

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW
EVIDENCE
CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION
DECEMBER 11, 2023
PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI

DO NOT OPEN THE EXAM BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR STUDENT ID NUMBER: _____

SECTION (day/eve): _____

YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR STUDENT ID AND THE SECTION (DAY OR EVENING) IN THIS EXAM BOOKLET AS REQUESTED ABOVE. ALSO, INCLUDE THIS INFORMATION IN YOUR BLUE BOOK(S) OR TYPED ANSWERS.

YOU SHOULD NOT INCLUDE YOUR NAME UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES.

You are to hand in this “EXAM BOOKLET” (whether your exam was typed or handwritten) at the end of the exam.

This is a three-hour examination. Your success on this examination will depend on your careful analysis of the questions and the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended “treatises” on the areas of law presented by these questions, and you should therefore avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question.

It is **mandatory** that your **answers exactly correspond to the number and/or letter of each question** of this exam booklet (**including subsections**). Failure to do so shall result in point reductions.

You will not receive any credit for answers written on this exam booklet. Your answers should be placed in your blue book or if typing on examsoft.

This examination consists of twenty (20) questions. Five (5) are “short essay” questions; ten (10) are “essay” questions; and five (5) are “multiple choice” questions.

The “short essay” questions are weighted at two (2) points each. The weight of the “essay questions” are set forth within the question and should be the basis of your time allocation per question. The “multiple choice” questions are weighted at five (5) points each.

It is imperative that you place your ANSWERS TO THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS in your blue book or with your typed answers on examsoft. There will be no credit given for answers that are included in this EXAM BOOKLET.

It is your responsibility to check that your exam contains the correct number of questions - twenty (20).

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from other sections unless, all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action, which may include expulsion from MSL.

When finished, check to verify that your Student ID number is on this exam booklet and your blue book(s) or in your typed answers using examsoft.

If you are handwriting the exam, make sure that each blue book is numbered sequentially (example, “Book 1 of 2”, “Book 2 of 3”, “Book 3 of 3”) and so forth.

Whether you are typing your exam or using a blue book, you must hand in this exam booklet before you leave the class.

FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE HANDWRITTEN THE EXAM

Place this EXAM BOOKLET inside your blue book(s) when signing out.

STUDENTS WHO HAVE TYPED THE EXAM

Complete the front page of a blue book and include the following information: Student ID, Section, and the word “TYPED”. Place this exam booklet inside the blue book when signing out.

DO NOT SUBMIT ANY SCRAP BLUE BOOKS WHETHER YOUR EXAM WAS TYPED OR HANDWRITTEN.

Again, failure to comply with the above **shall result in point reductions**, so carefully check to insure that you have complied with the above instructions.

**BEST WISHES FOR A HAPPY HOLIDAY AND
A PROFESSIONAL CAREER THAT IS
FUFILLING AND REWARDING!**

DO NOT BEGIN THE EXAM UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

EVIDENCE FINAL – FALL 2023

Professor Anthony A. Copani

SHORT ANSWER QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS 1-5 (2pts each)

You are to evaluate the following out of court statements to determine their admissibility at trial. After you have made your determination, indicate whether each statement is:

**HEARSAY
NOT HEARSAY, or
HEARSAY EXCEPTION.**

IF AN EXCEPTION, YOU MUST ALSO IDENTIFY THE APPROPRIATE EXCEPTION.

In addition, you must briefly **discuss the basis** for your decision. Answers must be based upon the Federal Rules of Evidence.

1. Action for adultery. Wife offers evidence that a house guest after a visit had described a birthmark on Husband's buttocks to a mutual friend. The existence of the mark had previously been testified to by Wife, while Husband had previously testified that only his parents and Wife knew of the birthmark.
2. A doctor writes a prescription for John for a newly developed drug by Pfizer called "Paxlovid" which is used to treat Covid. Can this be used as evidence that John has contracted Covid.
3. On the issue as to whether a \$10,000.00 transfer was a gift or a loan, statement by Transferor, "Here is your graduation present."
4. Suit for property damage. At trial, Plaintiff seeks to introduce note that was found on Plaintiff's windshield when Plaintiff returned to her car that had been damaged when it was struck by another vehicle. The note stated, "I saw the accident. The car that hit you had license plate XYZ-111." The Defendant owned an automobile with the same plate number on the date of the accident.
5. To show that the defendant was home, and therefore could have killed his wife, the prosecution calls Wife's lover, who testifies that when Husband was gone and the coast was clear, Wife always pulled down the shade in the living room, but when Husband was home, the shade was always open. The prosecutor calls a neighbor who testifies that on the night the murder occurred, the shade was open.

You must label your answers to correspond exactly to the numbers as set forth to the Questions above. FAILURE TO DO SO WILL RESULT IN NO CREDIT GIVEN FOR YOUR RESPONSES.

ESSAY QUESTIONS

Questions 6-13 (5pts each)

Question 14 - (10pts)

Question 15 - (15pts)

Question Six

This is a robbery prosecution. The victim testifies on direct as follows:

Q. (By prosecutor) Ms. Jennifer do you see the man who robbed you in court today?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Please point to him and describe what he's wearing.

A. He's the man right over there (pointing to the defendant) wearing the brown pants and white shirt.

Prosecutor: May the record show that the witness has pointed to the defendant?

Judge: Yes.

Q. Ms. Jennifer, you also attended a lineup?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you identify anyone?

A. Yes,

Q. What did you tell the detective at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, your honor. It's hearsay.

Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.

A. I told the detective that the defendant, who was one of the people in the lineup, was the one who robbed me.

Was the court's ruling correct? What is the applicable FRE? Explain your answer.

Question Seven

This is a personal injury case in which the plaintiff was injured in a head-on collision with the defendant. The plaintiff seeks to introduce in evidence an accident report prepared by a police officer. The police report includes the following notations:

- (1) “Defendant said he was going about 45 mph and didn’t realize that the roadway was icy”;
- (2) “This collision was caused when the Defendant’s car crossed the center line into the plaintiff’s lane of traffic.

The Defendant objects to the admission of the report. What are the issues raised? How should the Court rule? Explain your answer in detail.

Question Eight

Compare and contrast, “Admissions” with “Declaration Against Interests” listing five major distinctions. In your **blue book**, draw a “T” chart and label the left column “Admissions” and the right column, “Declarations Against Interests”. Number the columns “1 through 5”. Failure to set up columns will result in point reductions.

If you are typing your answers, instead of a “T” column, label your answers with the heading of “Admissions” and list the distinctions “1 through 5” and the heading of “Declarations Against Interests” and list the distinctions “1 through 5.”

Question Nine

This is a robbery prosecution. The defense claims another person, Smith, actually committed the robbery and set up, the defendant Williams. Smith is subpoenaed for trial but asserts his Fifth Amendment privilege in court. The next defense witness is then called.

Q: (By defendant’s lawyer) Mr. Gibbs were you with Smith two days after the robbery?

A: Yes

Q: Where?

A: Over Smith’s house.

Q: Was anyone else there with you?

A: Jones was there also.

Q: What did Smith say to you and Jones that day?

Prosecutor: Objection, Hearsay

Defense Counsel: Your Honor, if allowed, the witness will testify that Smith said,

“I set up Williams so the police would bust him instead of me. Can’t believe it worked.”

Should the Court allow the statement? What is the applicable FRE?

Question Ten

The Plaintiff, Wilma, claims to be a widow. Wilma is suing the All-Life Insurance Company for payment of a life insurance policy on her husband, Harry. The only issue being contested is the question of whether or not Harry is dead.

Wilma takes the stand and testifies that she has not heard from her husband in over seven years. (There is a presumption of death if a person has been missing for seven or more years.)

Wilma further offers to testify that on the first night her husband was gone which was on April 1, 2015, she found a note on the refrigerator in Harry's handwriting, saying, "I'm off to catch Eastern Flight 257 to Miami with Jack. I'll be back tomorrow night." She has not heard from him since and cannot find the note. Jack is also missing.

Is the note admissible at trial? If so, for what purpose? Explain your answer.

Question Eleven

This is a murder case. In the defendant's case-in-chief, the defendant calls a witness to testify to the defendant's reputation for being peaceful. The following then happens:

Q: (By defendant's lawyer) Mr. Johnson do you know the defendant, Avery Smith?

A: Yes.

Q: Do you have an opinion as to whether he is a peaceful person?

A: Yes, I have an opinion.

Q: What is your opinion based on?

A: I've known Mr. Avery for about 10 years. He's my neighbor.

Q: What is your opinion as to whether Avery Smith is a peaceful person?

A: It's great. I know him to be a gentle, quiet, peaceful kind of guy, all the years I've known him.

Q: Specifically, Mr. Johnson, what's the basis for concluding that he's a peaceful person?

A: Well, I know that one time he was confronted by a driver who cut him off and he just walked away instead of getting into a fight.

Prosecutor: Objection, your honor.

Court: Sustained

Is the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

Question Twelve

This is an assault case. The defense is self-defense. During the defendant's case-in-chief, the defendant introduces evidence of the victim's reputation for violence. The defendant does not testify. In the prosecution's rebuttal case, the following happens:

Judge: Prosecution, call your next witness.

Judge: Counsel, approach the bench. [Lawyers come to the bench.]. Defense, what's the basis for the objection?

Defendant: Your honor, I believe that the prosecution is calling Mary Martin to testify that the defendant has a reputation for violence. That's improper. We haven't opened the door to such evidence. We didn't call witnesses to testify as to the defendant's character, so there's been absolutely no evidence of the defendant's pertinent character. Consequently, there's nothing for the prosecution to rebut.

How should the Court Rule? Explain your answer.

Question Thirteen

The Defendant is charged with conspiring to manufacture fentanyl. At trial, the Government offers photographs of papers seized at the house of a coconspirator which outlines the manufacturing process. On the stand, a DEA Agent reads from the photographs. Defense counsel objects.

How should the Court rule? Explain your answer.

Question Fourteen - (10pts)

Professor Copani has a nephew named "Dante" who was born and raised in southern Italy. Recently, Dante came to the United States to visit with Professor Copani.

Dante had always expressed an interest in becoming an attorney in Italy and had made many trips to the States. During his stay, Professor Copani invited Dante to the Massachusetts School of Law to observe his evidence class. While in class, Dante immediately became attracted to a female student. They both made eye contact throughout the class.

Dan, one of the students in class, noticed this interaction and decided to have some fun. Dan was aware of a custom in southern Italy where, if a male was attracted to a female, it was a sign of

affection for him to “pat her butt”. As the female student was walking out of the class, Dante was walking closely behind her. Dan cut in between them and then “patted the female’s butt” and then quickly moved away.

The female student immediately turned and saw Dante and yelled at him, “How dare you slap my butt!” Dante looked at her and laughed. The female student has now brought assault and battery charges against Dante.

Lee, who was in class, told Hannah that it was him that “patted the butt” of the female student.

- A) What evidence will the Commonwealth attempt to introduce at trial against Dante?**
- B) What is the likelihood that the Court will admit this evidence? Explain your answer applying the applicable federal rules of evidence.**
- C) Can Lee’s testimony be allowed into evidence? Explain.**

Question Fifteen – (15pts)

Mark is charged with murdering Laura. Mark and Laura have been involved in a significant dating relationship. During this relationship, they argued frequently resulting in Mark being physically abusive to her.

One day while visiting Laura at her home, Mark lost his temper and punched Laura several times in the stomach causing her to drop to the floor in great pain.

While lying on the floor, Laura called 911 on her cell phone and stated to the operator that her boyfriend was beating her. At this point, Mark immediately ran out of the house. Laura, in response to the operator’s questioning, told the operator that Mark had left the house and gave a physical description of Mark and what he had done to her. At this time her neighbor, Jennifer, went to Laura’s house to determine the cause of the commotion. Laura answered the door and while crying hysterically, stated that Mark had punched her in the stomach several times causing her to fall to the floor in great pain.

Shortly thereafter, the police arrived at the house and Laura gave Officer Smith a detailed description as to how Mark beat her that day and how he had done so frequently in the past.

The police searched the area but were unable to locate Mark. Two weeks later, Mark showed up at Laura’s home and shot and killed her. At trial, Mark testifies that he shot Laura in self-defense, thinking that she was advancing on him with a knife. To rebut the self-defense claim the prosecution seeks to offer the following into evidence:

- a) Laura’s statements to the 911Operator;

- b) Laura's statement to Jennifer;
- c) Laura's statement to Officer Smith;

How should the Court rule on each statement? Discuss the issues that arise from this fact pattern?

MULTI-STATE QUESTIONS

Questions 16-20 (5pts each)

Question 16

A man was on trial for date rape. The prosecution called a witness to testify. The witness testified that she was told by a bystander that he heard the man in the bathroom bragging about putting a "roofie" drug in his date's cocktail. The man's defense attorney objected, arguing that the testimony was inadmissible.

Is the testimony admissible?

- A. No, because it is hearsay.
- B. No, because FRE 412 prohibits its admission.
- C. Yes, because it was an excited utterance.
- D. Yes, because it was a statement against interest.

Question 17

A man sued a doctor for malpractice. At trial, the doctor was unavailable to testify because she had left the country. The doctor did not give a deposition in this case, but had given a deposition in the past, under oath and subject to cross-examination, on the same subject matter as the instant case. The doctor's attorney now seeks to introduce the doctor's previous deposition into evidence.

Is the doctor's former deposition testimony considered inadmissible hearsay?

- A. No, because the doctor had previously given the deposition subject to cross-examination.
- B. No, because the doctor purposely made herself unavailable.
- C. Yes, because the deposition was in another matter.
- D. Yes, because the doctor is not available to testify at trial.

Question 18

A woman went to visit her gynecologist for a regular yearly checkup. The doctor examined the woman and told her, “based on your family history, you have a high risk of breast cancer. You really need to stop smoking, lose weight and perform a monthly self-examination. I also suggest you get a mammogram immediately. I’ll call the lab right now to schedule the tests if you like.” The doctor included this very same information, along with the note that he had advised her about the danger of breast cancer and the benefits of early detection in the woman’s medical records. The woman did not follow the doctor’s advice. A year later, the woman was diagnosed with a serous form of breast cancer. The woman sued the doctor for failure to warn her of the probability of breast cancer. The doctor’s attorney seeks to admit the woman’s medical file into evidence to prove that the doctor did in fact warn the woman about the dangers of breast cancer and the need for early detection.

Is the patient’s medical record admissible to prove that the doctor adequately warned the patient?

- A. No, because the record is hearsay not within any exceptions.
- B. No, because the record must be entered by the plaintiff as the statement of a party opponent.
- C. Yes, because the record was made for the purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment.
- D. Yes, because the record is a business record.

Question 19

A delivery man sued a homeowner for injuries resulting when the delivery man tripped on a broken step leading to the homeowner’s front door. At trial, the delivery man’s attorney called a bystander to testify that just before the delivery man was injured, he heard him say, “It is so dark out here I can’t even see where I’m walking.” The homeowner’s attorney objected to the bystander’s testimony.

Is the bystander’s testimony admissible?

- A. No, because it is hearsay not within a recognized exception.
- B. No, because only the delivery man has firsthand knowledge of the lighting conditions.
- C. Yes, as a statement of a party opponent.
- D. Yes, as a statement of present sense impression.

Question 20

A man was found beaten to death in his apartment. The police arrested one of the victim’s brothers. During the presentation of the state’s case-in-chief, the prosecution offered into evidence a sketch, which was authenticated by a police officer who testified that he found the victim lying bleeding and semi-conscious. The officer testified that when he asked the victim

what happened, the victim could not answer, because he was moaning in pain. The officer further testified that the victim grabbed a pencil and a newspaper from the floor and drew a picture of a face with a larger right eye and a small dark spot on the left side chin. The victim then died. The prosecution asserted that the defendant was born with a large right eye and has a noticeable wart of the left side of his chin. The defendant's attorney objects to the admission of the sketch.

How should the Court rule?

- A. The court should not admit the sketch because is inadmissible opinion.
- B. The court should not admit the sketch because it is hearsay not within any exception.
- C. The court should admit the sketch as a dying declaration.
- D. The court should admit the sketch as a recorded recollection.

END OF EXAM

HAPPY HOLIDAYS

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW
EVIDENCE
CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION
DECEMBER 12, 2022
PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI

DO NOT OPEN THE TEST BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR STUDENT ID NUMBER: _____

SECTION: _____

YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR STUDENT ID AND THE SECTION (DAY OR EVENING THAT YOU ARE ENROLLED) ABOVE AND ALSO IN YOUR BLUE BOOK OR TYPED ANSWERS. DO NOT INCLUDE YOUR NAME.

This is a three-hour examination. Your success on this examination will depend on your careful analysis of the questions and the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended “treatises” on the areas of law presented by these questions, and you should therefore avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question.

It is **mandatory** that your **answers exactly correspond to the number and/or letter of each question** of this exam booklet (**including subsections**). Failure to do so shall result in point reductions.

You will not receive any credit for answers written on this exam booklet. Your answers should be placed in your blue book or if typing on examsoft.

This examination consists of twenty-two (22) questions. Twelve (12) questions are “essay” and ten (10) questions are “multiple choice”. The weight of each “essay” question is set forth within the question and should be the basis of your time allocation per question. The “multiple choice” questions are weighted at three (3) points each.

It is imperative that you place your ANSWERS TO THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS in your blue book or with your typed answers on examsoft. There will be no credit given for answers that are included in this EXAM BOOKLET.

It is your responsibility to check that your exam contains the correct number of questions (22).

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from other sections unless, all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action, which may include expulsion from MSL.

When finished, check to verify that your Student ID number is on this exam booklet and your blue book(s) or in your typed answers using examsoft.

If you are handwriting the exam, make sure that each blue book is numbered sequentially (example, “Book 1 of 2”, “Book 2 of 3”, “Book 3 of 3” and so forth.

Whether you are typing your exam or using a blue book, be sure to include whether you are enrolled in the DAY or EVENING class (both on the exam and blue book(s))

AT THE END OF THE EXAM, PLACE YOUR EXAM INSIDE YOUR BLUE BOOK(s). YOU ARE REQUIRED TO INCLUDE THE EXAM WITH YOUR BLUE BOOK(s).

DO NOT SUBMIT ANY SCRAP BOOKLETS WHETHER YOU TYPED THE EXAM OR USED A BLUE BOOK.

Again, failure to comply with the above **shall result in point reductions**, so carefully check to insure that you have complied with the above instructions.

**BEST WISHES FOR A HAPPY HOLIDAY AND
A PROFESSIONAL CAREER THAT IS
FUFILLING AND REWARDING!**

DO NOT BEGIN THE EXAM UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

EVIDENCE – FALL 2022

Professor Anthony A. Copani

Essay Section – *Twelve Questions*

QUESTION ONE – (8pts)

Paul, a pedestrian, was struck and injured by a negligent hit and run driver while walking on Federal Street in Andover. Paul brought suit against Debra, claiming she was the driver. Debra denied she was involved in the accident, and by way of further defense alleged that Paul's injury was due to his own negligence in walking on Federal Street while intoxicated. The license number of Debra's car is XCX-596. The following occurred at trial

Scenario One:

Ed, an eyewitness, testified at trial on behalf of Paul, that he was at the scene and observed the accident. He testified that the license number of the car that struck Paul was XCX-596.

A) Is Ed's testimony admissible? State the basis for your answer.

Scenario Two:

Same facts as above, but now Ed is unable to remember the license plate number. Ed, after observing the accident, wrote the number down on a napkin that he pulled out of his pocket immediately after observing the accident.

B) How can Ed's memory be refreshed? Discuss in detail the foundational requirements and procedure to refresh memory.

Scenario Three:

After following the procedure you have set forth in your answer to question B above, Ed still cannot remember the license plate number.

C) How would you get the evidence of the license number into evidence. Discuss the issues and applicable FRE in your answer.

QUESTION TWO - (9pts)

James and Michael were driving their respective cars when they collided at an intersection. In a suit brought by James to recover damages, the critical issue was whether Michael had entered the intersection without stopping, in violation of a red traffic light. At a trial conducted on September 1, 2022, the Court heard the following evidence:

A) James, during cross examination of Michael, introduced certified convictions of the following:

1) 2018 felony for larceny;

Should the Court allow this conviction into evidence? Discuss its admissibility and the test that the Court should apply.

2) 2015 felony for perjury;

The Court did not allow this conviction into evidence. Was the Court correct? What test the court should apply.

3) **Assume, for this question only that this is a criminal case.** Michael is charged with operating to endanger. The court, on cross examination, allowed a certified copy of Michael's prior conviction dated 2014 of vehicular homicide into evidence. Discuss its admissibility and the test that the court should apply. What issues should the Defense counsel raise.

QUESTION THREE - (8pts)

On September 1, 2022, at approximately 6:00 am, Martha was awakened by her boyfriend, Jim, who lived with her in an apartment in Andover. Martha telephoned her mother saying that Jim would not let her leave to go to work and he was going to kill her. Martha frantically asked her mother to call 911. Jim grabbed the phone and disconnected the call. Martha's mother immediately called the police. In the meantime, Jim ran out of the apartment and as he reached the street, he saw a police cruiser. He then approached the officers who were seated in the cruiser and told them that he had hurt his girlfriend. Jim was covered in blood and had cuts to his face and hands. The police found Martha in her apartment dead of multiple stab wounds.

Jim claims that he acted in self-defense. At Jim's murder trial, the Commonwealth called Martha's mother to the stand to testify as to what Martha stated during their telephone conversation that morning.

Defense counsel objects. **What are the issues raised by this fact pattern?**

QUESTION FOUR - (5pts)

This is a robbery prosecution. The victim testifies on direct as follows:

Q. (By prosecutor) Ms. Adams, do you see the man who robbed you in court today?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Please point to him and describe what he's wearing.

A. He's the man right over there (pointing to the defendant) wearing the brown pants and white shirt.

Prosecutor: May the record show that the witness has pointed to the defendant?

Judge: Yes.

Q. Ms. Adams, you also attended a lineup?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you identify anyone?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you tell the detective at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection (See below response the witness were allowed to answer)

A. *I told the detective that the defendant, who was one of the people in the lineup, was the one who robbed me.*

a) Who is the Declarant?

b) Who is the Witness?

c) Is the statement Hearsay? **Explain your answer.**

QUESTION FIVE – (5pts)

Same facts as QUESTION FOUR ABOVE. The victim has no memory of the lineup and has been unable to identify anyone in court. The prosecution calls a detective as its next witness:

Q. (By prosecutor) Detective Peterson, you ran the lineup?

- A. I did.
Q. The victim, Ms. Adams, was present?
A. She was.
Q. What did Ms. Adams tell you at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, it's hearsay.

- a) Who is the Declarant?
- b) Who is the Witness?
- c) Is the statement Hearsay? **Explain your answer.**

QUESTION SIX - (5pts)

Compare and contrast, “Admissions” with “Declaration Against Interests” listing five major distinctions. In your **blue book**, draw a “T” chart and label the left column “Admissions” and the right column, “Declarations Against Interests”. Number the columns “1 through 5”. Failure to set up columns will result in point reductions.

If you are typing your answers, instead of a “T” column, label your answers with the heading of “Admissions” and list the distinctions “1 through 5” and the heading of “Declarations Against Interests” and list the distinctions “1 through 5.”

QUESTION SEVEN - (5pts)

Matt ordered a cheeseburger at Will’s Pub. Within hours of eating the burger, he became violently ill and had to be rushed to the emergency room. Matt nearly died on the ambulance ride to the hospital, but emergency personnel were able to restart his heart using a portable defibrillator. His heart, however, was permanently damaged. Matt filed a products liability action against the pub and the distributor of the meat. At trial, the Matt’s attorney called the bartender to the stand to testify that the day after the accident, a delivery truck driver from the meat manufacturer said to him, "I heard about last night. I'll bet it was the burger, wasn't it? The distributor mixes in a meat substitute to the meat in order to increase the weight per pound; everyone knows it's poison."

The defense attorney objects on hearsay grounds.

How should the Court rule? Explain your answer.

QUESTION EIGHT – (5pts)

Professor Copani has a nephew named “Dante” who was born and raised in southern Italy. Recently, Dante came to the United States to visit with Professor Copani. This was his first venture outside of Italy and he was excited to see all the famous landmarks and institutions.

During his stay, Professor Copani invited Dante to the Massachusetts School of Law. While there, he sat in Professor Copani’s Evidence Class. Dante had always expressed an interest in becoming an attorney in Italy. While in class, Dante immediately became attracted to a female student. The both of them made eye contact throughout the class.

Ted, one of the students in the class, noticed this interaction and decided to have some fun. Ted was aware of a custom in southern Italy where, if a male was attracted to a female, it was a sign of affection for him to “pat her butt”. As the female student was walking out of the class, Dante was walking closely behind her. Ted cut in between them and then “patted the female’s butt” and then quickly moved away.

The female student immediately turned and saw Dante and yelled at him, “How dare you slap my butt!” Dante, looked at her and said nothing. The female student has now brought assault and battery charges against Dante.

What evidence will the Commonwealth attempt to introduce at trial against Dante? What is the likelihood that the Court will admit this evidence? Explain your answer applying the Federal Rules of Evidence.

QUESTION NINE - (5pts)

The Plaintiff, Wilma, claims to be a widow. Wilma is suing the All-Life Insurance Company for payment of a life insurance policy on her husband, Harry. The only issue being contested is the question of whether or not Harry is dead.

Wilma takes the stand and testifies that she has not heard from her husband in over seven years. (There is a presumption of death if a person has been missing for seven or more years.)

Wilma further offers to testify that on the first night her husband was gone which was on April 1, 2012, she found a note on the refrigerator in Harry’s handwriting, saying, “I’m off to catch Eastern Flight 257 to Miami with Jack. I’ll be back tomorrow night.” She has not heard from him since and cannot find the note. Jack is also missing.

Is her testimony admissible? Discuss the issues raised by this fact pattern.

QUESTION TEN - (5pts)

Sally brings a tort action against Roger, claiming that she contracted herpes from him, and that he negligently failed to inform her that he was infected with herpes when they had sexual relations.

Roger defends, contending that Sally probably contracted herpes from David, with whom she had a sexual relationship prior to meeting Roger. David is now living in Thailand. Roger seeks to call Wendy as a witness, who would testify that at the time Sally and David's relationship was ongoing, David said to her:

"I've got herpes, but it doesn't bother me. They have drugs for it now."

Sally's attorney objects.

What are the issues? How should the Court rule? Explain your answer.

QUESTION ELEVEN – (5pts)

This is a personal injury case. The plaintiff claims her rheumatoid arthritis was caused by trauma. The plaintiff calls a medical expert who testifies on direct examination that the plaintiff's arthritis was caused by the trauma from the vehicle collision. On cross-examination, the following happens:

Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Dr. Ginsberg, your opinion is that Mrs. Smith's rheumatoid arthritis was caused by the trauma she received from the collision, is that right?

A. Yes, that's my opinion.

Q. You can make that causal connection?

A. That's what I believe.

Q. What does the word "etiology" mean?

A. It simply means the origin or cause of something.

Q. Dr. Ginsberg, are you familiar with Cecil and Loeb's Textbook of Medicine?

A. Of course.

Q. That treatise is a reliable authority on internal medicine, isn't it?

A. Yes.

Q. In fact, it's a popular textbook in medical schools?

A. Yes.

Q. The most recent edition, you would consider that authoritative, wouldn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Dr. Ginsberg, I'm going to read a section from Cecil and Loeb's Textbook of Medicine. I'm giving you a copy of that page, as well as the court and lawyers. On page 1413, it says: "The etiology of rheumatoid arthritis has not been finally determined." Do you agree with that statement?

A. In general terms, yes.

Defendant: Your Honor, we offer Page 1413 into Evidence as Exhibit 1.

Plaintiff: Objection.

How should the Court rule? Is the Text hearsay? If admissible, is it for impeachment purposes or for the truth of the matter? Is the Exhibit admissible? Explain your answer.

QUESTION TWELVE - (5pts)

As Amanda lay dying of gunshot wounds after a robbery of her purse, she gasped, "I know my time is almost up, thanks to that gunshot wound. I want you to know that it was Max who robbed me!" Amanda then lapsed into a coma. Amanda eventually recovered and travelled to Thailand to study a new sect of spiritualism. The prosecution offers Amanda's statement against Max in his subsequent trial for robbery.

Is Amanda's statement admissible if offered by the prosecution? Explain your answer.

MULTI STATE SECTION FOLLOWS

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW
EVIDENCE
CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION
DECEMBER 13, 2021
PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI

DO NOT OPEN THE TEST BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR STUDENT ID NUMBER: _____

SECTION: _____

YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR STUDENT ID AND THE SECTION (DAY OR EVENING THAT YOU ARE ENROLLED) ABOVE AND ALSO IN YOUR BLUE BOOK OR TYPED ANSWERS.

This is a three-hour examination. Your success on this examination will depend on your careful analysis of the questions and the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended “treatises” on the areas of law presented by these questions, and you should therefore avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question.

It is mandatory that your answers exactly correspond to the number of each question of this exam booklet **(including subsections)**. Failure to do so shall result in point reductions.

You will not receive any credit for answers written on this exam booklet. Your answers should be placed in your blue book or if typing utilizing examsoft.

This examination consists of a total of seventeen (17) pages containing twenty-seven (27) questions.

Seventeen (17) questions are “essay” and ten (10) questions consist of “multiple choice”. The weight of each question is set forth within the question and should be the basis of your time allocation per question.

It is imperative that you place your ANSWERS TO THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS in your blue book or with your typed answers. There will be no credit given for answers that are included in this EXAM BOOKLET.

It is your responsibility to check that your exam contains the correct number of pages (17) and the correct number of questions (27).

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from other sections unless, all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you

discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action, which may include expulsion from MSL.

When finished, check to verify that your Student ID number is on this exam booklet and your blue book(s) or in your typed answers using examsoft.

Make sure that each blue book is numbered sequentially (example, “Book 1 of 2”, “Book 2 of 2”, and so forth. Be sure to include whether you are enrolled in the DAY or EVENING class (both on the exam and blue book(s))

AT THE END OF THE EXAM, PLACE YOUR EXAM INSIDE YOUR BLUE BOOK(s). YOU ARE REQUIRED TO INCLUDE THE EXAM WITH YOUR BLUE BOOK(s).

DO NOT SUBMIT ANY SCRAP BOOKLETS WHETHER YOU TYPED THE EXAM OR USED A BLUE BOOK.

Again, failure to comply with the above **shall result in point reductions**, so carefully check to insure that you have complied with the above instructions.

**BEST WISHES FOR A HAPPY HOLIDAY AND
A PROFESSIONAL CAREER THAT IS
FUFILLING AND REWARDING!**

DO NOT BEGIN THE EXAM UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

EVIDENCE – FALL 2021

Professor Anthony A. Copani

Essay Section - *Seventeen Questions*

QUESTION ONE (3pts)

As NG lay dying of gunshot wounds after a robbery of her purse, she gasped, “I know my time is almost up, thanks to that gunshot wound. I want you to know that it was Tim who robbed me!” NG then lapsed into a coma. NG eventually recovered and travelled to Thailand to study a new sect of spiritualism. The prosecution offers NG’s statement against Tim in his subsequent trial for robbery.

Is NG’s statement admissible if offered by the prosecution? Explain your answer.

QUESTION TWO (3pts)

The Defendant, Victoria, is charged with theft of Jacquelynn’s car. Victoria’s defense is that she had Jacquelynn’s consent. At trial, defendant, Victoria calls a witness who testifies as follows:

- Q. (By defendant’s lawyer) Danielle, were you at the party?
A. Yes
Q. Did you see my client, Victoria and the owner, Jacquelynn, talking that evening?
A. Yes.
Q. Where and when was that?
A. It was around 11:00 p.m. in the kitchen. There was just me and the two of them.
Q. What did Jacquelynn say at the time?

Prosecutor: Objection, your honor.

Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.

A. Jacquelynn said to Victoria, “You can take my car to pick up the wine.”

Was the Judge’s ruling correct?

Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION THREE (3pts)

This is a robbery prosecution. The victim testifies on direct as follows:

- Q. (By prosecutor) Ms. Jennifer do you see the man who robbed you in court today?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Please point to him and describe what he's wearing.
A. He's the man right over there (pointing to the defendant) wearing the brown pants and white shirt.

Prosecutor: May the record show that the witness has pointed to the defendant?

Judge: Yes.

- Q. Ms. Jennifer, you also attended a lineup?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you identify anyone?
A. Yes,
Q. What did you tell the detective at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, your honor. It's hearsay.

Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.

A. I told the detective that the defendant, who was one of the people in the lineup, was the one who robbed me.

Was the court's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FOUR (3pts)

Aster sends a letter to Brittany defaming her by stating that she is a liar, a cheat and is not a person who can be trusted when it comes to money. Aster also sends a copy of this letter to Brittany's friend Evelyn. Brittany brings suit against Aster for defamation.

At trial, Brittany testifies about the content of the letter. Aster's attorney objects.

A) How should the Court Rule? State your reasons.

Evelyn is next called to the stand. Evelyn begins to testify about the contents of the letter. Aster's attorney objects.

B) How should the court rule? State your reasons.

QUESTION FIVE (3pts)

This is an assault prosecution in which the defendant is charged with beating his former girlfriend. The defendant calls a witness, Ms. Isabella who testifies on direct examination that she never saw the defendant beat his girlfriend. On cross-examination, the following happens:

- Q. (By Prosecutor) Ms. Isabella you claim that you've never seen the defendant beat his girlfriend?
- A. That's right.
- Q. Well, didn't you tell my investigator, Mr. Donald, a few weeks ago that you saw the defendant beat his wife?

Defendant: Objection, your honor. May we approach?

Judge: You may. (Lawyers come to the bench.) What's the basis for your objection?

Defendant: It is Hearsay.

Judge: Sustained.

Was the Judge's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

QUESTION SIX (3pts)

Collin became ill and was rushed to the local hospital's emergency room. The Doctor at the emergency room had Collin taken by ambulance to the Covid Clinic of Mass General Hospital.

Can this be used at trial (assuming it is relevant) as evidence of Collin contracting Covid. Explain your answer.

QUESTION SEVEN (3pts)

The other day Susan, a law student, tweeted that Megan stole her class notes and outlines. Lizzy, who was a recipient of the tweet, retweeted same to her followers. Megan, who denied the allegation, commenced suit against Lizzy for defamation.

What evidence can be introduced at trial by Megan against Lizzy? Explain the basis of your answer.

QUESTION EIGHT (5pts)

Compare and contrast, "Admissions" with "Declaration Against Interests" listing five major distinctions. In your **blue book**, draw a "T" chart and label the left column "Admissions" and the right column, "Declarations Against Interests". Number the columns "1 through 5". Failure to set up columns will result in point reductions.

If you are typing your answers, instead of a "T" column, label your answers with the heading of "Admissions" and list the distinctions "1 through 5" and the heading of "Declarations Against Interests" and list the distinctions "1 through 5."

QUESTION NINE (5pts)

Keith is indicted on charges of murdering James. Keith doesn't deny killing James but raises a temporary insanity defense. Keith claims that James induced him to drink a beverage containing a newly discovered "herbal type" substance which caused Keith to go "bersek" which resulted in him killing James.

To support his defense, Keith seeks to call Dr. Slip, a board-certified psychiatrist, to provide expert witness testimony on the effects that the "beverage" had on Keith's mental state. This opinion was based upon a theory that Dr. Slip recently discovered and developed.

If permitted, Dr. Slip would testify that the effect of this beverage on a person is that he loses control and acts purely instinctively, causing the person to be unable to control the nature of his acts. Dr. Slip would further testify that he examined Keith and concluded that he did suffer from the effects of the drink and thus was not legally sane when he stabbed Peter.

The prosecution objects to the testimony. How should the court rule? Explain your answer in detail.

QUESTION TEN (5pts)

Matt ordered a cheeseburger at Will's Pub. Within hours of eating the burger, he became violently ill and had to be rushed to the emergency room. Matt nearly died on the ambulance ride to the hospital, but emergency personnel were able to restart his heart using a portable defibrillator. His heart, however, was permanently damaged. Matt filed a products liability action against the pub and the distributor of the meat. At trial, the Matt's attorney called the bartender to the stand to testify that the day after the accident, a delivery truck driver from the meat manufacturer said to him, "I heard about last night. I'll bet it was the burger, wasn't it? The distributor mixes in a meat substitute to the meat in order to increase the weight per pound; everyone knows it's poison."

The defense attorney objects on hearsay grounds.

How should the Court rule? Explain your answer.

QUESTION ELEVEN (5pts)

Coyne and Malaguti were driving their respective cars when they collided at an intersection. In a suit brought by Coyne to recover damages, the critical issue was whether Malaguti had entered the intersection without stopping, in violation of a red traffic light. At a trial conducted on September 1, 2021, the Court heard the following evidence:

Coyne, during cross examination of Malaguti, introduced the following:

A) Certified copy of a 2016 felony for operating to endanger.

The Court allowed this conviction into evidence. Discuss its admissibility and the standard that the Court should apply.

B) 2014 felony for perjury;

The Court did not allow this conviction into evidence. Discuss its admissibility and the standard the court should apply.

QUESTION TWELVE (5pts)

Same fact as Question One but instead of a civil action, Malaguti is charged criminally with operating to endanger causing serious bodily injury to Coyne.

Coyne, during cross examination of Malaguti, introduced the following:

A) Certified copy the 2016 felony for operating to endanger.

The Court allowed this conviction into evidence. Discuss its admissibility and the standard that the Court should apply.

B) Assume the same facts above, except that Malaguti's attorney filed a Motion in Limine seeking the Court to rule in advance that the felony conviction for operating to endanger would not be admissible. The Court denied the Motion. Malaguti's attorney stated that, as a result, he is not putting Malaguti on the stand to testify and is preserving the issue as a ground for appeal if there is a guilty verdict. **How will the Court rule on appeal? Discuss the issue.**

QUESTION THIRTEEN (5pts)

Willow is the Plaintiff in a personal injury action. She calls her friend, Stephanie, to testify that the day after the accident, Willow complained to her that she was feeling head and back pains.

A) Are Willow's statements to Stephanie's admissible as proof that Willow experienced those symptoms?

B) Willow was taken to the emergency room by ambulance, while on route, she told the EMT that the person who collided with her vehicle had gone through the red light traveling at 60mph, stuck her in the driver's side, and was drunk. Is this testimony admissible?

QUESTION FOURTEEN (5pts)

Professor Copani has a nephew named “Dante” who was born and raised in southern Italy. Recently, Dante came to the United States to visit with Professor Copani. This was his first venture outside of Italy and he was excited to see all the famous landmarks and institutions.

During his stay, Professor Copani invited Dante to the Massachusetts School of Law. While there, he sat in the evidence class. Dante had always expressed an interest in becoming an attorney in Italy. While in class, Dante immediately became attracted to a female student. They both made eye contact throughout the class.

Joshua, one of the students, noticed this interaction and decided to have some fun. Joshua was aware of a custom in southern Italy where, if a male was attracted to a female, it was a sign of affection for him to “pat her butt”. As the female student was walking out of the class, Dante was walking closely behind her. Joshua cut in between them and then “patted the female’s butt” and then quickly moved away.

The female student immediately turned and saw Dante and yelled at him, “How dare you slap my butt!” Dante looked at her and said nothing. The female student has now brought assault and battery charges against Dante.

Will, who was in class, told Taylor that it was him that “patted the butt” of the female student.

A) What evidence will the Commonwealth attempt to introduce at trial against Dante. What is the likelihood that the Court will admit this evidence? Explain your answer applying the federal rule of evidence that is applicable.

B) What are the issues to determine whether Will’s testimony would be allowed?

QUESTION FIFTEEN (5pts)

This is a robbery prosecution. The defense claims that a person named, Bryan, is the one who committed the robbery and set up Pedro, the defendant. Bryan is subpoenaed as a witness for trial but asserts his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination in court. The next witness called to the stand is Kyzer who testifies that he was with Bryan at his house two days after the robbery. He stated also in attendance was Micah. Kyzer stated that Bryan said, “I set up Pedro so the police would arrest him instead of me. Can’t believe it worked.”

The Prosecution objects to Kyzer’s testimony as to what Bryan said.

Is Kyzer’s testimony admissible? Is this hearsay. Discuss the issues.

QUESTION SIXTEEN (5pts)

The Plaintiff, Wilma, claims to be a widow. Wilma is suing the All-Life Insurance Company for payment of a life insurance policy on her husband, Harry. The only issue being contested, however, is the question of whether or not Harry is dead.

Wilma takes the stand and testifies that she has not heard from her husband in over seven years. (There is a presumption of death if a person has been missing for seven or more years.)

Wilma further offers to testify that on the first night her husband was gone which was on April 1, 2010, she found a note on the refrigerator in Harry's handwriting, saying, "I'm off to catch Eastern Flight 257 to Miami with Jack. I'll be back tomorrow night." She has not heard from him since and cannot find the note. Jack is also missing.

Is her testimony admissible? Discuss the issues.

QUESTION SEVENTEEN (14pts)

Mark is charged with murdering Laura. Mark and Laura have been involved in a significant dating relationship. During this relationship, they argued frequently resulting in Mark being physically abusive to her.

One day while visiting Laura at her home, Mark lost his temper and punched Laura several times in the stomach causing her to drop to the floor in great pain.

While lying on the floor, Laura called 911 on her cell phone and stated to the operator that her boyfriend was beating her. At this point, Mark immediately ran out of the house. Laura, in response to the operator's questioning, told the operator that Mark had left the house and gave a physical description of Mark and what he had done to her. At this time her neighbor, Jennifer, went to Laura's house to determine the cause of the commotion. Laura answered the door and while crying hysterically, stated that Mark had punched her in the stomach several times causing her to fall to the floor in great pain.

Shortly thereafter, the police arrived at the house and Laura gave Officer Smith a detailed description as to how Mark beat her that day and how he had done so frequently in the past.

The police searched the area but were unable to locate Mark. Two weeks later, Mark showed up at Laura's home and shot and killed her. At trial, Mark testifies that he shot Laura in self-defense, thinking that she was advancing on him with a knife. To rebut the self-defense claim the prosecution seeks to offer the following into evidence:

- a) Laura's statements to the 911 Operator;

- b) Laura's statement to Office Smith;
- c) Laura's statement to Jennifer;

How should the Court rule on each statement? What issues arise from this fact pattern?

**Multi-State Section Follows
On next page**

EVIDENCE – FALL 2021

Professor Anthony A. Copani

Multi-State Section

Ten Questions – (2 points each)

QUESTION ONE

During a trial, a man sought to have hospital admission records admitted. He wanted to demonstrate that he received medical treatment, after a vehicle accident, at a hospital that was operated as a non-profit. At the time the man was admitted to the hospital, the hospital was extremely busy and failed to create admission records for the man. When the man contacted the hospital regarding the trial, the hospital realized its mistake and created hospital admission records for the man. The man intended to introduce the records into evidence through the testimony of the head of the hospital's admissions office, who was the custodian of the records. The defendant objected based on impermissible hearsay. The man's attorney countered that the records were admissible under the records of a regularly conducted activity hearsay exception.

Is the court likely to allow the introduction of the records?

- A) No, because the records do not satisfy the records of a regularly conducted activity hearsay exception.
- B) No, because the hospital is operated as a non-profit and not a for profit business.
- C) Yes, because the records satisfy the records of a regularly conducted activity hearsay exception.
- D) Yes, because the records are not hearsay.

QUESTION TWO

The CEO of a small company participated in an important meeting of the board of directors, in which a number of new policies were enacted. The CEO had her assistant take notes during the meeting, which the assistant later formatted into a memorandum. The CEO reviewed the memorandum and signed her name at the bottom, confirming its accuracy. The company then implemented the new policies. Several shareholders of the company filed suit against the company and the CEO in federal court, due to these new policies.

At a trial by jury, the CEO testified on her own behalf about the meeting. The CEO explained that, at the time of the meeting, she was taking medication which affected her memory and did not recall the substance of the meeting. The CEO then attempted to introduce the memorandum that she had signed. The shareholders objected to the introduction of the memorandum, stating that it constituted inadmissible hearsay. The CEO's attorney responded by stating that the memorandum was admissible under the recorded recollection hearsay exception.

Is the court likely to allow the introduction of the memorandum as a recorded recollection?

- A) No, because the CEO was not available.
- B) No, because the memorandum was written by the Assistant and not the CEO.
- C) Yes, and the memorandum may be received as an exhibit by the jury.
- D) Yes, and the memorandum may not be received as an exhibit by the jury.

QUESTION THREE

A man and a woman were walking along the sidewalk when they saw a car traveling well over the posted speed limit. The woman calmly mentioned to the man, "That car is going fast." The car passed them and, moments later, was involved in an accident with a federal government postal carrier. Both the driver of the car and the postal carrier suffered serious injuries. The driver filed a civil complaint against the postal carrier's employer, the government, in federal court. Prior to trial, the woman informed the government that she was nervous about testifying. For that reason, the government called the man to testify about the woman's statement. The driver objected to the testimony as inadmissible hearsay. The government's attorney was young and unfamiliar with the Federal Rules of Evidence. For that reason, the government's attorney responded that the woman's statement was

admissible under either the present sense impression hearsay exception or the excited utterance hearsay exception.

Is the court likely to allow the woman's statement to be introduced?

- A) No, because the woman was not unavailable.
- B) No, because the woman was not under any stress of excitement.
- C) Yes, because the woman's statement satisfies the excited utterance hearsay exception.
- D) Yes, because the woman's statement satisfies the present sense impression hearsay exception.

QUESTION FOUR

A speeding car swerved onto a sidewalk, narrowly missing a man and woman. The woman dived out of the path of the car and this incident induced a severe panic attack, which lasted almost two hours. The woman was finally able to speak toward the end of her panic attack and commented to the man, "That car was going so fast." The man and woman later learned that, after their near miss, the same car had been involved in an accident with a federal government postal carrier. Both the driver of the car and the postal carrier suffered serious injuries. The driver filed a civil complaint against the postal carrier's employer, the government, in federal court. Prior to trial, the woman informed the government that she was nervous and did not want to testify. Therefore, the government called the man to testify about the woman's statement. The driver objected to the testimony as inadmissible hearsay. The government's attorney was young and unfamiliar with the Federal Rules of Evidence. For that reason, the government's attorney responded that the woman's statement was admissible under either the present sense impression hearsay exception or the excited utterance hearsay exception.

Is the court likely to allow the woman's statement?

- A) No, because the woman did not make the statement immediately after she was nearly struck by the car.
- B) No, because the woman only requested not to testify and was not unavailable.
- C) Yes, because the woman's statement satisfies the excited utterance hearsay exception.
- D) Yes, because the woman's statement satisfies the present sense impression hearsay exception.

QUESTION FIVE

A defendant was on trial for robbery and criminal battery. These charges stemmed from the defendant shooting a customer while robbing a grocery store. The prosecution called the store manager to testify that it was company policy to prepare an incident report describing any unusual events or incidents that took place in the store on the same day that the incident occurred. The store manager then further testified that he began preparing an incident report immediately after the police had arrested the defendant and left the store. The prosecution then offered into evidence the store manager's incident report. The report included a statement by a customer who witnessed the incident and was unavailable to testify. According to the statement, which was made an hour after the police had arrested the defendant, the witness identified the defendant and said, "He shot that woman, and I thought she was going to die." The defendant objected to the introduction of the incident report.

How should the court rule on the defendant's objection?

- A) To overrule the objection, because the incident report is admissible as a record of regularly conducted activity.
- B) To overrule the objection, because the witness's statement was a present sense impression.
- C) To sustain the objection, because the incident report is inadmissible double hearsay.
- D) To sustain the objection, because the incident report was prepared in anticipation of litigation.

QUESTION SIX

A man was charged with the murder of his ex-wife. The police alleged that the ex-wife went to visit the man before the two became involved in an argument that resulted in the ex-wife being killed. Before the ex-wife went to visit the man, she called her mother and told her, "I'm going to go and visit that no-good ex-husband of mine [the man] and give him a piece of my mind." During the trial, the prosecution called the mother to testify about the ex-wife's statement. The man's defense attorney objected to the testimony, stating that it was inadmissible hearsay.

Is the mother's testimony admissible?

- A) No, because the ex-wife's statement does not fall within any exception to the hearsay rule.
- B) No, because the ex-wife did not believe that her death was imminent.
- C) Yes, because the ex-wife's statement described her then-existing state of mind.
- D) Yes, because the ex-wife's statement is not hearsay.

QUESTION SEVEN

A boyfriend borrowed his girlfriend's car when his failed to start one winter morning. Because the roads were icy, the boyfriend drove with extra caution. However, when another driver ran a stop sign, the boyfriend was unable to stop in time, and he collided with the other car that was operated by a female. The boyfriend rushed over to the other driver's car where he found her bleeding profusely from a head injury. The boyfriend said, "I'm so sorry – I just know there must have been something I could have done to avoid this." He then offered to pay all of her hospital bills.

When the boyfriend received that astronomical bill to repair his girlfriend car, he decided to withdraw his offer to the other driver. If the other driver commences suit, which of the following evidence will be admissible.

- A) The boyfriend's statement regarding his fault for the accident and his offer to pay the driver's medical bills are both admissible on the issue of negligence.
- B) The boyfriend's statement regarding his fault for the accident is admissible on the issue of negligence, but his offer to pay the driver's medical bills is not admissible.
- C) Neither the boyfriend's statement regarding his fault for the accident nor his offer to pay the driver's medical bills is admissible on the issue of negligence.
- D) The boyfriend's statement regarding his fault for the accident is not admissible on the issue of negligence, but his offer to pay the driver's medical bills is admissible.

QUESTION EIGHT

A plaintiff brought an action to recover child support from her ex-husband. She obtained several years of her ex-husband's monthly credit card statements, totaling 30,000 pages. In preparation for trial, the plaintiff hired an expert to prepare graphs to

establish the ex-husband's excessive spending habits. Based on the information contained in the credit card statements, the expert compiled a number of graphs, which the plaintiff sought to introduce into evidence. During the discovery period, all credit card statements were made available for copying to the defense counsel. At trial, the defendant objected to the introduction of the graphs into evidence.

How will the court rule on the objection?

- A) To sustain the objection, because the best evidence rule requires the production of the credit card statements.
- B) To sustain the objection, because the credit card statements must be produced to prove their contents.
- C) To overrule the objection, because the graphs are summaries of voluminous records.
- D) To overrule the objection, because the graphs were compiled by an expert.

QUESTION NINE

A woman was injured when a drunk driver hit her in a head-on collision. The woman sued the driver for her extensive injuries. During trial, the woman called her doctor as a witness to testify as to her injuries. After the woman rested her case, the driver then also called the woman's doctor as a witness. The doctor was uncooperative, and the driver began to ask the doctor leading questions. The woman immediately objected, stating leading questions were impermissible. The driver countered that the doctor was a hostile witness, and the trial judge agreed.

How should the trial judge rule on the woman's objection?

- A) To overrule the objection because the doctor is a hostile witness.
- B) To overrule the objection because the doctor is on cross-examination.
- C) To sustain the objection because leading questions are always impermissible.
- D) To sustain the objection, because leading questions are impermissible on direct examination.

QUESTION TEN

A college student was on trial for involuntary manslaughter, resulting from the death of a fellow classmate. The prosecution alleged that the college student forced the classmate to consume large amounts of alcohol and illegal drugs as part of a "hazing" party. During trial, the prosecution called one of the college student's childhood friends to testify. The childhood friend testified that, during middle school, the college student had attempted to force him to consume copious amounts of alcohol and drugs. The college student's defense lawyer objected to the testimony, stating that it was not relevant.

Should the defense lawyer succeed in their relevance objection?

- A) No, because the testimony's probative value is not substantially outweighed by any unfairly prejudicial effect.
- B) No, because the testimony is relevant and admissible, regardless of any prejudice.
- C) Yes, because the childhood friend is not a party to the action against the defendant.
- D) Yes, because the testimony's prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value.

END OF MULTI-STATE SECTION

END OF EXAM

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW

EVIDENCE

CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION

DECEMBER 13, 2011

PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI

DO NOT OPEN THE TEST BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR EXAM NUMBER: _____

This is a three-hour examination. Your success on this examination will depend on your careful analysis of the questions and the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended "treatises" on the areas of law presented by these questions, and you should, therefore, avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question. It is mandatory that you number your answers to correspond to the number as set forth in each question. Again, you must explain your reasons for each answer.

THIS EXAM CONTAINS TEN PAGES AND CONSISTS OF SIXTEEN QUESTIONS. THE WEIGHT OF EACH QUESTION IS SET FORTH IN THE QUESTION. IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO CHECK THAT YOUR EXAM CONTAINS THE CORRECT NUMBER OF QUESTIONS.

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from other sections unless all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action, which shall include expulsion from MSL.

WHEN FINISHED, CHECK TO MAKE SURE YOUR EXAM NUMBER IS ON THIS TEXT BOOKLET AND YOUR BLUE BOOK(S).

MAKE SURE YOU NUMBER EACH BLUE BOOK SEQUENTIALLY (EXAMPLE, BOOK 1 OF 2, BOOK 2 OF 2) AND INCLUDE WHETHER YOU ARE ENROLLED IN THE DAY OR EVENING CLASS.

PLACE THE EXAM INSIDE YOUR BLUE BOOK AND HAND IN ALL.

FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE WILL RESULT IN POINT REDUCTIONS, SO CAREFULLY CHECK TO INSURE YOU HAVE COMPLIED WITH THE ABOVE INSTRUCTIONS.

BEST WISHES FOR A HAPPY HOLIDAY

AND A PROFESSIONAL CAREER THAT IS FULFILLING AND REWARDING!

QUESTION ONE (12 PTS)

Francis testifies for the defense in an action involving the sale of real property. Francis was an eyewitness to the alleged contract to sell the property.

1. During cross-examination by the plaintiff, Francis is asked whether he had been convicted of attempted robbery in 2009. Is this question permissible?
2. Francis denied having been convicted of attempted robbery. Can the opposing counsel offer in evidence a certified copy of the attempted robbery conviction?
3. On cross-examination, Francis is asked whether he was wearing his hearing aid at the time of the alleged sale. Francis responded by saying that he was indeed using his hearing aid. Can opposing counsel call a different witness, Tiffany, to testify that Francis was not wearing a hearing aid at the time of the alleged sale?
4. On cross-examination, Francis is asked, "Wasn't it raining on the day in question and not bright and sunny" as he had testified to on direct. Francis answered the question by denying it was raining. Can opposing counsel call a different witness in rebuttal to testify that it was raining on the day of the sale?
5. Francis is also asked whether he had said in a deposition two months before trial, "I was the first one there for the meeting about the sale," when on direct he testified that he "was the third or fourth person there." If Francis claims he made no such prior statement, can a rebuttal witness who was present at the deposition testify that Francis made the statement?
6. If Francis is asked on cross-examination whether he owes the defendant a large sum of money and he denies it, can the Plaintiff call a different witness in rebuttal to confirm this fact?

QUESTION TWO (6 PTS)

Leanne, after moving to Alaska to be closer to her idol, Sally Pailin, decided to take up ice skating. One day, after completing a two hour workout, she put her skates outside the front door of her apartment. When she returned for the skates minutes later, they were gone. Tim standing nearby said, "Oh, Steve just stopped by and took the skates." Leanne sued Steve for conversion. At trial, Leanne called Tim to testify on her behalf. When Leanne's counsel asked Tim who took the skates, he stated, "Why, Danielle took them."

1. Can Leanne impeach Tim on direct examination with his previous out-of-court statement.
2. Is Tim's prior statement admissible for the truth of the matter asserted?
3. If Leanne produces no evidence other than Tim's testimony and stipulation that Leanne's skates were taken without permission, will Leanne win at trial?

QUESTION THREE (5 PTS)

A twin-engine plane flying for US Scare, a small commuter airline, was forced to make an emergency crash landing after the engines failed. The pilot jumped out unscathed and stated to the press as soon as it arrived, "While I did not see the mechanics work on this plane, this landing was due to the incompetence of the mechanics and not pilot error, I'll tell you that!"

1. If several injured passengers brought suit against the pilot, can the passengers offer the pilot's statements in evidence? Why?
2. Will the answer to 1 hinge on whether the pilot's statement was based on personal knowledge?
3. If US Scare is also sued, can the pilot's statements be offered against the company? Explain.

QUESTION FOUR (4 PTS)

During the busy afternoon rush hour, Cathy became very sick. She was quickly transported by ambulance to the Healthwise Hospital, located downtown. On the way, Cathy

managed to tell the emergency medical technician in the ambulance that “I started feeling dizzy and faint, after I had the lobster special at MSL’s Beef and Beer Joint; I’m sure it is food poisoning because MSL’s chefs are careless and do not cook the food as thoroughly as they should.”

Cathy subsequently brings suit against MSL’s. She wishes to introduce her prior statements to the emergency medical technician. Are those statements admissible?

QUESTION FIVE (4 PTS)

Roland, an accountant with SBP Company, a chemical manufacturer, stated at a private dinner party to some friends that “SBP is really pouring those hazardous chemicals into the river, including dangerous PCBs.” In a subsequent lawsuit accusing SBP of improperly dumping chemicals into the river, one of the friends who heard Roland’s statement at the dinner party is called to testify about the statement for the plaintiffs. Is Roland’s statement hearsay? Is it admissible? Explain.

QUESTION SIX (10 PTS)

Bonnie is charged with stealing and then selling neighborhood dogs for considerable profit. Dionne Sullivan owned a dog named Acceptance, who was one of the animals allegedly sold by defendant Bonnie. At Bonnie’s trial, which of the following testimony meets the technical definition of hearsay?

1. Dionne testified that, when she saw Acceptance in Bonnie’s yard eating a steak, Acceptance wagged his tail upon seeing her.
2. Dionne testified that she said to her friend, Michelle while observing Acceptance in Bonnie’s yard, “That’s my dog!”
3. Dionne told the police that the dog she saw in Bonnie’s yard was Acceptance.
4. When Officer Roland asked Dionne if she was sure it was Acceptance, Dionne scratched her head, looked quizzical, and then nodded her head, yes.

5. Dionne testified that the dog she saw in Bonnie's backyard was her very own Acceptance.

QUESTIONS SEVEN (4 PTS)

In a robbery trial, an eyewitness, Jetzenia, testifies that she saw the defendant snatch the victim's purse and quickly exit the mall through the A-Mart located on the mall's south side. Jetzenia added, "I ran up to Officer Dick. I was out of breath and couldn't speak. Later, he showed me several photographs. I pointed to the photograph of the defendant, indicating that he was the guy who snatched the purse and ran out of the A-Mart.

1. Is Jetzenia's testimony hearsay? Why?
2. Jetzenia wishes to testify that "my best friend, Karl, was standing right next to me when the defendant ran out of the store. Karl also told the police officer after looking at the pictures that the defendant was the fellow who snatched the purse." Is this testimony admissible?

QUESTION EIGHT (4 PTS)

Georgie, at his weekly card game, was being teased by the other card players. "Hey, hey Georgie, I heard you were the person responsible for sticking up the First National Bank last week and escaping with \$83,000.00 in new \$50.00 bills. Is it true Georgie? Georgie did not respond, but merely smiled weakly and dealt the cards. Is evidence of Georgie's silence admissible?

QUESTION NINE (10 PTS)

Fiorentino is charged with attempted murder after allegedly shooting and seriously injuring Stephen. At trial, a government witness, Daniel, testified about the events on the evening of April 26, 2010, when Stephen was shot.

PROSECUTOR: What happened at approximately 7 p.m. on April 26, 2010?

1. Stephen told me he was going to William's house that night to drink some beers;
2. Stephen told me he had been having drinks with William on a regular basis for the last three weeks.
3. Stephen said he's feeling kind of depressed that that his head hurts;
4. Stephen said he had twisted his knee the week before in a touch football game, and wanted to know if I had any aspirin or pain reliever to give to him.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Objection to the each answer. Motion to strike.

What ruling and why? Answer each question separately.

QUESTION TEN (5 PTS)

Compare and contrast the differences between Admissions and Declaration Against Interest.

QUESTION ELEVEN (4 PTS)

During her lunch hour, Jill witnessed a horrific car crash in which several people were seriously injured. Because Jill was shaken up after observing the carnage at close range, she left her investment banking job much earlier than usual. After an hour-long commute home, she still felt agitated. When she walked into the house, her sister, Celine, asked her about her day. Scarcely able to contain herself, Jill said, "I saw a woman and two youngsters practically killed by a guy who ran a red light! He went through the intersection long after the light had turned red. It made me sick."

The people injured in the crash subsequently brought suit and Celine is asked to testify about Jill's statement. Jill is available to testify, but prefers not to recall the incident. Is Celine permitted to testify to Jill's statement? Explain.

QUESTION TWELVE (4 PTS)

Veronica, a billionaire, discovers Buddhism. She denounces her worldly possessions and boards a flight to Tibet, where she plans to spend the rest of her natural life in a monastery. As the plane takes off, she exclaims, "I must set the record straight before I begin my new life; I did pay Steven to kill my poor departed husband and his lover."

Is this statement admissible, if offered by the prosecution in Steven's subsequent trial for murdering Veronica's husband?

QUESTION THIRTEEN (8 PTS)

Jason sues NBS Television for distributing a videotape in which NBS made allegedly libelous statements about him. At trial, Jason testifies about the tape, but does not bring it with him.

1. Is Jason's testimony admissible?
2. If Jason brings a copy of the videotape, does this satisfy the best evidence rule?
3. The president of NBS was overheard two weeks prior to trial at a cocktail party saying, "Our employees said in that videotape that Jason was a slippery snake-so what?" Is this testimony admissible?

4. If Jason has accidentally destroyed the videotape, what recourse does he have, if any, at trial?

QUESTION FOURTEEN (4 PTS)

The government charged William and Tim with first degree murder of Fiorentino. At the joint trial of William and Tim, Dick testified that he saw the two defendants shortly after the alleged homicide. According to Dick, Tim told William that he “love(d) how cold hearted William cut, stabbed and beat Fiorentino while Tim pulled Fiorentino’s hair and shot him in the head.” Dick also testified that, although William said nothing in response to Tim, he nodded his head, grinned, and slapped Tim’s hands in a “high five.” Tim and William both objected to this testimony. Is it admissible?

QUESTION FIFTEEN (4 PTS)

Leah, the wife calls 911, “please help, my husband, Karl, is trying to kill me.”

In a trial against Karl for domestic violence, Leah testifies she was just kidding when she made the call. The prosecutor wants to play the tape of the call. The Defendant, Karl, objects. Is the tape admissible?

QUESTION SIXTEEN (12 PTS)

Renee who is twenty (20) years of age, was in her bedroom with her boyfriend, Tim, the defendant.

Renee's mother was two rooms away in her own bedroom. The mother heard an argument between Renee and the defendant. The mother went to Renee's room to see what was wrong. The defendant had already left and Renee was lying on her bed crying.

The mother asked Renee what happened and she replied that, "Tim grabbed the front of her shirt and then he began to choke me and then hit my head on the floor."

The next door neighbor, hearing the commotion, called the police who arrived at the scene within fifteen minutes. The police spoke with the mother and Renee.

Officer Dan asked Renee what happened and she related the same statement she told her mother. She further gave the police a physical description of the defendant, that he was six feet two inches and weighed 230 pounds.

An ambulance shortly arrived at the scene and Renee was taken to the Lawrence Hospital. While being admitted she gave the same account that she told the police to Marissa, the admitting nurse. Despite the doctor's best effort to save Renee, she died as a result of massive brain damage.

Tim is now on trial for murder. Assume the Commonwealth intends to call Renee's mother, Officer Dan, and Marissa to the stand, what evidence is admissible? Explain in detail the reasons for your answer.

**MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW
EVIDENCE
CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION
DECEMBER 8, 2009
PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI**

DO NOT OPEN THE TEST BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR EXAM NUMBER: _____

This is a three-hour examination. Your success on this examination will depend on your careful analysis of the questions and the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended "treatises" on the areas of law presented by these questions, and you should, therefore, avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question.

QUESTIONS WILL BE WEIGHED AT 5 POINTS EACH. THERE ARE A TOTAL OF TWENTY QUESTIONS ON THIS EXAM.

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from other sections unless all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action, which shall include expulsion from MSL.

WHEN FINISHED, CHECK TO MAKE SURE YOUR EXAM NUMBER IS ON THIS TEST BOOKLET AND YOUR BLUE BOOK(S).

MAKE SURE YOU NUMBER EACH BLUE BOOK SEQUENTIALLY (EXAMPLE, BOOK 1 OF 2, BOOK 2 OF 2) AND INCLUDE WHETHER YOU ARE ENROLLED IN THE DAY OR EVENING CLASS.

PLACE THE EXAM INSIDE YOUR BLUE BOOK AND HAND IN ALL.

**BEST WISHES FOR A HAPPY HOLIDAY
AND FOR A PROFESSIONAL CAREER THAT IS FULFILLING AND REWARDING!**

ESSAY QUESTIONS

ANSWER EACH QUESTION IN DETAIL APPLYING THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE. BE SURE TO NUMBER YOUR ANSWERS IN YOUR BLUE BOOK TO CORRESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE EXAM

QUESTION ONE:

This is a civil action on a life insurance policy. The principal issue at trial is whether policy exclusion applies to prevent payment on the policy. The insurance company cannot find the original policy, which should have been in the policyholder's file. At a bench trial, the insurance company calls as a witness the manager of the claims department. The following then happens:

Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Ms. Walker, did you look for the executed original of the plaintiff's policy with your company?

A. I did, and the people in my department did. The executed original should be in the policyholder's file. We looked in all the places it might have been misfiled, but weren't able to locate it. I have no idea what happened to it.

[Defendant's lawyer has exhibit marked and shows it to opposing counsel.]

Q. I'm showing you Defendant's Exhibit No. 2. Please examine it for a moment. What kind of document is that?

A. It's one of our standard life insurance contracts.

Q. Was that the standard policy your company used at the time you insured the plaintiff?

A. Yes, that's our standard life insurance policy, which we've used for several years, including the year we insured the plaintiff.

Defendant: We offer Defendant's Exhibit No. 2.

Plaintiff: We object, Your Honor.

How should the Court rule? Explain your answer.

QUESTION TWO:

This is a robbery prosecution. The victim testifies on direct as follows:

Q. (By prosecutor) Ms. Adams, do you see the man who robbed you in court today?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Please point to him and describe what he's wearing.

A. He's the man right over there (pointing to the defendant) wearing the brown pants and white shirt.

Prosecutor: May the record show that the witness has pointed to the defendant?

Judge: Yes.

Q. Ms. Adams, you also attended a lineup?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you identify anyone?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you tell the detective at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, Your Honor. It's hearsay.

Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.

A. I told the detective that the defendant, who was one of the people in the lineup, was the one who robbed me.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

QUESTION THREE:

Same case as QUESTION TWO. The victim has no memory of the lineup and has been unable to identify anyone in court. The prosecution calls a detective as its next witness:

Q. (By prosecutor) Detective Peterson, you ran the lineup?

A. I did.

Q. The victim, Ms. Adams, was present?

A. She was.

Q. What did Ms. Adams tell you at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, it's hearsay.

Judge: Sustained. Move on to another topic.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FOUR:

This is a child molestation prosecution against the victim's stepfather. At trial, the prosecution calls the victim's treating physician. During the doctor's direct examination, the following happens:

Q. (By prosecutor) Dr. Williams, did you talk to Mary when you examined her?

A. Yes.

Q. Tell us what Mary said.

Defendant: Objection, Your Honor.

Judge: Overruled.

A. That her stepfather had fondled her.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Is this hearsay, non-hearsay, or an exception? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FIVE:

John was found murdered in the parking lot at WalMart. The police suspected his girlfriend, Stacey, as a suspect. When the police arrived at Stacey's apartment, they observed her lying on the family room floor, dead from a bullet wound to her head in an apparent suicide. Next to the body was Stacey's computer, which was still on at the time. The police observed a message on the screen, which read as follows:

"I cannot live with myself anymore because I killed my boyfriend John in WalMart's parking lot."

John's estate has brought a wrongful death claim against Stacey's estate. Is the above statement admissible at trial? EXPLAIN

QUESTION SIX:

This is an automobile negligence case. A witness, who observed the accident, testified on direct examination that the defendant's car ran the red light. The witness is now being cross-examined as follows:

- Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Mr. Wilbur, you say you saw the big black car run through that red light?
- A. Yes.
- Q. The day after the collision an investigator came to your home?
- A. That's right.
- Q. You talked to him about the accident?
- A. Right.
- Q. And you signed a one-page statement stating what you saw?
- A. Right.
- Q. Let me show you that statement, which has been marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 3. That's your signature on the bottom, isn't it?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Didn't you say in your signed statement: "I didn't really see the traffic light until afterwards, but I assumed the big black car must have run the red light."?
- A. That's what I said.

When the plaintiff rests, the defendant moves for a judgment as a matter of law.

Defendant: There is no evidence my client went through the red light. The only eyewitness to the accident, Mr. Wilbur, told the investigator he did not see the light until after the collision.

Should the Judge grant Defendant's motion for a judgment as a matter of law? Explain your answer.

QUESTION SEVEN:

After Paul and Angie are involved in an automobile accident, Angie approaches Paul and says, "You ran that red light." Paul remains silent.

At trial, Angie wants to introduce evidence of Paul's silence to prove he ran the red light.

Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION EIGHT:

In a Paternity action, the mother, Jennifer, seeks to introduce a letter from the defendant's attorney in which the attorney stated that his client, Pablo, had admitted that he was the child's father. This letter is offered to prove that the defendant is the father of the child.

Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION NINE:

Mark was driving his car and had stopped at a traffic light. After waiting for a period of time, the driver in the car behind him honked his horn. Immediately after this occurred, cars going in opposite directions collided in the intersection. Jessie, a passenger in the car with Mark, who did not see the color of the light, is asked to testify about what the driver behind Mark had done, for the purpose of proving that the light had turned green in the direction that Mark was traveling.

Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION TEN:

This is a rape case. Martha has alleged that her estranged husband forced her to have sexual intercourse against her wishes. Martha filed a complaint with the District Attorney's Office and her husband, Rob Blake, was arraigned in the Superior Court. One month later, Blake was so enraged that he drove to Martha's house and shot her in the chest. A next-door neighbor rushed to her house after hearing gunshots. The neighbor heard Martha say as she was dying, "Get me a priest. I know I am dying. I should have been a more understanding wife, but my husband didn't have to shoot me."

Is the above statement admissible by the defendant? Is it hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION ELEVEN:

Mandy called 911 complaining that her ex-boyfriend just broke into her house and was beating her. The 911 operator asked Mandy a series of questions which led Mandy to identify her attacker as Mario Jones. Mario was later arrested and charged with violating a domestic no contact order.

At trial, Mandy did not appear as a witness. The prosecution sought to introduce that portion of the 911 tape in which Mandy identified Mario as her attacker.

The Court, over the Defendant's objection, and allowed the tapes into evidence.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer in detail.

QUESTION TWELVE:

COMPARE AND CONTRAST "Admissions" with "Declarations Against Interest" setting forth the elements of each.

QUESTION THIRTEEN:

The police raid Katie's residence on a tip that it is a betting establishment. The local minister observes the raid and calls the telephone number listed for Katie. When an unfamiliar voice answers, the minister assumes it is the police and states, "I'm glad you people finally realized that Katie's place is a betting establishment. Good work!" The prosecution subsequently offers the minister's statement at Katie's trial to prove the residence is being used as a betting establishment.

Is the statement hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FOURTEEN:

Defendant is charged with theft of the owner's car. Defendant's defense is that he had the owner's consent. At trial, defendant calls a witness who testifies as follows:

Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Mr. Avery, were you at the party?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you see my client, Chris Johnson, and the owner, Bobby Franklin, talking that evening?

A. Yes.

Q. Where and when was that?

A. It was around 11:00 p.m. in the kitchen. There was just me and the two of them.

Q. What did Bobby Franklin say at the time?

Prosecutor: Objection, Your Honor.

Judge: What's the basis for your objection?

Prosecutor: It's hearsay, Your Honor.

Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.

A. Bobby said to Chris, "You can take my car to pick up the beer."

Was the Judge's ruling correct? Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FIFTEEN:

James Kelly, a state senator, was indicted for extortion induced under color of authority. To establish that the victims of Kelly's alleged extortion scheme feared official retribution should they have failed to comply with Kelly's requests, an essential element of the crime charged, the Government seeks to introduce a letter that one of the victims had written to his business associate in which the victim explained: "Kelly seems to have us over a barrel on this one. If we don't give his nephew a job, we may have several of our contracts with the state canceled, or worse. You know these politicians, they don't get mad, they just get even."

Is the above statement admissible at trial. Explain your answer.

QUESTION SIXTEEN:

Shawn is prosecuted for allegedly battering Bobbi on a Colorado ski slope. The only eyewitness is Shawn's sister, Sandy. The prosecutor calls Sandy as a witness. On direct examination, the prosecutor questions Sandy.

Q. (By prosecutor) Sandy, you are the sister of the defendant, Shawn, correct?

Defense counsel: Objection. The question is misleading and therefore improper.

a. **How should the Court rule? Explain.**

Q. Sandy, are you currently facing a criminal charge of attempted murder?

Defense counsel: Objection.

b. **How should the Court rule? Explain.**

Prosecutor: Have any deals been made in return for your testimony?

Defense Counsel: Objection!

c. **How should the Court rule? Explain.**

QUESTION SEVENTEEN:

A University School of Law student was recently raped while studying late at night in the library. The University hired an outside consulting firm to prepare a report on what steps, if any, the school could take to avoid future such incidents. The consultant recommended that the library be locked during night hours; that only students, faculty and staff have keys; that locks be changed each semester; and that video cameras and emergency alarm buttons be installed on every floor. However, none of these changes have been implemented. The rape victim sues the University for damages and seeks to offer the report into evidence.

Ignoring hearsay issues, should the University's objection be sustained or overruled?

QUESTION EIGHTEEN:

Dan is charged with murdering Anna. Consider the following two potential items of evidence:

1. The prosecution calls Anna's friend, Ellen, to testify that "I talked to Anna on the morning of the day that she was killed. During that conversation, Anna told me that Dan had visited her the day before and said that he was going to kill her."

Is Ellen's testimony admissible? Explain.

2. The prosecution calls Anna's friend Ellen to testify that "I talked to Anna on the morning of the day that she was killed. During that conversation, Anna told me that after I left she was going to pay a visit to Dan."

Is Ellen's testimony hearsay? Explain.

QUESTION NINETEEN:

Oriana attends a dinner party and sees an old friend, Dr. Hurley. Oriana has never been a patient of Dr. Hurley, an internist. However, from time to time when they have been together on social occasions, Oriana has talked to Dr. Hurley about personal medical concerns. At the dinner party, Oriana tells Dr. Hurley that "I've been getting really bad headaches for a few weeks now, they started when that auto paint shop opened up next to where I live. Do you think I should wait to see if they go away, or should I make an appointment with my doctor?" Sometime later, Oriana files suit against the auto paint shop.

Is Oriana's statement to Dr. Hurley admissible?

QUESTION TWENTY:

In a complex commercial litigation case, the plaintiff offers various items in evidence. **What would the plaintiff have to do, if anything, to authenticate the following evidence? Explain.**

- a. A telephone conversation.
- b. A business associate's handwriting.
- c. A *Newsweek* magazine.
- d. A Diet Coke label.
- e. A photograph of the defendant.

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW
EVIDENCE
CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION
DECEMBER 9, 2008
PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI

DO NOT OPEN THE TEST BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: _____

This is a three-hour examination. Your success on this examination will depend on your careful analysis of the questions and the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended "treatises" on the areas of law presented by these questions, and you should, therefore, avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question.

QUESTIONS WILL BE WEIGHED AT 5 POINTS EACH

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from other sections unless all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action, which shall include expulsion from MSL.

WHEN FINISHED, CHECK TO MAKE SURE YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER IS ON THIS TEST BOOKLET AND YOUR BLUE BOOK(S).

MAKE SURE YOU NUMBER EACH BLUE BOOK SEQUENTIALLY (EXAMPLE, BOOK 1 OF 2, BOOK 2 OF 2) AND INCLUDE WHETHER YOU ARE ENROLLED IN THE DAY OR EVENING CLASS.

PLACE THE EXAM INSIDE YOUR BLUE BOOK AND HAND IN ALL.

BEST WISHES FOR A HAPPY HOLIDAY
AND FOR A PROFESSIONAL CAREER THAT IS FULFILLING AND REWARDING!

ESSAY QUESTIONS

ANSWER EACH QUESTION IN DETAIL APPLYING THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE. BE SURE TO NUMBER YOUR ANSWERS IN YOUR BLUE BOOK TO CORRESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE EXAM

QUESTION ONE:

This is a civil action on a life insurance policy. The principal issue at trial is whether policy exclusion applies to prevent payment on the policy. The insurance company cannot find the original policy, which should have been in the policyholder's file. At a bench trial, the insurance company calls as a witness the manager of the claims department. The following then happens:

Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Ms. Walker, did you look for the executed original of the plaintiff's policy with your company?

A. I did, and the people in my department did. The executed original should be in the policyholder's file. We looked in all the places it might have been misfiled, but weren't able to locate it. I have no idea what happened to it.

[Defendant's lawyer has exhibit marked and shows it to opposing counsel.]

Q. I'm showing you Defendant's Exhibit No. 2. Please examine it for a moment. What kind of document is that?

A. It's one of our standard life insurance contracts.

Q. Was that the standard policy your company used at the time you insured the plaintiff?

A. Yes, that's our standard life insurance policy, which we've used for several years, including the year we insured the plaintiff.

Defendant: We offer Defendant's Exhibit No. 2.

Plaintiff: We object, Your Honor.

How should the Court rule? Explain your answer.

QUESTION TWO:

This is a robbery prosecution. The victim testifies on direct as follows:

Q. (By prosecutor) Ms. Adams, do you see the man who robbed you in court today?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Please point to him and describe what he's wearing.

A. He's the man right over there (pointing to the defendant) wearing the brown pants and white shirt.

Prosecutor: May the record show that the witness has pointed to the defendant?

Judge: Yes.

Q. Ms. Adams, you also attended a lineup?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you identify anyone?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you tell the detective at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, Your Honor. It's hearsay.

Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.

A. I told the detective that the defendant, who was one of the people in the lineup, was the one who robbed me.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

QUESTION THREE:

Same case as QUESTION TWO. The victim has no memory of the lineup and has been unable to identify anyone in court. The prosecution calls a detective as its next witness:

Q. (By prosecutor) Detective Peterson, you ran the lineup?

A. I did.

Q. The victim, Ms. Adams, was present?

A. She was.

Q. What did Ms. Adams tell you at the lineup?

Defendant: Objection, it's hearsay.

Judge: Sustained. Move on to another topic.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FOUR:

This is a child molestation prosecution against the victim's stepfather. At trial, the prosecution calls the victim's treating physician. During the doctor's direct examination, the following happens:

Q. (By prosecutor) Dr. Williams, did you talk to Mary when you examined her?

A. Yes.

Q. Tell us what Mary said.

Defendant: Objection, Your Honor.

Judge: Overruled.

A. That her stepfather had fondled her.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Is this hearsay, non-hearsay, or an exception? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FIVE:

Jane was found murdered in the parking lot at WalMart. The police suspected her boyfriend, Ken Mitchell, as a suspect. When the police arrived at Mitchell's apartment, they observed him lying on the family room floor, dead from a bullet wound to his head in an apparent suicide. Next to the body was Ken's computer, which was still on at the time. The police observed a message on the screen, which read as follows:

"I cannot live with myself anymore because I killed my girlfriend Jane in WalMart's parking lot."

Jane's estate has brought a wrongful death claim against Ken's estate. Is the above statement admissible at trial?

QUESTION SIX:

This is an automobile negligence case. A witness, who observed the accident, testified on direct examination that the defendant's car ran the red light. The witness is now being cross-examined as follows:

- Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Mr. Wilbur, you say you saw the big black car run through that red light?
- A. Yes.
- Q. The day after the collision an investigator came to your home?
- A. That's right.
- Q. You talked to him about the accident?
- A. Right.
- Q. And you signed a one-page statement stating what you saw?
- A. Right.
- Q. Let me show you that statement, which has been marked Defendant's Exhibit No. 3. That's your signature on the bottom, isn't it?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Didn't you say in your signed statement: "I didn't really see the traffic light until afterwards, but I assumed the big black car must have run the red light."
- A. That's what I said.

When the plaintiff rests, the defendant moves for a judgment as a matter of law.

Defendant: There is no evidence my client went through the red light. The only eyewitness to the accident, Mr. Wilbur, told the investigator he did not see the light until after the collision.

Should the Judge grant Defendant's motion for a judgment as a matter of law? Explain your answer.

QUESTION SEVEN:

After Danilo and Anya are involved in an automobile accident, Anya approaches Danilo and says, "You ran that red light." Danilo remains silent.

At trial, Anya wants to introduce evidence of Danilo's silence to prove he ran the red light.

Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION EIGHT:

Lee was involved in an automobile accident on Route 495. At the scene, Lee's body was placed in a hearse and then driven away to the morgue. Can this be used as evidence of his death?

Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION NINE:

This is a medical malpractice case brought against a doctor as a result of a surgical procedure. The defendant claims the plaintiff's injuries were caused by a nurse's negligence. At trial, the defendant intends to call a witness who will testify that the nurse, immediately after the surgery, stated, "I made a big mistake in there."

Is the above statement admissible by the defendant? Is it hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION TEN:

This is a rape case. Margaret has alleged that her estranged husband forced her to have sexual intercourse against her wishes. Margaret filed a complaint with the District Attorney's Office and her husband, Dale Blake, was arraigned in the Superior Court. One month later, Blake was so enraged that he drove to Margaret's house and shot her in the chest. A next-door neighbor rushed to her house after hearing gunshots. The neighbor heard Margaret say as she was dying, "Get me a priest. I know I am dying. I should have been a more understanding wife, but my husband didn't have to shoot me."

Is the above statement admissible by the defendant? Is it hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION ELEVEN:

Stacey called 911 complaining that her ex-boyfriend has just broke into her house and was beating her. The 911 operator asked Stacy a series of questions which led Stacey to identify her attacker as Patrick Smith. Patrick was later arrested and charged with violating a domestic no contact order.

At trial, Stacey did not appear as a witness. The prosecution sought to introduce that portion of the 911 tape in which Stacy identified Patrick as her attacker.

The Court, over the Defendant's objection, allowed the tapes into evidence.

Was the Court's ruling correct? Explain your answer in detail.

QUESTION TWELVE:

Glen is charged with murdering Kim, a prostitute. The defense seeks to show that Kim had been blackmailing a number of her clients, to show that others had a motive to kill her. As evidence that Kim had been blackmailing clients, the defense seeks to offer into evidence a portion of her diary detailing clients' names, the amounts of money she had demanded that the clients pay her, the dates of the demands and any payments made by the clients. The prosecutor objects that the diary is inadmissible hearsay. The defense argues that Rule 803(6) business records applies.

How should the judge rule and why?

QUESTION THIRTEEN:

Billy Bob tells Tattle Tale, "You remember when I wrote my will, the witnesses weren't really there when I signed it." Billy Bob dies. Tattle Tale takes the stand in a probate contest.

Is the statement hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FOURTEEN:

Defendant is charged with theft of the owner's car. Defendant's defense is that he had the owner's consent. At trial, defendant calls a witness who testifies as follows:

- Q. (By defendant's lawyer) Mr. Avery, were you at the party?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see my client, Chris Johnson, and the owner, Bobby Franklin, talking that evening?
A. Yes.
Q. Where and when was that?
A. It was around 11:00 p.m. in the kitchen. There was just me and the two of them.
Q. What did Bobby Franklin say at the time?
Prosecutor: Objection, Your Honor.
Judge: What's the basis for your objection?
Prosecutor: It's hearsay, Your Honor.
Judge: Overruled. The witness may answer.
A. Bobby said to Chris, "You can take my car to pick up the beer."

Was the Judge's ruling correct? Is this hearsay? Explain your answer.

QUESTION FIFTEEN:

Carolyn testified in a commercial litigation action.

Which of the following questions are permissible during the cross-examination of Carolyn? Explain.

- a. "You used your personal computer to make notes of the meeting with the opposing party two days after the meeting occurred, not immediately thereafter, as you testified on direct examination, isn't that right?"
- b. "You have a Macintosh computer, not a Dell as you just testified on direct, isn't that correct?"
- c. "You left your office last Wednesday at 5:30 p.m., not 7:30 p.m. as you testified on direct examination, right?"
- d. "Your boss, Ms. Sanders, was wrong when she testified that she deposited the March proceeds on March 4th, wasn't she?"
- e. "Isn't it true that you are one big liar?"

QUESTION SIXTEEN:

Shawn is prosecuted for allegedly battering Bobbi on a Colorado ski slope. The only eyewitness is Shawn's sister, Sandy. The prosecutor calls Sandy as a witness. On direct examination, the prosecutor questions Sandy.

Q. (By prosecutor) Sandy, you are the sister of the defendant, Shawn, correct?

Defense counsel: Objection. The question is misleading and therefore improper.

a. **How should the Court rule? Explain.**

Q. Sandy, are you currently facing a criminal charge of attempted murder?

Defense counsel: Objection.

b. **How should the Court rule? Explain.**

Prosecutor: Have any deals been made in return for your testimony?

Defense Counsel: Objection!

c. **How should the Court rule? Explain.**

QUESTION SEVENTEEN:

A University School of Law student was recently raped while studying late at night in the library. The University hired an outside consulting firm to prepare a report on what steps, if any, the school could take to avoid future such incidents. The consultant recommended that the library be locked during night hours; that only students, faculty and staff have keys; that locks be changed each semester; and that video cameras and emergency alarm buttons be installed on every floor. However, none of these changes have been implemented. The rape victim sues the University for damages and seeks to offer the report into evidence.

Ignoring hearsay issues, should the University's objection be sustained or overruled?

QUESTION EIGHTEEN:

Dale is charged with murdering Jennifer. Consider the following two potential items of evidence:

1. The prosecution calls Jennifer's friend, Marjie, to testify that "I talked to Jennifer on the morning of the day that she was killed. During that conversation, Jennifer told me that Dale had visited her the day before and said that he was going to kill her.

Is Marjie's testimony admissible? Explain.

2. The prosecution calls Jennifer's friend Marjie to testify that "I talked to Jennifer on the morning of the day that she was killed. During that conversation, Jennifer told me that after I left she was going to pay a visit to Dale."

Is Marjie's testimony hearsay? Explain.

QUESTION NINETEEN:

Ashley attends a dinner party and sees an old friend, Dr. Marie. Ashley has never been a patient of Dr. Marie, an internist. However, from time to time when they have been together on social occasions, Ashley has talked to Dr. Marie about personal medical concerns. At the dinner party, Ashley tells Dr. Marie that "I've been getting really bad headaches for a few weeks now. They started when that auto paint shop opened up next to where I live. Do you think I should wait to see if they go away, or should I make an appointment with my doctor?" Sometime later, Ashley files suit against the auto paint shop.

Is Ashley's statement to Dr. Marie admissible?

QUESTION TWENTY:

In a complex commercial litigation case, the plaintiff offers various items in evidence. **What would the plaintiff have to do, if anything, to authenticate the following evidence? Explain.**

- a. A telephone conversation.
- b. A business associate's handwriting.
- c. A *Newsweek* magazine.
- d. A Diet Coke.
- e. A photograph of the defendant.

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW
EVIDENCE
CLOSED BOOK FINAL EXAMINATION
DECEMBER 14, 1992
PROFESSOR ANTHONY A. COPANI

DO NOT OPEN THE TEST BOOKLET UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.

WRITE YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: _____

This is a three-hour examination consisting of three questions. Your success on this examination will depend in large measure on your careful analysis of the questions and on the structure of your answers. There will be no credit given for extended "treatises" on the areas of the law presented by those questions, and you should, therefore, attempt to avoid any rambling discourses. However, you should discuss with adequate particularity the issues and the applicable law for each question.

Please indicate jurisdictional differences, if applicable, when analyzing fact patterns.

Please budget your time carefully. Credit will be given for clarity of your analysis.

Questions will be weighed as follows:

MULTISTATE QUESTIONS (20)	20%
ESSAY QUESTION ONE	40%
ESSAY QUESTION TWO	40%

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination. Nor are you to discuss this examination with students from the other section unless all examinations have been completed by all sections. Nor should you discuss this examination with a student who has not taken this exam during its regularly scheduled time because of an excused absence. Infractions of the above will subject any students involved to disciplinary action which shall include expulsion from MSL.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. MULTIPLE CHOICE

- A. READ EACH QUESTION THOROUGHLY AND CHOOSE THE BEST ANSWER.
- B. CIRCLE THE ANSWER ON THE EXAM THAT YOU BELIEVE IS THE BEST ONE.
- C. USE PENCIL AND REMEMBER TO ERASE COMPLETELY IF YOU WISH TO CHANGE YOUR ANSWER.
- D. NO CREDIT WILL BE GIVEN FOR MULTIPLE ANSWERS IF YOU FAIL TO ERASE.

2. ESSAY QUESTIONS

- A. WRITE LEGIBLY.
- B. USE PEN.

3. WHEN FINISHED, CHECK TO MAKE SURE YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER IS ON THIS TEST BOOKLET AND YOUR BLUE BOOK.

PLACE THE EXAM INSIDE YOUR BLUE BOOK AND HAND IT IN.

1. Kramden was involved in an accident with Norton at the intersection of Tremont and Broadway. Kramden sustained a fractured skull and broken neck. Trixie was one of the eyewitnesses to the accident.

At trial, Trixie was called as a witness by Kramden. Trixie testified as a lay witness, without objection, that based on her observations, she thought that Norton was at fault in the accident. On cross-examination, Norton's attorney asked her if she had a conversation with anyone at the accident scene. Trixie replied affirmatively. Norton's counsel asked Trixie the following: "Please tell the court what the other person said was the cause of this accident."

Kramden's counsel objected to the question. The objection should be:

- A. sustained, unless the other party is shown to be unavailable to testify.
 - B. sustained, because the other party's statement is hearsay, and not within any recognized exception.
 - C. overruled, because the other party's statement may contradict the testimony of Trixie.
 - D. overruled, because Kramden has laid the foundation for such rebuttal by eliciting testimony from Trixie.
2. Weld is suing Cellucci for injuries to his back received in an automobile accident. Cellucci calls Dr. Peter Envy who testifies that he saw Weld two months before the accident and Weld stated that his back hurt him so bad, he was forced to quit his job. Weld also stated that his back had been bad since he had injured it in an accident with Bulger four years prior to this occurrence.

Dr. Envy's testimony should be:

- A. excluded, because Bulger is available as a witness.
- B. excluded, because it is hearsay not within any exception.
- C. admitted, because it is a statement of present sense impression.
- D. admitted, because it is a statement given for the purpose of diagnosis and treatment.

3. In a suit by Silber against the Jacobson Insurance Company, notice of a claim is an essential element of Silber's case. Silber has filed a motion for Jacobson to produce the original notice and Jacobson has answered that she is unable to locate same.

At trial, Silber calls his secretary, Maitre. Maitre testifies that he does not remember specifically mailing the notice of the claim, but has in his possession a copy of the letter which was found in the file in Silber's office. Maitre further testifies that it is his custom and practice to place a copy of each piece of correspondence, after he has mailed, it in the appropriate file.

Maitre's testimony should be:

- A. admissible because it falls within the business records exception to the hearsay rule.
 - B. admissible as evidence of business routine tending to show that the letter was actually mailed.
 - C. inadmissible because there is no corroborating evidence of the business routine.
 - D. inadmissible because its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value.
4. If Maitre properly identifies the copy of the document he had in his possession, it should be:
- A. admissible, because it comes within the business record exception to the hearsay rule.
 - B. admissible, because secondary evidence is admissible in this instance.
 - C. inadmissible, because it is hearsay.
 - D. inadmissible, because its prejudicial effect is outweighed by its probative value.
5. In a medical malpractice suit in Federal District Court, Dr. Ray Dick Ulopathy is called as an expert witness in neurology by the plaintiff. Dr. Ulopathy testified regarding the standard of care in treatment of a spinal cord injury patient, a relevant issue in the case. On cross-examination, Dr. Ulopathy is asked by defense counsel if he recognizes a medical textbook written by Dr. Turner Headankoff, as being one of the medical publications he relied upon in reaching his opinion as to the standard of care. Dr. Ulopathy answered in the negative.

Defense counsel then offers to read relevant passages from the textbook which directly contradict the opinion given by Dr. Ulopathy. Plaintiff's counsel objects. The trial judge should:

- A. sustain the objection, because the prejudicial effect is outweighed by the probative value.
- B. sustain the objection, because the textbook is hearsay and not within any exception.
- C. overrule the objection, because Dr. Ulopathy did not identify the book as one on which he relied in giving his opinion.
- D. overrule the objection, because the author is unavailable to testify.

6. Defense counsel then offers the medical textbook into evidence and Plaintiff's counsel objects. The trial judge should:
- A. sustain the objection, because the prejudicial effect is outweighed by the probative value.
 - B. sustain the objection, because the textbook is hearsay and not within any exception.
 - C. overrule the objection, because Dr. Ulopathy did not identify the book as one on which he relied in giving his opinion.
 - D. overrule the objection, because the author is unavailable to testify.

7. Clinton was charged with the murder of Bush. Clinton claimed that Bush was the aggressor and that he acted in self-defense.

The prosecution has called Gore as a witness. Gore has offered to testify that he has known Clinton for many years and that, in his opinion, Clinton has a reputation for being violent and displaying aggressive behavior. The trial judge should:

- A. admit the testimony, if it can be corroborated that Bush knew of Clinton's reputation.
- B. admit the testimony, because it is more probative than prejudicial.
- C. deny the testimony, because it attacks Clinton's character when it has not been placed in issue.
- D. deny the testimony, because Clinton's character may be proven only by reputation after a proper foundation was laid.

8. Quayle was called by Clinton to testify that Bush had a reputation as a brawling hothead and frequently provoked fights. The trial judge should:

- A. deny the testimony because it is more prejudicial than probative
- B. deny the testimony because Clinton did not lay the proper foundation.
- C. admit the testimony because it proves that Bush was the aggressor.
- D. admit the testimony because character may be proven by specific acts of conduct.

9. On cross-examination, Quayle is asked by the prosecutor if he was convicted of shoplifting nine years ago. Clinton's counsel objects. The trial judge should:

- A. sustain the objection, because the prejudicial effect is outweighed by the probative value.
- B. overrule the objection, because the conviction is within ten years of the time of testimony.
- C. overrule the objection, because it goes to the ultimate issue in the case.
- D. sustain the objection, because the offense is not a felony or otherwise admissible for impeachment purposes.

Oscar Madison, a minor, suffered permanent head injuries as a result of being hit by a car driven by defendant Jones. Oscar's father commences this action as a parent in his own right and on behalf of his son.

10. At trial, Plaintiff's attorney called the only witness to the accident, Buddy Brown, aged 7, Oscar's playmate who was four years of age at the time of the accident. The Court should rule that Buddy Brown would be:

- A. competent to testify, since he had personal knowledge of the accident.
- B. competent to testify, since a seven year old is presumed to be chronologically mature.
- C. incompetent, if he lacked the capacity to perceive and relate the accident at the time of its occurrence.
- D. incompetent, since all children under the age of ten are deemed incompetent to testify.

11. Oscar's mother is then called to testify on her conversation with the Defendant at the hospital where her son was rushed immediately following the accident. Defendant told Mrs. Madison, "Don't worry, my insurance company will offer to settle this case because it was my fault. My agent says the company will offer at least \$100,000." If offered into evidence, the court will most likely rule that Mrs. Madison's statement is:

- A. admissible, on the issue of Defendant's negligence.
- B. admissible to show that Defendant is able to pay for the damages to the plaintiff.
- C. inadmissible, since the testimony was highly prejudicial.
- D. admissible, only to prove ownership or control of the vehicle.

In an action for malpractice, Boggs sued Dr. Gorman claiming that the latter failed to properly diagnose his emphysema condition. Boggs contends that he went to Dr. Gorman for a medical examination after experiencing chest pains and shortness of breath. However, Dr. Gorman found no evidence of the disease and advised him that he was probably suffering from indigestion. Thereafter, Boggs was examined by Dr. Yawkey who discovered that Boggs in fact was suffering from a chronic case of emphysema.

12. At trial, Boggs calls Dr. Yawkey as his first witness. Dr. Yawkey proposes to testify that the x-rays of Bogg's lungs showed that his respiratory organs were marked by distension which was characteristic of emphysema. Upon objection by Dr. Gorman's attorney, Dr. Yawkey's testimony should be:

- A. admitted, because a doctor is properly qualified as an expert in medical matters.
- B. admitted, because Dr. Yawkey followed accepted medical practice in arriving at his opinion.
- C. excluded, because his opinion is based upon facts not in evidence.
- D. excluded, because the x-rays are the best evidence to show the distension of Black's lungs.

6. Defense counsel then offers the medical textbook into evidence and Plaintiff's counsel objects. The trial judge should:
- A. sustain the objection, because the prejudicial effect is outweighed by the probative value.
 - B. sustain the objection, because the textbook is hearsay and not within any exception.
 - C. overrule the objection, because Dr. Ulopathy did not identify the book as one on which he relied in giving his opinion.
 - D. overrule the objection, because the author is unavailable to testify.
7. Clinton was charged with the murder of Bush. Clinton claimed that Bush was the aggressor and that he acted in self-defense. The prosecution has called Gore as a witness. Gore has offered to testify that he has known Clinton for many years and that, in his opinion, Clinton has a reputation for being violent and displaying aggressive behavior. The trial judge should:
- A. admit the testimony, if it can be corroborated that Bush knew of Clinton's reputation.
 - B. admit the testimony, because it is more probative than prejudicial.
 - C. deny the testimony, because it attacks Clinton's character when it has not been placed in issue.
 - D. deny the testimony, because Clinton's character may be proven only by reputation after a proper foundation was laid.
8. Quayle was called by Clinton to testify that Bush had a reputation as a brawling hothead and frequently provoked fights. The trial judge should:
- A. deny the testimony because it is more prejudicial than probative
 - B. deny the testimony because Clinton did not lay the proper foundation.
 - C. admit the testimony because it proves that Bush was the aggressor.
 - D. admit the testimony because character may be proven by specific acts of conduct.
9. On cross-examination, Quayle is asked by the prosecutor if he was convicted of shoplifting nine years ago. Clinton's counsel objects. The trial judge should:
- A. sustain the objection, because the prejudicial effect is outweighed by the probative value.
 - B. overrule the objection, because the conviction is within ten years of the time of testimony.
 - C. overrule the objection, because it goes to the ultimate issue in the case.
 - D. sustain the objection, because the offense is not a felony or otherwise admissible for impeachment purposes.

Popeye brings an action against the administrator of his Uncle Bluto's estate based upon a contract for services rendered in the management of his Uncle's property. In order to rebut the presumption that the services rendered were gratuitous, since Popeye was a relative of Uncle Bluto, Popeye called his sister-in-law, Olive, as a witness. Assume that his jurisdiction has a relevant dead man's statute in effect.

13. Olive testified that she had lived in Popeye's house, knew his Uncle Bluto, and that she was familiar with Bluto's handwriting. Popeye's attorney asked her to look at a letter and to tell the Court whether it was written by Uncle Bluto. Upon objection by the attorney for the administrator of the estate, the trial judge would likely:
 - A. sustain the objection, since Olive is not a handwriting expert.
 - B. sustain the objection, because of the Dead Man's Rule.
 - C. overrule the objection, since the letter qualifies as a past recollection recorded, in exception to the hearsay rule.
 - D. overrule the objection, since an authenticating witness need not be an expert if familiar with the handwriting of the person in question.
14. Olive testified further concerning the contents of the letters and a telegram sent by Bluto to his nephew, in which he stated that he would pay Popeye for his management services. She stated that "she had responded to the Uncle's request for Popeye since he was away at the time." She also said "that she has made copies of the letters and the telegram for Popeye's files." However, the letters, the telegram, and the copies of this correspondence were destroyed inadvertently because of a fire in Popeye's house. The trial judge should rule that Olive's testimony is:
 - A. admissible as secondary evidence under the circumstances.
 - B. admissible as a written admission by the party opponent.
 - C. inadmissible under the Dead Man's Rule.
 - D. inadmissible, because it violated the Best Evidence Rule.

Plaintiff Orr was seriously injured in a collision involving three trucks. A sideswipe occurred between Orr's pick-up truck and a trailer driven by Park as they passed in opposite directions on Route 141. The sideswipe caused Orr's truck to careen down the road and into the path of a third trailer truck operated by Esposito. Orr was immediately killed. Both of the tractor trailer trucks were owned by Sinden Transport Company.

15. At trial, Orr called Cashman, a witness to the collision to testify that he heard an unidentified female witness scream, "Oh my God, that trailer truck sideswiped that little pick-up truck." The trial judge should rule Cashman's testimony:
 - A. admissible as a declaration of existing state of mind.
 - B. inadmissible as hearsay, not within any of the exceptions.
 - C. inadmissible, because it contains inadmissible opinion evidence.
 - D. admissible as excited utterance.

16. Orr further offers that testimony of Hodge, in which he stated that "Park, driver of the trailer truck, ran over to Orr as he was lying on the ground awaiting an ambulance, and said "it is all my fault, I should have been paying more attention to my driving." Assume for this question that Sinden Transport Company is the defendant and that Park is available to testify. The trial judge should rule that the testimony is:
- A. admissible as a declaration against interest.
 - B. admissible as a present sense impression.
 - C. admissible as a vicarious admission.
 - D. inadmissible as hearsay, not within any of the exceptions.
17. Assume that Sinden Transport Company's insurer pays for Plaintiff's hospital bills. Plaintiff's attorney offers the receipts of these bills as evidence to show admission of liability of the company for Park's negligent operation of the trailer truck. On objection to this offer of proof, the court should:
- A. sustain the objection, since the payment of medical expenses is not admissible to prove liability.
 - B. sustain the objection, since the prejudice in admitting the receipts outweighs their probative value.
 - C. overrule the objection, since Park admitted liability.
 - D. overrule the objection, because it violates the Best Evidence Rule.
18. Assume for the purposes of this question only that one week after the accident, Sinden Transport Company hired Smith, a traffic engineer expert to conduct an investigation. He immediately took photographs of the damaged vehicles which were in substantially the same condition as they were following the accident. During the trial, Smith was called to testify. As he was reconstructing the accident scene, the Company's attorney offered the photographs taken by Smith into evidence. On objection by the Plaintiff's attorney to this evidence, the trial judge should:
- A. admit the photographs since Smith was qualified as an expert witness.
 - B. admit the photographs as demonstrative evidence, since they accurately portrayed the damage caused by the collision.
 - C. admit the photographs as secondary evidence.
 - D. admit none of the photographs, since they were taken one week after the accident.

19. Cagle and Copani were involved in an automobile accident in which Cagle was injured and his ostrich boots were ruined. Copani was tried for driving while intoxicated. At the trial of Copani, the prosecutor called Coyne as a witness. Coyne testified that Copani had driven through a red light prior to the accident. On cross-examination by Copani's attorney, Coyne admitted that he told Velvel that he did not know what color the light was when Copani went through it. "

The trial judge should:

- A. admit the statement of Coyne to Velvel as substantive evidence.
 - B. admit the statement only if it is corroborated by Velvel.
 - C. instruct the jury, upon proper request, that the prior inconsistent statement of Coyne to Velvel is to be admitted for impeachment purposes only, and not as substantive evidence.
 - D. instruct the jury, upon proper request, that the testimony of Coyne regarding the statement to Velvel, be disregarded.
20. Cagle subsequently sued Copani for the physical injuries to his back which forced him to occasionally use a cane while teaching and for his subsequent manic depression and eventual psychotic breakdown over the loss of his boots. At the civil trial, Coyne was outside the jurisdiction of the court and would not testify.

Cagle's attorney and guardian, Thomas Kiley, offered a transcript of Coyne's testimony at the civil trial. The evidence is:

- A. admissible as past recollection recorded.
- B. admissible as prior recorded hearsay.
- C. inadmissible because it is hearsay, not within any exception.
- D. inadmissible because its prejudicial effect is outweighed by its probative value.

ESSAY QUESTION ONE:

Brady Cardia consulted Dr. Izzy Skemia, a cardiologist, because of fainting spells. Dr. Skemia diagnosed Brady's condition as right bundle branch block, a cardiac condition that caused the heart to stop beating intermittently and made Brady faint.

Dr. Skemia recommended the implementation of a permanent cardiac pacemaker for treatment of the condition. Because the implementation of a pacemaker was a surgical procedure, Dr. Skemia arranged for the surgery to be performed on Brady by Dr. Claude E. Cator, a thoracic (chest) surgeon. Brady consulted Dr. Cator and the surgery was scheduled at St. Timothy the Benevolent Hospital.

On November 10, 1991, Dr. Cator implanted a pacemaker manufactured by Creve Coeur, Inc., a company with corporate headquarters located in another jurisdiction. Brady was scheduled to receive Creve Coeur's model, the "Lazarus", which was a dual chambered, atrial tracking, telemetry equipped device considered to be the state-of-the-art in the pacemaker industry. Instead, due to a mislabeling problem, he had a model implanted known by the generic name "Nova" that had been manufactured by four different manufacturers and had also been obsolete for several years. "Nova" models had not been regularly distributed in the stream of commerce since 1988, when a particular lot of product had been recalled by the Food and Drug Administration for premature battery failure. Creve Coeur and the other companies had been ordered to destroy all remaining supplies but Creve Coeur had not done so.

After the surgery, Brady was taken to recovery. While recording notations in his chart, the nurse reviewed the literature that had accompanied the pacemaker and discovered the mistake. He immediately called Dr. Skemia, who screamed into the telephone.

"That Goddam Cator should be suspended from practice for not checking the label!"

Skemia then left for the hospital to see Brady. Before he arrived, Brady awoke in recovery. The defective pacer began to skip beats and Brady fainted. Just before he lost consciousness, he whispered to the nurse,

"I think it's all over for me. I wish I wouldn't have taken that money that Tachy is accused of stealing from Copani Enterprises. When I wake up, I'm going to call the DA and clear his name."

Tachy Cardia was Brady's brother and scheduled to go to trial the following week for embezzlement of company funds from his employer, Copani Enterprises.

When Dr. Skemia arrived at the hospital, Brady's body was being taken to the morgue. Enraged, Skemia confronted Cator in front of a technician and screamed,

"Cator, it looks like you're still on the take from Creve Coeur for implanting those outdated pacers!"

Cator replied, "Don't act so high and mighty, you hypocritical sonofabitch! I gave you half of the money I got!"

Dr. Skemia remained silent. Dr. Cator died one week before trial. The attorney for his estate, Lou Pole, called Will I.

Stuffum, vice president of Creve Coeur, as a witness. Pole showed Stuffum the pacemaker that had been explanted from Brady and asked if it was manufactured by Creve Coeur. Stuffum replied in the negative. On the bottom of the can was a heart with a lightning bolt, the corporate symbol of Creve Coeur. Pole then introduced the can into evidence.

Pole then asked Stuffum if Creve Coeur had received a notice from the government requiring destruction of all remaining "Nova" pacemakers. Stuffum replied in the negative. Pole then introduced into evidence a copy of an official government record referencing the notice.

Pole then asked Stuffum if he had even been employed by the Heart Break Corporation, another pacemaker company. Stuffum replied in the affirmative. Pole then asked Stuffum if he was fired from Heart Break for sending pacemakers with defective circuits to hospitals after Heart Break discovered the problem. Stuffum answered in the negative. Pole then introduced a carbon copy of a memo from the payroll department of Heart Break, together with a check stub entitled "severance pay." The memo was unsigned and entitled, "Termination of Will I. Stuffum."

The body of the memo read:

"You are hereby terminated, effective immediately, for violating company policy by shipping defective products."

DISCUSS THE EVIDENTIARY ISSUES, THE APPROPRIATE OBJECTIONS, HOW THE COURT SHOULD RULE ON THE OBJECTIONS AND WHAT EVIDENCE SHOULD BE ADMITTED.

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL OF LAW

EVIDENCE

Professor Anthony A. Copani

December 1989

Closed Book Exam

Number of Pages: 5
(Including the
instruction page)

Your success on this examination will depend in large measure on your careful analysis of the questions and on the structure of your answers. There will be no time for extended "treatises" on the areas of the law of Evidence presented by these questions, and you should, therefore, attempt to avoid any rambling discourses.

The questions will be given equal weight in grading, although you may have to spend more time on one or more questions than on others.

Please indicate in each of your answers the jurisdiction, whether Federal or State or both, whose law of Evidence will be applied.

Please budget your time carefully. Credit will be given for good English and clarity of your analysis.

No materials of any type are to be used in this examination.

Best wishes and happy holiday.

EVIDENCE

Professor Anthony A. Copani

December 1989
Closed Book Exam
Number of Pages: 5
(Including the
instruction page)

QUESTION 1

P, a pedestrian, was struck and injured by a negligent hit and run driver. He instituted suit against D claiming he was the driver. D denied he had the accident with P and by way of further defense alleged that P's injury was due to his own negligence in walking on the highway while intoxicated. The license number of D's car was X 3124. The following matters occurred at the trial:

W testified for P, that he was at the scene of the accident with his blind friend J. Without objection, W further testified that he noted the license number of the car that struck P, that he called it off aloud to J, but that he has since forgotten the number. J was then called and, over D's objection, was permitted to testify that the number W called off at the time was X 3124.

Over D's objection, P was permitted to introduce evidence showing that D had been prosecuted for hit and run driving by reason of the accident in question; that although he had pleaded not guilty, he had failed to take the stand or offer any evidence by way of defense; and that he had been found guilty.

F testified for D that at the time of the accident in question she was having dinner with D in a neighboring county. On cross-examination, P's counsel asked F if it was not a fact that she had been having illicit relations with D recently. Objection by D's counsel to the question was sustained.

Over objection by P, Y was permitted to testify that he observed P just prior to the accident and that in his opinion P was intoxicated.

P had testified the accident broke off three of his front teeth. D called attorney X, who, over objection by P, was permitted to testify that P had consulted him after the accident to bring suit against D and that he had said he would claim his three front teeth had been broken by the accident although he had suffered that particular injury the night before in a drunken brawl.

Discuss the propriety of the court's rulings assuming all appropriate reasons for introducing the testimony and for the objections were given.

EVIDENCE

Professor Anthony A. Copani

December 1989
Closed Book Exam
Number of Pages: 5
(Including the
instruction page)

QUESTION 2

P sues D for personal injuries as a result of an accident in which A was driving D's car. D was not present at the accident. P alleges that A was negligent and was driving within the scope of his authority as an agent for D. D's answer denied the agency and denied that A was driving negligently. P has called A as a witness and A testified that he was not D's agent and that the accident was all P's fault.

P's attorney calls D to the witness stand and asks him the following questions, after D testified that A was not his agent:

1. Did A say to Y, in your presence, two weeks after the accident, that he (A) was driving within the scope of his employment by you at the time of the accident?

2. Isn't it true, to your personal knowledge, that A had four serious accidents driving his own car before the accident in question and that, for two of those accidents, he was convicted of operating to endanger?

3. Isn't it true that, in A's community, A has a reputation for not telling the truth?

4. Isn't it true that A is an addicted gambler?

5. (Showing D a certified copy of a criminal sentence imposed upon D for larceny one year before the date of the trial): Are you the same D who was sentenced for larceny in this court record?

6. Did you tell P six months after the accident that it was your belief that the driver of your car must have been going too fast?

7. Did you transfer your \$300,000 house into your wife's name one week after the accident happened?

D'S LAWYER OBJECTS TO EACH QUESTION. HOW SHOULD THE JUDGE RULE AND WHY?

EVIDENCE

Professor Anthony A. Copani

December 1989
Closed Book Exam
Number of Pages: 5
(Including the
instruction page)

QUESTION 3

1. Malloy was rushed to a nearby hospital by ambulance with six bullet wounds in his chest. Also in the ambulance was his five year old daughter, Gail. During the ride Malloy regained consciousness long enough to mumble: "Tricky Tony got me." When the ambulance arrived at the hospital, Gail told Nurse Pringle what she heard her father mumble during the ride. Pringle transcribed what Gail had told her in an official hospital record. Three weeks later Malloy died. Anthony "Tricky" Adverse is now being tried for his murder.

a. The prosecution calls Gail to the stand to testify to her father's statement during the ambulance ride.

b. The prosecution calls Nurse Pringle to testify as to what Gail had said to her.

c. The prosecution calls the medical record librarian to testify as to what Nurse Pringle had transcribed in the hospital record.

A. YOU ARE MALLOY'S DEFENSE COUNSEL. DISCUSS WHAT OBJECTIONS YOU COULD MAKE.

B. IF THE SAME WITNESSES HAD BEEN CALLED FOR THE SAME PURPOSES BY MALLOY'S WIDOW IN A WRONGFUL DEATH ACTION AGAINST ADVERSE, WOULD THERE BE ANY BASIS FOR OBJECTIONS?

2. D is on trial for income tax fraud. By way of defense D seeks to establish that he was merely following a procedure approved by his employer, W, and that he lacked the specific intent to violate the law. At an ex parte investigatory hearing before officials of the taxing authority W testified under oath. W was represented by counsel at the hearing. W is not physically able to testify as a witness at D's trial. D offers in evidence that portion of a properly authenticated stenographic record of the investigatory hearing which contains W's testimony. The prosecution objects on hearsay grounds.

HOW SHOULD THE COURT RULE ON THE OBJECTION: WOULD THE RULING BE DIFFERENT IF THE PROSECUTION SOUGHT TO SO INTRODUCE THE TESTIMONY?

Evidence

Question 4

Dan was tried for theft and burglary of the home of Mr. and Mrs. Charles in Central City. The crimes had been committed during the early morning hours of April 17. Dan's defense was that he had been 200 miles away at the time. Mrs. Charles testified to the losses, described the scene, and identified a half-eaten piece of cheese found in the kitchen following the burglary.

The court admitted the following evidence offered by the prosecution:

The testimony of Mr. Charles that while he and Mrs. Charles were sitting in a park a week following the burglary, Dan walked by and Mrs. Charles screamed, "You stole that jacket from our house," whereupon Dan ran away without saying a word..

The testimony of Yank, a dentist, that, based upon a comparison of legally obtained impressions of Dan's teeth and a cast of the piece of cheese identified by Mrs. Charles, the bite in the cheese was made by Dan's teeth.

The court then admitted the following evidence offered by the defense: The testimony of Bob that on April 16, Dan told Bob that he wanted to use Bob's mountain cabin, which was 200 miles from Central City, for the next two days; that Bob consented and gave Dan the key to the cabin; that on April 18 Dan returned the key and said that the stove had exploded when the stove pipe was struck by lightning during the early morning hours of April 17; and that when he visited the cabin the evening of April 18 the stove was as Dan had described.

The prosecution then offered and the court admitted Able's testimony that Bob had told him that Bob had not seen Dan during the entire month of April.

Assuming that all appropriate objections were timely made, did the court err in admitting the testimony of Mr. Charles, Yank, Bob and Able? Discuss.