent, plan, motive, design, mental feeling, pain, and bodily health), but not including a statement of memory or belief to prove the fact remembered or believed unless it relates to the execution, revocation, identification, or terms of declarant's will.	**(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.
(4) Statements for purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment. Statements made for purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment and describing medical history, or past or present symptoms, pain, or sensations, or the inception or general character of the cause or external source thereof insofar as reasonably pertinent to diagnosis or treatment.	**(4)** ***Statement 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; or the inception or general character of their cause.

(5) Recorded recollection. A memorandum or record concerning a matter about which a witness once had knowledge but now has insufficient recollection to enable the witness to testify fully and accurately, shown to have been made or adopted by the witness when the matter was fresh in the witness' memory and to reflect that knowledge correctly. If admitted, the memorandum or record may be read into evidence but may not itself be received as an exhibit unless offered by an adverse party.	**(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 regularly conducted activity. A memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, in any form, of acts, events, conditions, opinions, or diagnoses, made at or near the time by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge, if kept in the course of a regularly conducted business activity, and if it was the regular practice of that business activity to make the memorandum, report, record or data compilation, all as shown by the testimony of the custodian or other qualified witness, or by certification that complies with Rule 902(11), Rule 902(12), or a statute permitting certification, unless the source of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness. The term ''business'' as used in this paragraph includes business, institution, association, profession, occupation, and calling of every kind, whether or not conducted for profit.	**(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; and **(D)** all these conditions are shown by the testimony of the custodian or another qualified witness, or by a certification that complies with Rule 902(b)(11) or (12) or with a statute permitting certification. But this exception does not apply if the source of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate a lack of trustworthiness.

(7) Absence of entry in records kept in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (6). Evidence that a matter is not included in the memoranda reports, records, or data compilations, in any form, kept in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (6), to prove the nonoccurrence or nonexistence of the matter, if the matter was of a kind of which a memorandum, report, record, or data compilation was regularly made and preserved, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate 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; and **(B)** a record was regularly kept for a matter of that kind. But this exception does not apply if the possible source of the information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.
(8) Public records and reports. Records, reports, statements, or data compilations, in any form, of public offices or agencies, setting forth (A) the activities of the office or agency, or (B) matters observed pursuant to duty imposed by law as to which matters there was a duty to report, excluding, however, in criminal cases matters observed by police officers and other law enforcement personnel, or (C) in civil actions and proceedings and against the Government in criminal cases, factual findings resulting from an investigation made pursuant to authority granted by law, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness.	**(8)** ***Public Records.*** A record of a public office setting out: **(A)** the office's activities; **(B)** 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 **(C)** in a civil case or against the government in a criminal case, factual findings from a legally authorized investigation. But this exception does not apply if the source of information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.
(9) Records of vital statistics. Records or data compilations, in any form, of births, fetal deaths, deaths, or marriages, if the report thereof was made to a public office pursuant to requirements of law.	**(9)** ***Public 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 public record or entry. To prove the absence of a record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, or the nonoccurrence or nonexistence of a matter of which a record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, was regularly made and preserved by a public office or agency, evidence in the form of a certification in accordance with rule 902, or testimony, that diligent search failed to disclose the record, report, statement, or data compilation, or entry.	**(10)** ***Absence of a Public Record.*** Testimony — or a certification under Rule 902 — that a diligent search failed to disclose a public record if the testimony or certification is admitted to prove that: **(A)** the record does not exist; or **(B)** a matter did not occur or exist, even though a public office regularly kept a record 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.	**(11)** ***Records of Religious Organizations Concerning Personal or Family History.*** A statement of birth, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, death, relationship by blood or marriage, or similar facts of personal or family history, contained in a regularly kept record of a religious organization.
(12) Marriage, baptismal, and similar certificates. Statements of fact contained in a certificate that the maker performed a marriage or other ceremony or administered a sacrament, made by a clergyman, public official, or other person authorized by the rules or practices of a religious organization or by law to perform the act certified, and purporting to have been issued at the time of the act or within a reasonable time thereafter.	**(12)** ***Certificates of Marriage, Baptism, and Similar Ceremonies.*** A statement of fact contained in a certificate: **(A)** made by a person who is authorized by a religious organization or by law to perform the act certified; **(B)** attesting that the person performed a marriage or similar ceremony or administered a sacrament; and **(C)** purporting to have been issued at the time of the act or within a reasonable time after it.
(13) Family records. Statements of fact concerning personal or family history contained in family Bibles, genealogies, charts, engravings on rings, inscriptions on family portraits, engravings on urns, crypts, or tombstones, or the like.	**(13)** ***Family Records.*** A statement of fact about personal or family history contained in a family record, such as a Bible, genealogy, chart, engraving on a ring, inscription on a portrait, or engraving on an urn or burial marker.

(14) Records of documents affecting an interest in property. The record of a document purporting to establish or affect an interest in property, as proof of the content of the original recorded document and its execution and delivery by each person by whom it purports to have been executed, if the record is a record of a public office and an applicable statute authorizes the recording of documents of that kind in that office.	**(14)** ***Records of Documents That Affect an Interest in Property.*** The record of a document that purports to establish or affect an interest in property if: **(A)** the record is admitted to prove the content of the original recorded document, along with its signing and its delivery by each person who purports to have signed it; **(B)** the record is kept in a public office; and **(C)** a statute authorizes recording documents of that kind in that office.
(15) Statements in documents affecting an interest in property. A statement contained in a document purporting to establish or affect an interest in property if the matter stated was relevant to the purpose of the document, unless dealings with the property since the document was made have been inconsistent with the truth of the statement or the purport of the document.	**(15)** ***Statements in Documents That Affect an Interest in Property.*** A statement contained in a document that purports to establish or affect an interest in property if the matter stated was relevant to the document's purpose — unless later dealings with the property are inconsistent with the truth of the statement or the purport of the document.
(16) Statements in ancient documents. Statements in a document in existence twenty years or more the authenticity of which is established.	**(16)** ***Statements in Ancient Documents.*** A statement in a document that is at least 20 years old and whose authenticity is established.
(17) Market reports, commercial publications. Market quotations, tabulations, lists, directories, or other published compilations, generally used and relied upon by the public or by persons in particular occupations.	**(17)** ***Market Reports and Similar Commercial Publications.*** Market quotations, lists, directories, or other compilations that are generally relied on by the public or by persons in particular occupations.

(18) Learned treatises. To the extent called to the attention of an expert witness upon cross-examination or relied upon by the expert witness in direct examination, statements contained in published treatises, periodicals, or pamphlets on a subject of history, medicine, or other science or art, established as a reliable authority by the testimony or admission of the witness or by other expert testimony or by judicial notice. If admitted, the statements may be read into evidence but may not be received as exhibits.	**(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.	**(19)** ***Reputation Concerning Personal or Family History.*** A reputation among a person's family by blood, adoption, or marriage — or among a person's associates or in the community — concerning the person's birth, adoption, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, death, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, or similar facts of personal or family history.
(20) Reputation concerning boundaries or general history. Reputation in a community, arising before the controversy, as to boundaries of or customs affecting lands in the community, and reputation as to events of general history important to the community or State or nation in which located.	**(20)** ***Reputation Concerning Boundaries or General History.*** A reputation in a community — arising before the controversy — concerning boundaries of land in the community or customs that affect the land, or about general historical events important to that community, state, or nation.
(21) Reputation as to character. Reputation of a person's character among associates or in the community.	**(21)** ***Reputation Concerning Character.*** A reputation among a person's associates or in the community concerning the person's character.

(22) Judgment of previous conviction. Evidence of a final judgment, entered after a trial or upon a plea of guilty (but not upon a plea of nolo contendere), adjudging a person guilty of a crime punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year, to prove any fact essential to sustain the judgment, but not including, when offered by the Government in a criminal prosecution for purposes other than impeachment, judgments against persons other than the accused. The pendency of an appeal may be shown but does not affect admissibility.	**(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 judgment 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) Judgment as to personal, family, or general history, or boundaries. Judgments as proof of matters of personal, family or general history, or boundaries, essential to the judgment, if the same would be provable by evidence of reputation.	**(23)** ***Judgments Involving Personal, Family, or General History or a Boundary.*** A judgment that is admitted to prove a matter of personal, family, or general history, or boundaries, if the matter: **(A)** was essential to the judgment; and **(B)** could be proved by evidence of reputation.
(24) [Other exceptions.] [Transferred to Rule 807]	**(24) [Other exceptions.]** [Transferred to Rule 807]

Committee Note

The language of Rule 803 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 804. Hearsay Exceptions; Declarant Unavailable	Rule 804 — Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay — When the Declarant Is Unavailable as a Witness
(a) Definition of unavailability. ''Unavailability as a witness'' includes situations in which the declarant— **(1)** is exempted by ruling of the court on the ground of privilege from testifying concerning the subject matter of the declarant's statement; or **(2)** persists in refusing to testify concerning the subject matter of the declarant's statement despite an order of the court to do so; or **(3)** testifies to a lack of memory of the subject matter of the declarant's statement; or **(4)** is unable to be present or to testify at the hearing because of death or then existing physical or mental illness or infirmity; or **(5)** is absent from the hearing and the proponent of a statement has been unable to procure the declarant's attendance (or in the case of a hearsay exception under subdivision (b)(2), (3), or (4), the declarant's attendance or testimony) by process or other reasonable means. A declarant is not unavailable as a witness if exemption, refusal, claim of lack of memory, inability, or absence is due to the procurement or wrongdoing of the proponent of a statement for the purpose of preventing the witness from attending or testifying.	**(a) Criteria for Being Unavailable.** A declarant is considered to be unavailable as a witness if the declarant: **(1)** is exempted by a court ruling on the ground of having a privilege to not testify about the subject matter of the declarant's statement; **(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; or **(B)** in the case of a hearsay exception under Rule 804(b)(2), (3), or (4) below, the declarant's attendance or testimony. But this subdivision (a) does not apply if the statement's proponent procured or wrongfully caused the declarant's unavailability in order to prevent the declarant from attending or testifying.

(b) Hearsay exceptions. The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule if the declarant is unavailable as a witness:	**(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 given as a witness at another hearing of the same or a different proceeding, or in a deposition taken in compliance with law in the course of the same or another proceeding, if the party against whom the testimony is now offered, or, in a civil action or proceeding, a predecessor in interest, had an opportunity and similar motive to develop the testimony by direct, cross, or redirect examination.	**(1)** ***Former Testimony.*** Testimony that: **(A)** was given as a witness at a trial, hearing, or 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 belief of impending death. In a prosecution for homicide or in a civil action or proceeding, a statement made by a declarant while believing that the declarant's death was imminent, concerning the cause or circumstances of what the declarant believed to be impending death.	**(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 which was at the time of its making so far contrary to the declarant's pecuniary or proprietary interest, or so far tended to subject the declarant to civil or criminal liability, or to render invalid a claim by the declarant against another, that a reasonable person in the declarant's position would not have made the statement unless believing it to be true. A statement tending to expose the declarant to criminal liability and offered to exculpate the accused is not admissible unless corroborating circumstances clearly indicate the trustworthiness of the statement.	**(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) A statement concerning the declarant's own birth, adoption, marriage, divorce, legitimacy, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, ancestry, or other similar fact of personal or family history, even though declarant had no means of acquiring personal knowledge of the matter stated; or (B) a statement concerning the foregoing matters, and death also, of another person, if the declarant was related to the other by blood, adoption, or marriage or was so intimately associated with the other's family as to be likely to have accurate information concerning the matter declared.	**(4)** ***Statement of Personal or Family History.*** A statement about: **(A)** the declarant's own birth, adoption, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, relationship by blood 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) [Other exceptions.] [Transferred to Rule 807] **(6) Forfeiture by wrongdoing.** A statement offered against a party that has engaged or acquiesced in wrongdoing that was intended to, and did, procure the unavailability of the declarant as a witness.	**(5)** ***Statement Offered Against a Party Who Wrongfully Caused the Declarant's Unavailability.*** A statement offered against the party that wrongfully caused — or acquiesced in wrongfully causing — the declarant to be unavailable in order to prevent the declarant from attending or testifying. **[Other exceptions.]** [Transferred to Rule 807]

Committee Note

The language of Rule 804 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The amendment to Rule 804(b)(3) provides that the corroborating circumstances requirement applies not only to declarations against penal interest offered by the defendant in a criminal case, but also to such statements offered by the government. The language in the original rule does not so provide, but a proposed amendment to Rule 804(b)(3) — released for public comment in 2008 and scheduled to be enacted before the restyled rules — explicitly extends the corroborating circumstances requirement to statements offered by the government.

Rule 805. Hearsay Within Hearsay	Rule 805 — Hearsay Within Hearsay
Hearsay included within hearsay is not excluded under the hearsay rule if each part of the combined statements conforms with an exception to the hearsay rule provided in these rules.	Hearsay within hearsay is not excluded by the rule against hearsay if each part of the combined statements conforms with an exception to the rule.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 805 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 806. Attacking and Supporting Credibility of Declarant	Rule 806 — Attacking and Supporting the Declarant's Credibility
When a hearsay statement, or a statement defined in Rule 801(d)(2)(C), (D), or (E), has been admitted in evidence, the credibility of the declarant may be attacked, and if attacked may be supported, by any evidence which would be admissible for those purposes if declarant had testified as a witness. Evidence of a statement or conduct by the declarant at any time, inconsistent with the declarant's hearsay statement, is not subject to any requirement that the declarant may have been afforded an opportunity to deny or explain. If the party against whom a hearsay statement has been admitted calls the declarant as a witness, the party is entitled to examine the declarant on the statement as if under cross-examination.	When a hearsay statement — or a statement described in Rule 801(d)(2)(C), (D), or (E) — has been admitted in evidence, the declarant's credibility may be attacked, and then supported, by any evidence that would be admissible for those purposes if the declarant had testified as a witness. The court may admit evidence of the declarant's inconsistent statement or conduct, regardless of when it occurred or whether the declarant had an opportunity to explain or deny it. If the party against whom the statement was admitted calls the declarant as a witness, the party may examine the declarant on the statement as if on cross-examination.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 806 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 807. Residual Exception	Rule 807 — Residual Exception
A statement not specifically covered by Rule 803 or 804 but having equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness, is not excluded by the hearsay rule, if the court determines that (A) the statement is offered as evidence of a material fact; (B) the statement is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence which the proponent can procure through reasonable efforts; and (C) the general purposes of these rules and the interests of justice will best be served by admission of the statement into evidence. However, a statement may not be admitted under this exception unless the proponent of it makes known to the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the trial or hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to meet it, the proponent's intention to offer the statement and the particulars of it, including the name and address of the declarant.	**(a) In General.** Under the following circumstances, a hearsay statement is not excluded by the rule against hearsay even if the statement is not specifically covered by a hearsay exception in Rule 803 or 804: **(1)** the statement has equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness; **(2)** it is offered as evidence of a material fact; **(3)** it is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence that the proponent can obtain through reasonable efforts; and **(4)** admitting it will best serve the purposes of these rules and the interests of justice. **(b) Notice.** The statement is admissible only if, before the trial or hearing, the proponent gives an adverse party reasonable notice of the intent to offer the statement and its particulars, including the declarant's name and address, so that the party has a fair opportunity to meet it.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 807 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE IX. AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTIFICATION Rule 901. Requirement of Authentication or Identification	ARTICLE IX. AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTIFICATION Rule 901 — Authenticating or Identifying Evidence
(a) General provision. The 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.	**(a) In General.** To authenticate or identify an item of evidence in order to have it admitted, the proponent must produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is.
(b) Illustrations. By way of illustration only, and not by way of limitation, the following are examples of authentication or identification conforming with the requirements of this rule:	**(b) Examples.** The following are examples only — not a complete list — of evidence that satisfies the requirement:
(1) Testimony of witness with knowledge. Testimony that a matter is what it is claimed to be.	**(1)** ***Testimony of a Witness with Knowledge.*** Testimony that an item is what it is claimed to be.
(2) Nonexpert opinion on handwriting. Nonexpert opinion as to the genuineness of handwriting, based upon familiarity not acquired for purposes of the litigation.	**(2)** ***Nonexpert Opinion About Handwriting.*** A nonexpert's opinion that the handwriting is genuine, based on a familiarity with it that was not acquired for the current litigation.
(3) Comparison by trier or expert witness. Comparison by the trier of fact or by expert witnesses with specimens which have been authenticated.	**(3)** ***Comparison by an Expert Witness or the Trier of Fact.*** A comparison with an authenticated specimen by an expert witness or the trier of fact.
(4) Distinctive characteristics and the like. Appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics, taken in conjunction with circumstances.	**(4)** ***Distinctive Characteristics and the Like.*** The appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics of the item, taken together with all the circumstances.
(5) Voice identification. Identification of a voice, whether heard firsthand or through mechanical or electronic transmission or recording, by opinion based upon hearing the voice at any time under circumstances connecting it with the alleged speaker.	**(5)** ***Opinion About a Voice.*** An opinion identifying a person's voice — whether heard firsthand or through mechanical or electronic transmission or recording — based on hearing the voice at any time under circumstances that connect it with the alleged speaker.

(6) Telephone conversations. Telephone conversations, by evidence that a call was made to the number assigned at the time by the telephone company to a particular person or business, if (A) in the case of a person, circumstances, including self-identification, show the person answering to be the one called, or (B) in the case of a business, the call was made to a place of business and the conversation related to business reasonably transacted over the telephone.	**(6)** ***Evidence About a Phone Conversation.*** For a phone conversation, evidence that a call was made to the number assigned at the time to: **(A)** a particular person, if circumstances, including self-identification, show that the person answering was the one called; or **(B)** a particular business, if the call was made to a business and the call related to business reasonably transacted over the phone.
(7) Public records or reports. Evidence that a writing authorized by law to be recorded or filed and in fact recorded or filed in a public office, or a purported public record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, is from the public office where items of this nature are kept.	**(7)** ***Evidence About Public Records.*** Evidence that: **(A)** a record is from the public office where items of this kind are kept; or **(B)** a document was lawfully recorded or filed in a public office.
(8) Ancient documents or data compilation. Evidence that a document or data compilation, in any form, (A) is in such condition as to create no suspicion concerning its authenticity, (B) was in a place where it, if authentic, would likely be, and (C) has been in existence 20 years or more at the time it is offered.	**(8)** ***Evidence About Ancient Documents or Data Compilations.*** For a document or data compilation, evidence that it: **(A)** is in a condition that creates no suspicion about its authenticity; **(B)** was in a place where, if authentic, it would likely be; and **(C)** is at least 20 years old when offered.
(9) Process or system. Evidence describing a process or system used to produce a result and showing that the process or system produces an accurate result.	**(9)** ***Evidence About a Process or System.*** Evidence describing a process or system and showing that it produces an accurate result.
(10) Methods provided by statute or rule. Any method of authentication or identification provided by Act of Congress or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority.	**(10)** ***Methods Provided by a Statute or Rule.*** Any method of authentication or identification allowed by a federal statute or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 901 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 902. Self-authentication	Rule 902 — Evidence That Is Self-Authenticating
Extrinsic evidence of authenticity as a condition precedent to admissibility is not required with respect to the following: **(1) Domestic public documents under seal.** A document bearing a seal purporting to be that of the United States, or of any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, or insular possession thereof, or the Panama Canal Zone, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or of a political subdivision, department, officer, or agency thereof, and a signature purporting to be an attestation or execution.	The following items of evidence are self-authenticating; they require no extrinsic evidence of authenticity in order to be admitted. **(1)** ***Domestic Public Documents That Are Signed and Sealed.*** A document that bears: **(A)** a signature purporting to be an execution or attestation; and **(B)** a seal purporting to be that of the United States; any state, district, commonwealth, territory, or insular possession of the United States; the former Panama Canal Zone; the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; a political subdivision of any of these entities; or a department, agency, or officer of any entity named above.
(2) Domestic public documents not under seal. A document purporting to bear the signature in the official capacity of an officer or employee of any entity included in paragraph (1) hereof, having no seal, if a public officer having a seal and having official duties in the district or political subdivision of the officer or employee certifies under seal that the signer has the official capacity and that the signature is genuine.	**(2)** ***Domestic Public Documents That Are Signed But Not Sealed.*** A document that bears no seal if: **(A)** it bears the signature of an officer or employee of an entity named in Rule 902(1)(B); and **(B)** another public officer who has a seal and official duties within that same entity certifies under seal — or its equivalent — that the signer has the official capacity and that the signature is genuine.

(3) Foreign public documents. A document purporting to be executed or attested in an official capacity by a person authorized by the laws of a foreign country to make the execution or attestation, and accompanied by a final certification as to the genuineness of the signature and official position (A) of the executing or attesting person, or (B) of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness of signature and official position relates to the execution or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness of signature and official position relating to the execution or attestation. A final certification may be made by a secretary of an embassy or legation, consul general, consul, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States, or a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the United States. If reasonable opportunity has been given to all parties to investigate the authenticity and accuracy of official documents, the court may, for good cause shown, order that they be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification or permit them to be evidenced by an attested summary with or without final certification.	**(3)** ***Foreign Public Documents.*** A document that purports to be signed or attested by a person who is authorized by a foreign country's law to do so. The document must be accompanied by a final certification that certifies the genuineness of the signature and official position of the signer or attester — or of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness relates to the signature or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness relating to the signature or attestation. The certification may be made by a secretary of a United States embassy or legation; by a consul general, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States; or by a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the United States. If all parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to investigate the document's authenticity and accuracy, the court may, for good cause, either: **(A)** order that it be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification; or **(B)** allow it to be evidenced by an attested summary with or without final certification.
(4) Certified copies of public records. A copy of an official record or report or entry therein, or of a document authorized by law to be recorded or filed and actually recorded or filed in a public office, including data compilations in any form, certified as correct by the custodian or other person authorized to make the certification, by certificate complying with paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this rule or complying with any Act of Congress or rule prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority.	**(4)** ***Certified Copies of Public Records.*** A copy of an official record — or a copy of a document that was lawfully recorded or filed in a public office — if the copy is certified as correct by: **(A)** the custodian or another person authorized to make the certification; or **(B)** a certificate that complies with Rule 902(1), (2), or (3), a federal statute, or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court.
(5) Official publications. Books, pamphlets, or other publications purporting to be issued by public authority.	**(5)** ***Official Publications.*** A book, pamphlet, or other publication purporting to be issued by a public authority.
(6) Newspapers and periodicals. Printed materials purporting to be newspapers or periodicals.	**(6)** ***Newspapers and Periodicals.*** Printed material purporting to be a newspaper or periodical.

(7) Trade inscriptions and the like. Inscriptions, signs, tags, or labels purporting to have been affixed in the course of business and indicating ownership, control, or origin.	**(7)** ***Trade Inscriptions and the Like.*** An inscription, sign, tag, or label purporting to have been affixed in the course of business and indicating origin, ownership, or control.
(8) Acknowledged documents. Documents accompanied by a certificate of acknowledgment executed in the manner provided by law by a notary public or other officer authorized by law to take acknowledgments.	**(8)** ***Acknowledged Documents.*** A document accompanied by a certificate of acknowledgment that is lawfully signed by a notary public or another officer who is authorized to take acknowledgements.
(9) Commercial paper and related documents. Commercial paper, signatures thereon, and documents relating thereto to the extent provided by general commercial law.	**(9)** ***Commercial Paper and Related Documents.*** Commercial paper, a signature on it, and related documents, to the extent allowed by general commercial law.
(10) Presumptions under Acts of Congress. Any signature, document, or other matter declared by Act of Congress to be presumptively or prima facie genuine or authentic.	**(10)** ***Presumptions Under a Federal Statute.*** A signature, document, or anything else that a federal statute declares to be presumptively or prima facie genuine or authentic.
(11) Certified domestic records of regularly conducted activity. The original or a duplicate of a domestic record of regularly conducted activity that would be admissible under Rule 803(6) if accompanied by a written declaration of its custodian or other qualified person, in a manner complying with any Act of Congress or rule prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority, certifying that the record— **(A)** was made at or near the time of the occurrence of the matters set forth by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of those matters; **(B)** was kept in the course of the regularly conducted activity; and **(C)** was made by the regularly conducted activity as a regular practice. A party intending to offer a record into evidence under this paragraph must provide written notice of that intention to all adverse parties, and must make the record and declaration available for inspection sufficiently in advance of their offer into evidence to provide an adverse party with a fair opportunity to challenge them.	**(11)** ***Certified Domestic Records of a Regularly Conducted Activity.*** The original or a copy of a domestic record that meets the requirements of Rule 803(6), modified as follows: the conditions referred to in 803(6)(D) must be shown by a certification of the custodian or another qualified person that complies with a federal statute or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court. Before the trial or hearing, the proponent must give an adverse party reasonable written notice of the intent to offer the record — and must make the record and certification available for inspection — so that the party has a fair opportunity to challenge them.

(12) Certified foreign records of regularly conducted activity. In a civil case, the original or a duplicate of a foreign record of regularly conducted activity that would be admissible under Rule 803(6) if accompanied by a written declaration by its custodian or other qualified person certifying that the record— **(A)** was made at or near the time of the occurrence of the matters set forth by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of those matters; **(B)** was kept in the course of the regularly conducted activity; and **(C)** was made by the regularly conducted activity as a regular practice. The declaration must be signed in a manner that, if falsely made, would subject the maker to criminal penalty under the laws of the country where the declaration is signed. A party intending to offer a record into evidence under this paragraph must provide written notice of that intention to all adverse parties, and must make the record and declaration available for inspection sufficiently in advance of their offer into evidence to provide an adverse party with a fair opportunity to challenge them.	**(12)** ***Certified Foreign Records of a Regularly Conducted Activity.*** In a civil case, the original or a copy of a foreign record that meets the requirements of Rule 902(11), modified as follows: the certification, rather than complying with a federal statute or Supreme Court rule, must be signed in a manner that, if falsely made, would subject the maker to a criminal penalty in the country where the certification is signed. The proponent must also meet the notice requirements of Rule 902(11).

Committee Note

The language of Rule 902 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 903. Subscribing Witness' Testimony Unnecessary	Rule 903 — Subscribing Witness's Testimony
The testimony of a subscribing witness is not necessary to authenticate a writing unless required by the laws of the jurisdiction whose laws govern the validity of the writing.	A subscribing witness's testimony is necessary to authenticate a writing only if required by the law of the jurisdiction that governs its validity.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 903 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

ARTICLE X. CONTENTS OF WRITINGS, RECORDINGS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS Rule 1001. Definitions	ARTICLE X. CONTENTS OF WRITINGS, RECORDINGS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS Rule 1001 — Definitions That Apply to This Article
For purposes of this article the following definitions are applicable: **(1) Writings and recordings.** ''Writings'' and ''recordings'' consist of letters, words, or numbers, or their equivalent, set down by handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, magnetic impulse, mechanical or electronic recording, or other form of data compilation. **(2) Photographs.** ''Photographs'' include still photographs, X-ray films, video tapes, and motion pictures. **(3) Original.** An ''original'' of a writing or recording is the writing or recording itself or any counterpart intended to have the same effect by a person executing or issuing it. An ''original'' of a photograph includes the negative or any print therefrom. If data are stored in a computer or similar device, any printout or other output readable by sight, shown to reflect the data accurately, is an ''original''. **(4) Duplicate.** A ''duplicate'' is a counterpart produced by the same impression as the original, or from the same matrix, or by means of photography, including enlargements and miniatures, or by mechanical or electronic re-recording, or by chemical reproduction, or by other equivalent techniques which accurately reproduces the original.	In this article, the following definitions apply: **(a) Writing.** A "writing" consists of letters, words, numbers, or their equivalent set down in any form. **(b) Recording.** A "recording" consists of letters, words, numbers, or their equivalent recorded in any manner. **(c) Photograph.** "Photograph" means a photographic image or its equivalent stored in any form. **(d) Original.** An "original" of a writing or recording means the writing or recording itself or any counterpart intended to have the same effect by the person who executed or issued it. For electronically stored information, "original" means any printout — or other output readable by sight — if it accurately reflects the information. An "original" of a photograph includes the negative or a print from it. **(e) Duplicate.** "Duplicate" means a counterpart produced by a mechanical, photographic, chemical, electronic, or other equivalent process or technique that accurately reproduces the original.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1001 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1002. Requirement of Original	Rule 1002 — Requirement of the Original
To prove the content of a writing, recording, or photograph, the original writing, recording, or photograph is required, except as otherwise provided in these rules or by Act of Congress.	An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless these rules or a federal statute provides otherwise.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1002 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1003. Admissibility of Duplicates	Rule 1003 — Admissibility of Duplicates
A duplicate is admissible to the same extent as an original unless (1) a genuine question is raised as to the authenticity of the original or (2) in the circumstances it would be unfair to admit the duplicate in lieu of the original.	A duplicate is admissible to the same extent as the original unless a genuine question is raised about the original's authenticity or the circumstances make it unfair to admit the duplicate.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1003 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1004. Admissibility of Other Evidence of Contents	Rule 1004 — Admissibility of Other Evidence of Content
The original is not required, and other evidence of the contents of a writing, recording, or photograph is admissible if— **(1) Originals lost or destroyed.** All originals are lost or have been destroyed, unless the proponent lost or destroyed them in bad faith; or **(2) Original not obtainable.** No original can be obtained by any available judicial process or procedure; or **(3) Original in possession of opponent.** At a time when an original was under the control of the party against whom offered, that party was put on notice, by the pleadings or otherwise, that the contents would be a subject of proof at the hearing, and that party does not produce the original at the hearing; or **(4) Collateral matters.** The writing, recording, or photograph is not closely related to a controlling issue.	An original is not required and other evidence of the content of a writing, recording, or photograph is admissible if: **(a)** all the originals are lost or destroyed, and not by the proponent acting in bad faith; **(b)** an original cannot be obtained by any available judicial process; **(c)** the party against whom the original would be offered had control of the original; was at that time put on notice, by pleadings or otherwise, that the original would be a subject of proof at the trial or hearing; and fails to produce it at the trial or hearing; or **(d)** the writing, recording, or photograph is not closely related to a controlling issue.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1004 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1005. Public Records	Rule 1005 — Copies of Public Records to Prove Content
The contents of an official record, or of a document authorized to be recorded or filed and actually recorded or filed, including data compilations in any form, if otherwise admissible, may be proved by copy, certified as correct in accordance with rule 902 or testified to be correct by a witness who has compared it with the original. If a copy which complies with the foregoing cannot be obtained by the exercise of reasonable diligence, then other evidence of the contents may be given.	The proponent may use a copy to prove the content of an official record — or of a document that was lawfully recorded or filed in a public office — if these conditions are met: the record or document is otherwise admissible; and the copy is certified as correct in accordance with Rule 902(4) or is testified to be correct by a witness who has compared it with the original. If no such copy can be obtained by reasonable diligence, then the proponent may use other evidence to prove the content.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1005 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1006. Summaries	Rule 1006 — Summaries to Prove Content
The contents of voluminous writings, recordings, or photographs which cannot conveniently be examined in court may be presented in the form of a chart, summary, or calculation. The originals, or duplicates, shall be made available for examination or copying, or both, by other parties at reasonable time and place. The court may order that they be produced in court.	The proponent may use a summary, chart, or calculation to prove the content of voluminous writings, recordings, or photographs that cannot be conveniently examined in court. The proponent must make the originals or duplicates available for examination or copying, or both, by other parties at a reasonable time or place. And the court may order the proponent to produce them in court.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1006 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1007. Testimony or Written Admission of Party	Rule 1007 — Testimony or Admission of a Party to Prove Content
Contents of writings, recordings, or photographs may be proved by the testimony or deposition of the party against whom offered or by that party's written admission, without accounting for the nonproduction of the original.	The proponent may prove the content of a writing, recording, or photograph by the testimony, deposition, or written admission of the party against whom the evidence is offered. The proponent need not account for the original.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1007 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1008. Functions of Court and Jury	Rule 1008 — Functions of the Court and Jury
When the admissibility of other evidence of contents of writings, recordings, or photographs under these rules depends upon the fulfillment of a condition of fact, the question whether the condition has been fulfilled is ordinarily for the court to determine in accordance with the provisions of rule 104. However, when an issue is raised (a) whether the asserted writing ever existed, or (b) whether another writing, recording, or photograph produced at the trial is the original, or (c) whether other evidence of contents correctly reflects the contents, the issue is for the trier of fact to determine as in the case of other issues of fact.	Ordinarily, the court determines whether the proponent has fulfilled the factual conditions for admitting other evidence of the content of a writing, recording, or photograph under Rule 1004 or 1005. But in a jury trial, the jury determines — in accordance with Rule 104(b) — any issue about whether: **(a)** an asserted writing, recording, or photograph ever existed; **(b)** another one produced at the trial or hearing is the original; or **(c)** other evidence of content accurately reflects the content.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1008 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

XI. MISCELLANEOUS RULES Rule 1101. Applicability of Rules	XI. MISCELLANEOUS RULES Rule 1101 — Applicability of the Rules
(a) Courts and judges. These rules apply to the United States district courts, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States courts of appeals, the United States Claims Court, 1 and to United States bankruptcy judges and United States magistrate judges, in the actions, cases, and proceedings and to the extent hereinafter set forth. The terms ''judge'' and ''court'' in these rules include United States bankruptcy judges and United States magistrate judges.	**(a) To Courts and Judges.** These rules apply to proceedings before: • United States district courts; • United States bankruptcy and magistrate judges; • United States courts of appeals; • the United States Court of Federal Claims; and • the district courts of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.
(b) Proceedings generally. These rules apply generally to civil actions and proceedings, including admiralty and maritime cases, to criminal cases and proceedings, to contempt proceedings except those in which the court may act summarily, and to proceedings and cases under title 11, United States Code.	**(b) To Proceedings.** These rules apply in: • civil cases and proceedings, including admiralty and maritime cases; • criminal cases and proceedings; • contempt proceedings, except those in which the court may act summarily; and • cases and proceedings under 11 U.S.C.
(c) Rule of privilege. The rule with respect to privileges applies at all stages of all actions, cases, and proceedings.	**(c) Rules on Privilege.** The rules on privilege apply to all stages of a case or proceeding.
(d) Rules inapplicable. The rules (other than with respect to privileges) do not apply in the following situations: **(1) Preliminary questions of fact.** The determination of questions of fact preliminary to admissibility of evidence when the issue is to be determined by the court under rule 104. **(2) Grand jury.** Proceedings before grand juries. **(3) Miscellaneous proceedings.** Proceedings for extradition or rendition; preliminary examinations in criminal cases; sentencing, or granting or revoking probation; issuance of warrants for arrest, criminal summonses, and search warrants; and proceedings with respect to release on bail or otherwise.	**(d) Exceptions.** These rules — except for those on privilege — do not apply to the following: **(1)** the court's determination, under Rule 104(a), on a preliminary question of fact governing admissibility; **(2)** grand-jury proceedings; and **(3)** miscellaneous proceedings such as: • extradition or rendition; • issuing an arrest warrant, criminal summons, or search warrant; • a preliminary examination in a criminal case; • sentencing; • granting or revoking probation or supervised release; and • considering whether to release on bail or otherwise.

(e) Rules applicable in part. In the following proceedings these rules apply to the extent that matters of evidence are not provided for in the statutes which govern procedure therein or in other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority: the trial of misdemeanors and other petty offenses before United States magistrate judges; review of agency actions when the facts are subject to trial de novo under section 706(2)(F) of title 5, United States Code; review of orders of the Secretary of Agriculture under section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products'' approved February 18, 1922 (7 U.S.C. 292), and under sections 6 and 7(c) of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (7 U.S.C. 499f, 499g(c)); naturalization and revocation of naturalization under sections 310–318 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1421–1429); prize proceedings in admiralty under sections 7651–7681 of title 10, United States Code; review of orders of the Secretary of the Interior under section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing associations of producers of aquatic products'' approved June 25, 1934 (15 U.S.C. 522); review of orders of petroleum control boards under section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes'', approved February 22, 1935 (15 U.S.C. 715d); actions for fines, penalties, or forfeitures under part V of title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1581–1624), or under the Anti-Smuggling Act (19 U.S.C. 1701–1711); criminal libel for condemnation, exclusion of imports, or other proceedings under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301–392); disputes between seamen under sections 4079, 4080, and 4081 of the Revised Statutes (22 U.S.C. 256–258); habeas corpus under sections 2241–2254 of title 28, United States Code; motions to vacate, set aside or correct sentence under section 2255 of title 28, United States Code; actions for penalties for refusal to transport destitute seamen under section 4578 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 679); 2 actions against the United States under the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage service rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1925 (46 U.S.C. 781–790), as implemented by section 7730 of title 10, United States Code.	**(e) Other Statutes and Rules.** A federal statute or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court may provide for admitting or excluding evidence independently from these rules.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1101 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1102. Amendments	Rule 1102 — Amendments
Amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence may be made as provided in section 2072 of title 28 of the United States Code.	These rules may be amended as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2072.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1102 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

Rule 1103. Title	Rule 1103 — Title
These rules may be known and cited as the Federal Rules of Evidence.	These rules may be cited as the Federal Rules of Evidence.

Committee Note

The language of Rule 1103 has been amended as part of the restyling of the Evidence Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE*

Rule 804. Hearsay Exceptions; Declarant Unavailable

* * * * *

(b) Hearsay exceptions. The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule if the declarant is unavailable as a witness:

*** * * * ***

(3) Statement against interest. A statement ~~which~~ 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

*New material is underlined; matter to be omitted is lined through.

invalidate the declarant's claim against someone else or to expose the declarant to civil or criminal liability ~~was at the time of its making so far contrary to the declarant's pecuniary or proprietary interest, or so far tended to subject the declarant to civil or criminal liability, or to render invalid a claim by the declarant against another, that a reasonable person in the declarant's position would not have made the statement unless believing it to be true.~~ ; and

(B) ~~A statement tending to expose the declarant to criminal liability and offered to exculpate the accused is not admissible unless~~ is supported by

corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate ~~the~~ its trustworthiness ~~of the statement~~ , if it is offered in a criminal case as one that tends to expose the declarant to criminal liability.

* * * * *

Committee Note

Subdivision (b)(3). Rule 804(b)(3) has been amended to provide that the corroborating circumstances requirement applies to all declarations against penal interest offered in criminal cases. A number of courts have applied the corroborating circumstances requirement to declarations against penal interest offered by the prosecution, even though the text of the Rule did not so provide. *See, e.g., United States v. Alvarez,* 584 F.2d 694, 701 (5thCir. 1978) ("by transplanting the language governing exculpatory statements onto the analysis for admitting inculpatory hearsay, a unitary standard is derived which offers the most workable basis for applying Rule 804(b)(3)");*United States v. Shukri,* 207 F.3d 412 (7th Cir. 2000) (requiring corroborating circumstances for against-penal-interest statements offered by the government). A unitary approach to declarations against penal interest assures both the prosecution and the accused that the Rule will not be abused and that only reliable hearsay statements will be admitted under the exception.

All other changes to the structure and wording of the Rule are intended to be stylistic only. There is no intent to change any other result in any ruling on evidence admissibility.

The Committee found no need to address the relationship between Rule 804(b)(3) and the Confrontation Clause, because the requirements of this exception assure that declarations admissible under it will not be testimonial.

The amendment does not address the use of the corroborating circumstances for declarations against penal interest offered in civil cases.

In assessing whether corroborating circumstances exist, some courts have focused on the credibility of the witness who relates the hearsay statement in court. But the credibility of the witness who relates the statement is not a proper factor for the court to consider in assessing corroborating circumstances. To base admission or exclusion of a hearsay statement on the witness's credibility would usurp the jury's role of determining the credibility of testifying witnesses.

CHANGES MADE AFTER PUBLICATION AND COMMENTS

The rule, as submitted for public comment, was restyled in accordance with the style conventions of the Style Subcommittee of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure. As restyled, the proposed amendment addresses the style suggestions made in public comments.

The proposed Committee Note was amended to add a short discussion on applying the corroborating circumstances requirement.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

David F. Binder, Esq. (08-EV-001) favors the amendment as it will make the rule consistent with much of the case law, which has extended the corroborating circumstances requirement to declarations against interest offered by the prosecution. He suggests that the amendment clarify that the corroborating circumstances requirement applies only to hearsay offered as a declaration against penal interest under Rule 804(b)(3), and is not intended to affect admissibility under other hearsay exceptions. This suggestion was implemented in the rule as restyled after public comment.

The Federal Magistrate Judges Association (08-EV-003) is in agreement with the general principle that the prosecution, as well as the accused, must show corroborating circumstances clearly indicating trustworthiness before a declaration against penal interest may be admitted. But the Association suggests that the reference in the amended rule to "criminal case" should be changed to "criminal case or proceeding" in order to make the rule more consistent with other Evidence Rules and with the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This suggestion is being implemented in the project to restyle all of the Evidence Rules — under which "criminal case" is defined as including a "criminal proceeding."

Professor David P. Leonard (08-EV-004) favors the amendment because it is "sensible and fair to level the playing field by imposing the same restrictions on the prosecution as are imposed on the accused." He suggests that the amendment clarify that the corroborating circumstances requirement applies only to hearsay offered as a declaration against penal interest under Rule 804(b)(3), and is not intended to affect admissibility under other hearsay exceptions. This suggestion was implement in the rule as restyled after public comment.

The National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (08-EV-005) approves the extension of the corroborating circumstances requirement to declarations against penal interest offered by the prosecution. The Association recommends, however, that the corroborating circumstances requirement be deleted insofar as it applies to statements offered by the accused.

Professor Richard Friedman (08-EV-006) advocates the elimination of the corroborating circumstances requirement as applied to hearsay statements offered by an accused. Professor Friedman also suggests that the proposed amendment be changed to add language that would reject the Supreme Court's analysis in *Williamson v. United States*, 512 U.S. 594 (1994), by providing that a non-adverse statement that is part of a broader inculpatory statement would be admissible if "it appears likely that the declarant would make the statement in question only if believing it to be true." Finally, Professor Friedman suggests that the text of the Rule include language providing that the credibility of the in-court witness is irrelevant to the reliability of the hearsay statement — and that if such a statement is not included in the text, it should at least be included in the Committee Note. The Committee added a paragraph to the Committee Note in response to Professor Friedman's suggestion.

What follows is the proposed amendment in "clean" form:

(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.