

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

- § 1:1 Text of Rule 101: Title, scope, and applicability of the rules; Definitions
- § 1:2 Description of Rule 101
- § 1:3 Basis of Rule 101
- § 1:4 Interaction between Rule 101 and other authorities
- § 1:5 Rule not applicable to nonadjudicative juvenile proceedings
- § 1:6 Rule not applicable to arbitrations

II. RULE 102—PURPOSE

- § 1:7 Text of Rule 102: Purpose
- § 1:8 Description of Rule 102
- § 1:9 Basis of Rule 102
- § 1:10 Supporting exercise of trial court’s discretion
- § 1:11 Evaluating trial court’s conduct of trial
- § 1:12 Evaluating trial court’s conduct of trial: Determining experts’ reliability

III. RULE 103—RULINGS ON EVIDENCE

- § 1:13 Text of Rule 103: Rulings on evidence
- § 1:14 Description of Rule 103
- § 1:15 Basis of Rule 103
- § 1:16 Harmless error rule
- § 1:17 —Cumulative evidence
- § 1:18 —Inadmissible evidence
- § 1:19 Preserving error
- § 1:20 —Objecting to evidence
- § 1:21 — —Motions in limine are not sufficient
- § 1:22 — —Timeliness
- § 1:23 — — —Failure to object during voir dire
- § 1:24 — — —Running objections
- § 1:25 — — —Objections to deposition testimony
- § 1:26 — — —Objections made out of jury’s presence
- § 1:27 — —Articulating basis of objection
- § 1:28 — — —Hearsay objections

- § 1:29 — — —Objections where part of offer is admissible
- § 1:30 — — —No objection required in limited circumstances
- § 1:31 —Where evidence is excluded
- § 1:32 — — —Offer of proof
- § 1:33 — — —Content of offer
- § 1:34 — — —Voir dire
- § 1:35 — — —Attacking witness's credibility
- § 1:36 — — —Offer of Proof—Effect of offer of proof on
postjudgment interest
- § 1:37 —Examples related to expert testimony
- § 1:38 —Obtaining ruling from trial court

IV. RULE 104—PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

- § 1:39 Text of Rule 104: Preliminary questions
- § 1:40 Description of Rule 104
- § 1:41 Basis of Rule 104
- § 1:42 Trial court not bound by rules of evidence except as to
privileges when ruling on preliminary admissibility
questions
- § 1:43 —Trial court determination
- § 1:44 —Admission required when fact issue raised on
genuineness of evidence
- § 1:45 —Abuse of discretion required for reversal
- § 1:46 —Application of abuse of discretion standard
- § 1:47 —Rule 104(a) governs preliminary determinations
regarding experts
- § 1:48 — —Preliminary determinations regarding
qualifications of expert
- § 1:49 — —Preliminary determinations whether experts
reasonably rely on particular data
- § 1:50 — —Medical experts and standard of care
- § 1:51 — —Medical experts and validity of scientific
knowledge
- § 1:52 — —Novel scientific evidence in criminal cases
- § 1:53 —Evidentiary prerequisites for admission of co-
conspirators' statements not eliminated
- § 1:54 —Admissibility of photographs conditioned upon
identification as accurate portrayal
- § 1:55 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
- § 1:56 Conditional relevancy under Rule 104(b)
- § 1:57 —Criminal cases
- § 1:58 Purpose of Rule 104(c) to keep jury from hearing
inadmissible evidence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 1:59 No limit on evidence relevant to weight and credibility

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

- § 1:60 Text of Rule 105: Evidence that is not admissible
against other parties or for other purposes
- § 1:61 Description of Rule 105
- § 1:62 Basis of Rule 105
- § 1:63 Construction of Rule 105
- § 1:64 Evidence for limited purpose
- § 1:65 —Limiting instructions and legally sufficient evidence
- § 1:66 —When limiting instruction required
- § 1:67 — —Timeliness of request
- § 1:68 — —Timeliness of objection
- § 1:69 —Effect of failure to request instruction
- § 1:70 —Limited admissibility on appeal
- § 1:71 —Error waived under Rule 105(b) where no limit of
offer to admissible purpose
- § 1:72 — —No segregation of admissible from inadmissible
parts

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

- § 1:73 Text of Rule 106: Remainder of or related writings or
recorded statements
- § 1:74 Description of Rule 106
- § 1:75 Basis of Rule 106
- § 1:76 Comparison of Rule 106 with Rule 107
- § 1:77 Purpose of Rules 106 and 107
- § 1:78 Rule 106 is a rule of admission, not exclusion
- § 1:79 No prohibition against editing video depositions
- § 1:80 No prohibition against video depositions—Extensively
edited video deposition alleged to be misleading
- § 1:81 —Video deposition edited to present testimony out of
chronological sequence
- § 1:82 Contemporaneous introduction of another document

VII. RULE 107—RULE OF OPTIONAL COMPLETENESS

- § 1:83 Text of Rule 107: Rule of optional completeness
- § 1:84 Description of Rule 107
- § 1:85 Basis of Rule 107

- § 1:86 Using Rule 107 to admit additional evidence
- § 1:87 —Sixth Amendment right to confrontation supersedes Rule 107
- § 1:88 Rule 107 is not a rule of exclusion

CHAPTER 2. JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ADJUDICATIVE FACTS

I. RULE 201—JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ADJUDICATIVE FACTS

- § 2:1 Text of Rule 201: Judicial notice of adjudicative facts
- § 2:2 Description of Rule 201
- § 2:3 Basis of Rule 201
- § 2:4 Scope of Rule 201
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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	Text of Rule 202: Judicial notice of other states' law
§ 2:51	Description of Rule 202
§ 2:52	Basis of Rule 202
§ 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
§ 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 Text of Rule 203: Determining foreign law
- § 2:71 Description of Rule 203
- § 2:72 Basis of Rule 203
- § 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 Text of Rule 204: Judicial notice of Texas municipal and county ordinances, Texas Register contents, and published agency rules
- § 2:82 Description of Rule 204
- § 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 Text of Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. § 38.004: Judicial Notice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:90 Applicability of Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann.
§ 38.004: Judicial Notice
- § 2:91 Judicial notice constitutes evidence of attorney's fees
- § 2:92 Judicial notice of entire case file, proceedings before
the court
- § 2:93 —Judicially noticed evidence not hearsay
- § 2:94 —Severed case file
- § 2:95 Presumption that attorney's fees judicially noticed on
review

CHAPTER 3. BURDENS 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
- § 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
Ann. § 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 —Burden to prove jurisdiction in Texas Business Court
- § 3:33 —Title to land
- § 3:34 —Burden to prove alter-ego for jurisdictional purposes
- § 3:35 —Burden to show existence of arbitration agreement
- § 3:36 —Habeas corpus proceedings
- § 3:37 —Burden to segregate damages
- § 3:38 —Involuntary termination of parental rights
- § 3:39 —Corporate tortious interference
- § 3:40 Burden of persuasion—Gifts
- § 3:41 Burden of production
- § 3:42 —Burden shifts
- § 3:43 —Burden of production shifts after party makes prima facie case
- § 3:44 —Burden of production on party who would lose absent further evidence
- § 3:45 — —Statute of limitations defense
- § 3:46 — —Equitable tolling
- § 3:47 — —Untimely expert witness designation
- § 3:48 — —Admission of Expert testimony
- § 3:49 — —Quantum-meruit claim for attorney's fees
- § 3:50 —Cannot satisfy with incompetent evidence
- § 3:51 —Finality of a criminal conviction
- § 3:52 Legal sufficiency challenge—Party with burden of persuasion
- § 3:53 —Party without burden of persuasion
- § 3:54 Contradictory evidence—Party with burden of proof

III. PRESUMPTIONS AND INFERENCES

- § 3:55 Presumptions
- § 3:56 —Irrebuttable or conclusive presumptions
- § 3:57 —Conclusive presumptions created by statute
- § 3:58 —Rebuttable presumptions
- § 3:59 — —Operation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:60	—Rebuttable Presumptions—Operation— Presumptions do not satisfy burden of proof under a summary judgment motion
§ 3:61	—Rebuttable presumptions—Operation— Presumption regarding notice
§ 3:62	— — —In favor of arbitration
§ 3:63	— — —Presumption that employee driving company vehicle is acting in course of employment
§ 3:64	— — —Presumption of employment
§ 3:65	— — —Failure to produce will
§ 3:66	— — —Continuity of will by execution with requisite formalities
§ 3:67	— — —Intent of deed delivery
§ 3:68	— — —Contracts
§ 3:69	— — —Unread contract
§ 3:70	— — —Statutes
§ 3:71	— — —Allegedly libelous statement with status of qualified privilege
§ 3:72	— — —Medical disclosures
§ 3:73	— — —Texas Medical Liability Act Claims
§ 3:74	— — —Presumption regarding settlement agreements satisfying liability
§ 3:75	— — —Effect of rebuttal evidence
§ 3:76	— — —“Fraud on the Market” presumption in securities class actions must be rebutted on the merits, not at certification stage
§ 3:77	— — —Presumption of validity of judgments and administrative decisions
§ 3:78	— — —Presumption of validity of foreign judgments
§ 3:79	— — —Child possession orders
§ 3:80	— — —Presumption of bad faith of landlord
§ 3:81	— — —Presumptions cannot be based on presumptions
§ 3:82	— — —Presumption of proper police conduct in search and seizure
§ 3:83	Inferences
§ 3:84	—Operation of inferences
§ 3:85	— — —To prove actual malice
§ 3:86	— — —To prove knowledge or intent
§ 3:87	— — —Summary judgment proceedings
§ 3:88	— — —To prove authority
§ 3:89	— — —Waiver of condition precedent
§ 3:90	— — —Contempt proceedings
§ 3:91	— — —Admission by conduct
§ 3:92	— — —Applies to witnesses

- § 3:93 — — — Failure to testify
- § 3:94 — — Damages
- § 3:95 — Inferences must be supported by evidence
- § 3:96 — Circumstantial evidence
- § 3:97 — Scientific evidence
- § 3:98 When inference insufficient—Manufacturer’s duty to indemnify
- § 3:99 — Product-related accident
- § 3:100 Inferences—Falsity

IV. EXAMPLES OF PRESUMPTIONS

- § 3:101 Examples of presumptions
- § 3:102 Spoliation of evidence
- § 3:103 — Presumption prerequisites
- § 3:104 — Duty to preserve
- § 3:105 — When presumption should be denied
- § 3:106 — Physical evidence requirement
- § 3:107 — Lost evidence compared
- § 3:108 — — Spoliation of evidence as a separate tort
- § 3:109 Failure to produce evidence
- § 3:110 Mail receipt
- § 3:111 — Hearing notice
- § 3:112 Contracting parties intend consequences of performance
- § 3:113 — Forum selection clauses
- § 3:114 — Releases
- § 3:115 Usual and customary attorney fees are reasonable
- § 3:116 Assistance of counsel
- § 3:117 Governmental authorities discharge duties according to law
- § 3:118 City ordinance presumption
- § 3:119 Habeas corpus
- § 3:120 Business transactions are done in good faith and for an honest purpose
- § 3:121 Love of life, avoidance of danger
- § 3:122 Products without warnings
- § 3:123 Products with inadequate warnings
- § 3:124 — Rebuttal evidence
- § 3:125 — No presumption that additional warning would be followed
- § 3:126 Community property presumption
- § 3:127 Gift presumption upon transfer of separate property between spouses
- § 3:128 Presumption of paternity from refusal to submit to blood test—Burden of proof shifts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 3:129	Presumption in favor of preserving the parent-child relationship
§ 3:130	Continuance of agency relationship
§ 3:131	Foreign law same as Texas law
§ 3:132	Presumptions created by Texas Rules of Civil Procedure
§ 3:133	—Notice and proof of loss on claim for damages
§ 3:134	—Workers' compensation cases
§ 3:135	—Cases against automobile insurance companies
§ 3:136	Presumptions created by Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure—Court reporter's record
§ 3:137	—Nonevidentiary hearing
§ 3:138	Negligence where goods from bailee damaged
§ 3:139	Transactions between corporations and corporate fiduciaries
§ 3:140	Presumption of separateness for corporations
§ 3:141	Good character
§ 3:142	Failure to reply
§ 3:143	Malicious prosecution
§ 3:144	Valid will
§ 3:145	Missing will
§ 3:146	Testamentary capacity
§ 3:147	Presumption of intended revocation of will last seen in testator's possession
§ 3:148	Facts recited in correction deed
§ 3:149	Assets traced to fiduciary
§ 3:150	Homestead—Requisite intent
§ 3:151	That homestead continues
§ 3:152	Inference from parental misconduct
§ 3:153	Possession
§ 3:154	Gifts to children
§ 3:155	Presumption of sanity
§ 3:156	Certificate of title
§ 3:157	Ancient judgments
§ 3:158	Fee title
§ 3:159	Deed
§ 3:160	Deed not accepted
§ 3:161	Public use
§ 3:162	Abandoned easement
§ 3:163	Rejection of ballot
§ 3:164	Presumption of unfairness
§ 3:165	Certificate of acknowledgement
§ 3:166	Submerged lands
§ 3:167	Registration of trademark
§ 3:168	Cab drivers

- § 3:169 Libelous/Defamatory *per se*
- § 3:170 Probable cause presumption
- § 3:171 Branded vehicle doctrine
- § 3:172 Authority of counsel
- § 3:173 Voters
- § 3:174 Statutes are constitutional

V. STATUTORY PRESUMPTIONS

- § 3:175 Presumptions created or addressed by statute
- § 3:176 Presumption regarding managing conservators
- § 3:177 Forum selection clauses presumptively valid
- § 3:178 Request under Texas Public Information Act
presumed to be required public disclosure

VI. PRESUMPTION AGAINST PREEMPTION

- § 3:179 Preemption

VII. PRESUMPTIONS THAT DO NOT EXIST

- § 3:180 No presumption of agency
- § 3:181 No presumption that documents are privileged
- § 3:182 No presumption that default or summary judgment
disposes of all parties
- § 3:183 No presumption of proper service in attack on default
judgment
- § 3:184 No presumption vote count accurate
- § 3:185 Texas Transportation Code does not create a
presumption from refusal to take breath test
- § 3:186 No presumption of negligence in rear-end collision
- § 3:187 No presumption of contempt

CHAPTER 4. RELEVANCE AND ITS LIMITS

I. RULE 401—TEST FOR RELEVANT EVIDENCE

- § 4:1 Text of Rule 401: Test for relevant evidence
- § 4:2 Description of Rule 401
- § 4:3 Basis of Rule 401
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:10 —*Ipse 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 Text of Rule 402: General admissibility of relevant evidence
- § 4:24 Description of Rule 402
- § 4:25 Basis of Rule 402
- § 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 — —Federal wiretap statute
- § 4:31 — —Texas wiretap statute
- § 4:32 —Other rules
- § 4:33 Relevancy conditioned on fact
- § 4:34 Admission or exclusion of evidence
- § 4:35 —Rule 402 as basis for admitting evidence
- § 4:36 —Rule 402 as basis for excluding evidence
- § 4:37 Common relevancy issues
- § 4:38 —Conduct of driver before accident
- § 4:39 —Similar occurrences at same company but involving different employees
- § 4:40 —Sales of similar property
- § 4:41 —Out-of-court experiments
- § 4:42 —Invited evidence
- § 4:43 —Collateral source
- § 4:44 —Net worth
- § 4:45 —Other accidents/same product
- § 4:46 — —OSHA standards
- § 4:47 — — —Knowledge to industry

§ 4:48 —Medical Damages—Texas Civil Practice and
Remedies Code § 41.0105

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

- § 4:49 Text of Rule 403: Excluding relevant evidence for
prejudice, confusion, or other reasons
- § 4:50 Description of Rule 403
- § 4:51 Basis of Rule 403
- § 4:52 Construction of Rule 403
- § 4:53 Balancing probative value against other reasons for
exclusion
- § 4:54 —Presumption that relevant evidence is more
probative than prejudicial
- § 4:55 —Effect when door is opened
- § 4:56 —Factors
- § 4:57 — —Probative value
- § 4:58 — —Proponent's need
- § 4:59 — —Prejudicial effect
- § 4:60 — —Confusing the issues
- § 4:61 — —Undue delay
- § 4:62 — —Cumulative evidence
- § 4:63 — — —Examples
- § 4:64 — — —Erroneous exclusion
- § 4:65 —Application of balancing test
- § 4:66 — —Alcohol use
- § 4:67 — —Drug use
- § 4:68 — —Entire scheme
- § 4:69 — —Expert testimony
- § 4:70 — —Extraneous acts
- § 4:71 — — —Conduct preceding incident
- § 4:72 — — —Other accidents
- § 4:73 — — — —Medical malpractice
- § 4:74 — — — —Product liability
- § 4:75 — — —Subsequent accidents
- § 4:76 — —Gruesome photographs
- § 4:77 — —Net worth
- § 4:78 — —Racism
- § 4:79 — —Other examples
- § 4:80 — —Cases holding no abuse of discretion to admit
certain evidence
- § 4:81 — —Cases in which prejudicial effect of evidence held
to outweigh probative value

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:82 — —Reversible error to admit evidence
- § 4:83 — —Reversible error to exclude evidence
- § 4:84 —Standards for appellate review

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

- § 4:85 Text of Rule 404: Character evidence; crimes or other acts
- § 4:86 Rule 404(a)
- § 4:87 Rule 404(b)
- § 4:88 Rule 404—Compared to Federal Rules of Evidence
- § 4:89 Character evidence generally not admissible to prove conduct
- § 4:90 Exceptions when character evidence admissible to prove conduct
- § 4:91 —Character of party accused of conduct involving moral turpitude
- § 4:92 — —Moral turpitude defined
- § 4:93 —Character of alleged victim
- § 4:94 — —Particular acts of victim inadmissible to prove character
- § 4:95 — —Evidence of victim's trait for violence where self-defense alleged
- § 4:96 —Evidence regarding character of witness
- § 4:97 Evidence of other wrongs or acts not admissible to show character or conduct
- § 4:98 —Evidence of prior customer problems
- § 4:99 —False answer on job application in workers' compensation case
- § 4:100 —Evidence of defendant's drug use in accident case
- § 4:101 —Evidence of prior fire at defendant's property in insurance case
- § 4:102 —Evidence of defendant's prior affairs in alienation of affections action
- § 4:103 —Evidence of joint venturer's independent project
- § 4:104 —Evidence of lie in unrelated matter
- § 4:105 —Evidence of doctor's conduct in other cases
- § 4:106 —Res inter alios acta doctrine
- § 4:107 — —Exceptions to rule
- § 4:108 Exceptions to exclusion of other wrongs or acts
- § 4:109 —Refuting defense theory
- § 4:110 —Intent
- § 4:111 — —Consent as rebuttal to intent in sexual assault cases
- § 4:112 —Identity

- § 4:113 —Interests of child in family law cases
- § 4:114 —Punitive damages
- § 4:115 —Where door opened
- § 4:116 Modus operandi to prove identity

V. RULE 405—METHODS OF PROVING CHARACTER

- § 4:117 Text of Rule 405: Methods of proving character
- § 4:118 Rule 405(a)
- § 4:119 Rule 405(b)
- § 4:120 Basis of Rule 405
- § 4:121 Construction of Rule 405
- § 4:122 Proving character
- § 4:123 —Reputation
- § 4:124 —Opinion regarding character
- § 4:125 —Specific instances of conduct
- § 4:126 When character not in issue but used
circumstantially, only reputation, opinion permitted
- § 4:127 —Exception for cross-examination regarding specific
instances of conduct
- § 4:128 —Nature of opinion testimony regarding character
- § 4:129 When character in issue, any of three methods
permitted
- § 4:130 —Conviction as reputation evidence
- § 4:131 —Character trait as reputation
- § 4:132 Rule 405 may not apply to corporations, places, or
animals
- § 4:133 Reputation, opinion offered to prove other than
character
- § 4:134 Character witnesses must be qualified

VI. RULE 406—HABIT; ROUTINE PRACTICE

- § 4:135 Text of Rule 406: Habit; routine practice
- § 4:136 Description of Rule 406
- § 4:137 Basis of Rule 406
- § 4:138 Habit defined
- § 4:139 Sufficient instances, consistency of behavior required
- § 4:140 —One or two instances not sufficient to establish
habit
- § 4:141 —Four times during a ten-day period not sufficient to
establish habit
- § 4:142 —Three accidents in six years not sufficient to show
habit
- § 4:143 —Corporation's termination policy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:144 —Business transactions with third parties
- § 4:145 —Prior transactions between parties
- § 4:146 —Affidavit testimony excluded
- § 4:147 Method of proving habit

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

- § 4:148 Text of Rule 407: Subsequent remedial measures; notification of defect
- § 4:149 Rule 407(a)
- § 4:150 Rule 407(b)
- § 4:151 Construction of Rule 407
- § 4:152 Subsequent remedial measures
- § 4:153 —Purpose
- § 4:154 —Must be offered against a party
- § 4:155 —Exclusion in negligence cases
- § 4:156 — —Permissible for impeachment
- § 4:157 — — —Postaccident instruction excluded for impeachment
- § 4:158 — —Subsequent remedial measures admitted for another purpose
- § 4:159 — — —Other purpose must be controverted
- § 4:160 — — —Owner's control
- § 4:161 — — —Feasibility of precautionary measures
- § 4:162 — — —To show accident scene
- § 4:163 — —Harmless error rule
- § 4:164 —Application in products liability cases
- § 4:165 —Application in warning defect cases
- § 4:166 Notification of defect

VIII. RULE 408—COMPROMISE OFFERS AND NEGOTIATIONS

- § 4:167 Text of Rule 408: Compromise offers and negotiations
- § 4:168 Description of Rule 408
- § 4:169 Basis of Rule 408
- § 4:170 Discoverability does not confer admissibility
- § 4:171 Evidence of compromise negotiations
- § 4:172 —What constitutes an offer of compromise or compromise negotiation
- § 4:173 — —Must be part of negotiation or offer
- § 4:174 — —Ultimatums
- § 4:175 — —Mitigation attempts
- § 4:176 —Repudiated settlement agreement
- § 4:177 —Compromise evidence found inadmissible

- § 4:178 — —Statements made during compromise negotiations
- § 4:179 — —Documents prepared for settlement negotiations
- § 4:180 — —Failed attempt to show bias or prejudice
- § 4:181 — —Malice
- § 4:182 —Compromise evidence found admissible
- § 4:183 —Conduct or statements made during compromise negotiations found admissible—Discoverable materials not shielded
- § 4:184 — —State of mind
- § 4:185 — —Suits to enforce settlement agreement
- § 4:186 — —Actionable statements made during negotiations in bad faith insurance cases
- § 4:187 — — —Severance discretionary
- § 4:188 — —Alleged misrepresentations
- § 4:189 — —Undue delay
- § 4:190 — —Corporate resolution resulting from settlement
- § 4:191 — —Bias, prejudice, or interest
- § 4:192 — —Damages measured by pecuniary standard
- § 4:193 — —Mary Carter agreements
- § 4:194 —Objections
- § 4:195 Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 154.073—Confidentiality of certain records and communications

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

- § 4:196 Text of Rule 409: Offers to pay medical and similar expenses
- § 4:197 Description of Rule 409
- § 4:198 Basis of Rule 409
- § 4:199 Construction of Rule 409
- § 4:200 Incidental statements not excluded
- § 4:201 —No policy reason to protect incidental statements
- § 4:202 —Example of incidental statement
- § 4:203 Use of payment of medical and similar expenses for other purposes
- § 4:204 —Payment admissible to reduce amount of final judgment

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

- § 4:205 Text of Rule 410: Pleas, plea discussions, and related statements

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:206 Description of Rule 410
- § 4:207 Basis of Rule 410
- § 4:208 Withdrawn guilty pleas
- § 4:209 Pleas of nolo contendere
- § 4:210 —Nolo pleas admissible in disciplinary actions
against lawyers
- § 4:211 Statements made in Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 proceedings
or comparable state procedure
- § 4:212 Statements made in the course of plea discussions
with an attorney for prosecuting authority not
resulting in guilty plea
- § 4:213 —Improper questioning on the basis of attorney-client
privilege during punishment phase of trial
- § 4:214 Related statements that ought to be considered
contemporaneously

XI. RULE 411—LIABILITY INSURANCE

- § 4:215 Text of Rule 411: Liability insurance
- § 4:216 Description of Rule 411
- § 4:217 Basis of Rule 411
- § 4:218 Criminal Matters
- § 4:219 Insurance not admissible to prove fault
- § 4:220 —Parental immunity doctrine
- § 4:221 —Evidence of nonprofit status does not open door to
insurance evidence
- § 4:222 Insurance not excluded to prove other issues
- § 4:223 —Control
- § 4:224 —Ownership
- § 4:225 Not all insurance suggestions violate rule
- § 4:226 —Standard of review
- § 4:227 Other types of insurance admissible
- § 4:228 When liability insurance admissible as to only one
claim

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

- § 4:229 Text of Rule 412: Evidence of previous sexual conduct
in criminal cases
- § 4:230 Description of Rule 412
- § 4:231 Basis of Rule 412
- § 4:232 Purpose of Rule 412
- § 4:233 Legislative disapproval of Rule 412 in favor of Article
38.372 of the Code of Criminal Procedure; adoption
of new Rule 412

- § 4:234 Comparison of Rule 412 with Rule 403
- § 4:235 —Abuse of discretion to exclude testimony of complainant; balancing test
- § 4:236 —Exception for admissibility of sexual history of victim to rebut medical evidence
- § 4:237 Procedure of 412(c) hearing

CHAPTER 5. PRIVILEGES

I. RULE 501—PRIVILEGES IN GENERAL

- § 5:1 Text of Rule 501: Privileges in general
- § 5:2 Description of Rule 501
- § 5:3 Basis of Rule 501
- § 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 confidentiality and privilege
- § 5:27 — —Medical peer review committees
- § 5:28 — —State Board of Medical Examiners
- § 5:29 — — —Suspensions and disciplinary orders not confidential
- § 5:30 — — —Records or reports not discoverable
- § 5:31 — —Open Records Act exceptions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:32 — — — Law enforcement, prosecutorial records
- § 5:33 — — — Accident reports
- § 5:34 — — — Marriage counseling reports ordered in divorce proceedings
- § 5:35 — — — Medical committee records
- § 5:36 Burden of party seeking to show specific source of privilege
- § 5:37 — — — Constitution, statutes, or rules
- § 5:38 — — — Trial court may not create privileges
- § 5:39 — — — No privilege based on foreign law

II. RULE 502—REQUIRED REPORTS PRIVILEGED BY STATUTE

- § 5:40 Text of Rule 502: Required reports privileged by statute
- § 5:41 Description of Rule 502
- § 5:42 Basis of Rule 502
- § 5:43 No Rule 502 privilege absent statutory reporting requirement
- § 5:44 Existence of Rule 502 privilege determined by reference to statute
- § 5:45 No privilege absent evidence of privilege
- § 5:46 Rule 502 requires Texas courts to honor certain foreign privileges
- § 5:47 Rule 502 recognizes sister state statutory privileges
- § 5:48 No Rule 502 privilege for false reporting

III. RULE 503—LAWYER-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

- § 5:49 Text of Rule 503: Lawyer-client privilege
- § 5:50 Description of Rule 503
- § 5:51 Basis of Rule 503
- § 5:52 Application of Rule 503
- § 5:53 Privilege not presumed
- § 5:54 Definitions
- § 5:55 — — — Client
- § 5:56 — — — Client must be rendered professional legal services
- § 5:57 — — — Actual employment of lawyer need not result
- § 5:58 — — — Client need not be involved in litigation
- § 5:59 — — — Trust beneficiary not client of trustee's attorney
- § 5:60 — — — Representative of client
- § 5:61 — — — Control group test and modified subject matter test
- § 5:62 — — — Proof of client representative required

- § 5:63 — —Expert witness can be representative of client
- § 5:64 — —Lead entity is client representative for
Department of Family Protection Services
- § 5:65 —Lawyer
- § 5:66 — —Licensing state or nation need not recognize
attorney-client privilege
- § 5:67 — —Lawyer includes person reasonably believed to
be a lawyer
- § 5:68 — —Where attorney acts as something other than
attorney, privilege does not apply
- § 5:69 —Lawyer's representative
- § 5:70 — —Establishing representative of lawyer in
discovery by affidavit
- § 5:71 — —Lawyer's private investigator can be lawyer's
representative
- § 5:72 — —Whether lawyer or client pays representative is
not determinative
- § 5:73 — —Definition not met
- § 5:74 —Confidential communication
- § 5:75 — —Confidentiality defined in terms of intent
- § 5:76 — —Nature of communication, not subject matter,
determines whether privilege applies
- § 5:77 — — —Demonstrating prima facie claim
- § 5:78 — — —Burden shifts
- § 5:79 — —Factual information, advice
- § 5:80 — — —Information generally known cannot be made
confidential by communicating it to attorney
- § 5:81 — — —Entire document privileged
- § 5:82 — — —Rationale
- § 5:83 — —Communication not confidential where made in
presence of third parties
- § 5:84 — —Communications made in the presence of certain
third parties are privileged
- § 5:85 — —Lawyer-client relationship can be inferred when
determining whether communication is confidential
- § 5:86 General rule of privilege under Rule 503(b)
- § 5:87 —General principles applicable to Rule 503(b)
- § 5:88 — —Privilege applies only to communications made
in connection with rendition of legal services
- § 5:89 — —Privilege applies only to confidential
communications
- § 5:90 — —Confidential communications protected from
eavesdroppers
- § 5:91 — —No privilege absent attorney-client relationship
- § 5:92 — —No privilege absent evidence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 5:93	—Communications between client/representative and lawyer/representative
§ 5:94	—Communications between lawyer and lawyer’s representative
§ 5:95	—Allied litigant privilege
§ 5:96	— —Codefendant communications compared
§ 5:97	— —Common interest requirement
§ 5:98	— — —Workers compensation cases
§ 5:99	— — —Adversarial interests preclude privilege
§ 5:100	— —When disqualification required
§ 5:101	— — —Evidentiary hearing required
§ 5:102	— — —Standard of review
§ 5:103	—Communications between representatives of client, or client and representative of client
§ 5:104	—Communications between lawyers or their representatives representing same client
§ 5:105	—Special rule of privilege in criminal cases
§ 5:106	Procedure for determining privilege
§ 5:107	Who may claim or waive privilege
§ 5:108	—Lawyer in individual capacity has no standing
§ 5:109	—Lawyer on behalf of client
§ 5:110	—Lawyer’s investigator
§ 5:111	Exceptions to lawyer-client privilege
§ 5:112	—Crime-fraud exception
§ 5:113	— —Prima facie case of crime or fraud required
§ 5:114	— — —Proof required
§ 5:115	— —Intent requirement
§ 5:116	— —In camera review
§ 5:117	—No privilege for communications between those claiming through same deceased client
§ 5:118	—No privilege for communications relating to breach of duty by lawyer or client
§ 5:119	—No privilege for communications regarding certain attested documents
§ 5:120	—No privilege attaches to certain matters between joint clients
§ 5:121	—No effect on obligation to return misappropriated documents
§ 5:122	Waiver through offensive use
§ 5:123	—Factors in determining waiver through offensive use
§ 5:124	— —Affirmative relief sought
§ 5:125	— — —Declaratory judgment
§ 5:126	— — —Affirmative defenses
§ 5:127	— — —Rebuttal evidence

- § 5:128 — —Outcome-determinative information
- § 5:129 — — —Relevance compared
- § 5:130 — — —All or nothing approach rejected
- § 5:131 — —Alternative sources
- § 5:132 — — —All or nothing approach rejected

IV. RULE 504—SPOUSAL PRIVILEGES

- § 5:133 Text of Rule 504: Spousal privileges
- § 5:134 Description of Rule 504
- § 5:135 Basis of Rule 504
- § 5:136 Construction of Rule 504
- § 5:137 Who is a spouse
 - § 5:138 —Common law marriage
 - § 5:139 — —What constitutes common law marriage
- § 5:140 Scope of privilege
- § 5:141 Spousal Privilege—Common law marriage
- § 5:142 What is a communication
- § 5:143 To whom the privilege belongs
- § 5:144 Duration of the privilege
- § 5:145 Exceptions to marital communication privilege
 - § 5:146 —Communications in furtherance of crime or fraud
 - § 5:147 —Communications in a proceeding by or on behalf of one spouse against the other in civil cases
 - § 5:148 — —Proceeding between a surviving spouse and person claiming through deceased spouse
 - § 5:149 —Communications in proceeding involving crime against spouse or minor child
 - § 5:150 —Communications in proceeding for commitment of spouse or spouse's property
 - § 5:151 —Proceeding to establish competence of spouse
- § 5:152 Communication made in presence of third party
- § 5:153 Privilege not to testify in criminal cases
 - § 5:154 —Failure to call as witness
 - § 5:155 —Who may claim privilege
 - § 5:156 —Calling spouse is not ipso facto error
 - § 5:157 —Exceptions

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

- § 5:158 Text of Rule 505: Privilege for communications to a clergy member
- § 5:159 Description of Rule 505
- § 5:160 Basis of Rule 505
- § 5:161 Definition of member of clergy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:162 —Employer not dispositive
- § 5:163 —No self-denominated minister
- § 5:164 —Includes person who is reasonably believed to be a member of the clergy
- § 5:165 Definition of confidential communication
- § 5:166 —When privilege attaches to communication
- § 5:167 —Privilege not waived when communication made in front of third party
- § 5:168 —Communication need not be confidential in nature
- § 5:169 —Privilege belongs to communicant not clergy member
- § 5:170 —Communicant's identity
- § 5:171 —Factors to consider
- § 5:172 General rule
- § 5:173 —Scope of privilege
- § 5:174 —Disclosure by member of clergy and eavesdroppers
- § 5:175 —Crime/fraud exception
- § 5:176 Who may claim the privilege
- § 5:177 No offensive use doctrine available
- § 5:178 Disclosure may be compelled in proceedings involving child abuse or neglect
- § 5:179 Cross-examination available when member of clergy called as character witness
- § 5:180 Texas Family Code takes precedence over Rule 505

VI. RULE 506—POLITICAL VOTE PRIVILEGE

- § 5:181 Text of Rule 506: Political vote privilege
- § 5:182 Description of Rule 506
- § 5:183 Basis of Rule 506
- § 5:184 Construction of Rule 506

VII. RULE 507—TRADE SECRETS PRIVILEGE

- § 5:185 Text of Rule 507: Trade secrets privilege
- § 5:186 Description of Rule 507
- § 5:187 Basis of Rule 507
- § 5:188 Definition of trade secret
- § 5:189 —Restatement examples
- § 5:190 — —Patents distinguished
- § 5:191 Competing interests served by Rule 507
- § 5:192 Rule 507 privilege not absolute
- § 5:193 —Disclosure required only if necessary for fair adjudication
- § 5:194 Process for determining application of privilege
- § 5:195 Shifting burdens in application of Rule 507 privilege

- § 5:196 —Party resisting discovery
- § 5:197 —Party requesting disclosure
- § 5:198 — —More than mere relevancy required
- § 5:199 —Need for discovery must be weighed against
potential harm of disclosure
- § 5:200 — —Disclosure compelled, subject to protective order,
if burden met
- § 5:201 — — —Protective orders
- § 5:202 — —Discretion abused in denying discovery where
proprietary interests can be protected
- § 5:203 — —Discretion abused in compelling disclosure of
privileged material
- § 5:204 Level of proof on appeal

VIII. RULE 508—INFORMER’S IDENTITY PRIVILEGE

- § 5:205 Text of Rule 508: Informer’s identity privilege
- § 5:206 Description of Rule 508
- § 5:207 Process for resolving prosecution claims of informer’s
identity privilege
- § 5:208 Basis of Rule
- § 5:209 General rule of informer’s identity privilege
- § 5:210 —Privilege belongs to the public entity
- § 5:211 —Scope of privilege
- § 5:212 —Only identity is privileged
- § 5:213 Essential elements in establishing informer’s identity
privilege
- § 5:214 Proving factual predicate for informer’s identity
privilege through testimony or affidavits
- § 5:215 —In camera inspection of documents
- § 5:216 Who may claim informer’s identity privilege
- § 5:217 —Appropriate representative
- § 5:218 —State may claim
- § 5:219 Exceptions to informer’s identity privilege
- § 5:220 —Voluntary waiver of privilege
- § 5:221 — —Voluntary disclosure
- § 5:222 —Voluntary waiver of informer’s identity privilege—
Informer a witness
- § 5:223 —Informer giving testimony on the merits
- § 5:224 — —Public entity must be given opportunity to show
in camera facts on whether informer can testify
- § 5:225 — — —Purpose of in camera review
- § 5:226 — — —Protection of the informer by in camera
review
- § 5:227 — —Factors to consider

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:228 — —Possible relevance of informant’s identity is insufficient to discover identity of informant in criminal cases
- § 5:229 —Where informer can testify but public entity elects not to disclose identity, judge may make further orders
- § 5:230 Exceptions—Where informer can testify, judge may make any order that justice requires—Examples of court action
- § 5:231 —Determination of legality of obtaining evidence
- § 5:232 — —Function of in camera inspection

IX. RULE 509—PHYSICIAN-PATIENT PRIVILEGE

- § 5:233 Text of Rule 509: Physician-patient privilege
- § 5:234 Description of Rule 509
- § 5:235 Basis of Rule 509
- § 5:236 Definition of patient
- § 5:237 —Cases discussing Rule 509(a)(1)
- § 5:238 —Definition of physician
- § 5:239 —Chiropractors qualify as physicians
- § 5:240 Definition of confidential communications
- § 5:241 Limited privilege in criminal proceedings
- § 5:242 General rule of privilege
- § 5:243 —Confidential communications are privileged
- § 5:244 —Physicians’ records are privileged
- § 5:245 — —Not all records are privileged
- § 5:246 — —Pleading, proof requirements
- § 5:247 — — —In camera inspection
- § 5:248 — — —Tender of documents
- § 5:249 — — —Waiver
- § 5:250 — — —Physical, emotional condition in issue
- § 5:251 —Some medical billing records are privileged
- § 5:252 —Retroactive application of Rule
- § 5:253 Patient, patient’s representative may claim privilege
- § 5:254 —Patient’s estate
- § 5:255 —Attorney not representing witness cannot claim privilege on witness’s behalf
- § 5:256 Physician may claim privilege only on behalf of patient
- § 5:257 Exceptions in civil cases
- § 5:258 —Disclosure relevant to physician’s claim, defense
- § 5:259 —When patient gives written consent to release of information
- § 5:260 —Court-ordered disclosures

- § 5:261 — —Proof requirements for challenging court-ordered authorization
- § 5:262 —Proceedings to substantiate and collect on claim for medical services
- § 5:263 —Party relies on patient’s condition for claim or defense
- § 5:264 — —Whether patient’s condition is part of claim or defense
- § 5:265 — —Patient need not be a party
- § 5:266 — —Limitations on time and scope of records produced
- § 5:267 — —*In camera* inspection
- § 5:268 — —Offensive use doctrine independent from patient-condition exceptions
- § 5:269 —When disclosure is relevant to any disciplinary investigation or proceeding of a physician
- § 5:270 —Involuntary civil commitment proceedings, proceedings for court ordered treatment, or probable cause hearings
- § 5:271 — —Cases interpreting former Tex. R. Crim. Evid. 509(d)(7)
- § 5:272 —Abuse or neglect of institutional residents
- § 5:273 Consent for release of information
- § 5:274 —What written consent must specify
- § 5:275 —Withdrawal of consent
- § 5:276 —Disclosure of information obtained by consent limited
- § 5:277 Relationship of Rules 509 and 510

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

- § 5:278 Text of Rule 510: Mental health information privilege in civil cases
- § 5:279 Description of Rule 510
- § 5:280 Basis of Rule 510
- § 5:281 Definition of professional
- § 5:282 —Psychologists, psychiatrists, professional counselors, and social workers
- § 5:283 Definition of patient
- § 5:284 —Definition of representative of the patient
- § 5:285 —Definition of confidential communication
- § 5:286 General rule of privilege
- § 5:287 —Communications and records are confidential
- § 5:288 — —Records of identity
- § 5:289 — —Must plead and prove privilege

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:290 —Third party receipt of confidential communications
- § 5:291 —Retroactive application
- § 5:292 Privilege may be claimed by patient or patient's representative
- § 5:293 —Professional may claim privilege on patient's behalf
- § 5:294 Rule 510(d)—Exceptions
- § 5:295 —Proceedings by patient against professional
- § 5:296 — —Pleading places condition in issue
- § 5:297 —Written waiver
- § 5:298 —Collection proceedings
- § 5:299 —Certain statements made during court-ordered examinations
- § 5:300 — —Applies to court-ordered examinations
- § 5:301 — —Applies only where patient has been informed that communications would not be privileged
- § 5:302 — —Court-ordered disclosure requires safeguards
- § 5:303 —Party relies on condition for claim, defense
- § 5:304 — —Suit by next friend
- § 5:305 —Abuse and neglect proceedings
- § 5:306 — —Evidence admissible
- § 5:307 Relationship of Rule 509 and Rule 510

XI. RULE 511—WAIVER BY VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE

- § 5:308 Text of Rule 511: Waiver by voluntary disclosure
- § 5:309 Description of Rule 511
- § 5:310 Signing claims does not waive attorney-client privilege
- § 5:311 Basis of Rule 511
- § 5:312 Construction of Rule 511
- § 5:313 Waiver of privilege by voluntary disclosure
- § 5:314 —Inadvertent production is not involuntary production
- § 5:315 —Inadvertent production in a state civil proceeding
- § 5:316 —Inadvertent production is not involuntary production—Production not inadvertent where party subsequently changes its position
- § 5:317 —Procedure for determining voluntary waiver
- § 5:318 —Burden
- § 5:319 —Knowledge not required
- § 5:320 —Implied waiver
- § 5:321 — —General allegation insufficient
- § 5:322 Character testimony as voluntary disclosure
- § 5:323 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

- § 5:324 Text of Rule 512: Privileged matter disclosed under
compulsion or without opportunity to claim privilege
- § 5:325 Description of Rule 512
- § 5:326 Basis of Rule 512
- § 5:327 Construction of Rule 512
- § 5:328 Privilege not waived where disclosure compelled
erroneously
- § 5:329 —Objecting party not required to stand his or her
ground
- § 5:330 Privilege not waived where disclosure made without
opportunity to claim privilege
- § 5:331 —Illustrations of disclosure without opportunity to
waive privilege
- § 5:332 —Improper disclosure alone does not defeat a
privilege
- § 5:333 —Must explain disclosure of privileged material
- § 5:334 Remedy is exclusion

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

- § 5:335 Text of Rule 513: Comment on or inference from a
privilege claim; instruction
- § 5:336 Description of Rule 513
- § 5:337 Basis of Rule 513
- § 5:338 Comment or inference not permitted
- § 5:339 —Allowing comment restricts privilege
- § 5:340 —Privileged hospital peer review process
- § 5:341 —Comment or adverse inference from party's claim of
privilege against self-incrimination not prevented
- § 5:342 — —Federal law
- § 5:343 Claiming privilege without knowledge of jury
- § 5:344 —Parties shielded from adverse inferences
- § 5:345 —Jury exclusion not required
- § 5:346 —Value of privilege can be destroyed by innuendo
- § 5:347 —Deposition portion in which privilege asserted
should not be read to jury
- § 5:348 —Applies only to the extent practicable
- § 5:349 Exception for privilege against self-incrimination in
civil cases

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:350 —Present proceeding distinguished
- § 5:351 —Use of deposition testimony at trial
- § 5:352 — —Effect of motion in limine
- § 5:353 —Without some probative evidence, negative inference cannot rise beyond mere suspicion
- § 5:354 Jury instruction

CHAPTER 6. WITNESSES

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

- § 6:1 Text of 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)
 - § 6:5 —Insane persons
 - § 6:6 —Persons lacking sufficient intellect
 - § 6:7 — —No minimum age for competency
 - § 6:8 — —Rule does not require sua sponte competence evaluation
 - § 6:9 — —No requirement to understand oath
 - § 6:10 — —Confusing an inconsistent response go to credibility, not competence
 - § 6:11 — —Abuse of discretion standard
 - § 6:12 —Persons without personal knowledge incompetent witnesses
 - § 6:13 —Presiding judge incompetent witness
 - § 6:14 —Juror incompetent witness
 - § 6:15 —Felons not incompetent witnesses
 - § 6:16 —Outstanding civil contempt or arrest warrant does not create incompetence
- § 6:17 Oral statements by testator, intestate, ward, or decedent (Rule 601(b))
 - § 6:18 —Rule 601(b) and former dead man’s statute compared
 - § 6:19 —When Rule 601(b) applies
 - § 6:20 —When Rule 601(b) does not apply
 - § 6:21 —Corroboration exception
 - § 6:22 —Exception where party calls another party to testify about statement
 - § 6:23 —Discovery does not waive Rule 601(b)
 - § 6:24 —Jury instruction
 - § 6:25 —Waiver of Rule 601(b)

II. RULE 602—NEED FOR PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE

- § 6:26 Text of Rule 602: Need for personal knowledge
- § 6:27 Description of Rule 602
- § 6:28 Basis of Rule 602
- § 6:29 Construction of Rule 602
- § 6:30 Testimony excluded absent personal knowledge
- § 6:31 —Testimony improperly admitted
- § 6:32 Personal knowledge is issue of conditional relevancy under Rule 104(b)
- § 6:33 Witness can establish personal knowledge
- § 6:34 Burden to establish personal knowledge on offering party
- § 6:35 Establishing personal knowledge in affidavits
- § 6:36 Lay testimony/personal experience with medical condition
- § 6:37 Personal knowledge can be inferred
- § 6:38 Objections
- § 6:39 Lack of personal knowledge does not negate existence of fact
- § 6:40 Exceptions to personal knowledge requirement

III. RULE 603—OATH OR AFFIRMATION TO TESTIFY TRUTHFULLY

- § 6:41 Text of Rule 603: Oath or affirmation to testify truthfully
- § 6:42 Description of Rule 603
- § 6:43 Basis of Rule 603
- § 6:44 Construction of Rule 603
- § 6:45 No specific form for oath or affirmation
- § 6:46 Oath required for a party's in-court statements to judge to be considered evidence
- § 6:47 Sufficiency of oath, affirmation preliminary question for court
- § 6:48 —Timely objection required
- § 6:49 Lawyer's statements

IV. RULE 604—INTERPRETER

- § 6:50 Text of Rule 604: Interpreter
- § 6:51 Description of Rule 604
- § 6:52 Basis of Rule 604
- § 6:53 Construction of Rule 604
- § 6:54 Authority to hire or appoint interpreters

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:55 Interpreter for witness must be qualified as an expert
- § 6:56 —Special requirements for interpreter for deaf
- § 6:57 —Special requirement for interpreters in border counties
- § 6:58 Interpreter must swear or affirm that he will make a true translation
- § 6:59 —Failure to swear or affirm requires timely objection

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

- § 6:60 Text of Rule 605: Judge’s competency as a witness
- § 6:61 Description of Rule 605
- § 6:62 Basis of Rule 605
- § 6:63 Construction of Rule 605
- § 6:64 Applicable to more than members of the judiciary
- § 6:65 Testimony by presiding trial judge not considered for any purpose
- § 6:66 Court’s statements on fact issue cannot be relied upon as evidence
- § 6:67 Actual prejudice not needed for Rule 605 violation
- § 6:68 Judge need not leave bench to testify as witness
- § 6:69 —Admission before the jury of trial judge’s pretrial ruling may be tantamount to testimony by judge
- § 6:70 —Trial judge’s recitation of facts not otherwise in evidence cannot support a finding
- § 6:71 No objection needed to preserve error under Rule 605
- § 6:72 Other limitations on judicial testimony
- § 6:73 —Judges should not be voluntary character witnesses
- § 6:74 —Judges should not give expert testimony
- § 6:75 —Municipal trials
- § 6:76 When judges can testify

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

- § 6:77 Text of Rule 606: Juror’s competency as a witness
- § 6:78 Description of Rule 606
- § 6:79 Basis of Rule 606
- § 6:80 Juror may not testify in trial on which juror serves
- § 6:81 Defining the term: “Deliberations”
- § 6:82 Rule 606(b) and Tex. R. Civ. P. 327
- § 6:83 —Constitutional challenges
- § 6:84 —Need for evidentiary hearing
- § 6:85 Scope of juror’s testimony

- § 6:86 —Juror may not testify regarding information from deliberations
- § 6:87 —Juror may not testify about juror’s mental processes
- § 6:88 —Juror may testify regarding improper outside influence
- § 6:89 —A juror may testify regarding improper outside influence—Outside influence defined
- § 6:90 — —Matters not constituting outside influence
- § 6:91 — — —Coercion by jurors during deliberations
- § 6:92 — — —Juror bias
- § 6:93 — — —Jurors’ knowledge, personal experience
- § 6:94 — — —Jury instructions
- § 6:95 — — —Neutral information
- § 6:96 — — —Pressure to finish deliberations
- § 6:97 — —Matters constituting outside influence
- § 6:98 — —Matters that might constitute outside influence—Communications between a party and a juror
- § 6:99 — — —Communications between a juror and a bailiff
- § 6:100 — —Matters constituting outside influence—Juror’s research
- § 6:101 — — —Media coverage
- § 6:102 —Rule 606(b) does not govern substantive grounds for setting aside a verdict
- § 6:103 Court reporter afforded same judicial protections as juror

VII. RULE 607—WHO MAY IMPEACH A WITNESS

- § 6:104 Text of Rule 607: Who may impeach a witness
- § 6:105 Description of Rule 607
- § 6:106 Basis of Rule 607
- § 6:107 Party may impeach own witness
- § 6:108 Party cannot call witness solely to impeach with inadmissible hearsay
- § 6:109 Reversible error to exclude impeachment

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

- § 6:110 Text of Rule 608: A witness’s character for truthfulness or untruthfulness
- § 6:111 Summary of Rule 608
- § 6:112 Basis of Rule 608
- § 6:113 Opinion and reputation evidence of character

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:114 Opinion and reputation of character—Example of non-character evidence
- § 6:115 Opinion and reputation evidence of character—Exception to Rule 404(a)
- § 6:116 —Inquiry limited to character for veracity only
- § 6:117 —Bolstering with evidence of truthful character not permitted
- § 6:118 —Rehabilitation with evidence of truthful character permitted
- § 6:119 — —Character evidence admissible only after attack on witness’s truthfulness
- § 6:120 — —What constitutes attack on witness’s truthfulness
- § 6:121 — —Truthful character can be proved by opinion or reputation evidence
- § 6:122 — —Opinion and reputation evidence consistent with Rule 405
- § 6:123 — —Reputation
- § 6:124 — — —Reputation is opinion in disguise
- § 6:125 —Character witnesses must be qualified
- § 6:126 Specific instances of conduct
- § 6:127 —Specific instances of conduct not permitted to attack or support credibility
- § 6:128 — —Exception in criminal cases; correction of false impression
- § 6:129 —Specific instances of conduct excluded
- § 6:130 —Specific instance of conduct included

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

- § 6:131 Text of Rule 609: Impeachment by evidence of a criminal conviction
- § 6:132 Description of Rule 609
- § 6:133 Basis of Rule 609
- § 6:134 In general
- § 6:135 —Only applies to impeaching credibility
- § 6:136 —Impeaching credibility
- § 6:137 — —Conviction required
- § 6:138 — — —Details of offense not admissible
- § 6:139 — — — —Exceptions
- § 6:140 — — —Agreement inadmissible
- § 6:141 — — —Nolo contendere plea
- § 6:142 — — —Error waived
- § 6:143 — — —False imprisonment cases distinguished
- § 6:144 — — — —State courts

- § 6:145 — — — —Federal courts
- § 6:146 — — — —Door opened to extraneous offenses
- § 6:147 — — — —Defendant as witness
- § 6:148 — — — —Character witness compared
- § 6:149 — — — —Factual foundation required
- § 6:150 — — — —Outside jury's presence
- § 6:151 — — — —Moral turpitude crimes
- § 6:152 — — — —No clear-cut criteria
- § 6:153 — — — —Question of law
- § 6:154 — — — —General categories
- § 6:155 — — — —Probative value must outweigh prejudicial effect
- § 6:156 — — — —Trial court's discretion
- § 6:157 — — — —Exclusion as basis for reversible error
- § 6:158 — — — —Resolving conflicts questions
- § 6:159 — — — —Proving a conviction under Rule 609
- § 6:160 Time limit for use of evidence of conviction
- § 6:161 — — — —Fairness, relevancy require time limit
- § 6:162 Effect of pardon, annulment, certificate of
rehabilitation
- § 6:163 — — — —Policy
- § 6:164 Juvenile adjudications
- § 6:165 Pendency of appeal/When conviction is not final
- § 6:166 Notice of intent to use conviction evidence
- § 6:167 — — — —Courts of Appeals split over Rule 609(f)'s notice
requirement

X. RULE 610—RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR OPINIONS

- § 6:168 Rule 610: Religious beliefs or opinions
- § 6:169 Description of Rule 610
- § 6:170 Basis of Rule 610
- § 6:171 Construction of Rule 610
- § 6:172 Evidence of religious beliefs
- § 6:173 — — — —Admissible to show something other than
credibility
- § 6:174 — — — —Admissible where opposing party opens the door
- § 6:175 — — — —Not admissible

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

- § 6:176 Text of Rule 611: Mode and order of examining
witnesses and presenting evidence
- § 6:177 Description of Rule 611
- § 6:178 Basis of Rule 611
- § 6:179 Court's control

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:180	—Guiding principles
§ 6:181	—Court’s responsibility
§ 6:182	—Objectives
§ 6:183	— —Nearly complete freedom on re-direct
§ 6:184	— —Ascertaining truth
§ 6:185	— — —Proper subject matter required for use in impeachment
§ 6:186	— — — —Collateral matters improper
§ 6:187	— — — —Exception
§ 6:188	— —Avoiding needless consumption of time
§ 6:189	— — —Narrative testimony in nonjury trial
§ 6:190	— — — —Attorney’s fees
§ 6:191	— —Protecting witnesses from harassment, embarrassment
§ 6:192	Scope of cross-examination
§ 6:193	—Matters connected with case in chief
§ 6:194	— —Abandoned pleadings as admissions
§ 6:195	—Scope of cross-examination where both parties designate same expert witness
§ 6:196	—To preserve error, must obtain answer to improperly excluded question
§ 6:197	—Court’s ruling will not be disturbed unless it is arbitrarily and unreasonably made
§ 6:198	Leading questions
§ 6:199	—Leading questions should not be used in direct examination except as necessary
§ 6:200	— —Court’s discretion
§ 6:201	— —Developing preliminary matters on direct
§ 6:202	— — —Contested material issues distinguished
§ 6:203	— —Effect where witness cross-examined by own counsel
§ 6:204	— — —Exception
§ 6:205	—Leading questions on cross-examination
§ 6:206	—Leading hostile or adverse witness
§ 6:207	— —Determination of hostile status
§ 6:208	Redirect and recross-examination
§ 6:209	—Redirect
§ 6:210	—Recross
§ 6:211	Permitting jurors to question witnesses
§ 6:212	—Procedural safeguards

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

§ 6:213	Text of Rule 612: Writing used to refresh a witness’s memory
---------	---

- § 6:214 Description of Rule 612
- § 6:215 Basis of Rule 612
- § 6:216 Construction of Rule 612
- § 6:217 —Use of writing to refresh waives attorney-client privilege and work-product protection
- § 6:218 —Writing may have been prepared by someone other than witness
- § 6:219 Document used to refresh memory must be produced for examination
- § 6:220 Disclosure of writing is not a matter of right
- § 6:221 Obtaining disclosure of writing used to refresh memory of witness before testifying
- § 6:222 —Where writing used to refresh memory contains unrelated material
- § 6:223 —Where writing used to refresh memory does not contain unrelated material
- § 6:224 —Where writing used to refresh memory of attorney testifying in an Edmonson hearing
- § 6:225 Sanction for failure to produce documents under Rule 612
- § 6:226 Issue of whether Rule 612 applies to deposition testimony
- § 6:227 Record must reflect writing was used to refresh memory to preserve error

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

- § 6:228 Text of Rule 613: Witness’s prior statement and bias or interest
- § 6:229 Description of Rule 613
- § 6:230 Basis of Rule 613
- § 6:231 Examining witness concerning prior inconsistent statement
- § 6:232 —Proper foundation for impeachment under Rule 613(a)
- § 6:233 —Types of evidence that qualify as prior inconsistent statements
- § 6:234 — —Prior oral statements
- § 6:235 — —Prior claims by a party
- § 6:236 — —Prior claims against a party
- § 6:237 — —Statements in superseded pleadings
- § 6:238 — —Statements against interest in abandoned pleading
- § 6:239 — — —Filemark or verification not required
- § 6:240 — —Answers to requests for admission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 6:241 — —Answers to interrogatories
- § 6:242 Examining witness concerning bias or interest
- § 6:243 — —Proper foundation for impeachment under Rule
- § 6:244 — —Impeachment permitted only where witness
denies bias or interest
- § 6:245 Prior consistent statements of witnesses
- § 6:246 Weight versus admissibility of perjurer’s testimony
- § 6:247 Statements used for impeachment are not
substantive evidence
- § 6:248 — —Limited purpose evidence

XIV. RULE 614—EXCLUDING WITNESSES

- § 6:249 Text of Rule 614: Excluding witnesses
- § 6:250 Description of Rule 614
- § 6:251 Basis of Rule 614
- § 6:252 Witnesses must be excluded at request of party
- § 6:253 — —Purpose of sequestration
- § 6:254 — —Instructions given to excluded witnesses
- § 6:255 — —Instructions need not be given to exempt witnesses
- § 6:256 — —Including officers of the court
- § 6:257 — —Penalties for violation of Rule
- § 6:258 Exceptions
- § 6:259 — —Burden on party seeking to exempt
- § 6:260 — —Natural parties or their spouses
- § 6:261 — —Rationale
- § 6:262 — —Designated corporate representatives
- § 6:263 — —Rationale
- § 6:264 — —Designation required
- § 6:265 — —A person essential to presentation of case
- § 6:266 — —Within discretion of court
- § 6:267 — —Types of persons who may be essential
- § 6:268 — —Burden of proof
- § 6:269 Order excluding witness must not be overbroad
- § 6:270 Objecting to improper exclusion

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

- § 6:271 Text of Rule 615: Producing a Witness’s Statement in
Criminal Cases
- § 6:272 Description of Rule 615
- § 6:273 Basis of Rule 615

CHAPTER 7. OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

I. RULE 701—OPINION TESTIMONY BY LAY WITNESSES

- § 7:1 Text of Rule 701: Opinion testimony by lay witnesses
- § 7:2 Description of Rule 701
- § 7:3 Basis of Rule 701
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 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
- § 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 Text of Rule 702: Testimony by expert witnesses
- § 7:49 Description of Rule 702
- § 7:50 Basis of Rule 702
- § 7:51 Construction of Rule 702
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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
§ 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 — — — Expert must be physician
- § 7:176 — — Testimony on causation—Excluding other cases
- § 7:177 — — — 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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
§ 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

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

§ 7:200	Text of Rule 703: Bases of an expert’s opinion testimony
§ 7:201	Description of Rule 703
§ 7:202	Basis of Rule 703
§ 7:203	Data on which expert bases opinion may be reviewed at or before hearing
§ 7:204	No deadline at which an expert must stop considering facts and data
§ 7:205	Underlying facts or data need not be admissible if of a type reasonably relied on by experts in the field
§ 7:206	—Data reasonably relied upon by other experts
§ 7:207	— —Social worker reliance on penile plethysmograph test
§ 7:208	— —Expert reliance on tuition costs for special schools
§ 7:209	— —Doctor reliance on another expert not named as a witness
§ 7:210	— —Accountant reliance on summary accounting records
§ 7:211	— —Finance professor relying on information re employee cost of living
§ 7:212	— —Reliance on reports of third persons—Oral statements and business records

- § 7:213 — —Expert reliance on data re attorney’s fees
- § 7:214 —Whether experts in field rely on information is question for court under Rule 104(a)
- § 7:215 —Expert permitted to base opinions on evidence not admitted
- § 7:216 —Expert permitted to base opinions on inadmissible evidence
- § 7:217 — —Reliance on statements from expert not named in discovery
- § 7:218 — —Real estate appraiser’s reliance on third-party offers to buy
- § 7:219 — —Hearsay
- § 7:220 — — —Affidavits
- § 7:221 — — —Published articles
- § 7:222 — — —Undesignated expert’s statements
- § 7:223 — —Tape recordings
- § 7:224 — —However evidence must have some objective basis
- § 7:225 —Hypothetical questions
- § 7:226 — —Limited to facts in evidence
- § 7:227 — —Can be based on inferences from facts in evidence
- § 7:228 Subjects held to be proper bases of expert testimony
- § 7:229 —Condemnation expert’s reliance on his experience
- § 7:230 —Economist’s reliance on psychologist’s report, part of which was stricken
- § 7:231 —CPA’s reliance on interest rates and return on investments
- § 7:232 —Termite expert’s reliance on examination of premises and analysis of damaged wood
- § 7:233 —Legal malpractice damages in mass tort case
- § 7:234 Extent to which expert may disclose facts or data underlying his opinion governed by Rule 705
- § 7:235 Basis evidence must satisfy the Confrontation Clause to be admissible

IV. RULE 704—OPINION ON AN ULTIMATE ISSUE

- § 7:236 Text of Rule 704: Opinion on an ultimate issue
- § 7:237 Description of Rule 704
- § 7:238 Basis of Rule 704
- § 7:239 Construction of Rule 704
- § 7:240 Opinion on ultimate issue admitted
- § 7:241 —Opinion goes to an ultimate issue or invades province of jury not valid objection
- § 7:242 —Testimony that embraces ultimate issues may still be objectionable under other rules

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:243 Mixed questions of law and fact
- § 7:244 —Mixed question defined
- § 7:245 —Factual basis requirement
- § 7:246 —Proper legal standard requirement
- § 7:247 —General requirements
- § 7:248 — —Proximate cause
- § 7:249 — —Gross negligence
- § 7:250 — —Negligence and causation
- § 7:251 — —Medical negligence
- § 7:252 — —OSHA violations
- § 7:253 — —Propriety of Mary Carter agreements
- § 7:254 —Inadmissible where testimony not based on proper legal concepts
- § 7:255 — —Failure to define negligence
- § 7:256 — —Failure to explain definition of negligence
- § 7:257 — —Failure to connect facts regarding proximate cause
- § 7:258 Statements of law not admissible
- § 7:259 —Existence of legal duty
- § 7:260 —Legality of party's actions in driving automobile
- § 7:261 —Experts should not argue as lawyers
- § 7:262 Not all opinions admissible

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

- § 7:263 Text of Rule 705: Disclosing the underlying facts or data and examining an expert about them
- § 7:264 Description of Rule 705
- § 7:265 Basis of Rule 705
- § 7:266 Expert may testify without disclosing underlying facts or data
- § 7:267 —Exclusion of underlying facts or data relied upon by expert during direct examination
- § 7:268 — —Cross-examination compared
- § 7:269 —Burden of exploring bases of expert opinion shifted to cross-examiner
- § 7:270 — —Rationale
- § 7:271 —Expert opinion can be excluded under Rules 702, 703, and 403
- § 7:272 No absolute right to disclose underlying facts or data
- § 7:273 —Polygraph results never admitted in a criminal case
- § 7:274 Underlying facts or data admitted
- § 7:275 Admission of underlying hearsay deprived party of right of confrontation and cross-examination

- § 7:276 Error in admitting hearsay underlying expert opinion
must be shown to cause rendition of improper
judgment
- § 7:277 Conclusory evidence

VI. RULE 706—AUDIT IN CIVIL CASES

- § 7:278 Text of Rule 706: Audit in Civil Cases
- § 7:279 Description of Rule 706
- § 7:280 Basis of Rule 706
- § 7:281 Construction of Rule 706
- § 7:282 Admissibility of reports of court-appointed auditors
- § 7:283 Evidence of contradiction requires filing of exceptions

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 8. HEARSAY

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

§ 8:1	Text of Rule 801: Definitions that apply to this article; exclusions from hearsay
§ 8:2	Description of Rule 801
§ 8:3	Bases of Rule 801
§ 8:4	Definition of statement
§ 8:5	—When nonverbal conduct is a statement
§ 8:6	—Whether nonverbal conduct is statement is preliminary question under Rule 104(a)
§ 8:7	Definition of declarant
§ 8:8	Definition of matter asserted
§ 8:9	Definition of hearsay
§ 8:10	—Purpose of the Hearsay Rule
§ 8:11	—Evidence excluded as hearsay
§ 8:12	— —Witness’s knowledge acquired from statements of third parties
§ 8:13	— — —Bases of expert opinion compared
§ 8:14	— —Testimony regarding statements made by third parties
§ 8:15	— — —Witness statements in police reports
§ 8:16	— —Affidavits
§ 8:17	— —Invoices
§ 8:18	— —Unauthenticated documents
§ 8:19	— — —Newspaper articles
§ 8:20	— — —Letters
§ 8:21	— — —Valuation report
§ 8:22	— —Poster
§ 8:23	— —Value of property assessed without participation of landowner
§ 8:24	—Not hearsay where statement not offered to prove truth or offered for limited purpose
§ 8:25	— —To prove state of mind
§ 8:26	— —To prove intent
§ 8:27	— —To show notice
§ 8:28	— —To prove existence
§ 8:29	— —To prove statement made
§ 8:30	— — —To prove attitude

- § 8:31 — —Limited purpose admission, effect
- § 8:32 —Statement not hearsay where fact of utterance has legal significance; Operative fact
- § 8:33 Statements not hearsay
- § 8:34 —Prior statement by witness
- § 8:35 — —Prior inconsistent statement given under oath
- § 8:36 — — —Failure to meet requirements, effect
- § 8:37 — —Prior consistent statement to rebut charge of recent fabrication or improper influence or motive
- § 8:38 — — —Evidence excluded under Rule 801(e)(1)(B) where declarant did not testify and could not be cross-examined
- § 8:39 — — —Evidence excluded under Rule 801(e)(1)(B) where impeached witness excused
- § 8:40 — — —Trial court’s discretion
- § 8:41 — —Identification of a person made after perceiving him
- § 8:42 — —Prior statement admissible only if declarant has testified
- § 8:43 —Admissions by party-opponents
- § 8:44 — —Offered against party
- § 8:45 — —Party’s own statement
- § 8:46 — — —Prior testimony of party
- § 8:47 — —Co-defendants
- § 8:48 — —Not conclusive evidence
- § 8:49 — —Party’s own statement—Party’s own statement admitted
- § 8:50 — — —Error to exclude party’s own statement
- § 8:51 — —Victim in a criminal case is not a party-opponent
- § 8:52 — —Adopted statement
- § 8:53 — —Authorized statements
- § 8:54 — — —Whether statement is authorized is preliminary question under Rule 104(a)
- § 8:55 — — —Public employees’ statements
- § 8:56 — — —Attorney’s statements
- § 8:57 — — —Conclusions of experts
- § 8:58 — — —Pleadings in other cases
- § 8:59 — — —Abandoned pleadings
- § 8:60 — — —Unfiled, unverified abandoned pleading
- § 8:61 — — —Correspondence to court
- § 8:62 — —Failure of party to mention important event may be admission event did not occur
- § 8:63 — —Vicarious admissions
- § 8:64 — — —Preliminary question for court
- § 8:65 — — —Evidence admitted as vicarious admission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:66	— — —Agency requirement
§ 8:67	— — —Scope of employment requirement
§ 8:68	— — —During existence of relationship requirement
§ 8:69	— — —Employee whose statement proffered as vicarious admission need not be identified by name
§ 8:70	— — —Co-conspirator admissions
§ 8:71	— — —Preliminary question for court
§ 8:72	— — —Prima facie evidence required
§ 8:73	— — —Judicial notice exception to normal requirements of proof
§ 8:74	— — —Tangible, material evidence requirement
§ 8:75	— — —During course of conspiracy requirement
§ 8:76	— — —Privy admissions
§ 8:77	— — —Who qualifies as a party
§ 8:78	—Depositions
§ 8:79	— — —Party requirement
§ 8:80	— — —Effect of Rules of Civil Procedure
§ 8:81	— — —Deposition as admission by party-opponent
§ 8:82	— — —Deposition as former testimony
§ 8:83	—Judicial admissions
§ 8:84	— — —Admission must be clear and unequivocal
§ 8:85	— — —Statement not judicial admission where ambiguous
§ 8:86	— — —Statement not judicial admission where not made during course of judicial proceeding
§ 8:87	— — —Judicial admission can be made by party in testimony
§ 8:88	— — —Judicial admission can be made by party's lawyer
§ 8:89	— — —In arguments to court
§ 8:90	— — —In stipulations
§ 8:91	— — —In live pleadings
§ 8:92	— — —In briefs
§ 8:93	— — —Judicial admission need not be inconsistent with prior statement
§ 8:94	— — —Judicial admission is substitute for evidence
§ 8:95	— — —Judicial admission cannot be contradicted
§ 8:96	— — —Error to exclude judicial admissions
§ 8:97	— — —No conclusive judicial admission where pleading superseded
§ 8:98	— — —Superseded pleading as party admission
§ 8:99	— — —Fact question
§ 8:100	— — —Party judicially estopped
§ 8:101	— — —Party not judicially estopped
§ 8:102	—Impeachment

II. RULE 802—THE RULE AGAINST HEARSAY

- § 8:103 Text of Rule 802: The rule against hearsay
- § 8:104 Description of Rule 802
- § 8:105 Bases of Rule 802
- § 8:106 Not limited to contested hearings
- § 8:107 Hearsay not admissible
- § 8:108 —Admissions of former party are hearsay
- § 8:109 —Expert opinion not hearsay
- § 8:110 Unobjected-to hearsay not denied probative value
- § 8:111 —At trial
- § 8:112 —In summary judgment proceedings
- § 8:113 — —Affidavits
- § 8:114 —At hearings
- § 8:115 —On appeal
- § 8:116 Effect when hearsay improperly admitted
- § 8:117 —Evaluating sufficiency
- § 8:118 Statutory hearsay exceptions related to sexual assault
- § 8:119 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

- § 8:120 Text of Rule 803: Exceptions to the rule against hearsay—Regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness
- § 8:121 Description of Rule 803
- § 8:122 Bases of Rule 803
- § 8:123 Construction of Rule
- § 8:124 Present sense impression
- § 8:125 —Theory of Rule 803(1)
- § 8:126 —Time element of present sense impression
- § 8:127 —Declarant’s participation in event described not required
- § 8:128 —Permissible subject matter of present sense impression
- § 8:129 Excited utterance
- § 8:130 —Theory of Rule 803(2)
- § 8:131 —Admissibility
- § 8:132 —Time element of excited utterance
- § 8:133 — —Event can be remote in time if declarant is still in state of excitement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:134	— — —Statement admissible if it relates to the startling event
§ 8:135	—Statements made in response to a question
§ 8:136	—Declarant's tone and tenor of voice
§ 8:137	—Declarant's participation in the startling event not required
§ 8:138	— —Declarant must at least witness exciting event
§ 8:139	—Statements admitted as excited utterances under Rule 803(2)
§ 8:140	—No excited utterance under Rule 803(2) where no showing of spontaneity in response to startling event
§ 8:141	—Statement cannot be mere narrative of past events
§ 8:142	Then-existing mental, emotional, or physical condition
§ 8:143	—State of mind
§ 8:144	— —Intent
§ 8:145	—Evidence admitted under Rule 803(3)
§ 8:146	—Evidence excluded as not being statement of then-existing mental, emotional, or physical condition
§ 8:147	Statements for purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment
§ 8:148	—Statements need not have been made to physician
§ 8:149	—Statements regarding fault not ordinarily admissible
§ 8:150	—Statements for purpose of medical diagnosis admitted under Rule 803(4)
§ 8:151	—Letter regarding diagnosis is hearsay
§ 8:152	Recorded recollection
§ 8:153	—Writing containing recorded recollection need not be admissible for recollection to be admissible
§ 8:154	—Adopted statements
§ 8:155	Records of regularly conducted activity; business records
§ 8:156	—Authenticating witness need not be custodian
§ 8:157	— —Admissibility compared
§ 8:158	—Personal knowledge requirement liberally interpreted
§ 8:159	—Personal knowledge requirement strictly interpreted
§ 8:160	—Diagnoses, medical opinions
§ 8:161	— —Exception
§ 8:162	—Drug test results—More stringent business records exception in termination of parental rights cases
§ 8:163	—Documents admitted as business records
§ 8:164	— —Account statement

- § 8:165 — —Computer records
- § 8:166 — — —Need not prove computing equipment
recognized as standard equipment
- § 8:167 — — —Immaterial whether records maintained in
computer or company books
- § 8:168 — —Examples of miscellaneous documents admitted
as business records
- § 8:169 — — —Concrete test core results
- § 8:170 — — —Summer Simpson papers
- § 8:171 — — —Deposit slip, bank statement, ledger tape, and
inheritance check
- § 8:172 — — —Medical bills
- § 8:173 — — —Partnership income tax returns
- § 8:174 — — —Contracts
- § 8:175 —Documents received from another entity
- § 8:176 —Records held not to be business records
- § 8:177 — —Where Rule 803(6) predicate not laid
- § 8:178 — —Records prepared for use at trial
- § 8:179 — —Where evidence not trustworthy
- § 8:180 — — —Trustworthiness depends on regular course of
recording
- § 8:181 — — —Evidence not trustworthy where gaps in chain
of custody
- § 8:182 — —Where record contained notes and reports by
third parties
- § 8:183 — —Must object to lack of 803(6) predicate
- § 8:184 —Diagnosis contained in medical records
- § 8:185 —Self-authentication of business records under Rule
902(10)
- § 8:186 —Self-authentication of business records under Rule
902(5)
- § 8:187 Absence of entry in records kept in accordance with
the provisions of Rule 803(6)
- § 8:188 —Evidence admitted under Rule 803(7)
- § 8:189 —Evidence excluded under Rule 803(7)
- § 8:190 Public records and reports
- § 8:191 —Factors in determining trustworthiness of a report
under former Rule 803(8)(C)
- § 8:192 —No personal knowledge requirement
- § 8:193 —Rule 803(8) does not require regularity
- § 8:194 —Rule 803(8) does not require contemporaneity
- § 8:195 —Law enforcement reports in criminal cases
- § 8:196 —Evidence admitted as public record or report under
Rule 803(8)
- § 8:197 — —Records of the office's or agency's own activities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:198	— —Police reports need not be sworn
§ 8:199	— —Records of matters observed
§ 8:200	— —Fact findings in investigative reports
§ 8:201	— —Exception for third-party statements
§ 8:202	— —Opinions of foreign court
§ 8:203	— —Letters from other courts
§ 8:204	—Evidence admitted as public records or report under Rule 803(8)—Opinion from another court
§ 8:205	—Evidence not admitted as public record or report under Rule 803(8)
§ 8:206	— —Mere filing of proposed testimony does not make it a public record coming within the exception
§ 8:207	— —Where proffered evidence was not a report
§ 8:208	— —Where report contained ex parte statements, hearsay conclusions and opinions
§ 8:209	— —Where report lacked reliability
§ 8:210	— —Where report was not authenticated
§ 8:211	— —Factual findings of public agency excluded at trial de novo
§ 8:212	— —Testimony of expert hired by public agency
§ 8:213	—Improperly excluded public record must be included in appellate record to preserve error
§ 8:214	Records of vital statistics
§ 8:215	Absence of public record or entry
§ 8:216	—Evidence admitted
§ 8:217	—Evidence excluded
§ 8:218	Records of religious organizations
§ 8:219	Marriage, baptismal, and similar certificates
§ 8:220	Family records
§ 8:221	Records of documents affecting an interest in property
§ 8:222	—Rule 803(14) includes deeds, leases, and mortgages, but not affidavits of heirship
§ 8:223	Statements in documents affecting an interest in property
§ 8:224	—Documents that fall within Rule 803(15) excluded if not relevant
§ 8:225	—Rule 803(15) includes deeds, leases, and mortgages, but not affidavits of heirship
§ 8:226	Statements in ancient documents
§ 8:227	—Documents admitted as ancient documents under Rule 803(16)
§ 8:228	—Documents excluded as not meeting requirements of ancient documents
§ 8:229	Market reports, commercial publications

- § 8:230 —Evidence properly admitted under Rule 803(17)
- § 8:231 —Evidence erroneously admitted under Rule 803(17)
- § 8:232 Learned treatises
- § 8:233 —Expert cannot thwart cross-examination refusing to recognize treatise as authoritative
- § 8:234 — —Contrary authority
- § 8:235 —Treatise can be published after conduct at issue
- § 8:236 —Learned treatise cannot be admitted into evidence
- § 8:237 —Availability of declarant immaterial
- § 8:238 Reputation concerning personal or family history:
- § 8:239 Reputation concerning boundaries or general history
- § 8:240 Reputation as to character
- § 8:241 Judgment of previous conviction
- § 8:242 —Misdemeanors compared
- § 8:243 —Nolo contendere pleas
- § 8:244 —Exclusion of previous conviction
- § 8:245 —Judgment of conviction as offensive collateral estoppel
- § 8:246 — —Effect
- § 8:247 Judgment as to personal, family, or general history, or boundaries
- § 8:248 Statement against interest
- § 8:249 —Rationale
- § 8:250 —Time requirement
- § 8:251 — —Statement in police report
- § 8:252 — —Subsequent declaration
- § 8:253 —Offered against declarant
- § 8:254 —Evidence admitted as statement against interest under Rule 803(24)
- § 8:255 —Statements that tend to subject declarant to civil or criminal liability qualify as statements against interest
- § 8:256 —Statements against interest must be relevant
- § 8:257 —Statement against interest must be authenticated
- § 8:258 Declarant must have personal knowledge

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

- § 8:259 Text of Rule 804: Exceptions to the rule against hearsay—When the declarant is unavailable as a witness
- § 8:260 Description of Rule 804
- § 8:261 Bases of Rule 804

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:262	Statements against interest
§ 8:263	Residual hearsay exception
§ 8:264	Construction of Rule
§ 8:265	Definition of unavailability
§ 8:266	—Exemption by court ruling
§ 8:267	—Refusal to testify despite court order
§ 8:268	—Lack of memory
§ 8:269	—Death or illness
§ 8:270	— —Mental illness
§ 8:271	— —Physical incapacity
§ 8:272	—Inability to procure attendance
§ 8:273	— —Beyond jurisdiction of court
§ 8:274	— —Whereabouts unknown
§ 8:275	— — —Diligent search requirement
§ 8:276	— — —Absence due to procurement or wrongdoing
§ 8:277	— — —Unavailability must be proved
§ 8:278	—Even where declarant unavailable, evidence must fall within a hearsay exception to be admissible
§ 8:279	Hearsay exceptions
§ 8:280	—Former testimony
§ 8:281	— —Depositions from another proceeding
§ 8:282	— —Depositions taken in the same proceeding
§ 8:283	— —Deposition testimony from prior case
§ 8:284	— —Former testimony excluded where witness not unavailable
§ 8:285	—Dying declarations
§ 8:286	— —Dying declaration must be relevant
§ 8:287	— —Statement can be dying declaration even if declarant did not die
§ 8:288	— —Whether statement is dying declaration is preliminary question under Rule 104(a)
§ 8:289	—Statement of personal or family history
§ 8:290	— —Statement of declarant’s personal history
§ 8:291	— —Statement concerning history of another person
§ 8:292	— —Statement of personal or family history inadmissible absent showing of unavailability of declarant
§ 8:293	Declarant must have personal knowledge

V. RULE 805—HEARSAY WITHIN HEARSAY

§ 8:294	Text of Rule 805: Hearsay within hearsay
§ 8:295	Description of Rule 805
§ 8:296	Basis of Rule 805
§ 8:297	Construction of Rule 805

- § 8:298 Hearsay within hearsay admitted where falls within an exception to hearsay rule
- § 8:299 —Affidavits
- § 8:300 Hearsay within hearsay excluded where it does not fall within exception to hearsay rule
- § 8:301 Admission of hearsay within hearsay can be prejudicial error

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

- § 8:302 Text of Rule 806: Attacking and supporting the declarant’s credibility
- § 8:303 Description of Rule 806
- § 8:304 Basis of Rule 806
- § 8:305 Construction of Rule 806
- § 8:306 Hearsay declarant can be impeached with subsequent statement
- § 8:307 Hearsay declarant can be impeached with subsequent statement for purposes of credibility
- § 8:308 Affidavit admissible under Rule 806 for impeachment not substantive evidence
- § 8:309 Self-Authentication Affidavit Sample Form

CHAPTER 9. AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTIFICATION

I. RULE 901—AUTHENTICATING OR IDENTIFYING EVIDENCE

- § 9:1 Text of Rule 901: Authenticating or identifying evidence
- § 9:2 Description of Rule 901
- § 9:3 Bases of Rule 901
- § 9:4 Rule 901, in general
- § 9:5 —Relationship to relevancy
- § 9:6 —Preliminary question
- § 9:7 — —Proponent’s burden
- § 9:8 — — —Standard
- § 9:9 — —Judicial discretion to authenticate
- § 9:10 Provisions, in general—Preliminary question—Authentication under any applicable rule sufficient
- § 9:11 — —Effect
- § 9:12 Rule 901, in general—Preliminary question—Effect—Probative value balancing
- § 9:13 — — —Personal knowledge lacking

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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

- § 9:61 Text of Rule 902: Evidence that is self-authenticating
- § 9:62 Description of Rule 902
- § 9:63 Bases of Rule 902
- § 9:64 Construction of Rule 902
- § 9:65 Extrinsic evidence of authenticity is not required under certain circumstances
- § 9:66 —Domestic public documents under seal
- § 9:67 — —Evidence self-authenticated under Rule 902(1)
- § 9:68 — — —No requirement that stamp be from county where documents were prepared
- § 9:69 — —Evidence not self-authenticated under Rule 902(1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9:70	—Domestic public documents not under seal
§ 9:71	— —Rationale
§ 9:72	— —Passport is self-authenticating
§ 9:73	— —Certified foreign judgment is self-authenticating
§ 9:74	— —Texas Employment Commission Decision not self-authenticating
§ 9:75	—Foreign public documents
§ 9:76	— —Official who makes final certification need not be able to verify authority of original attesting officer
§ 9:77	— —Effect of Hague Convention abolishment of requiring legalization of foreign public documents
§ 9:78	—Certified copies of public records
§ 9:79	— —Records admitted under Rule 902(4)
§ 9:80	— —Records not admitted under Rule 902(4)
§ 9:81	—Official publications
§ 9:82	— —Evidence self-authenticated under Rule 902(5)
§ 9:83	— —Evidence not self-authenticated under Rule 902(5)
§ 9:84	—Newspapers and periodicals
§ 9:85	—Trade inscriptions and the like
§ 9:86	— —Trademarks connect product to manufacturer
§ 9:87	— —Website address insufficient to prove control
§ 9:88	—Acknowledged documents
§ 9:89	— —Authorization to take acknowledgments
§ 9:90	— — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments in Texas
§ 9:91	— — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments outside Texas but inside the United States or its territories
§ 9:92	— — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments outside the United States
§ 9:93	— — —Authorization in Texas law to take acknowledgments of members of the armed forces
§ 9:94	— —Proper methods and forms for acknowledgment
§ 9:95	— —Documents not self-authenticated under Rule 902(8)
§ 9:96	—Commercial paper and related documents
§ 9:97	— —Checks
§ 9:98	— —Requires reference to Texas U.C.C.
§ 9:99	—Requirements for self-authenticated business records under Rule 902(10)
§ 9:100	— —Form of affidavit or declaration
§ 9:101	— —Business records accompanied by a properly phrased and executed affidavit are treated as self-authenticating

- § 9:102 — —Documents not self-authenticated under Rule 902(10)
- § 9:103 — —Substantial compliance requirement
- § 9:104 — —Affiant need not be custodian
- § 9:105 —Presumptions under statutes or other rules
- § 9:106 Self-authenticated documents excluded if not otherwise admissible
- § 9:107 Documents excluded where not self-authenticating
- § 9:108 Genuineness of documents admitted as self-authenticating can be attacked

III. RULE 903—SUBSCRIBING WITNESS’S TESTIMONY

- § 9:109 Rule 903—Subscribing witness’s testimony
- § 9:110 Description of Rule 903
- § 9:111 Basis of Rule 903
- § 9:112 Construction of Rule 903

CHAPTER 10. CONTENTS OF WRITINGS, RECORDINGS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS

I. RULE 1001—DEFINITIONS THAT APPLY TO THIS ARTICLE

- § 10:1 Text of Rule 1001: Definitions that apply to this article
- § 10:2 Description of Rule 1001
- § 10:3 Basis of Rule 1001
- § 10:4 Construction of Rule 1001
- § 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 Text of Rule 1002: Requirement of the original

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 10:17	Description of Rule 1002
§ 10:18	Basis of Rule 1002
§ 10:19	Construction of Rule 1002
§ 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	Text of Rule 1003: Admissibility of duplicates
§ 10:34	Description of Rule 1003
§ 10:35	Basis of Rule 1003
§ 10:36	Construction of Rule 1003
§ 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	Text of Rule 1004: Admissibility of other evidence of content
§ 10:42	Description of Rule 1004
§ 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 1004
- § 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 Text of Rule 1005: Copies of public records to prove content
- § 10:59 Description of Rule 1005
- § 10:60 Basis of Rule 1005
- § 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 Text of Rule 1006: Summaries to prove content
- § 10:68 Description of Rule 1006
- § 10:69 Basis of Rule 1006
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

VIII. RULE 1008—FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT AND JURY

- § 10:83 Text of Rule 1008: Functions of the court and jury
- § 10:84 Description of Rule 1008
- § 10:85 Basis of Rule 1008
- § 10:86 Construction of Rule 1008
- § 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 Text of Rule 1009: Translating a foreign language document
- § 10:92 Description of Rule 1009
- § 10:93 Basis of Rule 1009
- § 10:94 Rule concerns admission, not substance
- § 10:95 Untranslated documents
- § 10:96 Waiver of objection to translation
- § 10:97 Affidavits in foreign languages
- § 10:98 Timing of objection to translation

CHAPTER 11. PAROL EVIDENCE

I. PAROL EVIDENCE RULE

- § 11:1 Description of Parol Evidence Rule

§ 11:2 Basis of Parol Evidence 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 from 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
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 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
- § 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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 an offer of proof
- § 12:3 Limiting instructions in jury trial
- § 12:4 When evidence of limited admissibility is wholly excluded

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 questions for business records
- § 12:9 Objections specific to offer of business records

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

- § 12:10 Predicate requirements for absence of entry in business records
- § 12:11 Predicate questions for absence of entry in business records

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 12:12	Objections specific to absence of entry in business records
D. PUBLIC RECORDS AND REPORTS (TEX. R. EVID. 803(8))	
§ 12:13	Predicate requirements for public records and reports
§ 12:14	Predicate questions for public records and reports
§ 12:15	Objections specific to public records and reports
E. ABSENCE OF PUBLIC RECORDS ENTRY (TEX. R. EVID. 803(10))	
§ 12:16	Predicate requirements for absence of public records entry
§ 12:17	Predicate questions for absence of public records entry
§ 12:18	Objections specific to absence of public records entry
F. MARKET REPORTS, COMMERCIAL PUBLICATIONS (TEX. R. EVID. 803(17))	
§ 12:19	Predicate requirements for market reports, commercial publications
§ 12:20	Predicate questions for market reports, commercial publications
§ 12:21	Objections specific to market reports, commercial publications
G. DOCUMENTS OR OBJECTS WITH UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS (TEX. R. EVID. 901(B)(1))	
§ 12:22	In general
§ 12:23	Predicate requirements for documents or objects with unique characteristics
§ 12:24	Predicate questions for documents or objects with unique characteristics
§ 12:25	Objections specific to objects with unique characteristics
H. OBJECTS WITHOUT UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS (TEX. R. EVID. 901(B)(1))	
§ 12:26	In general
§ 12:27	—Predicate requirements for objects without unique characteristics—chain of custody
§ 12:28	—Predicate questions for objects without specific characteristics—Chain of custody

- § 12:29 —Objections specific to objects without unique characteristics

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

- § 12:30 Predicate requirements for charts, summaries, and calculations
§ 12:31 Predicate questions for charts, summaries, and calculations
§ 12:32 Objections specific to charts, summaries, and calculations

III. INTRODUCTION OF DEMONSTRATIVE EVIDENCE

A. PHOTOGRAPHS AND VIDEOTAPES

- § 12:33 Predicate requirements for photographs and videotapes
§ 12:34 Predicate questions for photographs/videotapes
§ 12:35 Objections specific to photographs or videotapes

B. AUDIO TAPE RECORDINGS

- § 12:36 Predicate requirements for audio tape recordings
§ 12:37 Predicate questions for audio tape recordings
§ 12:38 Objections specific to audio tape recordings

C. OUT-OF-COURT EXPERIMENTS

- § 12:39 Predicate requirements for out-of-court experiments (Rule 402)
§ 12:40 Predicate questions for out-of-court experiments
§ 12:41 Objections specific to out-of-court experiments

IV. INTRODUCTION OF TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE

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

- § 12:42 Predicate requirements for habit evidence
§ 12:43 Predicate questions for habit evidence
§ 12:44 Objections specific to habit evidence

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

- § 12:45 Predicate requirements for writing used to refresh memory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 12:46	Predicate questions for writing used to refresh memory
§ 12:47	Objections specific to writing used to refresh memory
C. LAY OPINION (TEX. R. EVID. 701)	
§ 12:48	Predicate requirements for lay opinion
§ 12:49	Predicate questions for lay opinion
§ 12:50	Objections specific to lay opinion
D. EXPERT OPINION (TEX. R. EVID. 702)	
§ 12:51	In general
§ 12:52	Predicate requirements for expert opinion
§ 12:53	Predicate questions for expert opinion: Scientific
§ 12:54	Predicate questions for expert opinion: Nonscientific
§ 12:55	Objections specific to expert opinion
E. NONEXPERT OPINION ON HANDWRITING (TEX. R. EVID. 901(B)(2))	
§ 12:56	Predicate requirements for nonexpert opinion on handwriting
§ 12:57	Predicate questions for nonexpert opinion on handwriting
§ 12:58	Objections specific to nonexpert opinion on handwriting
F. COST AND NECESSITY OF SERVICES	
§ 12:59	Predicate requirements for cost and necessity of services
§ 12:60	Predicate questions for cost and necessity of services
§ 12:61	Objections specific to cost and necessity of services
V. CROSS-EXAMINATION	
§ 12:62	Challenges to testimony
§ 12:63	—Competency to testify
§ 12:64	—Oath
§ 12:65	—Personal knowledge requirement
§ 12:66	—Qualifications of expert witness
§ 12:67	—Qualifications of scientific expert
§ 12:68	Impeachment of witness—Admission by party-opponent
§ 12:69	—Bias or interest
§ 12:70	—Character for untruthfulness

- § 12:71 —Convictions, felony or involving moral turpitude
- § 12:72 —Character evidence
- § 12:73 —Other wrongs or acts
- § 12:74 —Prior inconsistent statement
- § 12:75 —Reputation
- § 12:76 —Statement against interest

VI. OBJECTIONS

- § 12:77 Objections
- § 12:78 Objections to form of question or responsiveness of answer
- § 12:79 Substantive objections to admissibility
- § 12:80 Objections to documents
- § 12:81 Objections to demonstrative evidence

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Index