

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

I. RULE 101—TITLE, SCOPE, AND APPLICABILITY OF THE RULES; DEFINITIONS

- § 1:1 Rule 101—Title, scope, and applicability of the rules; definitions
- § 1:2 Summary of Rule
- § 1:3 Basis of Rule
- § 1:4 Not applicable to judicial determination of preliminary fact question
- § 1:5 Statutes supplement rules
- § 1:6 —Cost or necessity of services and business records self-authentication rule
- § 1:7 —Presumption as to interest rates
- § 1:8 Hierarchy of rules and statutes
- § 1:9 Not applicable to nonadjudicative juvenile proceedings
- § 1:10 —Social history reports
- § 1:11 —Confession compared
- § 1:12 Not applicable to arbitrations

II. RULE 102—PURPOSE

- § 1:13 Rule 102—Purpose
- § 1:14 Summary of Rule
- § 1:15 Basis of Rule
- § 1:16 Construction of Texas Rules of Evidence
- § 1:17 Construction of Rule 606(b) through Rule 102
- § 1:18 Construing nonprivileged communications to mental health professionals exception
- § 1:19 Supporting exercise of trial court’s discretion
- § 1:20 Evaluating trial court’s conduct of trial
- § 1:21 —Determining experts’ reliability

III. RULE 103—RULINGS ON EVIDENCE

- § 1:22 Rule 103—Rulings on evidence
- § 1:23 Summary of Rule
- § 1:24 Error in evidentiary rulings
- § 1:25 Inadmissible evidence
- § 1:26 Basis of Rule
- § 1:27 Harmless error rule

- § 1:28 —Not calculated to cause rendition of improper judgment
- § 1:29 — —Standard to prove erroneously excluded evidence
- § 1:30 —Cumulative evidence
- § 1:31 — —Erroneously admitted evidence
- § 1:32 —Inadmissible evidence
- § 1:33 —Harmful error compared
- § 1:34 — —Proving harm
- § 1:35 — — —Expert testimony admitted
- § 1:36 — — —Expert testimony excluded
- § 1:37 Preserving error
- § 1:38 —Excluded questions during voir dire
- § 1:39 Objections to rulings admitting evidence under Rule 103(a)(1)
- § 1:40 —Objection required
- § 1:41 — —Motion in limine does not preserve error
- § 1:42 — —Informal presentation of evidence in non-jury trial
- § 1:43 — —Prior testimony in severed cause
- § 1:44 — —Subsequent testimony regarding expert’s report
- § 1:45 — —Reliability of expert testimony
- § 1:46 —No objection required in limited circumstances
- § 1:47 —Specificity required
- § 1:48 — —General hearsay objection may not be specific enough
- § 1:49 — —Objection preserves only specific ground cited
- § 1:50 — —Objections where part of offer is admissible
- § 1:51 — —Objections to attached depositions
- § 1:52 — —Objection sufficient even without referencing any particular Texas Rule of Evidence
- § 1:53 —Objection to evidence need only comport with trial objection
- § 1:54 —No error absent timely objection or motion to strike
- § 1:55 — —When objection is timely
- § 1:56 — —Failure to object to statements made during *voir dire* does not waive a later objection during trial
- § 1:57 —Exceptions for running objection and rulings outside the presence of the jury
- § 1:58 — —Deposition objections compared
- § 1:59 Objections to rulings admitting evidence under Rule 103(b)—Objections made out of jury’s presence apply when evidence is admitted
- § 1:60 Offer of proof, generally
- § 1:61 Offer of proof required of rulings excluding evidence to preserve error
- § 1:62 —Harmful error

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:63 —Offer not properly made
- § 1:64 — —Error not preserved even where exclusion is abuse of discretion
- § 1:65 — —Failure to offer excluded testimony
- § 1:66 —Concise statement sufficient
- § 1:67 —Substance of offer must be made known to the court
- § 1:68 — —Informal offer of proof
- § 1:69 — —Exception for attacking witness’s credibility
- § 1:70 —Offer not properly made—Failure to make excluded document part of record
- § 1:71 —Preserving error when court grants motion in limine
- § 1:72 When offer of proof not required
- § 1:73 —Fundamental error rule
- § 1:74 Timing of offer of proof on excluded evidence; bills of exception
- § 1:75 —Error not preserved in absence of bill of exception
- § 1:76 —Bill of exception showing content of excluded expert testimony
- § 1:77 Effect of offer of proof on postjudgment interest

IV. RULE 104—PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

- § 1:78 Rule 104—Preliminary questions
- § 1:79 Summary of Rule
- § 1:80 Basis of Rule
- § 1:81 Trial court not bound by rules of evidence except as to privileges when ruling on preliminary admissibility questions
- § 1:82 —Trial court determination
- § 1:83 —Admission required when fact issue raised on genuineness of evidence
- § 1:84 —Abuse of discretion required for reversal
- § 1:85 —Application of abuse of discretion standard
- § 1:86 —Rule 104(a) governs preliminary determinations regarding experts
- § 1:87 — —Preliminary determinations regarding qualifications of expert
- § 1:88 — —Preliminary determinations whether experts reasonably rely on particular data
- § 1:89 — —Medical experts and standard of care
- § 1:90 — —Medical experts and validity of scientific knowledge
- § 1:91 — —Novel scientific evidence in criminal cases
- § 1:92 —Evidentiary prerequisites for admission of co-conspirators’ statements not eliminated
- § 1:93 —Admissibility of photographs conditioned upon identification as accurate portrayal

- § 1:94 On appeal, evidence remains a part of the summary judgment record, and a no-evidence summary judgment is improper, unless preliminary questions of admissibility were determined at the trial court
- § 1:95 Conditional relevancy under Rule 104(b)
- § 1:96 —Criminal cases
- § 1:97 Purpose of Rule 104(c) to keep jury from hearing inadmissible evidence
- § 1:98 No limit on evidence relevant to weight and credibility

V. RULE 105—EVIDENCE THAT IS NOT ADMISSIBLE AGAINST OTHER PARTIES OR FOR OTHER PURPOSES

- § 1:99 Rule 105—Evidence that is not admissible against other parties or for other purposes
- § 1:100 Summary of Rule
- § 1:101 Basis of Rule
- § 1:102 Construction of Rule
- § 1:103 General rule
- § 1:104 —Limiting instructions and legally sufficient evidence
- § 1:105 —When limiting instruction required
- § 1:106 — —Timeliness of request
- § 1:107 — —Timeliness of objection
- § 1:108 —Effect of failure to request instruction
- § 1:109 —Limited admissibility on appeal
- § 1:110 Error waived under Rule 105(b) where no limit of offer to admissible purpose
- § 1:111 —No segregation of admissible from inadmissible parts

VI. RULE 106—REMAINDER OF OR RELATED WRITINGS OR RECORDED STATEMENTS

- § 1:112 Rule 106—Remainder of or related writings or recorded statements
- § 1:113 Summary of Rule
- § 1:114 Basis of Rule
- § 1:115 Comparison of Rule 106 with Rule 107
- § 1:116 Purpose of Rules 106 and 107
- § 1:117 Rule 106 is a rule of admission, not exclusion
- § 1:118 Rule 106 does not prohibit editing of video depositions
- § 1:119 —Extensively edited video deposition alleged to be misleading
- § 1:120 —Video deposition edited to present testimony out of chronological sequence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 1:121 Rule 106 permits another document to be introduced contemporaneously

VII. RULE 107—RULE OF OPTIONAL COMPLETENESS

- § 1:122 Rule 107—Rule of optional completeness
- § 1:123 Summary of Rule
- § 1:124 Basis of Rule
- § 1:125 Requirements for using Rule 107
- § 1:126 Construction of Rule—Sixth Amendment right to confrontation
- § 1:127 —Incomplete conversation
- § 1:128 —Audio portion of videotape

CHAPTER 2. JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ADJUDICATIVE FACTS

I. RULE 201—JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ADJUDICATIVE FACTS

- § 2:1 Rule 201—Judicial notice of adjudicative facts
- § 2:2 Summary of Rule
- § 2:3 Basis of Rule
- § 2:4 Scope of Rule
- § 2:5 —Adjudicative facts
- § 2:6 — —Usually established through evidence
- § 2:7 — —Indisputability required for judicial notice
- § 2:8 —Legislative facts
- § 2:9 — —Not usually established through evidence
- § 2:10 — —Indisputability not required for judicial notice
- § 2:11 — —Applicability of Rule 201
- § 2:12 —Nonadjudicative facts
- § 2:13 Kinds of facts under Rule 201(b)
- § 2:14 —Kinds of facts proper for judicial notice
- § 2:15 — —Records in same case, closely related case
- § 2:16 — — —Allegations within pleading compared
- § 2:17 — — —On appeal
- § 2:18 — — —Federal court proceedings
- § 2:19 — —Texas statutes
- § 2:20 — —Statistical facts
- § 2:21 — —Reliability of type of expert evidence
- § 2:22 — —Court’s ability to supplement the record on appeal
- § 2:23 — —Miscellaneous topics proper for judicial notice
- § 2:24 — —Facts improper for judicial notice

- § 2:25 — — —Records from another case
- § 2:26 — — —Proof required
- § 2:27 — — —Stipulation no exception
- § 2:28 — — —Prior testimony
- § 2:29 — — —Criminal codefendant testimony
- § 2:30 — — —Topics of which judge has personal knowledge
- § 2:31 — — —Local court rules not filed with Texas Supreme Court
- § 2:32 — — —Contested fact issues
- § 2:33 — — —Facts not generally known within territorial jurisdiction or whose sources can be questioned
- § 2:34 — — —Miscellaneous topics held improper for judicial notice
- § 2:35 — — —Error harmless
- § 2:36 When discretionary—Rule 201(c)
- § 2:37 —Notice to parties
- § 2:38 —Cases citing Rule 201(c)
- § 2:39 When mandatory
- § 2:40 —Necessary information
- § 2:41 When unavailable—Death penalty sanctions
- § 2:42 Time for taking notice—Rule 201(d)
- § 2:43 —Appellate court may take judicial notice for first time on appeal
- § 2:44 Opportunity to be heard—Rule 201(e)
- § 2:45 —Matter of right
- § 2:46 —Sua sponte judicial notice compared
- § 2:47 —Request after judicial notice taken
- § 2:48 —Preserving error
- § 2:49 Jury instructions—Rule 201(f)

II. RULE 202—JUDICIAL NOTICE OF OTHER STATES' LAW

- § 2:50 Rule 202—judicial notice of other states' law
- § 2:51 Summary of Rule
- § 2:52 Basis of rule
- § 2:53 Movant must furnish court with sufficient information
- § 2:54 Timing of judicial notice—Court may take judicial notice at any stage of the proceedings and on its own motion
- § 2:55 Distinction between choice-of-law and judicial notice of a foreign state's laws
- § 2:56 —Not required to plead laws of another jurisdiction
- § 2:57 —Broad, general request may not be sufficient
- § 2:58 —Court does not have to receive copy of foreign statute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:59 —Judicial notice of law not mandated
- § 2:60 Foreign law presumed same as Texas
- § 2:61 —Court’s own motion
- § 2:62 —In absence of proof of foreign law—Only portions of foreign law proved
- § 2:63 —Application of foreign law waived absent proper Rule 202 motion
- § 2:64 —Party estopped from arguing that opponent has waived application of foreign law where party first raised applicability of foreign law
- § 2:65 —Presumption that foreign law is same as Texas law cannot be used to invalidate sister state judgment
- § 2:66 Sua sponte judicial notice
- § 2:67 —Proof not required
- § 2:68 When court may take judicial notice of another jurisdiction’s laws
- § 2:69 Miscellaneous application of sister state law

III. RULE 203—DETERMINING FOREIGN LAW

- § 2:70 Rule 203—Determining foreign law
- § 2:71 Rule 203 is not a true “judicial notice” procedure
- § 2:72 Basis of Rule
- § 2:73 Written notice at least 30 days prior to trial
- § 2:74 Unproven foreign law presumed identical to Texas law
- § 2:75 Court may consider sources not admissible under rules of evidence
- § 2:76 Proving foreign law
- § 2:77 —Expert testimony
- § 2:78 —Summary judgment affidavits
- § 2:79 —Law question
- § 2:80 —Objection waived

IV. RULE 204—JUDICIAL NOTICE OF TEXAS MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY ORDINANCES, TEXAS REGISTER CONTENTS, AND PUBLISHED AGENCY RULES

- § 2:81 Rule 204—Judicial notice of Texas municipal and county ordinances, Texas Register contents, and published agency rules
- § 2:82 Summary of Rule
- § 2:83 Ordinances
- § 2:84 —City charters likened to ordinances
- § 2:85 — —Verification required
- § 2:86 Contents of the Texas register

- § 2:87 Rules of agencies published in the administrative code
- § 2:88 Rule 204 is mandatory

V. JUDICIAL NOTICE UNDER TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 38.004

- § 2:89 Code Provision
- § 2:90 Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, Chapter 38.
Attorneys' fees
- § 2:91 Judicial notice constitutes some evidence of attorney's fees
- § 2:92 —Expert testimony not required in proceeding before court
- § 2:93 —Error to deny award when fees judicially noticed
- § 2:94 Judicial notice of entire case file, proceedings before the court
- § 2:95 —Judicially noticed evidence not hearsay
- § 2:96 —Severed case file
- § 2:97 Judicial notice of attorney's fees for appeal
- § 2:98 Amount of award is within trial court's discretion
- § 2:99 Presumption that attorney's fees judicially noticed on review
- § 2:100 —Summary judgment compared
- § 2:101 Presumption that fees are reasonable
- § 2:102 —Limitation on claims arising under Section 38.001
- § 2:103 — —Where limitation not applied
- § 2:104 —Form of presentment
- § 2:105 — —No amount requirement
- § 2:106 — —Trial by consent
- § 2:107 Award of attorney's fees to prevailing party

CHAPTER 3. BURDEN OF PROOF, PRESUMPTIONS, AND INFERENCES

I. RULES ON PRESUMPTIONS

- § 3:1 No Texas Rules of Evidence regarding presumptions

II. BURDEN OF PROOF

- § 3:2 Burden of proof
- § 3:3 Burden of persuasion
- § 3:4 —Determining where burden of persuasion is located
- § 3:5 — —Party taking affirmative of issue
- § 3:6 — —Plaintiff's burden
- § 3:7 — —Defendant's burden—Affirmative defense

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:8	— — —Plea in confession and avoidance
§ 3:9	— — —Landlord-tenant
§ 3:10	— —Party to whom fact essential
§ 3:11	— —Attorneys' fees
§ 3:12	— —Party with peculiar knowledge of fact
§ 3:13	— — —Establishing privilege
§ 3:14	— —Establishing estoppel
§ 3:15	— —Party with peculiar knowledge of fact—Military retirement benefits
§ 3:16	— — —Community time, labor, talent
§ 3:17	— — —Intentional disregard for proper jurisdiction under the tolling statute, Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 16.064(b)
§ 3:18	— —Party seeking post-conviction DNA testing
§ 3:19	— —Failure to mitigate damages in wrongful discharge
§ 3:20	—Mandamus
§ 3:21	—Consideration
§ 3:22	—Public Information Act
§ 3:23	—Burden of proof on statutory exception
§ 3:24	—Burden to prove settlement credit
§ 3:25	—Plaintiff's burden on lack of consent in trespass action
§ 3:26	—Burden to prove application of Chapter 95 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code
§ 3:27	—Burden when bringing a forcible-detainer action
§ 3:28	—Defendant's burden when seeking forum non conveniens
§ 3:29	—Defendant's burden in defamation case
§ 3:30	—Implied dedication
§ 3:31	—Burden to prove jurisdiction
§ 3:32	—Title to land
§ 3:33	—Burden to prove alter-ego for jurisdictional purposes
§ 3:34	—Burden to show existence of arbitration agreement
§ 3:35	—Habeas corpus proceedings
§ 3:36	—Burden to segregate damages
§ 3:37	—Involuntary termination to parental rights
§ 3:38	—Corporate tortious interference
§ 3:39	Burden of persuasion—Gifts
§ 3:40	Burden of production
§ 3:41	—Burden shifts
§ 3:42	—Burden of production shifts after party makes prima facie case
§ 3:43	—Burden of production on party who would lose absent further evidence

- § 3:44 — — Statute of limitations defense
- § 3:45 — — — Equitable tolling
- § 3:46 — — — Untimely expert witness designation
- § 3:47 — — — Admission of Expert testimony
- § 3:48 — — — Quantum-meruit claim for attorney’s fees
- § 3:49 — — — Cannot satisfy with incompetent evidence
- § 3:50 — — — Finality of a criminal conviction
- § 3:51 Legal sufficiency challenge—Party with burden of persuasion
- § 3:52 — — — Party without burden of persuasion
- § 3:53 Contradictory evidence—Party with burden of proof

III. PRESUMPTIONS AND INFERENCES

- § 3:54 Presumptions
- § 3:55 — — — Categories
- § 3:56 — — — Irrebuttable or conclusive presumptions
- § 3:57 — — — Conclusive presumptions are rules of substantive law
- § 3:58 — — — Presumptions are not evidence
- § 3:59 — — — Conclusive presumptions created by statute
- § 3:60 — — — Rebuttable presumptions
- § 3:61 — — — Operation
- § 3:62 — — — Presumptions do not satisfy burden of proof under a summary judgment motion
- § 3:63 — — — Rebuttable presumptions—Operation—
Presumption regarding notice
- § 3:64 — — — — — In favor of arbitration
- § 3:65 — — — — — Presumption that employee driving company vehicle is acting in course of employment
- § 3:66 — — — — — Presumption of employment
- § 3:67 — — — — — Failure to produce will
- § 3:68 — — — — — Continuity of will by execution with requisite formalities
- § 3:69 — — — — — Intent of deed delivery
- § 3:70 — — — — — Contracts
- § 3:71 — — — — — Unread contract
- § 3:72 — — — — — Statutes
- § 3:73 — — — — — Allegedly libelous statement with status of qualified privilege
- § 3:74 — — — — — Medical disclosures
- § 3:75 — — — — — Effect of rebuttal evidence
- § 3:76 — — — — — Operation—Texas Medical Liability Act Claims
- § 3:77 — — — — — Effect of rebuttal evidence—“Fraud on the Market” presumption in securities class actions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	must be rebutted on the merits, not at certification stage
§ 3:78	— — —Presumption of validity of judgments and administrative decisions
§ 3:79	Presumption regarding settlement agreements satisfying liability
§ 3:80	Presumptions—Rebuttable presumptions—Effect of rebuttal evidence—Presumption of validity of foreign judgments
§ 3:81	— — —Child possession orders
§ 3:82	— — —Presumption of bad faith of landlord
§ 3:83	— — —Presumptions cannot be based on presumptions
§ 3:84	— — —Presumption of proper police conduct in search and seizure
§ 3:85	Inferences
§ 3:86	—Operation of inferences
§ 3:87	— — —To prove actual malice
§ 3:88	— — —To prove knowledge or intent
§ 3:89	— — —Summary judgment proceedings
§ 3:90	— — —To prove authority
§ 3:91	— — —Waiver of condition precedent
§ 3:92	— — —Contempt proceedings
§ 3:93	— — —Admission by conduct
§ 3:94	— — —Applies to witnesses
§ 3:95	— — —Failure to testify
§ 3:96	— — —Damages
§ 3:97	—Inferences must be supported by evidence
§ 3:98	—Circumstantial evidence
§ 3:99	—Scientific evidence
§ 3:100	When inference insufficient—Manufacturer’s duty to indemnify
§ 3:101	—Product-related accident
§ 3:102	Inferences—Falsity

IV. EXAMPLES OF PRESUMPTIONS

§ 3:103	Examples of presumptions
§ 3:104	Spoliation of evidence
§ 3:105	—Presumption prerequisites
§ 3:106	—Duty to preserve
§ 3:107	—When presumption should be denied
§ 3:108	—Physical evidence requirement
§ 3:109	—Lost evidence compared
§ 3:110	— — —Spoliation of evidence as a separate tort
§ 3:111	Failure to produce evidence

- § 3:112 Mail receipt
- § 3:113 —Rebuttal
- § 3:114 —Hearing notice
- § 3:115 — —Effect of certificate of service
- § 3:116 — —Rebuttal
- § 3:117 Contracting parties intend consequences of
performance
- § 3:118 —Forum selection clauses
- § 3:119 —Releases
- § 3:120 Usual and customary attorney fees are reasonable
- § 3:121 Assistance of counsel
- § 3:122 Governmental authorities discharge duties according
to law
- § 3:123 City ordinance presumption
- § 3:124 Habeas corpus
- § 3:125 Business transactions are done in good faith and for
an honest purpose
- § 3:126 Love of life, avoidance of danger
- § 3:127 Products without warnings
- § 3:128 Products with inadequate warnings
- § 3:129 —Rebuttal evidence
- § 3:130 —No presumption that additional warning would be
followed
- § 3:131 Community property presumption
- § 3:132 Gift presumption upon transfer of separate property
between spouses
- § 3:133 Presumption of paternity from refusal to submit to
blood test—Burden of proof shifts
- § 3:134 Presumption in favor of preserving the parent-child
relationship
- § 3:135 Continuance of agency relationship
- § 3:136 Foreign law same as Texas law
- § 3:137 Presumptions created by Texas Rules of Civil
Procedure
- § 3:138 —Notice and proof of loss on claim for damages
- § 3:139 —Workers' compensation cases
- § 3:140 —Cases against automobile insurance companies
- § 3:141 Presumptions created by Texas Rule of Appellate
Procedure—Court reporter's record
- § 3:142 —Nonevidentiary hearing
- § 3:143 Negligence where goods from bailee damaged
- § 3:144 Transactions between corporations and corporate
fiduciaries
- § 3:145 Presumption of separateness for corporations
- § 3:146 Good character

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:147	Failure to reply
§ 3:148	Malicious prosecution
§ 3:149	Valid will
§ 3:150	Missing will
§ 3:151	Testamentary capacity
§ 3:152	Presumption of intended revocation of will last seen in testator's possession
§ 3:153	Facts recited in correction deed
§ 3:154	Assets traced to fiduciary
§ 3:155	Homestead—Requisite intent
§ 3:156	That homestead continues
§ 3:157	Inference from parental misconduct
§ 3:158	Possession
§ 3:159	Gifts to children
§ 3:160	Presumption of sanity
§ 3:161	Certificate of title
§ 3:162	Ancient judgments
§ 3:163	Fee title
§ 3:164	Deed
§ 3:165	Deed not accepted
§ 3:166	Public use
§ 3:167	Abandoned easement
§ 3:168	Rejection of ballot
§ 3:169	Presumption of unfairness
§ 3:170	Certificate of acknowledgement
§ 3:171	Submerged lands
§ 3:172	Registration of trademark
§ 3:173	Cab drivers
§ 3:174	Libelous/Defamatory <i>per se</i>
§ 3:175	Probable cause presumption
§ 3:176	Branded vehicle doctrine
§ 3:177	Authority of counsel
§ 3:178	Voters
§ 3:179	Statutes are constitutional

V. STATUTORY PRESUMPTIONS

§ 3:180	Presumptions created or addressed by statute
§ 3:181	Presumption regarding managing conservators
§ 3:182	Forum selection clauses presumptively valid
§ 3:183	Request under Texas Public Information Act presumed to be required public disclosure

VI. PRESUMPTION AGAINST PREEMPTION

§ 3:184	Preemption
---------	------------

VII. PRESUMPTIONS THAT DO NOT EXIST

- § 3:185 No presumption of agency
- § 3:186 No presumption that documents are privileged
- § 3:187 No presumption that default or summary judgment disposes of all parties
- § 3:188 No presumption of proper service in attack on default judgment
- § 3:189 No presumption vote count accurate
- § 3:190 Texas Transportation Code does not create a presumption from refusal to take breath test
- § 3:191 No presumption of negligence in rear-end collision
- § 3:192 No presumption of contempt

CHAPTER 4. RELEVANCE AND ITS LIMITS

I. RULE 401—TEST FOR RELEVANT EVIDENCE

- § 4:1 Rule 401—Test for relevant evidence
- § 4:2 Summary of Rule
- § 4:3 Basis of Rule
- § 4:4 Use of Rule 401
- § 4:5 What is relevant evidence
- § 4:6 —Relevancy not inherent characteristic
- § 4:7 —Fact to which evidence offered need not be in dispute
- § 4:8 —Evidence must be probative
- § 4:9 —Evidence need not be conclusive to be relevant
- § 4:10 —*Ipsa dixit* of expert—Not relevant
- § 4:11 —Background evidence relevant in criminal cases
- § 4:12 Determining relevancy issues
- § 4:13 Relevancy conditioned on fact
- § 4:14 Relevancy coextensive with ingenuity of counsel
- § 4:15 —Relevance as basis for admitting evidence
- § 4:16 ——Ultimate issue defined
- § 4:17 —Relevance as basis for excluding evidence
- § 4:18 ——Collateral matters excluded
- § 4:19 ——Conclusory or speculative opinion testimony
- § 4:20 ——Scope of discovery
- § 4:21 ——Scope of discovery in attorney’s fees cases
- § 4:22 —Relevance as a basis for including evidence—Scope of discovery in product liability cases

II. RULE 402—GENERAL ADMISSIBILITY OF RELEVANT EVIDENCE

- § 4:23 Rule 402—General admissibility of relevant evidence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 4:24	Summary of Rule
§ 4:25	Basis of Rule
§ 4:26	Relevant evidence generally admissible
§ 4:27	Exceptions to admissibility of relevant evidence
§ 4:28	—Constitutional
§ 4:29	—Illegally obtained evidence—In criminal cases
§ 4:30	— — —Good faith exception
§ 4:31	— — —In civil cases—Good faith exception
§ 4:32	— — —Illegally obtained communications—Federal wiretap statute
§ 4:33	— — — —Purpose
§ 4:34	— — — —Consensual interception distinguished
§ 4:35	— — —Texas wiretap statute
§ 4:36	—Other rules
§ 4:37	Relevancy conditioned on fact
§ 4:38	Admission or exclusion of evidence
§ 4:39	—Rule 402 as basis for admitting evidence
§ 4:40	—Rule 402 as basis for excluding evidence
§ 4:41	Common relevancy issues
§ 4:42	—Conduct of driver before accident
§ 4:43	—Similar occurrences at same company but involving different employees
§ 4:44	—Sales of similar property
§ 4:45	—Out-of-court experiments
§ 4:46	—Invited evidence
§ 4:47	—Collateral source
§ 4:48	—Net worth
§ 4:49	—Other accidents/same product
§ 4:50	— — —OSHA standards
§ 4:51	— — —Knowledge to industry
§ 4:52	—Medical Damages— <i>Civil Practice and Remedies Code</i> § 41.0105

III. RULE 403—EXCLUDING RELEVANT EVIDENCE FOR PREJUDICE, CONFUSION, OR OTHER REASONS

§ 4:53	Rule 403—Excluding relevant evidence for prejudice, confusion, or other reasons
§ 4:54	Summary of Rule
§ 4:55	Basis of Rule
§ 4:56	Construction of Rule
§ 4:57	Balancing probative value against other reasons for exclusion
§ 4:58	—Presumption that relevant evidence is more probative than prejudicial

- § 4:59 —Effect when door is opened
- § 4:60 —Factors
- § 4:61 — —Probative value
- § 4:62 — —Proponent's need
- § 4:63 — —Prejudicial effect
- § 4:64 — —Confusing the issues
- § 4:65 — —Undue delay
- § 4:66 — —Cumulative evidence
- § 4:67 — — —Examples
- § 4:68 — — —Erroneous exclusion
- § 4:69 —Application of balancing test
- § 4:70 — —Alcohol use
- § 4:71 — —Drug use
- § 4:72 — —Entire scheme
- § 4:73 — —Expert testimony
- § 4:74 — —Extraneous acts
- § 4:75 — — —Conduct preceding incident
- § 4:76 — — —Other accidents
- § 4:77 — — — —Medical malpractice
- § 4:78 — — — —Product liability
- § 4:79 — — —Subsequent accidents
- § 4:80 — —Gruesome photographs
- § 4:81 — —Net worth
- § 4:82 — —Racism
- § 4:83 — —Other examples
- § 4:84 — —Cases holding no abuse of discretion to admit certain evidence
- § 4:85 — —Cases in which prejudicial effect of evidence held to outweigh probative value
- § 4:86 — —Reversible error to admit evidence
- § 4:87 — —Reversible error to exclude evidence
- § 4:88 —Standards for appellate review

IV. RULE 404—CHARACTER EVIDENCE; CRIMES OR OTHER ACTS

- § 4:89 Rule 404—Character evidence; crimes or other acts
- § 4:90 Rule 404(a)
- § 4:91 Rule 404(b)
- § 4:92 Rule 404—Compared to Federal Rules of Evidence
- § 4:93 Character evidence generally not admissible to prove conduct
- § 4:94 Exceptions when character evidence admissible to prove conduct
- § 4:95 —Character of party accused of conduct involving moral turpitude

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 4:96	— —Moral turpitude defined
§ 4:97	—Character of alleged victim
§ 4:98	— —Particular acts of victim inadmissible to prove character
§ 4:99	— —Evidence of victim's trait for violence where self-defense alleged
§ 4:100	—Evidence regarding character of witness
§ 4:101	Evidence of other wrongs or acts not admissible to show character or conduct
§ 4:102	—Evidence of prior customer problems
§ 4:103	—False answer on job application in workers' compensation case
§ 4:104	—Evidence of defendant's drug use in accident case
§ 4:105	—Evidence of prior fire at defendant's property in insurance case
§ 4:106	—Evidence of defendant's prior affairs in alienation of affections action
§ 4:107	—Evidence of joint venturer's independent project
§ 4:108	—Evidence of lie in unrelated matter
§ 4:109	—Evidence of doctor's conduct in other cases
§ 4:110	—Res inter alios acta doctrine
§ 4:111	— —Exceptions to rule
§ 4:112	Exceptions to exclusion of other wrongs or acts
§ 4:113	—Refuting defense theory
§ 4:114	—Intent
§ 4:115	— —Consent as rebuttal to intent in sexual assault cases
§ 4:116	—Identity
§ 4:117	—Interests of child in family law cases
§ 4:118	—Punitive damages
§ 4:119	—Where door opened
§ 4:120	Modus operandi to prove identity

V. RULE 405—METHODS OF PROVING CHARACTER

§ 4:121	Rule 405—Methods of proving character
§ 4:122	Rule 405(a)
§ 4:123	Rule 405(b)
§ 4:124	Basis of Rule
§ 4:125	Construction of Rule
§ 4:126	Proving character
§ 4:127	—Reputation
§ 4:128	—Opinion regarding character
§ 4:129	—Specific instances of conduct

- § 4:130 When character not in issue but used
circumstantially, only reputation, opinion permitted
- § 4:131 —Exception for cross-examination regarding specific
instances of conduct
- § 4:132 —Nature of opinion testimony regarding character
- § 4:133 When character in issue, any of three methods
permitted
- § 4:134 —Conviction as reputation evidence
- § 4:135 —Character trait as reputation
- § 4:136 Rule 405 may not apply to corporations, places, or
animals
- § 4:137 Reputation, opinion offered to prove other than
character
- § 4:138 Character witnesses must be qualified

VI. RULE 406—HABIT; ROUTINE PRACTICE

- § 4:139 Rule 406—Habit; routine practice
- § 4:140 Summary of Rule
- § 4:141 Basis of Rule
- § 4:142 Habit defined
- § 4:143 Sufficient instances, consistency of behavior required
- § 4:144 —One or two instances not sufficient to establish
habit
- § 4:145 —Four times during a ten-day period not sufficient to
establish habit
- § 4:146 —Three accidents in six years not sufficient to show
habit
- § 4:147 —Corporation's termination policy
- § 4:148 —Business transactions with third parties
- § 4:149 —Prior transactions between parties
- § 4:150 —Affidavit testimony excluded
- § 4:151 Method of proving habit

VII. RULE 407—SUBSEQUENT REMEDIAL MEASURES; NOTIFICATION OF DEFECT

- § 4:152 Rule 407—Subsequent remedial measures;
notification of defect
- § 4:153 Rule 407(a)
- § 4:154 Rule 407(b)
- § 4:155 Construction of Rule
- § 4:156 Subsequent remedial measures
- § 4:157 —Purpose
- § 4:158 —Must be offered against a party
- § 4:159 —Exclusion in negligence cases

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 4:160	— — Permissible for impeachment
§ 4:161	— — — Postaccident instruction excluded for impeachment
§ 4:162	— — Subsequent remedial measures admitted for another purpose
§ 4:163	— — — Other purpose must be controverted
§ 4:164	— — — Owner's control
§ 4:165	— — — Feasibility of precautionary measures
§ 4:166	— — — To show accident scene
§ 4:167	— — Harmless error rule
§ 4:168	— Application in products liability cases
§ 4:169	— Application in warning defect cases
§ 4:170	Notification of defect

VIII. RULE 408—COMPROMISE OFFERS AND NEGOTIATIONS

§ 4:171	Rule 408—Compromise offers and negotiations
§ 4:172	Summary of Rule
§ 4:173	Basis of Rule
§ 4:174	Discoverability does not confer admissibility
§ 4:175	Evidence of compromise negotiations
§ 4:176	— What constitutes an offer of compromise or compromise negotiation
§ 4:177	— — Must be part of negotiation or offer
§ 4:178	— — Ultimatums
§ 4:179	— — Mitigation attempts
§ 4:180	— — Repudiated settlement agreement
§ 4:181	— Compromise evidence found inadmissible
§ 4:182	— — Statements made during compromise negotiations
§ 4:183	— — Documents prepared for settlement negotiations
§ 4:184	— — Failed attempt to show bias or prejudice
§ 4:185	— — Malice
§ 4:186	— Compromise evidence found admissible
§ 4:187	— Conduct or statements made during compromise negotiations found admissible—Discoverable materials not shielded
§ 4:188	— — State of mind
§ 4:189	— — Suits to enforce settlement agreement
§ 4:190	— — Actionable statements made during negotiations in bad faith insurance cases
§ 4:191	— — — Severance discretionary
§ 4:192	— — Alleged misrepresentations
§ 4:193	— — Undue delay

- § 4:194 — —Corporate resolution resulting from settlement
- § 4:195 — —Bias, prejudice, or interest
- § 4:196 — —Damages measured by pecuniary standard
- § 4:197 — —Mary Carter agreements
- § 4:198 — —Objections

IX. RULE 409—OFFERS TO PAY MEDICAL AND SIMILAR EXPENSES

- § 4:199 Rule 409—Offers to pay medical and similar expenses
- § 4:200 Summary of Rule
- § 4:201 Basis of Rule
- § 4:202 Construction of Rule
- § 4:203 Incidental statements not excluded
- § 4:204 —No policy reason to protect incidental statements
- § 4:205 —Example of incidental statement
- § 4:206 Use of payment of medical and similar expenses for other purposes
- § 4:207 —Payment admissible to reduce amount of final judgment

X. RULE 410—PLEAS, PLEA DISCUSSIONS, AND RELATED STATEMENTS

- § 4:208 Rule 410—Pleas, plea discussions, and related statements
- § 4:209 Summary of Rule
- § 4:210 Basis of Rule
- § 4:211 Withdrawn guilty pleas
- § 4:212 Pleas of nolo contendere
- § 4:213 —Nolo pleas admissible in disciplinary actions against lawyers
- § 4:214 Statements made in Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 proceedings or comparable state procedure
- § 4:215 Statements made in the course of plea discussions with an attorney for prosecuting authority not resulting in guilty plea
- § 4:216 —Improper questioning on the basis of attorney-client privilege during punishment phase of trial
- § 4:217 Related statements that ought to be considered contemporaneously

XI. RULE 411—LIABILITY INSURANCE

- § 4:218 Rule 411—Liability insurance
- § 4:219 Summary of Rule

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:220 Basis of Rule
- § 4:221 Criminal Matters
- § 4:222 Insurance not admissible to prove fault
- § 4:223 —Parental immunity doctrine
- § 4:224 —Evidence of nonprofit status does not open door to insurance evidence
- § 4:225 Insurance not excluded to prove other issues
- § 4:226 —Control
- § 4:227 —Ownership
- § 4:228 Not all insurance suggestions violate rule
- § 4:229 —Record required
- § 4:230 —Standard of review
- § 4:231 Other types of insurance admissible
- § 4:232 When liability insurance admissible as to only one claim

XII. RULE 412—EVIDENCE OF PREVIOUS SEXUAL CONDUCT IN CRIMINAL CASES

- § 4:233 Rule 412—Evidence of previous sexual conduct in criminal cases
- § 4:234 Summary of Rule
- § 4:235 Basis of Rule
- § 4:236 Purpose of Rule 412
- § 4:237 Comparison with Rule 403
- § 4:238 —Abuse of discretion to exclude testimony of complainant; balancing test
- § 4:239 —Exception for admissibility of sexual history of victim to rebut medical evidence
- § 4:240 Procedure of 412(c) hearing

CHAPTER 5. PRIVILEGES

I. RULE 501—PRIVILEGES IN GENERAL

- § 5:1 Rule 501—Privileges in general
- § 5:2 Summary of Rule
- § 5:3 Basis of Rule
- § 5:4 Prohibition on court-created privileges
- § 5:5 No comprehensive list of all Texas privileges
- § 5:6 Types of privileges provided
- § 5:7 —Evidentiary privileges
- § 5:8 —Discovery privileges
- § 5:9 — —No patent-agent privilege
- § 5:10 —Constitutional privileges

- § 5:11 — —Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination
- § 5:12 — — —Civil proceedings distinguished
- § 5:13 — — — —Negative inference permitted
- § 5:14 — — — —Evidentiary limitation
- § 5:15 — — — —Offensive use compared
- § 5:16 — — —Effect of finding of offensive use
- § 5:17 — —Journalist's qualified privilege
- § 5:18 —Statutory privileges
- § 5:19 — —Work-product doctrine; criminal case
- § 5:20 — —Work-product doctrine; post-accident investigations
- § 5:21 — —Banking department records
- § 5:22 — — —Exceptions
- § 5:23 — —Savings and loan association records and books
- § 5:24 — — —Borrower, account holder exception
- § 5:25 — —Polygraph examination results
- § 5:26 — —Physician-patient communication
- § 5:27 — — —Exceptions to confidentiality
- § 5:28 — —Medical peer review committees
- § 5:29 — —State Board of Medical Examiners
- § 5:30 — — —Suspensions and disciplinary orders not confidential
- § 5:31 — — —Records or reports not discoverable
- § 5:32 — —Open Records Act exceptions
- § 5:33 — — —Law enforcement, prosecutorial records
- § 5:34 — — —Criminal investigations
- § 5:35 — — —Internal records, notations
- § 5:36 — —Accident reports
- § 5:37 — — —Exceptions
- § 5:38 — —Marriage counseling reports ordered in divorce proceedings
- § 5:39 — —Medical committee records
- § 5:40 — — —Business records compared
- § 5:41 Burden of party seeking to show specific source of privilege
- § 5:42 —Constitution, statutes, or rules
- § 5:43 —Trial court may not create privileges
- § 5:44 —No privilege based on foreign law
- § 5:45 Application in federal cases
- § 5:46 —Physician-patient privilege
- § 5:47 — —Personal injury action

II. RULE 502—REQUIRED REPORTS PRIVILEGED BY STATUTE

- § 5:48 Rule 502—Required reports privileged by statute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 5:49	Summary of Rule
§ 5:50	Basis of Rule
§ 5:51	No Rule 502 privilege absent statutory reporting requirement
§ 5:52	Existence of Rule 502 privilege determined by reference to statute
§ 5:53	No privilege absent evidence of privilege
§ 5:54	Rule 502 requires Texas courts to honor certain foreign privileges
§ 5:55	Rule 502 recognizes sister state statutory privileges
§ 5:56	No Rule 502 privilege for false reporting

III. RULE 503—LAWYER-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

§ 5:57	Rule 503—Lawyer-client privilege
§ 5:58	Summary of Rule
§ 5:59	Basis of Rule
§ 5:60	Application of Rule
§ 5:61	Privilege not presumed
§ 5:62	Definitions
§ 5:63	—Client
§ 5:64	— —Client must be rendered professional legal services
§ 5:65	— —Actual employment of lawyer need not result
§ 5:66	— —Client need not be involved in litigation
§ 5:67	— —Trust beneficiary not client of trustee’s attorney
§ 5:68	—Representative of client
§ 5:69	— —Control group test and modified subject matter test
§ 5:70	— —Proof of client representative required
§ 5:71	— —Expert witness can be representative of client
§ 5:72	—Lawyer
§ 5:73	— —Licensing state or nation need not recognize attorney-client privilege
§ 5:74	— —Lawyer includes person reasonably believed to be a lawyer
§ 5:75	— —Where attorney acts as something other than attorney, privilege does not apply
§ 5:76	—Lawyer’s representative
§ 5:77	— —Establishing representative of lawyer in discovery by affidavit
§ 5:78	— —Lawyer’s private investigator can be lawyer’s representative
§ 5:79	— —Whether lawyer or client pays representative is not determinative
§ 5:80	— —Definition not met

- § 5:81 —Confidential communication
- § 5:82 — —Confidentiality defined in terms of intent
- § 5:83 — —Nature of communication, not subject matter,
determines whether privilege applies
- § 5:84 — — —Demonstrating prima facie claim
- § 5:85 — — — —Burden shifts
- § 5:86 — —Factual information, advice
- § 5:87 — — —Information generally known cannot be made
confidential by communicating it to attorney
- § 5:88 — — —Entire document privileged
- § 5:89 — — — —Rationale
- § 5:90 — —Communication not confidential where made in
presence of third parties
- § 5:91 — —Communications made in the presence of certain
third parties are privileged
- § 5:92 — —Lawyer-client relationship can be inferred when
determining whether communication is confidential
- § 5:93 General rule of privilege under Rule 503(b)
- § 5:94 —General principles applicable to Rule 503(b)
- § 5:95 — —Privilege applies only to communications made
in connection with rendition of legal services
- § 5:96 — —Privilege applies only to confidential
communications
- § 5:97 — —Confidential communications protected from
eavesdroppers
- § 5:98 — —No privilege absent attorney-client relationship
- § 5:99 — —No privilege absent evidence
- § 5:100 —Communications between client/representative and
lawyer/representative
- § 5:101 —Communications between lawyer and lawyer's
representative
- § 5:102 —Allied litigant privilege
- § 5:103 — —Codefendant communications compared
- § 5:104 — —Common interest requirement
- § 5:105 — — —Workers compensation cases
- § 5:106 — — —Adversarial interests preclude privilege
- § 5:107 — —When disqualification required
- § 5:108 — — —Evidentiary hearing required
- § 5:109 — — —Standard of review
- § 5:110 —Communications between representatives of client,
or client and representative of client
- § 5:111 —Communications between lawyers or their
representatives representing same client
- § 5:112 —Special rule of privilege in criminal cases
- § 5:113 Procedure for determining privilege

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:114 Who may claim or waive privilege
- § 5:115 —Lawyer in individual capacity has no standing
- § 5:116 —Lawyer on behalf of client
- § 5:117 —Lawyer’s investigator
- § 5:118 Exceptions to lawyer-client privilege
- § 5:119 —Crime-fraud exception
- § 5:120 — —Prima facie case of crime or fraud required
- § 5:121 — — —Proof required
- § 5:122 — —Intent requirement
- § 5:123 — —In camera review
- § 5:124 —No privilege for communications between those claiming through same deceased client
- § 5:125 —No privilege for communications relating to breach of duty by lawyer or client
- § 5:126 —No privilege for communications regarding certain attested documents
- § 5:127 —No privilege attaches to certain matters between joint clients
- § 5:128 —No effect on obligation to return misappropriated documents
- § 5:129 Waiver through offensive use
- § 5:130 —Factors in determining waiver through offensive use
- § 5:131 — —Affirmative relief sought
- § 5:132 — — —Declaratory judgment
- § 5:133 — — —Affirmative defenses
- § 5:134 — — —Rebuttal evidence
- § 5:135 — —Outcome-determinative information
- § 5:136 — — —Relevance compared
- § 5:137 — — —All or nothing approach rejected
- § 5:138 — —Alternative sources
- § 5:139 — — —All or nothing approach rejected

IV. RULE 504—SPOUSAL PRIVILEGES

- § 5:140 Rule 504—Spousal privileges
- § 5:141 Summary of Rule
- § 5:142 Basis of Rule
- § 5:143 Construction of Rule
- § 5:144 Who is a spouse
- § 5:145 —Common law marriage
- § 5:146 — —What constitutes common law marriage
- § 5:147 Scope of privilege
- § 5:148 Spousal Privilege—Common law marriage
- § 5:149 What is a communication

- § 5:150 To whom the privilege belongs
- § 5:151 Duration of the privilege
- § 5:152 Exceptions to marital communication privilege
- § 5:153 —Communications in furtherance of crime or fraud
- § 5:154 —Communications in a proceeding by or on behalf of one spouse against the other in civil cases
- § 5:155 — —Proceeding between a surviving spouse and person claiming through deceased spouse
- § 5:156 —Communications in proceeding involving crime against spouse or minor child
- § 5:157 —Communications in proceeding for commitment of spouse or spouse's property
- § 5:158 —Proceeding to establish competence of spouse
- § 5:159 Communication made in presence of third party
- § 5:160 Privilege not to testify in criminal cases
- § 5:161 —Failure to call as witness
- § 5:162 —Who may claim privilege
- § 5:163 —Calling spouse is not ipso facto error
- § 5:164 —Exceptions

V. RULE 505—PRIVILEGE FOR COMMUNICATIONS TO A CLERGY MEMBER

- § 5:165 Rule 505—Privilege for communications to a clergy member
- § 5:166 Summary of Rule
- § 5:167 Basis of Rule
- § 5:168 Definition of member of clergy
- § 5:169 —Employer not dispositive
- § 5:170 —No self-denominated minister
- § 5:171 —Includes person who is reasonably believed to be a member of the clergy
- § 5:172 Definition of confidential communication
- § 5:173 —When privilege attaches to communication
- § 5:174 —Privilege not waived when communication made in front of third party
- § 5:175 —Communication need not be confidential in nature
- § 5:176 —Privilege belongs to communicant not clergy member
- § 5:177 —Communicant's identity
- § 5:178 —Factors to consider
- § 5:179 General rule
- § 5:180 —Scope of privilege
- § 5:181 —Disclosure by member of clergy and eavesdroppers
- § 5:182 —Crime/fraud exception

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:183 Who may claim the privilege
- § 5:184 No offensive use doctrine available
- § 5:185 Disclosure may be compelled in proceedings involving child abuse or neglect
- § 5:186 Cross-examination available when member of clergy called as character witness
- § 5:187 Texas Family Code takes precedence over Rule 505

VI. RULE 506—POLITICAL VOTE PRIVILEGE

- § 5:188 Rule 506—Political vote privilege
- § 5:189 Summary of Rule
- § 5:190 Basis of Rule
- § 5:191 Construction of Rule

VII. RULE 507—TRADE SECRETS PRIVILEGE

- § 5:192 Rule 507—Trade secrets privilege
- § 5:193 Summary of Rule
- § 5:194 Basis of Rule
- § 5:195 Definition of trade secret
- § 5:196 —Restatement examples
- § 5:197 — —Patents distinguished
- § 5:198 Competing interests served by Rule 507
- § 5:199 Rule 507 privilege not absolute
- § 5:200 —Disclosure required only if necessary for fair adjudication
- § 5:201 Process for determining application of privilege
- § 5:202 Shifting burdens in application of Rule 507 privilege
- § 5:203 —Party resisting discovery
- § 5:204 —Party requesting disclosure
- § 5:205 — —More than mere relevancy required
- § 5:206 —Need for discovery must be weighed against potential harm of disclosure
- § 5:207 — —Disclosure compelled, subject to protective order, if burden met
- § 5:208 — — —Protective orders
- § 5:209 — —Discretion abused in denying discovery where proprietary interests can be protected
- § 5:210 — —Discretion abused in compelling disclosure of privileged material
- § 5:211 Level of proof on appeal

VIII. RULE 508—INFORMER'S IDENTITY PRIVILEGE

- § 5:212 Rule 508—Informer's identity privilege

- § 5:213 Summary of Rule
- § 5:214 Process for resolving prosecution claims of informer's identity privilege
- § 5:215 Basis of Rule
- § 5:216 General rule of informer's identity privilege
- § 5:217 —Privilege belongs to the public entity
- § 5:218 —Scope of privilege
- § 5:219 —Only identity is privileged
- § 5:220 Essential elements in establishing informer's identity privilege
- § 5:221 Proving factual predicate for informer's identity privilege through testimony or affidavits
- § 5:222 —In camera inspection of documents
- § 5:223 Who may claim informer's identity privilege
- § 5:224 —Appropriate representative
- § 5:225 —State may claim
- § 5:226 Exceptions to informer's identity privilege
- § 5:227 —Voluntary waiver of privilege
- § 5:228 — —Voluntary disclosure
- § 5:229 —Voluntary waiver of informer's identity privilege—
Informer a witness
- § 5:230 —Informer giving testimony on the merits
- § 5:231 — —Public entity must be given opportunity to show
in camera facts on whether informer can testify
- § 5:232 — — —Purpose of in camera review
- § 5:233 — — — —Protection of the informer by in camera
review
- § 5:234 — —Factors to consider
- § 5:235 — —Possible relevance of informant's identity is
insufficient to discover identity of informant in
criminal cases
- § 5:236 —Where informer can testify but public entity elects
not to disclose identity, judge may make further
orders
- § 5:237 Exceptions—Where informer can testify, judge may
make any order that justice requires—Examples of
court action
- § 5:238 —Determination of legality of obtaining evidence
- § 5:239 — —Function of in camera inspection

IX. RULE 509—PHYSICIAN-PATIENT PRIVILEGE

- § 5:240 Rule 509—Physician-patient privilege
- § 5:241 Summary of Rule
- § 5:242 Basis of Rule
- § 5:243 Definition of patient

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 5:244	—Cases discussing Rule 509(a)(1)
§ 5:245	—Definition of physician
§ 5:246	—Chiropractors qualify as physicians
§ 5:247	Definition of confidential communications
§ 5:248	Limited privilege in criminal proceedings
§ 5:249	General rule of privilege
§ 5:250	—Confidential communications are privileged
§ 5:251	—Physicians' records are privileged
§ 5:252	— —Not all records are privileged
§ 5:253	— —Pleading, proof requirements
§ 5:254	— — —In camera inspection
§ 5:255	— — —Tender of documents
§ 5:256	— — —Waiver
§ 5:257	— — —Physical, emotional condition in issue
§ 5:258	—Some medical billing records are privileged
§ 5:259	—Retroactive application of Rule
§ 5:260	Patient, patient's representative may claim privilege
§ 5:261	—Patient's estate
§ 5:262	—Attorney not representing witness cannot claim privilege on witness' behalf
§ 5:263	Physician may claim privilege only on behalf of patient
§ 5:264	Exceptions in civil cases
§ 5:265	—Disclosure relevant to physician's claim, defense
§ 5:266	—When patient gives written consent to release of information
§ 5:267	—Court-ordered disclosures
§ 5:268	— —Proof requirements for challenging court-ordered authorization
§ 5:269	—Proceedings to substantiate and collect on claim for medical services
§ 5:270	—Party relies on patient's condition for claim or defense
§ 5:271	— —Whether patient's condition is part of claim or defense
§ 5:272	— —Patient need not be a party
§ 5:273	— —Limitations on time and scope of records produced
§ 5:274	— — <i>In camera</i> inspection
§ 5:275	— —Offensive use doctrine independent from patient- condition exceptions
§ 5:276	—When disclosure is relevant to any disciplinary investigation or proceeding of a physician
§ 5:277	—Involuntary civil commitment proceedings, proceedings for court ordered treatment, or probable cause hearings

- § 5:278 — —Cases interpreting former Tex. R. Crim. Evid.
509(d)(7)
- § 5:279 —Abuse or neglect of institutional residents
- § 5:280 Consent for release of information
- § 5:281 —What written consent must specify
- § 5:282 —Withdrawal of consent
- § 5:283 —Disclosure of information obtained by consent
limited
- § 5:284 Relationship of Rules 509 and 510

X. RULE 510—MENTAL HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVILEGE IN CIVIL CASES

- § 5:285 Rule 510—Mental health information privilege in
civil cases
- § 5:286 Summary of Rule
- § 5:287 Basis of Rule
- § 5:288 Definition of professional
- § 5:289 —Psychologists, psychiatrists, professional
counselors, and social workers
- § 5:290 Definition of patient
- § 5:291 —Definition of representative of the patient
- § 5:292 —Definition of confidential communication
- § 5:293 General rule of privilege
- § 5:294 —Communications and records are confidential
- § 5:295 — —Records of identity
- § 5:296 — —Must plead and prove privilege
- § 5:297 —Third party receipt of confidential communications
- § 5:298 —Retroactive application
- § 5:299 Privilege may be claimed by patient or patient's
representative
- § 5:300 —Professional may claim privilege on patient's behalf
- § 5:301 Rule 510(d)—Exceptions
- § 5:302 —Proceedings by patient against professional
- § 5:303 — —Pleading places condition in issue
- § 5:304 —Written waiver
- § 5:305 —Collection proceedings
- § 5:306 —Certain statements made during court-ordered
examinations
- § 5:307 — —Applies to court-ordered examinations
- § 5:308 — —Applies only where patient has been informed
that communications would not be privileged
- § 5:309 — —Court-ordered disclosure requires safeguards
- § 5:310 —Party relies on condition for claim, defense
- § 5:311 — —Suit by next friend

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:312 —Abuse and neglect proceedings
- § 5:313 — —Evidence admissible
- § 5:314 Relationship of Rule 509 and Rule 510

XI. RULE 511—WAIVER BY VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE

- § 5:315 Rule 511—Waiver by voluntary disclosure
- § 5:316 Summary of Rule
- § 5:317 Signing claims does not waive attorney-client privilege
- § 5:318 Basis of Rule
- § 5:319 Construction of Rule
- § 5:320 Waiver of privilege by voluntary disclosure
- § 5:321 —Inadvertent production is not involuntary production
- § 5:322 —Inadvertent production in a state civil proceeding
- § 5:323 —Inadvertent production is not involuntary production—Production not inadvertent where party subsequently changes its position
- § 5:324 —Procedure for determining voluntary waiver
- § 5:325 —Burden
- § 5:326 —Knowledge not required
- § 5:327 —Implied waiver
- § 5:328 — —General allegation insufficient
- § 5:329 Character testimony as voluntary disclosure
- § 5:330 Assignment of claims not waiver of privilege related to underlying litigation

XII. RULE 512—PRIVILEGED MATTER DISCLOSED UNDER COMPULSION OR WITHOUT OPPORTUNITY TO CLAIM PRIVILEGE

- § 5:331 Rule 512—Privileged matter disclosed under compulsion or without opportunity to claim privilege
- § 5:332 Summary of Rule
- § 5:333 Basis of Rule
- § 5:334 Construction of Rule
- § 5:335 Privilege not waived where disclosure compelled erroneously
- § 5:336 —Objecting party not required to stand his or her ground
- § 5:337 Privilege not waived where disclosure made without opportunity to claim privilege
- § 5:338 —Illustrations of disclosure without opportunity to waive privilege

- § 5:339 —Improper disclosure alone does not defeat a privilege
- § 5:340 —Must explain disclosure of privileged material
- § 5:341 Remedy is exclusion

XIII. RULE 513—COMMENT UPON OR INFERENCE FROM CLAIM OF PRIVILEGE; INSTRUCTION

- § 5:342 Rule 513—Comment on or inference from a privilege claim; instruction
- § 5:343 Summary of Rule
- § 5:344 Basis of Rule
- § 5:345 Comment or inference not permitted
- § 5:346 —Allowing comment restricts privilege
- § 5:347 —Privileged hospital peer review process
- § 5:348 —Comment or adverse inference from party’s claim of privilege against self-incrimination not prevented
- § 5:349 — —Federal law
- § 5:350 Claiming privilege without knowledge of jury
- § 5:351 —Parties shielded from adverse inferences
- § 5:352 —Jury exclusion not required
- § 5:353 —Value of privilege can be destroyed by innuendo
- § 5:354 —Deposition portion in which privilege asserted should not be read to jury
- § 5:355 —Applies only to the extent practicable
- § 5:356 Exception for privilege against self-incrimination in civil cases
- § 5:357 —Present proceeding distinguished
- § 5:358 —Use of deposition testimony at trial
- § 5:359 — —Effect of motion in limine
- § 5:360 —Without some probative evidence, negative inference cannot rise beyond mere suspicion
- § 5:361 Jury instruction

CHAPTER 6. WITNESSES

I. RULE 601—COMPETENCY TO TESTIFY IN GENERAL; “DEAD MAN’S RULE”

- § 6:1 Rule 601—Competency to testify in general; “Dead Man’s Rule”
- § 6:2 Rule 601(a)
- § 6:3 Rule 601(b)
- § 6:4 Every person competent witness except as provided in Rule 601(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:5	—Insane persons
§ 6:6	—Persons lacking sufficient intellect
§ 6:7	— —No minimum age for competency
§ 6:8	— —Minors not per se barred from testifying
§ 6:9	— —Rule does not require sua sponte competence evaluation
§ 6:10	— —No requirement to understand oath
§ 6:11	— —Confusing an inconsistent response go to credibility, not competence
§ 6:12	— —Abuse of discretion standard
§ 6:13	—Persons without personal knowledge incompetent witnesses
§ 6:14	—Presiding judge incompetent witness
§ 6:15	—Juror incompetent witness
§ 6:16	—Felons not incompetent witnesses
§ 6:17	—Outstanding civil contempt or arrest warrant does not create incompetence
§ 6:18	Oral statements by testator, intestate, ward, or decedent (Rule 601(b))
§ 6:19	—Rule 601(b) and former dead man’s statute compared
§ 6:20	—When Rule 601(b) applies
§ 6:21	—When Rule 601(b) does not apply
§ 6:22	—Corroboration required
§ 6:23	— —Statement inadmissible absent corroboration
§ 6:24	— —Statement sufficiently corroborated
§ 6:25	— — —Evidence showing conduct by decedent consistent with testimony concerning decedent’s statement
§ 6:26	— — —Corroborating evidence need not be sufficient standing alone to support verdict
§ 6:27	Oral statements by testator, intestate or ward (Rule 601(b))—Corroboration required—Statement sufficiently corroborated—Corroboration by two other witnesses not required
§ 6:28	Oral statements by testator, intestate, ward, or decedent (Rule 601(b))—Corroboration required—Instruction to jury absent corroboration
§ 6:29	—Question of whether Rule 601(b) prohibits testimony of parties only
§ 6:30	—Discovery does not waive Rule 601(b)
§ 6:31	—Cross-examination at trial does not waive Rule 601(b)
§ 6:32	—Judge’s questions at trial may waive Rule 601(b)

II. RULE 602—NEED FOR PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE

§ 6:33	Rule 602—Need for personal knowledge
--------	--------------------------------------

- § 6:34 Summary of Rule
- § 6:35 Basis of Rule
- § 6:36 Construction of Rule
- § 6:37 Testimony excluded absent personal knowledge
- § 6:38 —Testimony improperly admitted
- § 6:39 Personal knowledge is issue of conditional relevancy under Rule 104(b)
- § 6:40 Witness can establish personal knowledge
- § 6:41 Burden to establish personal knowledge on offering party
- § 6:42 Establishing personal knowledge in affidavits
- § 6:43 Lay testimony/personal experience with medical condition
- § 6:44 Personal knowledge can be inferred
- § 6:45 Objections
- § 6:46 Lack of personal knowledge does not negate existence of fact
- § 6:47 Exceptions to personal knowledge requirement

III. RULE 603—OATH OR AFFIRMATION TO TESTIFY TRUTHFULLY

- § 6:48 Rule 603—Oath or affirmation to testify truthfully
- § 6:49 Summary of Rule
- § 6:50 Basis of Rule
- § 6:51 Construction of Rule
- § 6:52 No specific form for oath or affirmation
- § 6:53 Oath required for a party's in-court statements to judge to be considered evidence
- § 6:54 Sufficiency of oath, affirmation preliminary question for court
- § 6:55 —Timely objection required
- § 6:56 Lawyer's statements

IV. RULE 604—INTERPRETER

- § 6:57 Rule 604—Interpreter
- § 6:58 Summary of Rule
- § 6:59 Basis of Rule
- § 6:60 Construction of Rule
- § 6:61 Authority to hire or appoint interpreters
- § 6:62 Interpreter for witness must be qualified as an expert
- § 6:63 —Special requirements for interpreter for deaf
- § 6:64 —Special requirement for interpreters in border counties
- § 6:65 Interpreter must swear or affirm that he will make a true translation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:66 —Failure to swear or affirm requires timely objection

V. RULE 605—JUDGE’S COMPETENCY AS A WITNESS

- § 6:67 Rule 605—Judge’s competency as a witness
- § 6:68 Summary of Rule
- § 6:69 Basis of Rule
- § 6:70 Construction of Rule
- § 6:71 Applicable to more than members of the judiciary
- § 6:72 Testimony by presiding trial judge not considered for any purpose
- § 6:73 Court’s statements on fact issue cannot be relied upon as evidence
- § 6:74 Actual prejudice not needed for Rule 605 violation
- § 6:75 Judge need not leave bench to testify as witness
- § 6:76 —Admission before the jury of trial judge’s pretrial ruling may be tantamount to testimony by judge
- § 6:77 —Trial judge’s recitation of facts not otherwise in evidence cannot support a finding
- § 6:78 No objection needed to preserve error under Rule 605
- § 6:79 Other limitations on judicial testimony
- § 6:80 —Judges should not be voluntary character witnesses
- § 6:81 —Judges should not give expert testimony
- § 6:82 —Municipal trials
- § 6:83 When judges can testify

VI. RULE 606—JUROR’S COMPETENCY AS A WITNESS

- § 6:84 Rule 606—Juror’s competency as a witness
- § 6:85 Summary of Rule
- § 6:86 Basis of Rule
- § 6:87 Juror may not testify in trial on which juror serves
- § 6:88 Defining the term: “Deliberations”
- § 6:89 Rule 606(b) and Tex. R. Civ. P. 327
- § 6:90 —Constitutional challenges
- § 6:91 —Need for evidentiary hearing
- § 6:92 Scope of juror’s testimony
- § 6:93 —Juror may not testify regarding information from deliberations
- § 6:94 —Juror may not testify about juror’s mental processes
- § 6:95 —Juror may testify regarding improper outside influence
- § 6:96 —A juror may testify regarding improper outside influence—Outside influence defined

- § 6:97 — —Matters not constituting outside influence
- § 6:98 — — —Coercion by jurors during deliberations
- § 6:99 — — —Juror bias
- § 6:100 — — —Jurors' knowledge, personal experience
- § 6:101 — — —Jury instructions
- § 6:102 — — —Neutral information
- § 6:103 — — —Pressure to finish deliberations
- § 6:104 — —Matters constituting outside influence
- § 6:105 — —Matters that might constitute outside
influence—Communications between a party and a
juror
- § 6:106 — — —Communications between a juror and a bailiff
- § 6:107 — —Matters constituting outside influence—Juror's
research
- § 6:108 — — —Media coverage
- § 6:109 —Rule 606(b) does not govern substantive grounds
for setting aside a verdict
- § 6:110 Court reporter afforded same judicial protections as
juror

VII. RULE 607—WHO MAY IMPEACH A WITNESS

- § 6:111 Rule 607—Who may impeach a witness
- § 6:112 Summary of Rule
- § 6:113 Basis of Rule
- § 6:114 Party may impeach own witness
- § 6:115 Party cannot call witness solely to impeach with
inadmissible hearsay
- § 6:116 Reversible error to exclude impeachment

VIII. RULE 608—A WITNESS'S CHARACTER FOR TRUTHFULNESS OR UNTRUTHFULNESS

- § 6:117 Rule 608—A witness's character for truthfulness or
untruthfulness
- § 6:118 Summary of Rule
- § 6:119 Basis of Rule
- § 6:120 Opinion and reputation evidence of character
- § 6:121 Opinion and reputation of character—Example of
non-character evidence
- § 6:122 Opinion and reputation evidence of character—
Exception to Rule 404(a)
- § 6:123 —Inquiry limited to character for veracity only
- § 6:124 —Bolstering with evidence of truthful character not
permitted
- § 6:125 —Rehabilitation with evidence of truthful character
permitted

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:126 — —Character evidence admissible only after attack on witness' truthfulness
- § 6:127 — —What constitutes attack on witness' truthfulness
- § 6:128 — —Truthful character can be proved by opinion or reputation evidence
- § 6:129 — —Opinion and reputation evidence consistent with Rule 405
- § 6:130 — —Reputation
- § 6:131 — — —Reputation is opinion in disguise
- § 6:132 —Character witnesses must be qualified
- § 6:133 Specific instances of conduct
- § 6:134 —Specific instances of conduct not permitted to attack or support credibility
- § 6:135 — —Exception in criminal cases; correction of false impression
- § 6:136 —Specific instances of conduct excluded
- § 6:137 —Specific instance of conduct included

IX. RULE 609—IMPEACHMENT BY EVIDENCE OF A CRIMINAL CONVICTION

- § 6:138 Rule 609—Impeachment by evidence of a criminal conviction
- § 6:139 Summary of Rule
- § 6:140 Basis of Rule
- § 6:141 In general
- § 6:142 —Only applies to impeaching credibility
- § 6:143 —Impeaching credibility
- § 6:144 — —Conviction required
- § 6:145 — — —Details of offense not admissible
- § 6:146 — — — —Exceptions
- § 6:147 — — —Agreement inadmissible
- § 6:148 — — —Nolo contendere plea
- § 6:149 — — —Error waived
- § 6:150 — — —False imprisonment cases distinguished
- § 6:151 — — — —State courts
- § 6:152 — — — —Federal courts
- § 6:153 — — —Door opened to extraneous offenses
- § 6:154 — — —Defendant as witness
- § 6:155 — — —Character witness compared
- § 6:156 — — — —Factual foundation required
- § 6:157 — — — —Outside jury's presence
- § 6:158 — —Moral turpitude crimes
- § 6:159 — — —No clear-cut criteria
- § 6:160 — — —Question of law

- § 6:161 — — —General categories
- § 6:162 — — —Probative value must outweigh prejudicial effect
- § 6:163 — — —Trial court’s discretion
- § 6:164 — — —Exclusion as basis for reversible error
- § 6:165 —Resolving conflicts questions
- § 6:166 —Proving a conviction under Rule 609
- § 6:167 Time limit for use of evidence of conviction
- § 6:168 —Fairness, relevancy require time limit
- § 6:169 Effect of pardon, annulment, certificate of rehabilitation
- § 6:170 —Policy
- § 6:171 Juvenile adjudications
- § 6:172 Pendency of appeal/When conviction is not final
- § 6:173 Notice of intent to use conviction evidence
- § 6:174 —Courts of Appeals split over Rule 609(f)’s notice requirement

X. RULE 610—RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR OPINIONS

- § 6:175 Rule 610—Religious beliefs or opinions
- § 6:176 Summary of Rule
- § 6:177 Basis of Rule
- § 6:178 Construction of Rule
- § 6:179 Evidence of religious beliefs
- § 6:180 —Admissible to show something other than credibility
- § 6:181 —Admissible where opposing party opens the door
- § 6:182 —Not admissible

XI. RULE 611—MODE AND ORDER OF EXAMINING WITNESSES AND PRESENTING EVIDENCE

- § 6:183 Rule 611—Mode and order of examining witnesses and presenting evidence
- § 6:184 Summary of Rule
- § 6:185 Basis of Rule
- § 6:186 Court’s control
- § 6:187 —Guiding principles
- § 6:188 —Court’s responsibility
- § 6:189 —Objectives
- § 6:190 — — —Nearly complete freedom on re-direct
- § 6:191 — — —Ascertaining truth
- § 6:192 — — —Proper subject matter required for use in impeachment
- § 6:193 — — — —Collateral matters improper
- § 6:194 — — — —Exception

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:195	— —Avoiding needless consumption of time
§ 6:196	— — —Narrative testimony in nonjury trial
§ 6:197	— — — —Attorney’s fees
§ 6:198	— —Protecting witnesses from harassment, embarrassment
§ 6:199	Scope of cross-examination
§ 6:200	—Matters connected with case in chief
§ 6:201	— —Abandoned pleadings as admissions
§ 6:202	—Scope of cross-examination where both parties designate same expert witness
§ 6:203	—To preserve error, must obtain answer to improperly excluded question
§ 6:204	—Court’s ruling will not be disturbed unless it is arbitrarily and unreasonably made
§ 6:205	Leading questions
§ 6:206	—Leading questions should not be used in direct examination except as necessary
§ 6:207	— —Court’s discretion
§ 6:208	— —Developing preliminary matters on direct
§ 6:209	— — —Contested material issues distinguished
§ 6:210	— —Effect where witness cross-examined by own counsel
§ 6:211	— — —Exception
§ 6:212	—Leading questions on cross-examination
§ 6:213	—Leading hostile or adverse witness
§ 6:214	— —Determination of hostile status
§ 6:215	Redirect and recross-examination
§ 6:216	—Redirect
§ 6:217	—Recross
§ 6:218	Permitting jurors to question witnesses
§ 6:219	—Procedural safeguards

XII. RULE 612—WRITING USED TO REFRESH A WITNESS’S MEMORY

§ 6:220	Rule 612—Writing used to refresh a witness’s memory
§ 6:221	Summary of Rule
§ 6:222	Basis of Rule
§ 6:223	Construction of Rule
§ 6:224	—Use of writing to refresh waives attorney-client privilege and work-product protection
§ 6:225	—Writing may have been prepared by someone other than witness
§ 6:226	Document used to refresh memory must be produced for examination

- § 6:227 Disclosure of writing is not a matter of right
- § 6:228 Obtaining disclosure of writing used to refresh
memory of witness before testifying
- § 6:229 —Where writing used to refresh memory contains
unrelated material
- § 6:230 —Where writing used to refresh memory does not
contain unrelated material
- § 6:231 —Where writing used to refresh memory of attorney
testifying in an Edmonson hearing
- § 6:232 Sanction for failure to produce documents under Rule
612
- § 6:233 Issue of whether Rule 612 applies to deposition
testimony
- § 6:234 Record must reflect writing was used to refresh
memory to preserve error

XIII. RULE 613—WITNESS’S PRIOR STATEMENT AND BIAS OR INTEREST

- § 6:235 Rule 613—Witness’s prior statement and bias or
interest
- § 6:236 Summary of Rule
- § 6:237 Basis of Rule
- § 6:238 Examining witness concerning prior inconsistent
statement
- § 6:239 —Proper foundation for impeachment under Rule
613(a)
- § 6:240 —Types of evidence that qualify as prior inconsistent
statements
- § 6:241 — —Prior oral statements
- § 6:242 — —Prior claims by a party
- § 6:243 — —Prior claims against a party
- § 6:244 — —Statements in superseded pleadings
- § 6:245 — — —Statements against interest in abandoned
pleading
- § 6:246 — — — —Filemark or verification not required
- § 6:247 — —Answers to requests for admission
- § 6:248 — —Answers to interrogatories
- § 6:249 Examining witness concerning bias or interest
- § 6:250 —Proper foundation for impeachment under Rule
- § 6:251 — —Impeachment permitted only where witness
denies bias or interest
- § 6:252 Prior consistent statements of witnesses
- § 6:253 Weight versus admissibility of perjurer’s testimony
- § 6:254 Statements used for impeachment are not
substantive evidence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:255 —Limited purpose evidence

XIV. RULE 614—EXCLUDING WITNESSES

- § 6:256 Rule 614—Excluding witnesses
- § 6:257 Summary of Rule
- § 6:258 Basis of Rule
- § 6:259 Witnesses must be excluded at request of party
- § 6:260 —Purpose of sequestration
- § 6:261 —Instructions given to excluded witnesses
- § 6:262 —Instructions need not be given to exempt witnesses
- § 6:263 —Including officers of the court
- § 6:264 —Penalties for violation of Rule
- § 6:265 Exceptions
- § 6:266 —Burden on party seeking to exempt
- § 6:267 —Natural parties or their spouses
- § 6:268 — —Rationale
- § 6:269 —Designated corporate representatives
- § 6:270 — —Rationale
- § 6:271 — —Designation required
- § 6:272 —A person essential to presentation of case
- § 6:273 — —Within discretion of court
- § 6:274 — —Types of persons who may be essential
- § 6:275 — —Burden of proof
- § 6:276 Order excluding witness must not be overbroad
- § 6:277 Objecting to improper exclusion

XV. RULE 615—PRODUCING A WITNESS'S STATEMENT IN CRIMINAL CASES

- § 6:278 Rule 615—Producing a Witness's Statement in Criminal Cases
- § 6:279 Summary of Rule
- § 6:280 Basis of Rule

CHAPTER 7. OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

I. RULE 701—OPINION TESTIMONY BY LAY WITNESSES

- § 7:1 Rule 701—Opinion testimony by lay witnesses
- § 7:2 Summary of Rule
- § 7:3 Basis of Rule
- § 7:4 Requirements for opinion testimony by lay witnesses

- § 7:5 —Rationally based on perception
- § 7:6 — —Rule 602 personal knowledge requirement
- § 7:7 — — —Examples of testimony rationally based on perception of witness
- § 7:8 — — —Examples of testimony excluded as not rationally based on perception of witness
- § 7:9 —Helpful to a clear understanding of witness’s testimony or determination of a fact in issue
- § 7:10 Witness list
- § 7:11 Types of lay opinion testimony admitted
- § 7:12 —The Property Owner Rule
- § 7:13 — —Who qualifies as a property owner
- § 7:14 — —Value of automobile
- § 7:15 — — —Stolen car and its contents
- § 7:16 — — —Cost of repairs
- § 7:17 — — —When cost of repairs not admissible
- § 7:18 — — —Cost of rental during repair period
- § 7:19 — — —Lay testimony excluded where witness not owner
- § 7:20 — —Market value of property
- § 7:21 — — —Establishing predicate for market value testimony
- § 7:22 — — —Testimony admitted
- § 7:23 — — —Testimony excluded
- § 7:24 — — —Abuse of discretion standard on appeal
- § 7:25 — —Value of business
- § 7:26 — —Amount of lost profits
- § 7:27 — —Lost rental income
- § 7:28 — —Damages
- § 7:29 —Value of furnishings
- § 7:30 —Architectural, historical, and cultural significance of property
- § 7:31 —State of mind of another person
- § 7:32 —Mental condition of another person
- § 7:33 —Competency of testator
- § 7:34 —Identifying handwriting
- § 7:35 —Meaning of another person’s notes
- § 7:36 —Incapacity/Intoxication
- § 7:37 Types of lay opinion testimony excluded
- § 7:38 —Expert opinion
- § 7:39 —Conclusions
- § 7:40 —Summary judgment context
- § 7:41 —Legal conclusions
- § 7:42 —Examples of specific subjects
- § 7:43 Effect of lay opinion

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:44 —Cannot raise fact issue regarding design, material,
or manufacture
- § 7:45 —Cannot controvert expert opinion
- § 7:46 Witness precluded from testifying as expert cannot
testify as fact witness
- § 7:47 Comparing Rule 701 with Rule 702

II. RULE 702—TESTIMONY BY EXPERT WITNESSES

- § 7:48 Rule 702—Testimony by expert witnesses
- § 7:49 Summary of Rule
- § 7:50 Basis of Rule
- § 7:51 Construction of Rule
- § 7:52 Three-prong test for expert testimony
- § 7:53 —Abuse of discretion standard
- § 7:54 Form of expert testimony
- § 7:55 —Reports
- § 7:56 —Must be reliable
- § 7:57 — —Determining reliability in civil cases
- § 7:58 — —Determining reliability in criminal cases
- § 7:59 —Conclusory statements of expert
- § 7:60 — —May be raised for the first time on appeal
- § 7:61 — —Testimony challenged as “no evidence” is
reviewed using a de novo standard of review
- § 7:62 Whether expert is qualified
- § 7:63 —Specialized knowledge
- § 7:64 — —To assist trier of fact
- § 7:65 — — —Reasonableness and necessity of chiropractic
care
- § 7:66 — —Expert’s opinion may not encroach upon the
province of the trial court to decide questions of law
- § 7:67 — — —Factfinder equally competent
- § 7:68 — —Expert’s opinion may not encroach upon the
province of the trial court to decide questions of
law—Expert testimony does not create a fact issue
by itself
- § 7:69 — —Helpfulness standard includes determination of
relevancy
- § 7:70 — —Helpfulness standard excludes cumulative expert
testimony
- § 7:71 —Experts’ qualifications
- § 7:72 — —Burden of establishing expert’s qualifications
- § 7:73 — —Types of witnesses qualified to give expert
testimony
- § 7:74 — — —Chiropractor

- § 7:75 — — —Part-time dentist
- § 7:76 — — —Engineers
- § 7:77 — — —Real estate appraiser
- § 7:78 — — —Real estate agent
- § 7:79 — — —Insurance instructor
- § 7:80 — — —Defendants in malpractice cases
- § 7:81 — — —Physician-defendants
- § 7:82 — — —Attorney-defendants
- § 7:83 — — —Certified public accountant
- § 7:84 — — —License not required
- § 7:85 — — —Formal education not required
- § 7:86 — — —Additional examples of witnesses qualified to
give expert testimony
- § 7:87 — — —General experience not sufficient to qualify as
expert
- § 7:88 — — —License required to testify about standard of
care within licensed profession
- § 7:89 — — —Architects, engineers
- § 7:90 — — —Attorney on insurance industry’s standard of
care
- § 7:91 — — —Pharmacist on medical profession’s standard
of care
- § 7:92 — — —Police officer without accident reconstruction
training
- § 7:93 — — —Nonlawyer regarding terms or effect of
contract
- § 7:94 — — —Proponent of expert testimony has burden of
proving qualification of witness
- § 7:95 — — —Disqualified expert precluded as fact witness
- § 7:96 — — —Witness’s qualification question for court
- § 7:97 — — —Court can consider bias in 702 analysis
- § 7:98 — — —Voir dire to test qualifications
- § 7:99 — — —Subjects of expert testimony
- § 7:100 — — —Proper subjects
- § 7:101 — — —Net worth and proper amount of punitive
damages
- § 7:102 — — —Attorney’s fees
- § 7:103 — — —Building, construction, and architectural issues
- § 7:104 — — —Real estate issues
- § 7:105 — — —Identifying boundaries
- § 7:106 — — —Fair market value of property
- § 7:107 — — —Market value of rent
- § 7:108 — — —Appraiser testimony
- § 7:109 — — —Construction of technical terms in deed
- § 7:110 — — —Value of mineral reserves

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 7:111	— —Value of business
§ 7:112	— —Automobiles
§ 7:113	— —Handwriting and forgery
§ 7:114	— —Products liability cases
§ 7:115	— —Warnings
§ 7:116	— —Contract issues
§ 7:117	— — —Meaning of term in contract
§ 7:118	— — —Binding agreement was reached
§ 7:119	— —Motives and methods of arson
§ 7:120	— —Lawyer's opinion of testator's intent
§ 7:121	— —Veterinary testimony
§ 7:122	— —Whistleblowing
§ 7:123	— —Fingerprint evidence
§ 7:124	— —Shoe Print Testimony
§ 7:125	—Improper subjects
§ 7:126	— —Truthfulness of witnesses
§ 7:127	— — —Child's truthfulness in sexual assault cases
§ 7:128	— —Opinion regarding plaintiff's motives for arson
§ 7:129	— —Testator's intent
§ 7:130	— —Spouse's future earning capacity in divorce
§ 7:131	— —Whether conduct is outrageous
§ 7:132	— —Income to show value of loss of affection and companionship
§ 7:133	— —Title
§ 7:134	Effect of expert's review of additional material
§ 7:135	Scientific expert testimony
§ 7:136	—Application to technical and other specialized knowledge
§ 7:137	— —Nonscientific testimony not always subject to same standard
§ 7:138	— —Preliminary questions
§ 7:139	— —Relevance
§ 7:140	— — —Relationship to issues
§ 7:141	— —Reliability
§ 7:142	— — —Relationship to science
§ 7:143	— — —Burden on proponent
§ 7:144	— — —Objections to reliability
§ 7:145	— —Factors to consider
§ 7:146	— — —Testing
§ 7:147	— — —Subjective interpretation
§ 7:148	— — —Single cause distinguished
§ 7:149	— — —Peer review and/or publication
§ 7:150	— — —Rate of error analysis
§ 7:151	— — —Acceptance by scientific community
§ 7:152	— — —Self-serving statements compared

- § 7:153 — — —Nonjudicial uses
- § 7:154 — — —Purposes of litigation
- § 7:155 — — —Tailored testimony compared
- § 7:156 — —Burden of production
- § 7:157 — —Probative value determinations
- § 7:158 — —Timing of objection
- § 7:159 *Robinson* does not necessarily apply to nonscientific expert testimony
- § 7:160 Expert testimony generally not binding
- § 7:161 —Unrebutted expert testimony
- § 7:162 — —Jury bound by expert testimony
- § 7:163 — —Jury not bound by expert testimony
- § 7:164 —Credible and free of contradiction and inconsistency
- § 7:165 —When there is a conflict in expert testimony
- § 7:166 —Using expert testimony to impute knowledge
- § 7:167 Medical expert testimony
- § 7:168 —Qualification of medical experts
- § 7:169 — —Expert report—Definition of “Expert”
- § 7:170 — — —Licensed Physician
- § 7:171 — — —Inferences based on medical history
- § 7:172 — —Suit against a physician
- § 7:173 — —Health care liability claims against a health care provider
- § 7:174 — —Expert on causation in health care liability claim
- § 7:175 — —Testimony on Causation
- § 7:176 — — —Excluding other cases
- § 7:177 — —Testimony on causation—Alternative causes
- § 7:178 — —Specialized knowledge requirement
- § 7:179 — — —Medical doctor not automatically qualified
- § 7:180 — — —Specialized knowledge must be stated in report
- § 7:181 — — —Nonphysician as medical expert
- § 7:182 — — —Nurse may not opine on medical causation
- § 7:183 — —Subjects common to all fields
- § 7:184 — — —Practical knowledge requirement
- § 7:185 — —Physician who did not treat patient
- § 7:186 —Standard of care
- § 7:187 — —Reasonable medical probability compared
- § 7:188 — — —Particular terms, phrases not required
- § 7:189 — — —Independent conclusions required
- § 7:190 — —Medical experts not required to state standard before giving opinion
- § 7:191 — —Physician-defendant in medical malpractice case can establish standard of care

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:192 — —Physician expert need not share the precise specialty or experience of the physician-defendant
- § 7:193 — —Summary judgment evidence
- § 7:194 — —Proper subjects of medical expert testimony
- § 7:195 — —Comparative responsibility
- § 7:196 — —Testimony regarding possibilities
- § 7:197 — —Informed consent
- § 7:198 — —Cost and necessity of medical expenses
- § 7:199 Reasonableness of medical charges
- § 7:200 Veterinary negligence expert testimony—Standard of care
- § 7:201 Exclusion of an expert as unreliable—Not good cause for late disclosure of new expert

III. RULE 703—BASES OF AN EXPERT’S OPINION TESTIMONY

- § 7:202 Rule 703—Bases of an expert’s opinion testimony
- § 7:203 Summary of Rule
- § 7:204 Basis of Rule
- § 7:205 Data on which expert bases opinion may be reviewed at or before hearing
- § 7:206 No deadline at which an expert must stop considering facts and data
- § 7:207 Underlying facts or data need not be admissible if of a type reasonably relied on by experts in the field
- § 7:208 —Data reasonably relied upon by other experts
- § 7:209 — —Social worker reliance on penile plethysmograph test
- § 7:210 — —Expert reliance on tuition costs for special schools
- § 7:211 — —Doctor reliance on another expert not named as a witness
- § 7:212 — —Accountant reliance on summary accounting records
- § 7:213 — —Finance professor relying on information re employee cost of living
- § 7:214 — —Reliance on reports of third persons—Oral statements and business records
- § 7:215 — —Expert reliance on data re attorney’s fees
- § 7:216 —Whether experts in field rely on information is question for court under Rule 104(a)
- § 7:217 —Expert permitted to base opinions on evidence not admitted
- § 7:218 —Expert permitted to base opinions on inadmissible evidence

- § 7:219 — —Reliance on statements from expert not named
in discovery
- § 7:220 — —Real estate appraiser's reliance on third-party
offers to buy
- § 7:221 — —Hearsay
- § 7:222 — — —Affidavits
- § 7:223 — — —Published articles
- § 7:224 — — —Undesignated expert's statements
- § 7:225 — —Tape recordings
- § 7:226 — —However evidence must have some objective
basis
- § 7:227 —Hypothetical questions
- § 7:228 — —Limited to facts in evidence
- § 7:229 — —Can be based on inferences from facts in
evidence
- § 7:230 Subjects held to be proper bases of expert testimony
- § 7:231 —Condemnation expert's reliance on his experience
- § 7:232 —Economist's reliance on psychologist's report, part
of which was stricken
- § 7:233 —CPA's reliance on interest rates and return on
investments
- § 7:234 —Termite expert's reliance on examination of
premises and analysis of damaged wood
- § 7:235 —Legal malpractice damages in mass tort case
- § 7:236 Extent to which expert may disclose facts or data
underlying his opinion governed by Rule 705
- § 7:237 Rule 703 does not violate the Confrontation Clause

IV. RULE 704—OPINION ON AN ULTIMATE ISSUE

- § 7:238 Rule 704—Opinion on an ultimate issue
- § 7:239 Summary of Rule
- § 7:240 Basis of Rule
- § 7:241 Construction of Rule
- § 7:242 Opinion on ultimate issue admitted
- § 7:243 —Opinion goes to an ultimate issue or invades
province of jury not valid objection
- § 7:244 —Testimony that embraces ultimate issues may still
be objectionable under other rules
- § 7:245 Mixed questions of law and fact
- § 7:246 —Mixed question defined
- § 7:247 —Factual basis requirement
- § 7:248 —Proper legal standard requirement
- § 7:249 —General requirements
- § 7:250 — —Proximate cause
- § 7:251 — —Gross negligence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:252 — —Negligence and causation
- § 7:253 — —Medical negligence
- § 7:254 — —OSHA violations
- § 7:255 — —Propriety of Mary Carter agreements
- § 7:256 — —Inadmissible where testimony not based on proper legal concepts
- § 7:257 — —Failure to define negligence
- § 7:258 — —Failure to explain definition of negligence
- § 7:259 — —Failure to connect facts regarding proximate cause
- § 7:260 Statements of law not admissible
- § 7:261 — —Existence of legal duty
- § 7:262 — —Legality of party's actions in driving automobile
- § 7:263 — —Experts should not argue as lawyers
- § 7:264 Not all opinions admissible

V. RULE 705—DISCLOSING THE UNDERLYING FACTS OR DATA AND EXAMINING AN EXPERT ABOUT THEM

- § 7:265 Rule 705—Disclosing the underlying facts or data and examining an expert about them
- § 7:266 Summary of Rule
- § 7:267 Basis of Rule
- § 7:268 Expert may testify without disclosing underlying facts or data
- § 7:269 — —Exclusion of underlying facts or data relied upon by expert during direct examination
- § 7:270 — —Cross-examination compared
- § 7:271 — —Burden of exploring bases of expert opinion shifted to cross-examiner
- § 7:272 — —Rationale
- § 7:273 — —Expert opinion can be excluded under Rules 702, 703, and 403
- § 7:274 No absolute right to disclose underlying facts or data
- § 7:275 — —Polygraph results never admitted in a criminal case
- § 7:276 Underlying facts or data admitted
- § 7:277 Admission of underlying hearsay deprived party of right of confrontation and cross-examination
- § 7:278 Error in admitting hearsay underlying expert opinion must be shown to cause rendition of improper judgment
- § 7:279 Conclusory evidence

VI. RULE 706—AUDIT IN CIVIL CASES

- § 7:280 Rule 706—Audit in Civil Cases

- § 7:281 Summary of Rule
- § 7:282 Basis of Rule
- § 7:283 Construction of Rule
- § 7:284 Admissibility of reports of court-appointed auditors
- § 7:285 —Effect of admissibility of data in report
- § 7:286 —Effect of report embracing ultimate issue
- § 7:287 Evidence of contradiction requires filing of exceptions
- § 7:288 —Exceptions must be filed within 30 days
- § 7:289 —Exceptions do not affect admissibility
- § 7:290 Report conclusive where neither side files exceptions

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 8. HEARSAY

I. RULE 801—DEFINITIONS THAT APPLY TO THIS ARTICLE; EXCLUSIONS FROM HEARSAY

§ 8:1	Rule 801—Definitions that apply to this article; exclusions from hearsay
§ 8:2	Summary of Rule
§ 8:3	Tex. R. Evid. 801(a)
§ 8:4	Tex. R. Evid. 801(b)
§ 8:5	Tex. R. Evid. 801(c)
§ 8:6	Tex. R. Evid. 801(d)
§ 8:7	Tex. R. Evid. 801(e)(1)
§ 8:8	Tex. R. Evid. 801(e)(1)(A)
§ 8:9	Tex. R. Evid. 801(e)(1)(B)
§ 8:10	Tex. R. Evid. 801(e)(1)(C)
§ 8:11	Tex. R. Evid. 801(e)(2)
§ 8:12	Tex. R. Evid. 801(e)(3)
§ 8:13	Definition of statement
§ 8:14	—When nonverbal conduct is a statement
§ 8:15	—Whether nonverbal conduct is statement is preliminary question under Rule 104(a)
§ 8:16	Definition of declarant
§ 8:17	Definition of matter asserted
§ 8:18	Definition of hearsay
§ 8:19	—Purpose of the Hearsay Rule
§ 8:20	—Evidence excluded as hearsay
§ 8:21	— —Witness’ knowledge acquired from statements of third parties
§ 8:22	— — —Bases of expert opinion compared
§ 8:23	— —Testimony regarding statements made by third parties
§ 8:24	— — —Witness statements in police reports
§ 8:25	— —Affidavits
§ 8:26	— —Invoices
§ 8:27	— —Unauthenticated documents
§ 8:28	— — —Newspaper articles
§ 8:29	— — —Letters
§ 8:30	— — —Valuation report
§ 8:31	— —Poster
§ 8:32	— —Value of property assessed without participation of landowner

- § 8:33 —Not hearsay where statement not offered to prove truth or offered for limited purpose
- § 8:34 — —To prove state of mind
- § 8:35 — —To prove intent
- § 8:36 — —To show notice
- § 8:37 — —To prove existence
- § 8:38 — —To prove statement made
- § 8:39 — — —To prove attitude
- § 8:40 — —Limited purpose admission, effect
- § 8:41 —Statement not hearsay where fact of utterance has legal significance; Operative fact
- § 8:42 Statements not hearsay
- § 8:43 —Prior statement by witness
- § 8:44 — —Prior inconsistent statement given under oath
- § 8:45 — — —Failure to meet requirements, effect
- § 8:46 — —Prior consistent statement to rebut charge of recent fabrication or improper influence or motive
- § 8:47 — — —Evidence excluded under Rule 801(e)(1)(B) where declarant did not testify and could not be cross-examined
- § 8:48 — — —Evidence excluded under Rule 801(e)(1)(B) where impeached witness excused
- § 8:49 — — —Trial court's discretion
- § 8:50 — —Identification of a person made after perceiving him
- § 8:51 — —Prior statement admissible only if declarant has testified
- § 8:52 —Admissions by party-opponents
- § 8:53 — —Offered against party
- § 8:54 — —Party's own statement
- § 8:55 — — —Prior testimony of party
- § 8:56 — —Co-defendants
- § 8:57 — —Not conclusive evidence
- § 8:58 — —Party's own statement—Party's own statement admitted
- § 8:59 — — —Error to exclude party's own statement
- § 8:60 — —Victim in a criminal case is not a party-opponent
- § 8:61 — —Adopted statement
- § 8:62 — —Authorized statements
- § 8:63 — — —Whether statement is authorized is preliminary question under Rule 104(a)
- § 8:64 — — —Public employees' statements
- § 8:65 — — —Attorney's statements
- § 8:66 — — —Conclusions of experts
- § 8:67 — — —Pleadings in other cases

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:68	— — —Abandoned pleadings
§ 8:69	— — —Unfiled, unverified abandoned pleading
§ 8:70	— — —Correspondence to court
§ 8:71	— — —Failure of party to mention important event may be admission event did not occur
§ 8:72	— — —Vicarious admissions
§ 8:73	— — —Preliminary question for court
§ 8:74	— — —Evidence admitted as vicarious admission
§ 8:75	— — —Agency requirement
§ 8:76	— — —Scope of employment requirement
§ 8:77	— — —During existence of relationship requirement
§ 8:78	— — —Employee whose statement proffered as vicarious admission need not be identified by name
§ 8:79	— — —Co-conspirator admissions
§ 8:80	— — —Preliminary question for court
§ 8:81	— — —Prima facie evidence required
§ 8:82	— — —Judicial notice exception to normal requirements of proof
§ 8:83	— — —Tangible, material evidence requirement
§ 8:84	— — —During course of conspiracy requirement
§ 8:85	— — —Privy admissions
§ 8:86	— — —Who qualifies as a party
§ 8:87	—Depositions
§ 8:88	— — —Party requirement
§ 8:89	— — —Effect of Rules of Civil Procedure
§ 8:90	— — —Deposition as admission by party-opponent
§ 8:91	— — —Deposition as former testimony
§ 8:92	—Judicial admissions
§ 8:93	— — —Admission must be clear and unequivocal
§ 8:94	— — —Statement not judicial admission where ambiguous
§ 8:95	— — —Statement not judicial admission where not made during course of judicial proceeding
§ 8:96	— — —Judicial admission can be made by party in testimony
§ 8:97	— — —Judicial admission can be made by party's lawyer
§ 8:98	— — —In arguments to court
§ 8:99	— — —In stipulations
§ 8:100	— — —In live pleadings
§ 8:101	— — —In briefs
§ 8:102	— — —Judicial admission need not be inconsistent with prior statement
§ 8:103	— — —Judicial admission is substitute for evidence
§ 8:104	— — —Judicial admission cannot be contradicted

- § 8:105 — —Error to exclude judicial admissions
- § 8:106 — —No conclusive judicial admission where pleading superseded
- § 8:107 — — —Superseded pleading as party admission
- § 8:108 — — —Fact question
- § 8:109 — —Party judicially estopped
- § 8:110 — —Party not judicially estopped
- § 8:111 —Impeachment

II. RULE 802—THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY

- § 8:112 Rule 802—The rule against hearsay
- § 8:113 Summary of Rule
- § 8:114 Bases of Rule
- § 8:115 Not limited to contested hearings
- § 8:116 Hearsay not admissible
- § 8:117 —Admissions of former party are hearsay
- § 8:118 —Expert opinion not hearsay
- § 8:119 Unobjected-to hearsay not denied probative value
- § 8:120 —At trial
- § 8:121 —In summary judgment proceedings
- § 8:122 — —Affidavits
- § 8:123 —At hearings
- § 8:124 —On appeal
- § 8:125 Effect when hearsay improperly admitted
- § 8:126 —Evaluating sufficiency
- § 8:127 Statutory hearsay exceptions related to sexual assault
- § 8:128 Statutory hearsay exception related to breath tests

III. RULE 803—EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY—REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE DECLARANT IS AVAILABLE AS A WITNESS

- § 8:129 Rule 803—Exceptions to the rule against hearsay—Regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness
- § 8:130 Summary of Rule
- § 8:131 Bases of Rule
- § 8:132 Construction of Rule
- § 8:133 Present sense impression
- § 8:134 —Theory of Rule 803(1)
- § 8:135 —Time element of present sense impression
- § 8:136 —Declarant’s participation in event described not required

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:137	—Permissible subject matter of present sense impression
§ 8:138	Excited utterance
§ 8:139	—Theory of Rule 803(2)
§ 8:140	—Admissibility
§ 8:141	—Time element of excited utterance
§ 8:142	— —Event can be remote in time if declarant is still in state of excitement
§ 8:143	— — —Statement admissible if it relates to the startling event
§ 8:144	—Statements made in response to a question
§ 8:145	—Declarant's tone and tenor of voice
§ 8:146	—Declarant's participation in the startling event not required
§ 8:147	— —Declarant must at least witness exciting event
§ 8:148	—Statements admitted as excited utterances under Rule 803(2)
§ 8:149	—No excited utterance under Rule 803(2) where no showing of spontaneity in response to startling event
§ 8:150	—Statement cannot be mere narrative of past events
§ 8:151	Then-existing mental, emotional, or physical condition
§ 8:152	—State of mind
§ 8:153	— —Intent
§ 8:154	—Evidence admitted under Rule 803(3)
§ 8:155	—Evidence excluded as not being statement of then-existing mental, emotional, or physical condition
§ 8:156	Statements for purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment
§ 8:157	—Statements need not have been made to physician
§ 8:158	—Statements regarding fault not ordinarily admissible
§ 8:159	—Statements for purpose of medical diagnosis admitted under Rule 803(4)
§ 8:160	—Letter regarding diagnosis is hearsay
§ 8:161	Recorded recollection
§ 8:162	—Writing containing recorded recollection need not be admissible for recollection to be admissible
§ 8:163	—Adopted statements
§ 8:164	Records of regularly conducted activity; business records
§ 8:165	—Authenticating witness need not be custodian
§ 8:166	— —Admissibility compared
§ 8:167	—Personal knowledge requirement liberally interpreted

- § 8:168 —Personal knowledge requirement strictly interpreted
- § 8:169 —Diagnoses, medical opinions
- § 8:170 — —Exception
- § 8:171 —Drug test results—More stringent business records exception in termination of parental rights cases
- § 8:172 —Documents admitted as business records
- § 8:173 — —Account statement
- § 8:174 — —Computer records
- § 8:175 — — —Need not prove computing equipment recognized as standard equipment
- § 8:176 — — —Immaterial whether records maintained in computer or company books
- § 8:177 — —Examples of miscellaneous documents admitted as business records
- § 8:178 — — —Concrete test core results
- § 8:179 — — —Summer Simpson papers
- § 8:180 — — —Deposit slip, bank statement, ledger tape, and inheritance check
- § 8:181 — — —Medical bills
- § 8:182 — — —Partnership income tax returns
- § 8:183 — — —Contracts
- § 8:184 —Documents received from another entity
- § 8:185 —Records held not to be business records
- § 8:186 — —Where Rule 803(6) predicate not laid
- § 8:187 — —Records prepared for use at trial
- § 8:188 — —Where evidence not trustworthy
- § 8:189 — — —Trustworthiness depends on regular course of recording
- § 8:190 — — —Evidence not trustworthy where gaps in chain of custody
- § 8:191 — —Where record contained notes and reports by third parties
- § 8:192 — —Must object to lack of 803(6) predicate
- § 8:193 —Diagnosis contained in medical records
- § 8:194 —Self-authentication of business records under Rule 902(10)
- § 8:195 —Self-authentication of business records under Rule 902(5)
- § 8:196 —Absence of entry in records kept in accordance with the provisions of Rule 803(6)
- § 8:197 —Evidence admitted under Rule 803(7)
- § 8:198 —Evidence excluded under Rule 803(7)
- § 8:199 —Public records and reports
- § 8:200 —Factors in determining trustworthiness of a report under 803(8)(C)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:201	—No personal knowledge requirement
§ 8:202	—Rule 803(8) does not require regularity
§ 8:203	—Rule 803(8) does not require contemporaneity
§ 8:204	—Law enforcement reports in criminal cases
§ 8:205	—Evidence admitted as public record or report under Rule 803(8)
§ 8:206	— —Records of the office’s or agency’s own activities
§ 8:207	— —Police reports need not be sworn
§ 8:208	— —Records of matters observed
§ 8:209	— —Fact findings in investigative reports
§ 8:210	— —Exception for third-party statements
§ 8:211	— —Opinions of foreign court
§ 8:212	— —Letters from other courts
§ 8:213	—Evidence admitted as public records or report under Rule 803(8)—Opinion from another court
§ 8:214	—Evidence not admitted as public record or report under Rule 803(8)
§ 8:215	— —Mere filing of proposed testimony does not make it a public record coming within the exception
§ 8:216	— —Where proffered evidence was not a report
§ 8:217	— —Where report contained ex parte statements, hearsay conclusions and opinions
§ 8:218	— —Where report lacked reliability
§ 8:219	— —Where report was not authenticated
§ 8:220	— —Factual findings of public agency excluded at trial de novo
§ 8:221	— —Testimony of expert hired by public agency
§ 8:222	—Improperly excluded public record must be included in appellate record to preserve error
§ 8:223	Records of vital statistics
§ 8:224	Absence of public record or entry
§ 8:225	—Evidence admitted
§ 8:226	—Evidence excluded
§ 8:227	Records of religious organizations
§ 8:228	Marriage, baptismal, and similar certificates
§ 8:229	Family records
§ 8:230	Records of documents affecting an interest in property
§ 8:231	—Rule 803(14) includes deeds, leases, and mortgages, but not affidavits of heirship
§ 8:232	Statements in documents affecting an interest in property
§ 8:233	—Documents that fall within Rule 803(15) excluded if not relevant
§ 8:234	—Rule 803(15) includes deeds, leases, and mortgages, but not affidavits of heirship

- § 8:235 Statements in ancient documents
- § 8:236 —Documents admitted as ancient documents under Rule 803(16)
- § 8:237 —Documents excluded as not meeting requirements of ancient documents
- § 8:238 Market reports, commercial publications
- § 8:239 —Evidence properly admitted under Rule 803(17)
- § 8:240 —Evidence erroneously admitted under Rule 803(17)
- § 8:241 Learned treatises
- § 8:242 —Expert cannot thwart cross-examination refusing to recognize treatise as authoritative
- § 8:243 — —Contrary authority
- § 8:244 —Treatise can be published after conduct at issue
- § 8:245 —Learned treatise cannot be admitted into evidence
- § 8:246 —Availability of declarant immaterial
- § 8:247 Reputation concerning personal or family history:
- § 8:248 Reputation concerning boundaries or general history
- § 8:249 Reputation as to character
- § 8:250 Judgment of previous conviction
- § 8:251 —Misdemeanors compared
- § 8:252 —Nolo contendere pleas
- § 8:253 —Exclusion of previous conviction
- § 8:254 —Judgment of conviction as offensive collateral estoppel
- § 8:255 — —Effect
- § 8:256 Judgment as to personal, family, or general history, or boundaries
- § 8:257 Statement against interest
- § 8:258 —Rationale
- § 8:259 —Time requirement
- § 8:260 — —Statement in police report
- § 8:261 — —Subsequent declaration
- § 8:262 —Offered against declarant
- § 8:263 —Evidence admitted as statement against interest under Rule 803(24)
- § 8:264 —Statements that tend to subject declarant to civil or criminal liability qualify as statements against interest
- § 8:265 —Statements against interest must be relevant
- § 8:266 —Statement against interest must be authenticated
- § 8:267 Declarant must have personal knowledge

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**IV. RULE 804—EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE
AGAINST HEARSAY—WHEN THE DECLARANT
IS UNAVAILABLE AS A WITNESS**

- § 8:268 Rule 804—Exceptions to the rule against hearsay—
When the declarant is unavailable as a witness
- § 8:269 Summary of Rule
- § 8:270 Basis of Rule
- § 8:271 Statements against interest
- § 8:272 Residual hearsay exception
- § 8:273 Construction of Rule
- § 8:274 Definition of unavailability
- § 8:275 —Exemption by court ruling
- § 8:276 —Refusal to testify despite court order
- § 8:277 —Lack of memory
- § 8:278 —Death or illness
- § 8:279 — —Mental illness
- § 8:280 — —Physical incapacity
- § 8:281 —Inability to procure attendance
- § 8:282 — —Beyond jurisdiction of court
- § 8:283 — —Whereabouts unknown
- § 8:284 — — —Diligent search requirement
- § 8:285 — — —Absence due to procurement or wrongdoing
- § 8:286 — — —Unavailability must be proved
- § 8:287 —Even where declarant unavailable, evidence must
fall within a hearsay exception to be admissible
- § 8:288 Hearsay exceptions
- § 8:289 —Former testimony
- § 8:290 — —Depositions from another proceeding
- § 8:291 — —Depositions taken in the same proceeding
- § 8:292 — —Deposition testimony from prior case
- § 8:293 — —Former testimony excluded where witness not
unavailable
- § 8:294 —Dying declarations
- § 8:295 — —Dying declaration must be relevant
- § 8:296 — —Statement can be dying declaration even if
declarant did not die
- § 8:297 — —Whether statement is dying declaration is
preliminary question under Rule 104(a)
- § 8:298 —Statement of personal or family history
- § 8:299 — —Statement of declarant’s personal history
- § 8:300 — —Statement concerning history of another person
- § 8:301 — —Statement of personal or family history
inadmissible absent showing of unavailability of
declarant

- § 8:302 Declarant must have personal knowledge

V. RULE 805—HEARSAY WITHIN HEARSAY

- § 8:303 Rule 805—Hearsay within hearsay
- § 8:304 Summary of Rule
- § 8:305 Basis of Rule
- § 8:306 Construction of Rule
- § 8:307 Hearsay within hearsay admitted where falls within an exception to hearsay rule
- § 8:308 —Affidavits
- § 8:309 Hearsay within hearsay excluded where it does not fall within exception to hearsay rule
- § 8:310 Admission of hearsay within hearsay can be prejudicial error

VI. RULE 806—ATTACKING AND SUPPORTING THE DECLARANT’S CREDIBILITY

- § 8:311 Rule 806—Attacking and supporting the declarant’s credibility
- § 8:312 Summary of Rule
- § 8:313 Bases of Rule
- § 8:314 Construction of Rule
- § 8:315 Hearsay declarant can be impeached with subsequent statement
- § 8:316 Hearsay declarant can be impeached with subsequent statement for purposes of credibility
- § 8:317 Affidavit admissible under Rule 806 for impeachment not substantive evidence
- § 8:318 Self-Authentication Affidavit Sample Form

CHAPTER 9. AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTIFICATION

I. RULE 901—AUTHENTICATING OR IDENTIFYING EVIDENCE

- § 9:1 Rule 901—Authenticating or identifying evidence
- § 9:2 Summary of Rule
- § 9:3 Basis of Rule
- § 9:4 Provisions, in general
- § 9:5 —Relationship to relevancy
- § 9:6 —Preliminary question
- § 9:7 — —Proponent’s burden
- § 9:8 — — —Standard

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9:9	— —Judicial discretion to authenticate
§ 9:10	— —Authentication under any applicable rule sufficient
§ 9:11	— —Effect
§ 9:12	— — —Probative value balancing
§ 9:13	— — —Personal knowledge lacking
§ 9:14	— — —Produced document
§ 9:15	— Properly authenticated document admitted
§ 9:16	— Unauthenticated evidence excluded
§ 9:17	— Stipulation can waive authentication requirement
§ 9:18	— Rule 901 and Rule 902 do not make otherwise inadmissible evidence admissible
§ 9:19	— Unauthenticated evidence will not support summary judgment
§ 9:20	Rule 901(b) illustrates conforming authentication or identification
§ 9:21	— Testimony of witness with knowledge
§ 9:22	— —Item with unique, distinctive characteristics
§ 9:23	— —Where item not distinctive, chain of custody may be required
§ 9:24	— —Where continuity of condition at issue
§ 9:25	— — —When testimony of single witness suffices
§ 9:26	— — —When chain of custody required to establish continuity of condition
§ 9:27	— —Photographs admissible if identified by witness with knowledge as accurately portraying relevant facts
§ 9:28	— — —Witness can identify same object photographed at different location
§ 9:29	— — —Length of time between incident and photograph may not preclude admission
§ 9:30	— — —Compare photograph excluded where not identified as accurate depiction
§ 9:31	— — —Dispute regarding accuracy of photograph does not render photograph inadmissible
§ 9:32	— — —Photographs and the best evidence rule
§ 9:33	— —Video recordings
§ 9:34	— — —Video recording admitted where properly authenticated
§ 9:35	— — —Videotape excluded where it was not accurate depiction
§ 9:36	— — —Video recordings without sound
§ 9:37	— —Tape recordings admissible if identified by witness with knowledge as accurately portraying relevant facts

- § 9:38 — —Inadmissible deposition cannot authenticate evidence under Rule 901(b)(1)
- § 9:39 — —Nonexpert opinion on handwriting
- § 9:40 — —Methods by which familiarity with handwriting can be acquired for Rule 901(b)(2)
- § 9:41 — —Nonexpert opinion can authenticate handwriting under Rule 901(b)(2)
- § 9:42 — —Comparison by trier or expert witness
- § 9:43 — —Differences between Tex. R. Evid. 901(b)(3) and Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(3)
- § 9:44 — —Authentication of handwriting by comparison by trier of fact or by expert with genuine specimens
- § 9:45 — —Distinctive characteristics and the like
- § 9:46 — —Evidence authenticated by distinctive characteristics
- § 9:47 — —Evidence not authenticated by distinctive characteristics
- § 9:48 — —Circumstantial authentication by special knowledge; Reply letter doctrine
- § 9:49 — —Voice identification
- § 9:50 — —Telephone conversations
- § 9:51 — —Not necessary to know number
- § 9:52 — —Public records or reports
- § 9:53 — —Rule 901(b)(7) treats only authentication of public records, not their admissibility
- § 9:54 — —Evidence properly authenticated under Rule 901(b)(7)
- § 9:55 — —Evidence not properly authenticated under Rule 901(b)(7)
- § 9:56 — —Ancient documents or data compilation
- § 9:57 — —Document not admitted as ancient document absent evidence of location in which kept
- § 9:58 — —Presumed authenticity of ancient documents can be rebutted
- § 9:59 — —Evidence describing process of system
- § 9:60 — —Authentication or identification methods provided by statute or rule

II. RULE 902—EVIDENCE THAT IS SELF-AUTHENTICATING

A. IN GENERAL

- § 9:61 Rule 902—Evidence that is self-authenticating
- § 9:62 Summary of Rule

B. BASIS OF RULE

- § 9:63 Tex. R. Evid. 902(1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9:64	Tex. R. Evid. 902(2)
§ 9:65	Tex. R. Evid. 902(3)
§ 9:66	Tex. R. Evid. 902(4)
§ 9:67	Tex. R. Evid. 902(5)
§ 9:68	Tex. R. Evid. 902(6)
§ 9:69	Tex. R. Evid. 902(7)
§ 9:70	Tex. R. Evid. 902(8)
§ 9:71	Tex. R. Evid. 902(9)
§ 9:72	Tex. R. Evid. 902(10)
§ 9:73	Tex. R. Evid. 902(11)

C. CONSTRUCTION OF RULE

§ 9:74	Construction of Rule
§ 9:75	Extrinsic evidence of authenticity is not required under certain circumstances
§ 9:76	—Domestic public documents under seal
§ 9:77	— —Evidence self-authenticated under Rule 902(1)
§ 9:78	— — —No requirement that stamp be from county where documents were prepared
§ 9:79	— —Evidence not self-authenticated under Rule 902(1)
§ 9:80	—Domestic public documents not under seal
§ 9:81	— —Rationale
§ 9:82	— —Passport is self-authenticating
§ 9:83	— —Certified foreign judgment is self-authenticating
§ 9:84	— —Texas Employment Commission Decision not self-authenticating
§ 9:85	—Foreign public documents
§ 9:86	— —Official who makes final certification need not be able to verify authority of original attesting officer
§ 9:87	— —Effect of Hague Convention abolishment of requiring legalization of foreign public documents
§ 9:88	—Certified copies of public records
§ 9:89	— —Records admitted under Rule 902(4)
§ 9:90	— —Records not admitted under Rule 902(4)
§ 9:91	—Official publications
§ 9:92	— —Evidence self-authenticated under Rule 902(5)
§ 9:93	— —Evidence not self-authenticated under Rule 902(5)
§ 9:94	—Newspapers and periodicals
§ 9:95	—Trade inscriptions and the like
§ 9:96	— —Trademarks connect product to manufacturer
§ 9:97	— —Website address insufficient to prove control
§ 9:98	—Acknowledged documents

- § 9:99 — —Authorization to take acknowledgments
- § 9:100 — — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments in Texas
- § 9:101 — — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments outside Texas but inside the United States or its territories
- § 9:102 — — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments outside the United States
- § 9:103 — — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments of members of the armed forces
- § 9:104 — —Proper methods and forms for acknowledgment
- § 9:105 — —Documents not self-authenticated under Rule 902(8)
- § 9:106 —Commercial paper and related documents
- § 9:107 — —Checks
- § 9:108 — —Requires reference to Texas U.C.C.
- § 9:109 —Requirements for self-authenticated business records under Rule 902(10)
- § 9:110 — —Form of affidavit or declaration
- § 9:111 — —Business records accompanied by a properly phrased and executed affidavit are treated as self-authenticating
- § 9:112 — —Documents not self-authenticated under Rule 902(10)
- § 9:113 — —Substantial compliance requirement
- § 9:114 — —Affiant need not be custodian
- § 9:115 —Presumptions under statutes or other rules
- § 9:116 Self-authenticated documents excluded if not otherwise admissible
- § 9:117 Documents excluded where not self-authenticating
- § 9:118 Genuineness of documents admitted as self-authenticating can be attacked

III. RULE 903—SUBSCRIBING WITNESS’ TESTIMONY

- § 9:119 Rule 903—Subscribing witness’s testimony
- § 9:120 Summary of Rule
- § 9:121 Basis of Rule
- § 9:122 Construction of Rule
- § 9:123 Self-Authentication Affidavit; Sample Form

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER 10. CONTENTS OF WRITINGS,
RECORDINGS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS**

**I. RULE 1001—DEFINITIONS THAT APPLY TO
THIS ARTICLE**

- § 10:1 Rule 1001—Definitions that apply to this article
- § 10:2 Summary of Rule
- § 10:3 Basis of Rule
- § 10:4 Construction of Rule
- § 10:5 Writings and Recordings
- § 10:6 Photographs and videos
- § 10:7 —Definition of photographs may not apply in
discovery
- § 10:8 —Admissibility of photographs
- § 10:9 —Admissibility of videotapes
- § 10:10 Definition of original
- § 10:11 —Question of authenticity must be raised
- § 10:12 Definition of duplicate
- § 10:13 —Difference between duplicates and copies
- § 10:14 — —Audiotape transcripts compared
- § 10:15 —Original for some purposes may be duplicate for
others

**II. RULE 1002—REQUIREMENT OF THE
ORIGINAL**

- § 10:16 Rule 1002—Requirement of the original
- § 10:17 Summary of Rule
- § 10:18 Basis of Rule
- § 10:19 Construction of Rule
- § 10:20 Rule 1002 applies only when contents sought to be
proved
- § 10:21 —Best evidence rule excludes testimony to prove
contents of documents—No exclusion of testimony to
prove existence of document
- § 10:22 — —No exclusion testimony about occurrences
reflected in document
- § 10:23 — —Does not apply to testimony that documents do
not contain a matter
- § 10:24 —Photographs and best evidence rule
- § 10:25 — —X-rays and best evidence rule
- § 10:26 Exceptions to Rule 1002
- § 10:27 —Duplicates admissible under Rule 1003 to same
extent as original

- § 10:28 — —Failure to admit duplicate is error absent question of authenticity
- § 10:29 —Secondary evidence of contents admissible in five circumstances
- § 10:30 —Original not required to prove contents of public records
- § 10:31 —Summaries, charts, and calculations
- § 10:32 —Party admission exception to best evidence rule

III. RULE 1003—ADMISSIBILITY OF DUPLICATES

- § 10:33 Rule 1003—Admissibility of duplicates
- § 10:34 Summary of Rule
- § 10:35 Basis of Rule
- § 10:36 Construction of Rule
- § 10:37 Duplicates admitted absent authenticity, fairness challenge
- § 10:38 —Explanation not required
- § 10:39 —Duplicates admitted
- § 10:40 Reasons for requiring original

IV. RULE 1004—ADMISSIBILITY OF OTHER EVIDENCE OF CONTENT

- § 10:41 Rule 1004—Admissibility of other evidence of content
- § 10:42 Summary of Rule
- § 10:43 Rule 1004(a)
- § 10:44 Rule 1004(b)
- § 10:45 Rule 1004(c)
- § 10:46 Rule 1004(d)
- § 10:47 Rule 1004(e)
- § 10:48 Construction of Rule
- § 10:49 Originals lost or destroyed
- § 10:50 —How to prove original lost
- § 10:51 —Copies admissible where original lost or destroyed
- § 10:52 —Oral testimony admissible where original lost or destroyed
- § 10:53 —Intentional destruction excuses production of original absent bad faith
- § 10:54 Original not obtainable
- § 10:55 Original outside the state
- § 10:56 Original in possession of opponent
- § 10:57 Collateral matters

V. RULE 1005—COPIES OF PUBLIC RECORDS TO PROVE CONTENT

- § 10:58 Rule 1005—Copies of public records to prove content

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 10:59 Summary of Rule
- § 10:60 Basis of Rule
- § 10:61 Original not required to prove contents of public records
- § 10:62 —Photocopy of federal regulations admissible
- § 10:63 —Judge's notes not official records
- § 10:64 Authentication required
- § 10:65 —Workers' compensation appeals panel decision
- § 10:66 When secondary evidence permitted

VI. RULE 1006—SUMMARIES TO PROVE CONTENT

- § 10:67 Rule 1006—Summaries to prove content
- § 10:68 Summary of Rule
- § 10:69 Basis of Rule
- § 10:70 Summaries admitted
- § 10:71 —Summaries may not be relevant and thus inadmissible
- § 10:72 —Summaries from savings and loan documents re properties
- § 10:73 —Summary schedule in divorce case
- § 10:74 —Summary of business records
- § 10:75 —Expert whose testimony introduces summary need not have personal knowledge
- § 10:76 Summaries excluded—Lack of supporting expert testimony
- § 10:77 —Lack of proper foundation
- § 10:78 Difference between summary and list

VII. RULE 1007—TESTIMONY OR STATEMENT OF A PARTY TO PROVE CONTENT

- § 10:79 Rule 1007—Testimony or statement of a party to prove content
- § 10:80 Summary of Rule
- § 10:81 Basis of Rule
- § 10:82 Construction of Rule

VIII. RULE 1008—FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT AND JURY

- § 10:83 Rule 1008—Functions of the court and jury
- § 10:84 Summary of Rule
- § 10:85 Basis of Rule
- § 10:86 Construction of Rule

- § 10:87 Admissibility of evidence conditioned on fact is issue
for court under Rule 104
- § 10:88 Three issues for trier of fact
- § 10:89 —Whether asserted writing ever existed
- § 10:90 —Whether another writing, recording or photograph
produced at trial is the original

IX. RULE 1009—TRANSLATING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE DOCUMENT

- § 10:91 Rule 1009—Translating a foreign language document
- § 10:92 Summary of Rule
- § 10:93 Basis of Rule
- § 10:94 Rule concerns admission not substance
- § 10:95 Untranslated documents
- § 10:96 Objection—Waiver
- § 10:97 Affidavits in foreign languages

CHAPTER 11. PAROL EVIDENCE

I. PAROL EVIDENCE RULE

- § 11:1 Summary of Rule
- § 11:2 Basis of Rule

II. CONSTRUCTION OF RULE

A. IN GENERAL

- § 11:3 Parol evidence not admissible to interpret or vary
terms of unambiguous written agreement
- § 11:4 —Question of law
- § 11:5 —Releases also subject to parol evidence rule
- § 11:6 —Question of law—Contract construction
- § 11:7 — —Enforcement
- § 11:8 — —Ambiguity defined
- § 11:9 Ambiguity distinguished for silence

B. SOURCES OF PROVING AMBIGUITY

- § 11:10 Dictionaries
- § 11:11 Conflicting judicial decisions
- § 11:12 Patent ambiguity
- § 11:13 Latent ambiguity
- § 11:14 Parties' intent
- § 11:15 —Prior, contemporaneous agreements
- § 11:16 — —Collateral agreements compared

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 11:17 — — —Subsequent agreements
- § 11:18 — — —Oral agreements
- § 11:19 —Resort to parties' interpretation
- § 11:20 — —Cannot create ambiguity
- § 11:21 —Fraud, accident, mistake

C. CONTRACTUAL TERMS

- § 11:22 Missing contract
- § 11:23 Duty
- § 11:24 Consideration
- § 11:25 Custom and usage
- § 11:26 —Reasonably susceptible standard
- § 11:27 — —Expert testimony regarding definition of
industry term
- § 11:28 Parties
- § 11:29 Incorporation by reference

D. PROOF THAT SALE OCCURRED

- § 11:30 Parol evidence inadmissible; contract dispositive
- § 11:31 Condition precedent
- § 11:32 Statute of frauds compared
- § 11:33 Parol evidence is not admissible to satisfy the statute
of frauds
- § 11:34 Statute of frauds compared—Subject to the statute of
frauds
- § 11:35 —Question of law
- § 11:36 —Land description and parol evidence
- § 11:37 Parol evidence of condition subsequent not admissible
re unambiguous written agreement

E. EXCLUSION OF PAROL EVIDENCE IN INTERPRETING SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS

- § 11:38 Agreements to sell real property
- § 11:39 —Parol evidence may not supply essential terms
- § 11:40 Deeds
- § 11:41 —Intent
- § 11:42 —Exception for latent ambiguity in deed
- § 11:43 Leases
- § 11:44 Oil and gas agreements
- § 11:45 Restrictive covenants
- § 11:46 Guaranty agreements
- § 11:47 —Affidavits
- § 11:48 Promissory notes/negotiable instruments

- § 11:49 —Fraudulent inducement of promissory note absent
showing of trickery, artifice, or device
- § 11:50 Survivorship account
- § 11:51 —Intent
- § 11:52 Wills
- § 11:53 Trust agreement
- § 11:54 Divorce agreement
- § 11:55 Attorney-client agreements
- § 11:56 Insurance contracts; intent
- § 11:57 —Ambiguity in exclusion
- § 11:58 Insurance contracts; consent to sue
- § 11:59 —Unambiguous contractual terms
- § 11:60 Merger doctrine operates in same way as parol
evidence rule

F. PAROL EVIDENCE ADMISSIBLE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

- § 11:61 Admissible as exception to parol evidence rule
- § 11:62 Admissible where agreement ambiguous
- § 11:63 —Parol evidence admissible to interpret ambiguous
term
- § 11:64 —Admissible to clarify contract without varying
terms
- § 11:65 —Admissible to complete contract exhibit where page
is missing
- § 11:66 —Admissible to apply contract to its subject matter
- § 11:67 —Admissible to show capacity in which contract
signed
- § 11:68 Admissible to show intent in certain circumstances
- § 11:69 —Where contract ambiguous
- § 11:70 —Where error made in contract
- § 11:71 — —Mismatch between signatory and person named
in contract
- § 11:72 —Mutual contractual wills
- § 11:73 Admissible to challenge existence or validity of
agreement
- § 11:74 —Admissible to show fraudulent intent
- § 11:75 —Admissible to show fraudulent inducement—Not
admissible to show fraudulent inducement absent
evidence of trickery or fraud
- § 11:76 — —Not admissible to show fraudulent inducement
of promissory note
- § 11:77 —Admissible to show forgery of written instrument
- § 11:78 —Admissible to show written instrument not
intended to create obligation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 11:79 —Admissible to show mutual mistake of fact
- § 11:80 — —Validity determined
- § 11:81 — —Mineral estates
- § 11:82 Admissible to show condition precedent
- § 11:83 Admissible to dispute factual recitals
- § 11:84 —Showing failure of consideration
- § 11:85 Admissible to determine intent of release of indebtedness
- § 11:86 Admissible to explain nature of consideration
- § 11:87 Admissible to determine marital-property issue

G. ADMISSION OF PAROL EVIDENCE TO INTERPRET SPECIFIC INSTRUMENTS

- § 11:88 Agreement to sell real property
- § 11:89 —Lost, destroyed contract of sale
- § 11:90 — —Standard of proof
- § 11:91 Deeds
- § 11:92 —Sufficiency of the legal description
- § 11:93 —Trespass to try title suits
- § 11:94 —Delivery of deed
- § 11:95 — —Question of law
- § 11:96 Leases
- § 11:97 Admissible to show intent or purpose of assignment
- § 11:98 Admissible to show fraudulent inducement of promissory note upon showing of trickery, artifice, or device
- § 11:99 Parol evidence admitted to show note not intended to create debt
- § 11:100 Parol evidence admitted to show mutual mistake of fact
- § 11:101 Parol evidence admitted to show subsequent acts constituting discharge
- § 11:102 Contracts for sale of goods

H. WHERE PAROL EVIDENCE RULE DOES NOT APPLY

- § 11:103 In general
- § 11:104 Rule does not apply where agreement is incomplete
- § 11:105 Rule does not apply to corporate records
- § 11:106 No application where party seeks to establish collateral agreement
- § 11:107 —Where written instrument incomplete
- § 11:108 —Where collateral agreement is inducement for execution of written instrument

- § 11:109 Separate obligation where suit based on underlying obligation, not written instrument
- § 11:110 Rule does not apply to subsequent agreements
- § 11:111 Rule does not apply to DTPA suits based on deceptive misrepresentations
 - § 11:112 —Oral misrepresentations
 - § 11:113 —Written misrepresentations
- § 11:114 Rule does not apply when determining whether mutual mistake in contract exists
- § 11:115 Rule does not apply to agreements for loans of over \$50,000 absent merger clause
- § 11:116 Rule does not apply to third party who is not a party to the agreement
- § 11:117 Rule does not apply when the parol evidence itself disclaims reliance

I. PAROL EVIDENCE RULE AND CHOICE OF LAW

- § 11:118 Waiver determined by Texas law even where parol evidence rule of another jurisdiction applies

J. EFFECT OF IMPROPER ADMISSION OF PAROL EVIDENCE

- § 11:119 Improperly admitted parol evidence will not support judgment
- § 11:120 Objection to parol evidence not waived by failure to object
- § 11:121 Improper admission of parol evidence in bench trial harmless error
- § 11:122 Objections regarding violations of the parol evidence rule may be raised for the first time on appeal

CHAPTER 12. OFFERING AND EXCLUDING EVIDENCE—SAMPLE PREDICATES AND OBJECTIONS

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES IN INTRODUCING EVIDENCE

- § 12:1 Introducing an exhibit
- § 12:2 Making a bill of exceptions
- § 12:3 Limiting instructions
- § 12:4 When evidence of limited admissibility is excluded

TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. INTRODUCTION OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

A. RECORDED RECOLLECTION (TEX. R. EVID. 803(5))

- § 12:5 Predicate requirements for recorded recollection
- § 12:6 Predicate questions for recorded recollection
- § 12:7 Objections specific to recorded recollection

B. BUSINESS RECORDS (TEX. R. EVID. 803(6))

- § 12:8 Predicate requirements for business records
- § 12:9 Predicate questions for business records
- § 12:10 Objections specific to offer of business records

C. ABSENCE OF ENTRY IN BUSINESS RECORDS (TEX. R. EVID. 803(7))

- § 12:11 Predicate requirements for absence of entry in business records
- § 12:12 Predicate questions for absence of entry in business records
- § 12:13 Objections specific to absence of entry in business records

D. PUBLIC RECORDS AND REPORTS (TEX. R. EVID. 803(8))

- § 12:14 Predicate requirements for public records and reports
- § 12:15 Predicate questions for public records and reports
- § 12:16 Objections specific to public records and reports

E. ABSENCE OF PUBLIC RECORDS ENTRY (TEX. R. EVID. 803(10))

- § 12:17 Predicate requirements for absence of public records entry
- § 12:18 Predicate questions for absence of public records entry
- § 12:19 Objections specific to absence of public records entry

F. MARKET REPORTS, COMMERCIAL PUBLICATIONS (TEX. R. EVID. 803(17))

- § 12:20 Predicate requirements for market reports, commercial publications
- § 12:21 Predicate questions for market reports, commercial publications

- § 12:22 Objections specific to market reports, commercial publications

G. DOCUMENTS OR OBJECTS WITH UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS (TEX. R. EVID. 901(B)(1))

- § 12:23 In general
- § 12:24 Predicate requirements for documents or objects with unique characteristics
- § 12:25 Predicate questions for objects with unique characteristics
- § 12:26 Objections specific to objects with unique characteristics

H. OBJECTS WITHOUT UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS (TEX. R. EVID. 901(B)(1))

- § 12:27 In general
- § 12:28 —Predicate requirements for objects without unique characteristics—chain of custody
- § 12:29 —Predicate questions for objects without specific characteristics
- § 12:30 —Objections specific to objects without unique characteristics

I. SUMMARIES (TEX. R. EVID. 1006)

- § 12:31 Predicate requirements for charts, summaries, and calculations
- § 12:32 Predicate questions for charts, summaries, and calculations
- § 12:33 Objections specific to charts, summaries, and calculations

III. INTRODUCTION OF DEMONSTRATIVE EVIDENCE

A. PHOTOGRAPHS AND VIDEOTAPES

- § 12:34 Predicate requirements for photographs and videotapes
- § 12:35 Predicate questions for photographs/videotapes
- § 12:36 Objections specific to photographs or videotapes

B. AUDIO TAPE RECORDINGS

- § 12:37 Predicate requirements for audio tape recordings
- § 12:38 Predicate questions for audio tape recordings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 12:39 Objections specific to audio tape recordings

C. OUT-OF-COURT EXPERIMENTS

§ 12:40 Predicate requirements for out-of-court experiments
(Rule 402)

§ 12:41 Predicate questions for out-of-court experiments

§ 12:42 Objections specific to out-of-court experiments

IV. INTRODUCTION OF TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE

A. HABIT OR ROUTINE PRACTICE (TEX. R. EVID. 406)

§ 12:43 Predicate requirements for habit evidence

§ 12:44 Predicate questions for habit evidence

§ 12:45 Objections specific to habit evidence

B. WRITING USED TO REFRESH MEMORY (TEX. R. EVID. 612)

§ 12:46 Predicate requirements for writing used to refresh
memory

§ 12:47 Predicate questions for writing used to refresh
memory

§ 12:48 Objections specific to writing used to refresh memory

C. LAY OPINION (TEX. R. EVID. 701)

§ 12:49 Predicate requirements for lay opinion

§ 12:50 Predicate questions for lay opinion

§ 12:51 Objections specific to lay opinion

D. EXPERT OPINION (TEX. R. EVID. 702)

§ 12:52 In general

§ 12:53 Predicate requirements for expert opinion

§ 12:54 Predicate questions for expert opinion: Federal and
Texas scientific

§ 12:55 Predicate questions for expert opinion: Texas
nonscientific

§ 12:56 Objections specific to expert opinion

**E. NONEXPERT OPINION ON HANDWRITING
(TEX. R. EVID. 901(B)(2))**

§ 12:57 Predicate requirements for nonexpert opinion on
handwriting

- § 12:58 Predicate questions for nonexpert opinion on handwriting
- § 12:59 Objections specific to nonexpert opinion on handwriting

F. COST AND NECESSITY OF SERVICES

- § 12:60 Predicate requirements for cost and necessity of services
- § 12:61 Predicate questions for cost and necessity of services
- § 12:62 Objections specific to cost and necessity of services

V. CROSS-EXAMINATION

- § 12:63 Challenges to testimony
- § 12:64 —Competency to testify
- § 12:65 —Oath
- § 12:66 —Personal knowledge requirement
- § 12:67 —Qualifications of expert witness
- § 12:68 —Qualifications of scientific expert
- § 12:69 Impeachment of witness
- § 12:70 —Admission by party-opponent
- § 12:71 —Bias or interest
- § 12:72 —Character for truthfulness or untruthfulness
- § 12:73 —Convictions, felony or involving moral turpitude
- § 12:74 —Credibility
- § 12:75 —Other wrongs or acts
- § 12:76 —Prior inconsistent statement
- § 12:77 —Reputation
- § 12:78 —Statement against interest

VI. OBJECTIONS

- § 12:79 Objections
- § 12:80 Objections to form of question or responsiveness of answer
- § 12:81 Substantive objections to admissibility
- § 12:82 Objections to documents
- § 12:83 Objections to demonstrative evidence

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Index