

REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

**TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEMBERS OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES:**

The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (Standing Committee or Committee) met on June 6, 2023. All members participated.

* * * * *

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

Rules Recommended for Approval and Transmission

The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules recommended for final approval proposed amendments to Evidence Rules 613, 801, 804, and 1006, and new Evidence Rule 107. The Standing Committee unanimously approved the Advisory Committee’s recommendations with minor changes to the text of Rules 107, 804, and 1006, and minor changes to the committee notes accompanying Rules 107, 801, 804, and 1006.

New Rule 107 (Illustrative Aids)

The distinction between “demonstrative evidence” (admitted into evidence and used substantively to prove disputed issues at trial) and “illustrative aids” (not admitted into evidence but used solely to assist the trier of fact in understanding evidence) is sometimes a difficult one to draw, and the standards for allowing the use of an illustrative aid are not made clear in the case law, in part because there is no specific rule that sets any standards. The proposed amendment, originally published for public comment as a new subsection of Rule 611, would

NOTICE

NO RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED HEREIN REPRESENT THE POLICY OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE
UNLESS APPROVED BY THE CONFERENCE ITSELF.

Excerpt from the September 2023 Report of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

provide standards for illustrative aids, allowing them to be used at trial after the court balances the utility of the aid against the risk of unfair prejudice, confusion, and delay. Following publication in August 2022, the Advisory Committee determined that the contents of the rule were better contained in a new Rule 107 rather than a new subsection of Rule 611, reasoning that Article VI is about witnesses, and illustrative aids are often used outside the context of witness testimony. In addition, the Advisory Committee determined to remove the notice requirement from the published version of the proposed amendment and to extend the rule to cover opening and closing statements. Finally, the Advisory Committee changed the proposed amendments to provide that illustrative aids can be used unless the negative factors “substantially” outweigh the educative value of the aid, to make clear that illustrative aids are not evidence, and to refer to Rule 1006 for summaries of voluminous evidence.

Rule 613 (Witness’s Prior Statement)

The proposed amendment would provide that extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement is not admissible until the witness is given an opportunity to explain or deny the statement. To allow flexibility, the amended rule would give the court the discretion to dispense with the requirement. The proposed amendment would bring the courts into uniformity, and would adopt the approach that treats the witness fairly and promotes efficiency.

Rule 801 (Definitions That Apply to This Article; Exclusions from Hearsay)

The proposed amendment to Rule 801(d)(2) would resolve the dispute in the courts about the admissibility of statements by the predecessor-in-interest of a party-opponent, providing that such a hearsay statement would be admissible against the declarant’s successor-in-interest. The Advisory Committee reasoned that admissibility is fair when the successor-in-interest is standing in the shoes of the declarant because the declarant is in substance the party-opponent.

Rule 804 (Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay—When the Declarant Is Unavailable as a Witness)

Rule 804(b)(3) provides a hearsay exception for declarations against interest. In a criminal case in which a declaration against penal interest is offered, the rule requires that the proponent provide “corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate the trustworthiness” of the statement. There is a dispute in the courts about the meaning of the “corroborating circumstances” requirement. The proposed amendments to Rule 804(b)(3) would require that, in assessing whether a statement is supported by corroborating circumstances, the court must consider not only the totality of the circumstances under which the statement was made, but also any evidence supporting or undermining it. This proposed amendment would help maintain consistency with the 2019 amendment to Rule 807, which requires courts to look at corroborating evidence, if any, in determining whether a hearsay statement is sufficiently trustworthy under the residual exception.


Rule 1006 (Summaries to Prove Content)

The proposed amendments to Rule 1006 would fit together with the proposed new Rule 107 on illustrative aids. The proposed rule amendment and new rule would serve to distinguish a summary of voluminous evidence (which summary is itself evidence and is governed by Rule 1006) from a summary that is designed to help the trier of fact understand admissible evidence (which summary is not itself evidence and would be governed by new Rule 107). The proposed amendment to Rule 1006 would also clarify that a Rule 1006 summary is admissible whether or not the underlying evidence has been admitted.

Recommendation: That the Judicial Conference approve the proposed amendments to Evidence Rules 613, 801, 804, and 1006, and new Rule 107, as set forth in Appendix D, and transmit them to the Supreme Court for consideration with a recommendation that they be adopted by the Court and transmitted to Congress in accordance with the law.

* * * * *

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John D. Bates", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

John D. Bates, Chair

Paul Barbadoro
Elizabeth J. Cabraser
Robert J. Giuffra, Jr.
William J. Kayatta, Jr.
Carolyn B. Kuhl
Troy A. McKenzie
Patricia Ann Millett

Lisa O. Monaco
Andrew J. Pincus
Gene E.K. Pratter
D. Brooks Smith
Kosta Stojilkovic
Jennifer G. Zipps

* * * * *

Excerpt from the May 10, 2023, Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

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

JOHN D. BATES
CHAIR

H. THOMAS BYRON III
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

JAY S. BYBEE
APPELLATE RULES

REBECCA B. CONNELLY
BANKRUPTCY RULES

ROBIN L. ROSENBERG
CIVIL RULES

JAMES C. DEVER III
CRIMINAL RULES

PATRICK J. SCHILTZ
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hon. John D. Bates, Chair
Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: Hon. Patrick J. Schiltz, Chair
Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

DATE: May 10, 2023

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules (the “Committee”) met in Washington, D.C., on April 28, 2023. At the meeting the Committee discussed and gave final approval to five proposed amendments that had been published for public comment in August 2022. The Committee also tabled a proposed amendment.

Excerpt from the May 10, 2023, Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

The Committee made the following determinations at the meeting:

- It unanimously approved proposals to add a new Rule 107 and to amend Rules 613(b), 801(d)(2), 804(b)(3), and 1006, and recommends that the Standing Committee approve the proposed rules amendments and new rule.

* * * * *

II. Action Items

A. New Rule 107, for Final Approval

At the Spring 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved a proposal to add a new rule to regulate the use of illustrative aids at trial. The distinction between “demonstrative evidence” (admitted into evidence and used substantively to prove disputed issues at trial) and “illustrative aids” (not admitted into evidence but used solely to assist the trier of fact in understanding other evidence) is sometimes a difficult one to draw, and is a point of confusion in the courts. Similar confusion exists in distinguishing a summary of voluminous evidence, covered by Rule 1006, and a summary that is not evidence but rather presented to assist the trier of fact in understanding evidence. In addition, the standards for allowing the use of an illustrative aid are not made clear in the case law, in part because there is no specific rule that sets any standards.

The proposed amendment, published for public comment as a new Rule 611(d), allowed illustrative aids to be used at trial after the court balances the utility of the aid against the risk of unfair prejudice, confusion, and delay. The pitch of that balance was left open for public comment --- whether the negative factors would have to *substantially* outweigh the usefulness of the aid (the same balance as Rule 403), or whether the aid would be prohibited if the negative factors simply outweighed the usefulness of the aid.

Because illustrative aids are not evidence, adverse parties do not receive pretrial discovery of such aids. The proposal issued for public comment would have required notice to be provided, unless the court for good cause orders otherwise. This notice requirement was most controversial when applied to the use of illustrative aids on opening and closing --- leading the Committee to exclude openings and closings from the proposal as issued for public comment.

Lawyer groups (such as bar associations) and the Federal Magistrate Judges’ Association submitted comments in favor of the proposed amendment. But most practicing lawyers were critical. Most of the negative public comment went to the notice requirement; the commenters argued that a notice requirement was burdensome and would lead to motion practice and less use of illustrative aids. Other comments questioned the need for the rule. Others argued (in the face of contrary case law) that the courts were having no problems in regulating illustrative aids.

In light of the public comment, as well as comments from the Standing Committee and those received at the symposium on the rule proposal in the Fall of 2022, the Committee unanimously agreed on the following changes: 1) deletion of the notice requirement; 2) extending the rule to openings and closings (reasoning that after lifting the notice requirement, there was no

Excerpt from the May 10, 2023, Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

reason not to cover openings and closings, especially because courts already regulate illustrative aids used in openings and closings and it would be best to have all uses at trial covered by a single rule); 3) providing that illustrative aids can be used unless the negative factors *substantially* outweigh the educative value of the aid (reasoning that it would be confusing to have a different balancing test than Rule 403, especially when the line between substantive evidence and illustrative aids may sometimes be difficult to draw); 4) specifying in the text of the rule that illustrative aids are not evidence; 5) adding a subdivision providing that summaries of voluminous evidence are themselves evidence and are governed by Rule 1006; and 6) relocating the proposal to a new Rule 107 (reasoning that Article VI is about witnesses, and illustrative aids are often used outside the context of witness testimony).

Because illustrative aids are not evidence, the proposed rule provides that an aid should not be allowed into the jury room during deliberations, unless the court, for good cause, orders otherwise. The committee note specifies that if the court does allow an illustrative aid to go to the jury room, the court must upon request instruct the jury that the aid is not evidence.

Finally, to assist appellate review of illustrative aids, the rule provides that illustrative aids must be entered into the record, unless it is impracticable to do so.

The Committee strongly believes that this rule on illustrative aids will provide an important service to courts and litigants. Illustrative aids are used in almost every trial, and yet nothing in the rules specifically addresses their use. This amendment rectifies that problem.

At its Spring 2023 meeting, the Committee unanimously gave final approval to the proposed new Rule 107. The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be approved by the Standing Committee.

* * * * *

B. Proposed Amendment to Rule 1006, for Final Approval¹

Evidence Rule 1006 provides that a summary can be admitted as evidence if the underlying records are admissible and too voluminous to be conveniently examined in court. The courts are in dispute about a number of issues regarding admissibility of summaries of evidence under Rule 1006 --- and much of the problem is that some courts do not properly distinguish between summaries of evidence under Rule 1006 (which are themselves admitted into evidence) and summaries that are illustrative aids (which are not evidence at all). Some courts have stated that summaries admissible under Rule 1006 are “not evidence,” which is incorrect. Other courts have stated that all of the underlying evidence must be admitted before the summary can be admitted; that, too, is incorrect. Still other courts state that the summary is inadmissible if any of the underlying evidence *has* been admitted; that is also wrong.

¹ This rule is taken out of numerical sequence because it is of a piece with the proposed amendment on illustrative aids.

Excerpt from the May 10, 2023, Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

After extensive research and discussion, the Committee unanimously approved an amendment to Rule 1006 that would provide greater guidance to the courts on the admissibility and proper use of summary evidence under Rule 1006.

The proposal to amend Rule 1006 dovetails with the proposal to establish a rule on illustrative aids, discussed above. These two rules serve to distinguish a summary of voluminous evidence (which is itself evidence and governed by Rule 1006) from a summary that is designed to help the trier of fact understand admissible evidence (which summary is not itself evidence and would be governed by new Rule 107). The proposed amendment to Rule 1006 would clarify that a summary is admissible whether or not the underlying evidence has been admitted. The Committee believes that the proposed amendment will provide substantial assistance to courts and litigants in navigating this confusing area.

The rule proposal for public comment received only a few public comments, largely favorable.

At its Spring 2023 meeting, the Committee unanimously gave final approval to the proposed amendment to Rule 1006. The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be approved by the Standing Committee.

* * * * *

C. Proposed Amendment to Rule 613(b) for Final Approval

The common law provided that before a witness could be impeached with extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement, the adverse party was required to give the witness an opportunity to explain or deny the statement. The existing Rule 613(b) rejects that “prior presentation” requirement. It provides that extrinsic evidence of the inconsistent statement is admissible so long as the witness is given an opportunity to explain or deny the statement at some point in the trial. It turns out, though, that most courts have retained the common law “prior presentation” requirement. These courts have found that a prior presentation requirement saves time, because a witness will often concede that she made the inconsistent statement, and that makes it unnecessary for anyone to introduce extrinsic evidence. The prior presentation requirement also avoids the difficulties inherent in calling a witness back to the stand to give her an opportunity at some later point to explain or deny a prior statement that has been proven through extrinsic evidence.

The Committee has unanimously determined that the better rule is to require a prior opportunity to explain or deny the statement, with the court having discretion to allow a later opportunity (for example, when the prior inconsistent statement is not discovered until after the witness testifies). The amendment will bring the rule into alignment with what appears to be the practice of most trial judges --- a practice that the Committee concluded is superior to the practice described in the current rule.

The rule published for public comment provides that extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement is not admissible until the witness is given an opportunity to explain or deny