

257-000, 003 and CP90-494-000, Sea Robin Pipeline Company
 CAG-18.
 Docket No. RP89-160-010, Trunkline Gas Company
 CAG-19.
 Docket No. RP89-161-011, AMR Pipeline Company
 CAG-20.
 Docket Nos. RP87-62-002 and RP86-148-004, Pacific Gas Transmission Company
 CAG-21.
 Docket Nos. RP85-194-007 and RP86-49-001, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company
 CAG-22.
 Omitted
 CAG-23.
 Omitted
 CAG-24.
 Docket No. RP89-251-003, Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Company
 CAG-25.
 Docket Nos. TA90-1-1-001 and RP89-251-000, Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Company
 CAG-26.
 Docket No. OR89-2-001, Trans Alaska Pipeline System
 Docket No. IS89-7-002, Amerada Hess Pipeline Corporation
 Docket No. IS89-8-002, ARCO Pipe Line Company
 Docket No. IS89-9-002, BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc.
 Docket No. IS89-10-002, Exxon Pipeline Company
 Docket No. IS89-11-002, Mobile Alaska Pipeline Company
 Docket No. IS89-12-002, Phillips Alaska Pipeline Corporation
 Docket No. IS89-13-002, Unocal Pipeline Company
 CAG-27.
 Docket No. RP88-191-015, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company
 CAG-28.
 Docket No. RP84-82-004, Tarpon Transmission Corporation
 CAG-29.
 Docket Nos. TM90-5-42-000, TM90-3-42-002, RP90-49-000 and CP88-99-008, Transwestern Pipeline Company
 CAG-30.
 Docket No. TA85-3-29-008, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation
 CAG-31.
 Docket Nos. ST90-458-000, ST90-459-000, ST90-460-000, ST90-461-000, ST90-802-000, ST90-872-000 and ST90-514-000, Transok, Inc.
 CAG-32.
 Docket No. ST90-567-000, Consumers Power Company
 CAG-33.
 Docket No. GP86-2-003, Southern Union Company
 CAG-34.
 Docket No. CI89-389-000, Plains Petroleum Operating Company
 CAG-35.
 Docket No. RM87-34-060, Regulation of Natural Gas Pipelines After Partial Wellhead Decontrol
 CAG-36.

Docket No. CI89-1121-001, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation
 CAG-37.
 Docket No. CP78-123-030, Northwest Alaskan Pipeline Company
 Docket No. RP90-16-001, Northwest Alaskan Pipeline Company
 Docket No. CP78-124-015, Northern Border Pipeline Company
 Docket No. CP79-400-006, United Gas Pipe Line Company
 Docket No. CP79-396-009, Northern Natural Gas Company, Division of Enron Corp. and Natgas U.S. Inc.
 Docket No. CP90-93-002, Natgas U.S. Inc.
 Docket No. CI89-348-002, Natgas U.S. Inc.
 Docket No. RP87-34-011, Northwest Alaskan Pipeline Company
 Docket No. RP89-109-001, United Gas Pipeline Company
 Docket No. CP88-699-002, Northern Natural Gas Company, Division of Enron Corp.
 CAG-38.
 Docket No. CP88-555-001, Gas Utility District No. 1 of Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana Southern Natural Gas Company
 CAG-39.
 CP86-492-002, Moraine Pipeline Company
 CAG-40.
 Docket No. CP90-1013, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation
 CAG-41.
 Docket No. CP90-919-000, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation
 CAG-42.
 Omitted
 CAG-43.
 Omitted
 CAG-44.
 Docket No. CP89-1286-000, Trunkline Gas Company
 CAG-45.
 Docket No. CP89-1337-000, Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Line Company
 CAG-46.
 Docket No. CP89-815-000, Iroquois Gas Transmission System
 CAG-47.
 Omitted
 CAG-48.
 Docket Nos. CP89-460-000, and 001, Pacific Gas Transmission Company
 Docket No. CP89-1851-000, Altamont Gas Transmission Project
 CAG-49.
 Docket No. CI87-547-006, Enron Gas Marketing, Inc.

Hydro Agenda

H-1.
 Reserved

Electric Agenda

E-1.
 Reserved

Oil and Gas Agenda

I. Pipeline Rate Matters

PR-1.
 Reserved

II. Producers Matters

PF-1.

Docket No. CI89-465-001, Union Pacific Fuels, Inc. Order on request for clarification.

PF-2.

Docket No. RM89-16-000, Proposal Implementing the Natural Gas Wellhead Decontrol Act of 1989. Final Rule.

PF-3.

Docket No. RM82-32-003, Limitation on Incentive Prices for High-Cost Gas Commodity Values. Order on rehearing.

III. Pipeline Certificate Matters

PC-1.

Docket Nos. CP88-171-000 and 001, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company. Order on application to construct and operate the proposed Niagara Spur Loop Line.

PC-2.

Docket No. CP88-136-012, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation. Order on requests for rehearing of order authorizing a transportation assignment program.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 90-8299 Filed 4-5-90; 3:55 pm]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

FCC To Hold Open Commission Meeting Thursday, April 12, 1990

April 5, 1990.

The Federal Communications Commission will hold an Open Meeting on the subjects listed below on Thursday, April 12, 1990, which is scheduled to commence at 9:30 a.m., in Room 856, at 1919 M Street, NW.

Item No., Bureau, and Subject

- 1—Common Carrier—Title: In the Matter of Access to telecommunications equipment and services by the hearing impaired and other disabled persons. (CC Docket No. 87-124.) Summary: The Commission will review the joint petition filed by various organizations representing the hearing impaired, seeking reconsideration of the Commission's decision in CC Docket No. 87-124 not to require certain telephones be compatible with hearing aids, and other relief.
- 2—Common Carrier—Title: Filing and Review of Open Network Architecture Plans (COCA ONA Amendments Order). (CC Docket No. 88-2, Phase I.) Summary: The Commission will consider the adoption of a Memorandum Opinion and Order regarding the amended Bell Operating Company (BOC) ONA plans.
- 3—Common Carrier—Title: Filing and Review of Open Network Architecture Plans. (BOC ONA Reconsideration). (CC Docket No. 88-2, Phase I.) Summary: The Commission will consider the adoption of a Memorandum Opinion and Order on reconsideration of the BOC ONA Order.
- 4—Mass Media—Title: Review of the Technical Assignment Criteria for the AM Broadcast Service. (MM Docket No. 87-267.) Summary: The Commission will

consider adopting a Notice of Proposed Rule Making examining possible methods for improving the AM broadcast service.

- 5—Mass Media—Title: *Report and Order* regarding policies to encourage interference reduction between AM stations. (MM Docket No. 89-46.) Summary: The Commission will consider whether to adopt a *Report and Order* to amend sections 73.1750, 73.3517 and 73.3571 of the Rules, and revision of policies with respect to reduction in AM interference.
- 6—Mass Media—Title: *Report and Order* Concerning Improved Methods for Calculating Skywave Field Strength in the AM Broadcast Band. (MM Docket No. 88-508.) Summary: The Commission will consider adoption of a *Report and Order* addressing whether the current method of computing skywave signal strength in the AM broadcast band should be replaced.
- 7—Mass Media—Title: *Report and Order* Concerning Improved Methods for Calculating Groundwave Field Strength in the AM Broadcast Band. (MM Docket No. 88-510.) Summary: The Commission will consider adoption of a *Report and Order* addressing whether the current AM broadcast band groundwave propagation curves should be replaced.
- 8—Chief Engineer—Title: Amendment of the Commission's Rules Relative to Allocation of the 849-851/894-896 MHz Bands. (Gen Docket No. 88-96.) Summary: The Commission will consider an item addressing the establishment of an air/ground telephone service in the 800 MHz band.
- 9—Chief Engineer—Title: Establishment of Procedure to Provide a Preference to Applicants Proposing an Allocation for New Services. Summary: The Commission will consider a proposal to award a preference to parties requesting spectrum allocation rules changes associated with

the development of new communications services.

- 10—Office of Plans & Policy—Title: *Inquiry into the Need for a Universal Encryption Standard for Satellite Cable Programming*. Summary: The Commission will consider whether to adopt a *Report* on this matter and whether any additional Commission action is necessary.

This meeting may be continued the following work day to allow the Commission to complete appropriate action.

Additional information concerning this meeting may be obtained from Audrey Spivack, Office of the Public Affairs, telephone number (202) 632-5050.

Federal Communications Commission.

Donna R. Searcy,
Secretary.

Issued: April 5, 1990.

[FR Doc. 90-8286 Filed 4-5-90; 3:10 pm]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

NOTICE OF VOTE TO CLOSE MEETING

At its meeting on April 2, 1990, the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service voted unanimously to close to public observation its meeting scheduled for May 7, 1990, in Washington, DC. The members will discuss possible strategies in collective bargaining negotiations.

The meeting is expected to be attended by the following persons: Governors Alvarado, del Junco,

Griesemer, Hall, Mackie, Nevin, Pace, Ryan and Setrakian; Postmaster General Frank, Deputy Postmaster General Coughlin, Secretary to the Board Harris, and General Counsel Hughes.

The Board determined that pursuant to section 552b(c)(3) of title 5, United States Code, and § 7.3(c) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, this portion of the meeting is exempt from the open meeting requirement of the Government in the Sunshine Act [5 U.S.C. 552b(b)] because it is likely to disclose information prepared for use in connection with the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements under chapter 12 of title 39, United States Code, which is specifically exempted from disclosure by section 410(c)(3) of title 39, United States Code.

In accordance with section 552b(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and § 7.6(a) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, the General Counsel of the United States Postal Service has certified that in his opinion the meeting may properly be closed to public observation pursuant to section 552b(c)(3) of title 5, United States Code; section 410(c)(3) of title 39 United States Code; and § 7.3(c) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations.

Requests for information about the meeting should be addressed to the Secretary of the Board, David F. Harris, at (202) 268-4800.

David F. Harris,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 90-8274 Filed 4-5-90; 1:53 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

Federal Register

Monday
April 9, 1990

Part II

Department of Labor

Office of the Secretary

29 CFR Part 18

Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings before the Office of Administrative Law Judges; Final Rule

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

29 CFR Part 18

Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings Before the Office of Administrative Law Judges

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Labor.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the Rules of Evidence to be used for formal adjudicatory hearings before the Office of Administrative Law Judges. The previous regulations provided no clear guidance as to the admissibility of evidence in administrative proceedings, resulting in uncertainty as to which documents and testimony may constitute the record in a particular matter. These Rules of Evidence modify the Federal Rules of Evidence for application in formal adversarial adjudicatory hearings, and will provide necessary guidance as to the admissibility of evidence in formal adjudicatory hearings.

EFFECTIVE DATES: These rules shall be effective after May 9, 1990, except that with respect to hearings held following an investigation conducted by the United States Department of Labor, these rules shall be effective only where the investigation commenced after May 9, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deputy Chief Judge John M. Vittone, U.S. Department of Labor, 1111 20th Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC 20036; telephone: (202) 653-5052.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The prior rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings before the Office of Administrative Law Judges, 29 CFR 18.44 provided that:

Unless otherwise provided by statute or these rules, and where appropriate, the Federal Rules of Evidence may be applied to all proceedings held pursuant to these rules.

In order to provide more specific guidance as to the admissibility of evidence in administrative hearings, uniform rules of evidence are hereby promulgated. Proposed rules of evidence for the Department of Labor, modifying the Federal Rules of Evidence for application in formal adjudicatory hearings, were published in the *Federal Register* on Thursday, January 19, 1989, 54 FR 2310, January 19, 1989. The proposed rules outlined the modifications of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Where the Federal Rules refer to the court, the Department of Labor rules refer to the judge, meaning the Administrative Law Judge or presiding

officer. The Federal Rules referring to criminal proceedings have been deleted. Further significant changes are explained in the Reporter's Notes which appear in the Appendix to these rules.

Comments by the Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of Labor, administrative law judges, and members of the practicing bar, were received. Comments were evaluated by an Advisory Committee consisting of Chief Administrative Law Judge Nahum Litt, Chairman; Judge J.F. Green, Judge E. Earl Thomas, Eugene R. Fidell, Esq., Donald A. McCoy, Esq., Ronald G. Whiting, Esq., and Professor Michael H. Graham, Reporter. The changes that were made represent a logical outgrowth of the prior notice and comment. The final rule also contains certain non-substantive, technical corrections.

The comments raised the issue that the Department of Labor promulgates rules and regulations not only pursuant to statutory authority, but also pursuant to executive order. The Committee did not intend to distinguish agency rules and regulations promulgated under statute and agency rules and regulations promulgated under executive order. Sections 18.501, 18.802, 18.1002, and 18.1101(c) have been changed to more accurately reflect the sources of governing law.

Section 18.103(a) has been changed to more closely parallel the existing harmless error standard. Error is not harmless, i.e., a substantial right is effected, unless on review it is determined that it is more probably true than not true that the error did not materially contribute to the decision or order of the judge.

Section 18.104(c) has been deleted. The comments stated that the rules of evidence govern formal adjudicatory hearings, and do not bind appellate bodies reviewing the decisions or orders of the judges. The comments questioned whether rules solely regarding appellate review standards were appropriate. The Committee chose to delete § 18.104(c) and its explanation in the Reporter's Note to § 18.104(c). Section 18.104 has been renumbered accordingly.

Under § 18.609(a), evidence that the witness has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted, *inter alia*, if elicited from the witness or established by public record during cross-examination. This requirement of admissibility has been deleted. The Committee has determined that this requirement has not been treated as operative under the Federal Rules. Moreover, proposed changes to the Federal Rules include a deletion of this requirement. The Committee deleted the requirement that evidence of conviction of a crime be

elicited from the witness or established on cross-examination, to conform to current practice.

Federal Rule of Evidence 706 is adopted as § 18.706. It was proposed to delete procedures regarding court appointed experts in the belief that such procedures were unnecessary. However, the Committee determined that while use of judge appointed experts may be uncommon, procedures should be in place in the event a judge may have occasion to appoint an expert. Section 18.706 sets forth procedures regarding judge appointed experts.

The comments raised the issue of the admissibility of an "administrative file." There is no intent to create a special hearsay exception to allow the admissibility of an administrative file. The comments stated that specific regulations may provide for the creation and admissibility of an administrative file. Under § 18.802, hearsay is generally inadmissible except, *inter alia*, as provided by regulations of the agency. The Reporter's Note to § 18.802 allows for hearsay exceptions for specific administrative files as provided by other regulations. The Reporter's Note to § 18.802 also indicates that an administrative file so admitted would also be self-authenticating under § 18.902(10).

The requirement of a final certification with regard to a foreign record under § 18.902(11) has been deleted. The Reporter's Note to § 18.902 states that such a requirement is unnecessary in light of the position adopted in 18 U.S.C. 3505 which governs the self-authentication of a foreign record offered in a federal criminal proceeding.

Certain hearsay exceptions under § 18.803 and self-authentication provisions under § 18.902 allow for an adverse party to call a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination. The comments questioned whether these provisions may work a hardship on parties with fewer financial resources. The Reporter's Note to § 18.902 provides that "these rules take no position with respect to which party must initially bear the cost of lay witness and expert witness fees nor as to the ultimate disposition of such fees. Ordinarily, however, it is anticipated that the adverse party calling the witness should initially pay statutory witness fees, mileage, etc., and reasonable compensation to an expert witness in whatever sum and at such time as the judge may allow. Such witness fees, mileage, etc., and reasonable expert witness compensation should thereafter be

charged to the same extent and in like manner as other such costs." The note is intended to accentuate the normal allocation of fees and costs, yet it indicates the discretion of the judge to be flexible in allocating fees and costs.

Several comments questioned whether specific types of hearings would be governed by these rules. Section 18.1101(c) provides that "these rules do not apply to the extent inconsistent with, in conflict with, or to the extent a matter is otherwise specifically provided by an Act of Congress, or by a rule or regulation of specific application prescribed by the United States Department of Labor pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order." Section 18.1101(b) was also clarified to provide that §§ 18.403, 18.611(a), and 18.614 are applicable to hearings pursuant to the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, its extensions, and the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act. Section 18.1101(b) was also clarified to provide that general inapplicability of the rules of evidence to these types of hearings is without prejudice to current practice.

Section 18.1104 was added to clarify the effective date of these rules. The comments questioned whether in cases where an investigation conducted by the Department of Labor results in the creation of an administrative file, current practice may be prejudiced by the general inadmissibility of such an administrative file. The Committee clarified the effective date with regard to such investigations.

Procedural Matters

Because this rule is procedural in nature, it is not a major rule as defined by Executive Order 12291. The rule will not have a significant effect on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.* The Secretary has certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration to this effect prior to the publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking. The rule as proposed contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 18

Administrative practice and procedure, Labor.

Accordingly, part 18 of subtitle A of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as set forth below:

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of March, 1990.

Elizabeth Dole,
Secretary of Labor.

PART 18—RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

1. The authority citation for part 18 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 5 U.S.C. 551–553.

2. Sections 18.1 through 18.59 are designated as "Subpart A—General."

§ 18.44 [Removed and Reserved]

3. Section 18.44 Evidence. is removed and reserved.

4. A new subpart B is added to read as follows:

Subpart B—Rules of Evidence

General Provisions

- Sec.
- 18.101 Scope.
- 18.102 Purpose and construction.
- 18.103 Rulings on evidence.
- 18.104 Preliminary questions.
- 18.105 Limited admissibility.
- 18.106 Remainder of or related writings or recorded statements.

Official Notice

- 18.201 Official notice of adjudicative facts.

Presumptions

- 18.301 Presumptions in general.
- 18.302 Applicability of state law.

Relevancy and Its Limits

- 18.401 Definition of "relevant evidence."
- 18.402 Relevant evidence generally admissible, irrelevant evidence inadmissible.
- 18.403 Exclusion of relevant evidence on grounds of confusion or waste of time.
- 18.404 Character evidence not admissible to prove conduct; exceptions; other crimes.
- 18.405 Methods of proving character.
- 18.406 Habit; routine practice.
- 18.407 Subsequent remedial measures.
- 18.408 Compromise and offers to compromise.
- 18.409 Payment of medical and similar expenses.
- 18.410 Inadmissibility of pleas, plea discussions; and related statements.
- 18.411 Liability insurance.

Privileges

- 18.501 General rule.

Witnesses

- 18.601 General rule of competency.
- 18.602 Lack of personal knowledge.
- 18.603 Oath or affirmation.
- 18.604 Interpreters.
- 18.605 Competency of judge as witness.
- 18.606 Reserved.
- 18.607 Who may impeach.
- 18.608 Evidence of character and conduct of witness.

Sec.

- 18.609 Impeachment by evidence of conviction of crime.
- 18.610 Religious beliefs or opinions.
- 18.611 Mode and order of interrogation and presentation.
- 18.612 Writing used to refresh memory.
- 18.613 Prior statements of witnesses.
- 18.614 Calling and interrogation of witnesses by judge.
- 18.615 Exclusion of witnesses.

Opinions and Expert Testimony

- 18.701 Opinion testimony by law witnesses.
- 18.702 Testimony by experts.
- 18.703 Bases of opinion testimony by experts.
- 18.704 Opinion on ultimate issue.
- 18.705 Disclosure of facts or data underlying expert opinion.
- 18.706 Judge appointed experts.

Hearsay

- 18.801 Definitions.
- 18.802 Hearsay rule.
- 18.803 Hearsay exceptions; availability of declarant immaterial.
- 18.804 Hearsay exceptions; declarant unavailable.
- 18.805 Hearsay within hearsay.
- 18.806 Attacking and supporting credibility of declarant.

Authentication and Identification

- 18.901 Requirement of authentication or identification.
- 18.902 Self-authentication.
- 18.903 Subscribing witness' testimony unnecessary.

Contents of Writings, Recordings, and Photographs

- 18.1001 Definitions.
- 18.1002 Requirement of original.
- 18.1003 Admissibility of duplicates.
- 18.1004 Admissibility of other evidence of contents.
- 18.1005 Public records.
- 18.1006 Summaries.
- 18.1007 Testimony or written admission of party.
- 18.1008 Functions of the judge.

Applicability

- 18.1101 Applicability of the rules.
- 18.1102 Reserved.
- 18.1103 Title.
- 18.1104 Effective date.

Appendix—Reporter's Notes

Subpart B—Rules of Evidence

General Provisions

§ 18.101 Scope.

These rules govern formal adversarial adjudications of the United States Department of Labor conducted before a presiding officer.

(a) which are required by Act of Congress to be determined on the record after opportunity for an administrative agency hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 554, 556 and 557, or

(b) which by United States Department of Labor regulation are conducted in conformance with the foregoing provisions, to the extent and with the exceptions stated in § 18.1101. "Presiding officer", referred to in these rules as "the judge", means an Administrative Law Judge, an agency head, or other officer who presides at the reception of evidence at a hearing in such an adjudication.

§ 18.102 Purpose and construction.

These rules shall be construed to secure fairness in administration, elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay, and promotion of growth and development of the law of evidence to the end that the truth may be ascertained and proceedings justly determined.

§ 18.103 Rulings on evidence.

(a) *Effect of erroneous ruling.* Error may not be predicated upon a ruling which admits or excludes evidence unless a substantial right of the party is affected, and

(1) *Objection.* In case the ruling is one admitting evidence, a timely objection or motion to strike appears of record, stating the specific ground of objection, if the specific ground was not apparent from the context; or

(2) *Offer of proof.* In case the ruling is one excluding evidence, the substance of the evidence was made known to the judge by offer or was apparent from the context within which questions were asked. A substantial right of the party is affected unless it is more probably true than not true that the error did not materially contribute to the decision or order of the judge. Properly objected to evidence admitted in error does not affect a substantial right if explicitly not relied upon by the judge in support of the decision or order.

(b) *Record of offer and ruling.* The judge may add any other or further statement which shows the character of the evidence, the form in which it was offered, the objection made, and the ruling thereon. The judge may direct the making of an offer in question and answer form.

(c) *Plain error.* Nothing in this rule precludes taking notice of plain errors affecting substantial rights although they were not brought to the attention of the judge.

§ 18.104 Preliminary questions.

(a) *Questions of admissibility generally.* Preliminary questions concerning the qualification of a person to be a witness, the existence of a privilege, or the admissibility of evidence shall be determined by the

judge, subject to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section. In making such determination the judge is not bound by the rules of evidence except those with respect to privileges.

(b) *Relevance conditioned on fact.* When the relevancy of evidence depends upon the fulfillment of a condition of fact, the judge shall admit it upon, or subject to, the introduction of evidence sufficient to support a finding of the fulfillment of the condition.

(c) *Weight and credibility.* This rule does not limit the right of a party to introduce evidence relevant to weight or credibility.

§ 18.105 Limited admissibility.

When evidence which is admissible as to one party or for one purpose but not admissible as to another party or for another purpose is admitted, the judge, upon request, shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope.

§ 18.106 Remainder of or related writings or recorded statements.

When a writing or recorded statement or part thereof is introduced by a party, an adverse party may require the introduction at that time of any other part or any other writing or recorded statement which ought in fairness to be considered contemporaneously with it.

Official Notice

§ 18.201 Official notice of adjudicative facts.

(a) *Scope of rule.* This rule governs only official notice of adjudicative facts.

(b) *Kinds of facts.* An officially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either:

(1) Generally known within the local area,

(2) Capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned, or

(3) Derived from a not reasonably questioned scientific, medical or other technical process, technique, principle, or explanatory theory within the administrative agency's specialized field of knowledge.

(c) *When discretionary.* A judge may take official notice, whether requested or not.

(d) *When mandatory.* A judge shall take official notice if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information.

(e) *Opportunity to be heard.* A party is entitled, upon timely request, to an opportunity to be heard as to the propriety of taking official notice and the tenor of the matter noticed. In the absence of prior notification, the request

may be made after official notice has been taken.

(f) *Time of taking notice.* Official notice may be taken at any stage of the proceeding.

(g) *Effect of official notice.* An officially noticed fact is accepted as conclusive.

Presumptions

§ 18.301 Presumptions in general.

Except as otherwise provided by Act of Congress, or by rules or regulations prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order, a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption, but does not shift to such party the burden of proof in the sense of the risk of nonpersuasion, which remains throughout the trial upon the party on whom it was originally cast.

§ 18.302 Applicability of state law.

The effect of a presumption respecting a fact which is an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision is determined in accordance with State law.

Relevancy and its Limits

§ 18.401 Definition of "relevant evidence."

"Relevant evidence" means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.

§ 18.402 Relevant evidence generally admissible; irrelevant evidence inadmissible.

All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the United States, by Act of Congress, pursuant to executive order, by these rules, or by other rules or regulations prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority. Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible.

§ 18.403 Exclusion of relevant evidence on grounds of confusion or waste of time.

Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of confusion of issues, or misleading the judge as trier of fact, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.

§ 18.404 Character evidence not admissible to prove conduct; exceptions; other crimes.

(a) *Character evidence generally.* Evidence of a person's character or a trait of character is not admissible for the purpose of proving action in conformity therewith on a particular occasion, except evidence of the character of a witness, as provided in §§ 18.607, 18.608, and 18.609.

(b) *Other crimes, wrongs, or acts.* Evidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts is not admissible to prove the character of a person in order to show action in conformity therewith. It may, however, be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident.

§ 18.405 Methods of proving character.

(a) *Reputation of opinion.* In all cases in which evidence of character or a trait of character of a person is admissible, proof may be made by testimony as to reputation or by testimony in the form of an opinion. On cross-examination, inquiry is allowable into relevant specific instances of conduct.

(b) *Specific instances of conduct.* In cases in which character or a trait of character of a person is an essential element of a claim or defense, proof may also be made of specific instances of that person's conduct.

§ 18.406 Habit; routine practice.

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

§ 18.407 Subsequent remedial measures.

When, after an event, measures are taken which, if taken previously, would have made the event less likely to occur, evidence of the subsequent measures is not admissible to prove negligence or culpable conduct in connection with the event. This rule does not require the exclusion of evidence of subsequent measures when offered for another purpose, such as proving ownership, control, or feasibility of precautionary measures, if controverted, or impeachment.

§ 18.408 Compromise and offers to compromise.

Evidence of furnishing or offering or promising to furnish, or of accepting or offering or promising to accept, a valuable consideration in compromising

or attempting to compromise a claim which was disputed as to either validity or amount, is not admissible to prove liability for or invalidity of the claim or its amount. Evidence of conduct or statements made in compromise negotiations is likewise not admissible. This rule does not require the exclusion of any evidence otherwise discoverable merely because it is presented in the course of compromise negotiations. This rule does not require exclusion when the evidence is offered for another purpose, such as proving bias or prejudice of a witness, or negating a contention of undue delay.

§ 18.409 Payment of medical and similar expenses.

Evidence of furnishing or offering or promising to pay medical, hospital, or similar expenses occasioned by an injury is not admissible to prove liability for the injury.

§ 18.410 Inadmissibility of pleas, plea discussion, and related statements.

Except as otherwise provided in this rule, evidence of the following is not admissible against the defendant who made the plea or was a participant in the plea discussions:

- (a) A plea of guilty which was later withdrawn;
- (b) A plea of nolo contendere;
- (c) Any statement made in the course of any proceedings under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or comparable state procedure regarding either of the foregoing pleas; or
- (d) Any statement made in the course of plea discussions with an attorney for the prosecuting authority which do not result in a plea of guilty or which result in a plea of guilty later withdrawn. However, such a statement is admissible in any proceeding wherein another statement made in the course of the same plea discussions has been introduced and the statement ought in fairness be considered contemporaneously with it.

§ 18.411 Liability insurance.

Evidence that a person was or was not insured against liability is not admissible upon the issue whether the person acted negligently or otherwise wrongfully. This rule does not require the exclusion of evidence of insurance against liability when offered for another purpose, such as proof of agency, ownership, or control, or bias or prejudice of a witness.

Privileges

§ 18.501 General rule.

Except as otherwise required by the

Constitution of the United States, or provided by Act of Congress, or by rules or regulations prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order, the privilege of a witness, person, government, State, or political subdivision thereof shall be governed by the principles of the common law as they may be interpreted by the courts of the United States in the light of reason and experience. However with respect to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision, the privilege of a witness, person, government, State, or political subdivision thereof shall be determined in accordance with State law.

Witnesses

§ 18.601 General rule of competency.

Every person is competent to be a witness except as otherwise provided in these rules. However with respect to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision, the competency of a witness shall be determined in accordance with State law.

§ 18.602 Lack of personal knowledge.

A witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter. Evidence to prove personal knowledge may, but need not, consist of the witness' own testimony. This rule is subject to the provisions of § 18.703, relating to opinion testimony by expert witnesses.

§ 18.603 Oath or affirmation.

Before testifying, every witness shall be required to declare that the witness will testify truthfully, by oath or affirmation administered in a form calculated to awaken the witness' conscience and impress the witness' mind with the duty to do so.

§ 18.604 Interpreters.

An interpreter is subject to the provisions of these rules relating to qualification as an expert and the administration of an oath or affirmation to make a true translation.

§ 18.605 Competency of judge as witness.

The judge presiding at the hearing may not testify in that hearing as a witness. No objection need be made in order to preserve the point.

§ 18.606 [Reserved]**§ 18.607 Who may impeach.**

The credibility of a witness may be attacked by any party, including the party calling the witness.

§ 18.608 Evidence of character and conduct of witness.

(a) *Opinion and reputation evidence of character.* The credibility of a witness may be attacked or supported by evidence in the form of opinion or reputation, but subject to these limitations:

(1) The evidence may refer only to character for truthfulness or untruthfulness, and

(2) Evidence of truthful character is admissible only after the character of the witness for truthfulness has been attacked by opinion or reputation evidence or otherwise.

(b) *Specific instances of conduct.* Specific instances of the conduct of a witness, for the purpose of attacking or supporting the witness' credibility, other than conviction of crime as provided in § 18.609, may not be proved by extrinsic evidence. They may, however, in the discretion of the judge, if probative of truthfulness or untruthfulness, be inquired into on cross-examination of the witness, concerning the witness' character for truthfulness or untruthfulness, or concerning the character for truthfulness or untruthfulness of another witness as to which character the witness being cross-examined has testified.

The giving of testimony by any witness does not operate as a waiver of the witness' privilege against self-incrimination when examined with respect to matters which relate only to credibility.

§ 18.609 Impeachment by evidence of conviction of crime.

(a) *General rule.* For the purpose of attacking the credibility of a witness, evidence that the witness has been convicted of a crime shall be admitted if the crime was punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year under the law under which the witness was convicted, or involved dishonesty or false statement, regardless of the punishment.

(b) *Time limit.* Evidence of a conviction under this rule is not admissible if a period of more than ten years has elapsed since the date of the conviction or of the release of the witness from the confinement imposed for that conviction, whichever is the later date.

(c) *Effect of pardon, annulment, or certificate of rehabilitation.* Evidence of

a conviction is not admissible under this rule if:

(1) The conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, certificate of rehabilitation, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding of the rehabilitation of the person convicted, and that person has not been convicted of a subsequent crime which was punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year, or

(2) The conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding of innocence.

(d) *Juvenile adjudications.* Evidence of juvenile adjudications is not admissible under this rule.

(e) *Pendency of appeal.* The pendency of an appeal therefrom does not render evidence of a conviction inadmissible. Evidence of the pendency of an appeal is admissible.

§ 18.610 Religious beliefs or opinions.

Evidence of the beliefs or opinions of a witness on matters of religion is not admissible for the purpose of showing that by reason of their nature the witness' credibility is impaired or enhanced.

§ 18.611 Mode and order of interrogation and presentation.

(a) *Control by judge.* The judge shall exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of interrogating witnesses and presenting evidence so as to:

(1) Make the interrogation and presentation effective for the ascertainment of the truth,

(2) Avoid needless consumption of time, and

(3) Protect witnesses from harassment or undue embarrassment.

(b) *Scope of cross-examination.* Cross-examination should be limited to the subject matter of the direct examination and matters affecting the credibility of the witness. The judge may, in the exercise of discretion, permit inquiry into additional matters as if on direct examination.

(c) *Leading questions.* Leading questions should not be used on the direct examination of a witness except as may be necessary to develop the witness' testimony. Ordinarily leading questions should be permitted on cross-examination. When a party calls a hostile witness, an adverse party, or a witness identified with an adverse party, interrogation may be by leading questions.

§ 18.612 Writing used to refresh memory.

If a witness uses a writing to refresh memory for the purpose of testifying,

either while testifying, or before testifying if the judge in the judge's discretion determines it is necessary in the interest of justice, an adverse party is entitled to have the writing produced at the hearing, to inspect it, to cross-examine the witness thereon, and to introduce in evidence those portions which relate to the testimony of the witness. If it is claimed that the writing contains matters not related to the subject matter of the testimony the judge shall examine the writing in camera, excise any portion not so related, and order delivery of the remainder to the party entitled thereto. Any portion withheld over objections shall be preserved and made available in the event of review. If a writing is not produced or delivered pursuant to order under this rule, the judge shall make any order justice requires.

§ 18.613 Prior statements of witnesses.

(a) *Examining witness concerning prior statement.* In examining a witness concerning a prior statement made by the witness, whether written or not, the statement need not be shown nor its contents disclosed to the witness at that time, but on request the same shall be shown or disclosed to opposing counsel.

(b) *Extrinsic evidence of prior inconsistent statement of witness.* Extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement by a witness is not admissible unless the witness is afforded an opportunity to explain or deny the same and the opposite party is afforded an opportunity to interrogate the witness thereon, or the interests of justice otherwise require. This provision does not apply to admissions of a party-opponent as defined in § 18.801(d)(2).

§ 18.614 Calling and interrogation of witnesses by judge.

(a) *Calling by the judge.* The judge may, on the judge's own motion or at the suggestion of a party, call witnesses, and all parties are entitled to cross-examine witnesses thus called.

(b) *Interrogation by the judge.* The judge may interrogate witnesses, whether called by the judge or by a party.

(c) *Objections.* Objections to the calling of witnesses by the judge or to interrogation by the judge must be timely.

§ 18.615 Exclusion of witnesses.

At the request of a party the judge shall order witnesses excluded so that they cannot hear the testimony of other witnesses, and the judge may make the order of the judge's own motion. This rule does not authorize exclusion of a

party who is a natural person, or an officer or employee of a party which is not a natural person designated as its representative by its attorney, or a person whose presence is shown by a party to be essential to the presentation of the party's cause.

Opinions and Expert Testimony

§ 18.701 Opinion testimony by lay witnesses.

If the witness is not testifying as an expert, the witness' testimony in the form of opinions or inferences is limited to those opinions or inferences which are rationally based on the perception of the witness and helpful to a clear understanding of the witness' testimony or the determination of a fact in issue.

§ 18.702 Testimony by experts.

If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the judge as trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise.

§ 18.703 Bases of opinion testimony by experts.

The facts or data in the particular case upon which an expert bases an opinion or inference may be those perceived by or made known to the expert at or before the hearing. If of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject, the facts or data need not be admissible in evidence.

§ 18.704 Opinion on ultimate issue.

Testimony in the form of an opinion or inference otherwise admissible is not objectionable because it embraces an ultimate issue to be decided by the judge as trier of fact.

§ 18.705 Disclosure of facts or data underlying expert opinion.

The expert may testify in terms of opinion or inference and give reasons therefor without prior disclosure of the underlying facts or data, unless the judge requires otherwise. The expert may in any event be required to disclose the underlying facts or data on cross-examination.

§ 18.706 Judge appointed experts.

(a) *Appointment.* The judge may on the judge's own motion or on the motion of any party enter an order to show cause why expert witnesses should not be appointed, and may request the parties to submit nominations. The judge may appoint any expert witnesses agreed upon by the parties, and may

appoint expert witnesses of the judge's own selection. An expert witness shall not be appointed by the judge unless the witness consents to act. A witness so appointed shall be informed of the witness' duties by the judge in writing, a copy of which shall be filed with the clerk, or at a conference in which the parties shall have an opportunity to participate. A witness so appointed shall advise the parties of the witness' findings, if any; the witness' deposition may be taken by any party; and the witness may be called to testify by the judge or any party. The witness shall be subject to cross-examination by each party, including a party calling the witness.

(b) *Compensation.* Expert witnesses so appointed are entitled to reasonable compensation in whatever sum the judge may allow. The compensation thus fixed is payable from funds which may be provided by law in hearings involving just compensation under the fifth amendment. In other hearings the compensation shall be paid by the parties in such proportion and at such time as the judge directs, and thereafter charged in like manner as other costs.

(c) *Parties' experts of own selection.* Nothing in this rule limits the parties in calling expert witnesses of their own selection.

Hearsay

§ 18.801 Definitions.

(a) *Statement.* A "statement" is (1) an oral or written assertion, or (2) nonverbal conduct of a person, if it is intended by the person as an assertion.

(b) *Declarant.* A "declarant" is a person who makes a statement.

(c) *Hearsay.* "Hearsay" is a statement, other than one made by the declarant while testifying at the hearing, offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted.

(d) *Statements which are not hearsay.* A statement is not hearsay if:

(1) *Prior statement by witness.* The declarant testifies at the hearing and is subject to cross-examination concerning the statement, and the statement is—

(i) Inconsistent with the declarant's testimony, or

(ii) Consistent with the declarant's testimony and is offered to rebut an express or implied charge against the declarant of recent fabrication or improper influence or motive, or

(iii) One of identification of a person made after perceiving the person; or

(2) *Admission by party-opponent.* The statement is offered against a party and is—

(i) The party's own statement in either an individual or a representative capacity, or

(ii) A statement of which the party has manifested an adoption or belief in its truth, or

(iii) A statement by a person authorized by the party to make a statement concerning the subject, or

(iv) A statement by the party's agent or servant concerning a matter within the scope of the agency or employment, made during the existence of the relationship, or

(v) A statement by a co-conspirator of a party during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

§ 18.802 Hearsay rule.

Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules, or by rules or regulations of the administrative agency prescribed pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order, or by Act of Congress.

§ 18.803 Hearsay exceptions; availability of declarant immaterial.

(a) The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule, even though the declarant is available as a witness:

(1) *Present sense impression.* A statement describing or explaining an event or condition made while the declarant was perceiving the event or condition, or immediately thereafter.

(2) *Excited utterance.* A statement relating to a startling event or condition made while the declarant was under the stress of excitement caused by the event or condition.

(3) *Then existing mental, emotional, or physical condition.* A statement of the declarant's then existing state of mind, emotion, sensation, or physical condition (such as intent, plan, motive, design, mental feeling, pain, and bodily health), but not including a statement of memory or belief to prove the fact remembered or believed unless it relates to the execution, revocation, identification, or terms of declarant's will.

(4) *Statements for purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment.* Statements made for purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment and describing medical history, or past or present symptoms, pain, or sensations or the inception or general character of the cause or external source thereof insofar as reasonably pertinent to diagnosis or treatment.

(5) *Recorded recollection.* A memorandum or record concerning a matter about which a witness once had knowledge but now has insufficient recollection to enable the witness to

testify fully and accurately, shown to have been made or adopted by the witness when the matter was fresh in the witness' memory and to reflect that knowledge correctly.

(6) *Records of regularly conducted activity.* A memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, in any form, of acts, events, conditions, opinions, or diagnoses, made at or near the time by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge, if kept in the course of a regularly conducted business activity, and if it was the regular practice of that business activity to make the memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, all as shown by the testimony of the custodian or other qualified witness, unless the source of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness. The term "business" as used in this paragraph includes business, institution, association, profession, occupation, and calling of every kind, whether or not conducted for profit.

(7) *Absence of entry in records kept in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (6).* Evidence that a matter is not included in the memoranda reports, records, or data compilations, in any form, kept in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (6), to prove the nonoccurrence or nonexistence of the matter, if the matter was of a kind of which a memorandum, report, record, or data compilation was regularly made and preserved, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness.

(8) *Public records and reports.* Records, reports, statements, or data compilations, in any form, of public offices or agencies, setting forth—

- (i) The activities of the office or agency, or
- (ii) Matters observed pursuant to duty imposed by law as to which matters there was a duty to report, or
- (iii) Factual findings resulting from an investigation made pursuant to authority granted by law, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness.

(9) *Records of vital statistics.* Records or data compilations, in any form, of births, fetal deaths, deaths, or marriages, if the report thereof was made to a public office pursuant to requirements of law.

(10) *Absence of public record or entry.* To prove the absence of a record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, or the nonoccurrence or nonexistence of a matter of which a record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, was regularly made and preserved by a public office

or agency, evidence in the form of a certification in accordance with § 18.902, or testimony, that diligent search failed to disclose the record, report, statement, or date compilation, or entry.

(11) *Records of religious organizations.* Statements of births, marriages, divorces, deaths, legitimacy, ancestry, relationship by blood or marriage, or other similar facts of personal or family history, contained in a regularly kept record of a religious organization.

(12) *Marriage, baptismal, and similar certificates.* Statements of fact contained in a certificate that the maker performed a marriage or other ceremony or administered a sacrament, made by a clergyman, public official, or other person authorized by the rules or practices of a religious organization or by law to perform the act certified, and purporting to have been issued at the time of the act or within a reasonable time thereafter.

(13) *Family records.* Statements of fact concerning personal or family history contained in family Bibles, genealogies, charts, engravings on rings, inscriptions on family portraits, engravings on urns, crypts, or tombstones, or the like.

(14) *Records of documents affecting an interest in property.* The record of a document purporting to establish or affect an interest in property, as proof of the content of the original recorded document and its execution and delivery by each person by whom it purports to have been executed, if the record is a record of a public office and an applicable statute authorizes the recording of documents of that kind in that office.

(15) *Statements in documents affecting an interest in property.* A statement contained in a document purporting to establish or affect an interest in property if the matter stated was relevant to the purpose of the document, unless dealings with the property since the document was made have been inconsistent with the truth of the statement or the purport of the document.

(16) *Statements in ancient documents.* Statements in a document in existence twenty years or more the authenticity of which is established.

(17) *Market reports, commercial publications.* Market quotations, tabulations, lists, directories, or other published compilations, generally used and relied upon by the public or by persons in particular occupations.

(18) *Learned treatises.* To the extent called to the attention of an expert witness upon cross-examination or relied upon by the expert witness in

direct examination, statements contained in published treatises, periodicals, or pamphlets on a subject of history, medicine, or other science or art, established as a reliable authority by the testimony or admission of the witness or by other expert testimony or by official notice.

(19) *Reputation concerning personal or family history.* Reputation among members of a person's family by blood, adoption, or marriage, or among a person's associates, or in the community, concerning a person's birth, adoption, marriage, divorce, death, legitimacy, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, ancestry, or other similar fact of personal or family history.

(20) *Reputation concerning boundaries or general history.* Reputation in a community, arising before the controversy, as to boundaries of or customs affecting lands in the community, and reputation as to events of general history important to the community or State or nation in which located.

(21) *Reputation as to character.* Reputation of a person's character among associates or in the community.

(22) *Judgment of previous conviction.* Evidence of a final judgment, entered after a trial or upon a plea of guilty (but not upon a plea of nolo contendere), adjudging a person guilty of a crime punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year, to prove any fact essential to sustain the judgment. The pendency of an appeal may be shown but does not affect admissibility.

(23) *Judgment as to personal, family, or general history, or boundaries.* Judgments as proof of matters of personal, family or general history, or boundaries, essential to the judgment, if the same would be provable by evidence of reputation.

(24) *Other exceptions.* A statement not specifically covered by any of the foregoing exceptions but having equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness to the aforementioned hearsay exceptions, if the judge determines that (i) the statement is offered as evidence of a material fact; (ii) the statement is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence which the proponent can procure through reasonable efforts; and (iii) the general purposes of these rules and the interests of justice will best be served by admission of the statement into evidence. However, a statement may not be admitted under this exception unless the proponent of it makes known to the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to

provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to meet it, the proponent's intention to offer the statement and the particulars of it, including the name and address of the declarant.

(25) *Self-authentication.* The self-authentication of documents and other items as provided in § 18.902.

(26) *Bills, estimates and reports.* In actions involving injury, illness, disease, death, disability, or physical or mental impairment, or damage to property, the following bills, estimates, and reports as relevant to prove the value and reasonableness of the charges for services, labor and materials stated therein and, where applicable, the necessity for furnishing the same, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness, provided that a copy of said bill, estimate, or report has been served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it:

(i) Hospital bills on the official letterhead or billhead of the hospital, when dated and itemized.

(ii) Bills of doctors and dentists, when dated and containing a statement showing the date of each visit and the charge therefor.

(iii) Bills of registered nurses, licensed practical nurses and physical therapists, or other licensed health care providers when dated and containing an itemized statement of the days and hours of service and charges therefor.

(iv) Bills for medicine, eyeglasses, prosthetic device, medical belts or similar items, when dated and itemized.

(v) Property repair bills or estimates, when dated and itemized, setting forth the charges for labor and material. In the case of an estimate, the party intending to offer the estimate shall forward with his notice to the adverse party, together with a copy of the estimate, a statement indicating whether or not the property was repaired, and, if so, whether the estimated repairs were made in full or in part and by whom, the cost thereof, together with a copy of the bill therefor.

(vi) Reports of past earnings, or of the rate of earnings and time lost from work or lost compensation, prepared by an employer on official letterhead, when dated and itemized. The adverse party may not dispute the authenticity, the value or reasonableness of such charges, the necessity therefore or the accuracy of the report, unless the adverse party files and serves written objection thereto sufficiently in advance of the hearing stating the objections, and the

grounds thereof, that the adverse party will make if the bill, estimate, or reports is offered at the time of the hearing. An adverse party may call the author of the bill, estimate, or report as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(27) *Medical reports.* In actions involving injury, illness, disease, death, disability, or physical or mental impairment, doctor, hospital, laboratory and other medical reports, made for purposes of medical treatment, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness, provided that a copy of the report has been filed and served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it. The adverse party may not object to the admissibility of the report unless the adverse party files and serves written objection thereto sufficiently in advance of the hearing stating the objections, and the grounds therefor, that the adverse party will make if the report is offered at the time of the hearing. An adverse party may call the author of the medical report as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(28) *Written reports of expert witnesses.* Written reports of an expert witness prepared with a view toward litigation, including but not limited to a diagnostic report of a physician, including inferences and opinions, when on official letterhead, when dated, when including a statement of the expert's qualifications, when including a summary of experience as an expert witness in litigation, when including the basic facts, data, and opinions forming the basis of the inferences or opinions, and when including the reasons for or explanation of the inferences and opinions, so far as admissible under rules of evidence applied as though the witness was then present and testifying, unless the sources of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness, provided that a copy of the report has been filed and served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it. The adverse party may not object to the admissibility of the report unless the adverse party files and serves written objection thereto sufficiently in advance of the hearing stating the objections, and the grounds therefor, that the adverse party will make if the report is offered at the time of the hearing. An adverse party may call the expert as a witness and examine

the witness as if under cross-examination.

(29) *Written statements of lay witnesses.* Written statements of a lay witness made under oath or affirmation and subject to the penalty of perjury, so far as admissible under the rules of evidence applied as though the witness was then present and testifying, unless the sources of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness provided that (i) a copy of the written statement has been filed and served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it, and (ii) if the declarant is reasonably available as a witness, as determined by the judge, no adverse party has sufficiently in advance of the hearing filed and served upon the noticing party a written demand that the declarant be produced in person to testify at the hearing. An adverse party may call the declarant as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(30) *Deposition testimony.* Testimony given as a witness in a deposition taken in compliance with law in the course of the same proceeding, so far as admissible under the rules of evidence applied as though the witness was then present and testifying, if the party against whom the testimony is now offered had an opportunity and similar motive to develop the testimony by direct, cross, or redirect examination, provided that a notice of intention to offer the deposition in evidence, together with a copy thereof if not otherwise previously provided, has been served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it. An adverse party may call the deponent as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(b) *Reserved.*

§ 18.804 Hearsay exceptions; declarant unavailable.

(a) *Definition of unavailability.* "Unavailability as a witness" includes situations in which the declarant:

(1) Is exempted by ruling of the judge on the ground of privilege from testifying concerning the subject matter of the declarant's statement; or

(2) Persists in refusing to testify concerning the subject matter of the declarant's statement despite an order of the judge to do so; or

(3) Testifies to a lack of memory of the subject matter of the declarant's statement; or

(4) Is unable to be present or to testify at the hearing because of death or then existing physical or mental illness or infirmity; or

(5) Is absent from the hearing and the proponent of a statement has been unable to procure the declarant's attendance (or in the case of a hearsay exception under paragraph (b) (2), (3), or (4) of this section, the declarant's attendance or testimony) by process or other reasonable means.

A declarant is not unavailable as a witness if exemption, refusal, claim of lack of memory, inability, or absence is due to the procurement or wrongdoing of the proponent of a statement for the purpose of preventing the witness from attending or testifying.

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

(1) *Former testimony.* Testimony given as a witness at another hearing of the same or a different proceeding, or in a deposition taken in compliance with law in the course of the same or another proceeding, if the party against whom the testimony is now offered, or a predecessor in interest, had an opportunity and similar motive to develop the testimony by direct, cross, or redirect examination.

(2) *Statement under belief of impending death.* A statement made by a declarant while believing that the declarant's death was imminent, concerning the cause or circumstances of what the declarant believed to be impending death.

(3) *Statement against interest.* A statement which was at the time of its making so far contrary to the declarant's pecuniary or proprietary interest, or so far tended to subject the declarant to civil or criminal liability, or to render invalid a claim by the declarant against another, that a reasonable person in the declarant's position would not have made the statement unless believing it to be true.

(4) *Statement of personal or family history.* (i) A statement concerning the declarant's own birth, adoption, marriage, divorce, legitimacy, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, ancestry, or other similar fact of personal or family history, even though declarant had no means of acquiring personal knowledge of the matter stated; or

(ii) A statement concerning the foregoing matters, and death also, of another person, if the declarant was related to the other by blood, adoption, or marriage or was so intimately associated with the other's family as to

be likely to have accurate information concerning the matter declared.

(5) *Other exceptions.* A statement not specifically covered by any of the foregoing exceptions but having equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness to the aforementioned hearsay exceptions, if the judge determines that—

(i) The statement is offered as evidence of a material fact;

(ii) The statement is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence which the proponent can procure through reasonable efforts; and

(iii) The general purposes of these rules and the interests of justice will best be served by admission of the statement into evidence. However, a statement may not be admitted under this exception unless the proponent of it makes known to the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to meet it, the proponent's intention to offer the statement and the particulars of it, including the name and address of the declarant.

§ 18.805 Hearsay within hearsay.

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

§ 18.806 Attacking and supporting credibility of declarant.

When a hearsay statement, or a statement defined in § 18.801(d)(2), (iii), (iv), or (v), has been admitted in evidence, the credibility of the declarant may be attacked, and if attacked may be supported, by any evidence which would be admissible for those purposes if declarant had testified as a witness. Evidence of a statement or conduct by the declarant at any time, inconsistent with the declarant's hearsay statement, is not subject to any requirement that the declarant may have been afforded an opportunity to deny or explain. If the party against whom a hearsay statement has been admitted calls the declarant as a witness, the party is entitled to examine the declarant on the statement as if under cross-examination.

Authentication and Identification

§ 18.901 Requirement of authentication or identification.

(a) *General provision.* The requirement of authentication or identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is satisfied by evidence sufficient to support a finding that the

matter in question is what its proponent claims.

(b) *Illustrations.* By way of illustration only, and not by way of limitation, the following are examples of authentication or identification conforming with the requirements of this rule:

(1) *Testimony of witness with knowledge.* Testimony that a matter is what it is claimed to be.

(2) *Nonexpert opinion on handwriting.* Nonexpert opinion as to the genuineness of handwriting, based upon familiarity not acquired for purposes of litigation.

(3) *Comparison by judge or expert witness.* Comparison by the judge as trier of fact or by expert witnesses with specimens which have been authenticated.

(4) *Distinctive characteristics and the like.* Appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics, taken in conjunction with circumstances.

(5) *Voice identification.* Identification of a voice, whether heard firsthand or through mechanical or electronic transmission or recording, by opinion based upon hearing the voice at any time under circumstances connecting it with the alleged speaker.

(6) *Telephone conversations.* Telephone conversations, by evidence that a call was made to the number assigned at the time by the telephone company to a particular person or business, if—

(i) In the case of a person, circumstances, including self-identification, show the person answering to be the one called, or

(ii) In the case of a business, the call was made to a place of business and the conversation related to business reasonably transacted over the telephone.

(7) *Public records or reports.* Evidence that a writing authorized by law to be recorded or filed and in fact recorded or filed in a public office, or a purported public record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, is from the public office where items of this nature are kept.

(8) *Ancient documents or data compilation.* Evidence that a document or data compilation, in any form,

(i) Is in such condition as to create no suspicion concerning its authenticity,

(ii) Was in a place where it, if authentic, would likely be, and

(iii) Has been in existence 20 years or more at the time it is offered.

(9) *Process or system.* Evidence describing a process or system used to produce a result and showing that the

process or system produces an accurate result.

(10) *Methods provided by statute or rule.* Any method of authentication or identification provided by Act of Congress, or by rule or regulation prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order.

§ 18.902 Self-authentication.

(a) Extrinsic evidence of authenticity as a condition precedent to admissibility is not required with respect to the following:

(1) *Domestic public documents under seal.* A document bearing a seal purporting to be that of the United States, or of any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, or insular possession thereof, or the Panama Canal Zone, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or of a political subdivision, department, officer, or agency thereof, and a signature purporting to be an attestation or execution.

(2) *Domestic public documents not under seal.* A document purporting to bear the signature in the official capacity of an officer or employee of any entity included in paragraph (a)(1) of this section, having no seal, if a public officer having a seal and having official duties in the district or political subdivision of the officer or employee certifies under seal that the signer has the official capacity and that the signature is genuine.

(3) *Foreign public documents.* A document purporting to be executed or attested in an official capacity by a person authorized by the laws of a foreign country to make the execution or attestation, and accompanied by a final certification as to the genuineness of the signature and official position—

(i) Of the executing or attesting person, or

(ii) Of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness of signature and official position relates to the execution or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness of signature and official position relating to the execution or attestation. A final certification may be made by a secretary of embassy or legation, consul, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States, or a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the United States. If reasonable opportunity has been given to all parties to investigate the authenticity and accuracy of official documents, the judge may, for good cause shown, order that they be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification or permit them to be

evidenced by an attested summary with or without final certification.

(4) *Certified copies of public records.* A copy of an official record or report or entry therein, or of a document authorized by law to be recorded or filed and actually recorded or filed in a public office, including data compilations in any form, certified as correct by the custodian or other person authorized to make the certification, by certificate complying with paragraph (a) (1), (2), or (3) of this section, with any Act of Congress, or with any rule or regulation prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order.

(5) *Official publications.* Books, pamphlets, or other publications purporting to be issued by public authority.

(6) *Newspapers and periodicals.* Printed materials purporting to be newspapers or periodicals.

(7) *Trade inscriptions and the like.* Inscriptions, signs, tags, or labels purporting to have been affixed in the course of business and indicating ownership, control, or origin.

(8) *Acknowledged documents.* Documents accompanied by a certificate of acknowledgment executed in the manner provided by law by a notary public or other officer authorized by law to take acknowledgments.

(9) *Commercial paper and related documents.* Commercial paper, signatures thereon, and documents relating thereto to the extent provided by general commercial law.

(10) *Presumptions under Acts of Congress or administrative agency rules or regulations.* Any signature, document, or other matter declared by Act of Congress or by rule or regulation prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority or pursuant to executive order to be presumptively or prima facie genuine or authentic.

(11) *Certified records of regularly conducted activity.* The original or a duplicate of a record of regularly conducted activity, within the scope of § 18.803(6), which the custodian thereof or another qualified individual certifies

(i) Was made, at or near the time of the occurrence of the matters set forth, by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of those matters,

(ii) Is kept in the course of the regularly conducted activity, and

(iii) Was made by the regularly conducted activity as a regular practice, unless the sources of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness. A

record so certified is not self-authenticating under this paragraph unless the proponent makes an intention to offer it known to the adverse party and makes it available for inspection sufficiently in advance of its offer in evidence to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to object or meet it. As used in this subsection, "certifies" means, with respect to a domestic record, a written declaration under oath subject to the penalty of perjury and, with respect to a foreign record, a written declaration signed in a foreign country which, if falsely made, would subject the maker to criminal penalty under the laws of that country.

(12) *Bills, estimates, and reports.* In actions involving injury, illness, disease, death, disability, or physical or mental impairment, or damage to property, the following bills, estimates, and reports provided that a copy of said bill, estimate, or report has been served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it:

(i) Hospital bills on the official letterhead or billhead of the hospital, when dated and itemized.

(ii) Bills of doctors and dentists, when dated and containing a statement showing the date of each visit and the charge therefor.

(iii) Bills of registered nurses, licensed practical nurses and physical therapists or other licensed health care providers, when dated and containing an itemized statement of the days and hours of service and the charges therefor.

(iv) Bills for medicine, eyeglasses, prosthetic devices, medical belts or similar items, when dated and itemized.

(v) Property repair bills or estimates, when dated and itemized, setting forth the charges for labor and material. In the case of an estimate, the party intending to offer the estimate shall forward with his notice to the adverse party, together with a copy of the estimate, a statement indicating whether or not the property was repaired, and, if so, whether the estimated repairs were made in full or in part and by whom, the cost thereof, together with a copy of the bill therefor.

(vi) Reports of past earnings, or of the rate of earnings and time lost from work or lost compensation, prepared by an employer on official letterhead, when dated and itemized. The adverse party may not dispute the authenticity, therefor, unless the adverse party files and serves written objection thereto sufficiently in advance of the hearing stating the objections, and the grounds therefor, the adverse party will make if

the bill, estimate, or report is offered at the time of the hearing. An adverse party may call the authors of the bill, estimate, or report as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(13) *Medical reports.* In actions involving injury, illness, disease, death, disability or physical or mental impairment, doctor, hospital, laboratory and other medical reports made for purposes of medical treatment, provided that a copy of the report has been filed and served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it. The adverse party may not object to the authenticity of the report unless the adverse party files and serves written objection thereto sufficiently in advance of the hearing stating the objections, and the grounds therefor, that the adverse party will make if the report is offered at the time of the hearing. An adverse party may call the author of the medical report as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(14) *Written reports of expert witnesses.* Written reports of an expert witness prepared with a view toward litigation including but not limited to a diagnostic report of a physician, including inferences and opinions, when on official letterhead, when dated, when including a statement of the experts' qualifications, when including a summary of experience as an expert witness in litigation, when including the basic facts, data, and opinions forming the basis of the inferences or opinions, and when including the reasons for or explanation of the inferences or opinions, so far as admissible under the rules of evidence applied as though the witness was then present and testifying, provided that a copy of the report has been filed and served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it. The adverse party may not object to the authenticity of the report unless the adverse party files and serves written objection thereto sufficiently in advance of the hearing stating the objections, and the grounds therefor, that the adverse party will make if the report is offered at the time of the hearing. An adverse party may call the expert as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(15) *Written statements of lay witnesses.* Written statements of a lay witness made under oath or affirmation and subject to the penalty of perjury, so far as admissible under the rules of

evidence applied as though the witness was then present and testifying, provided that:

(i) A copy of the written statement has been filed and served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it, and

(ii) If the declarant is reasonably available as a witness, as determined by the judge, no adverse party has sufficiently in advance of the hearing filed and served upon the noticing party a written demand that the declarant be produced in person to testify at the hearing. An adverse party may call the declarant as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(16) *Deposition testimony.* Testimony given as a witness in a deposition taken in compliance with law in the course of the same proceeding, so far as admissible under the rules of evidence applied as though the witness was then present and testifying, if the party against whom the testimony is now offered had an opportunity and similar motive to develop the testimony by direct, cross, or redirect examination, provided that a notice of intention to offer the deposition in evidence, together with a copy thereof if not otherwise previously provided, has been served upon the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to object or meet it. An adverse party may call the deponent as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination.

(b) [Reserved]

§ 18.903 Subscribing witness' testimony unnecessary.

The testimony of a subscribing witness is not necessary to authenticate a writing unless required by the laws of the jurisdiction whose laws govern the validity of the writing.

Contents of Writings, Recordings, and Photographs

§ 18.1001 Definitions.

(a) For purposes of this article the following definitions are applicable:

(1) *Writings and recordings.* "Writings" and "recordings" consist of letters, words, or numbers, or their equivalent, set down by handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, magnetic impulse, mechanical or electronic recording, or other form of data compilation.

(2) *Photographs.* "Photographs" include still photographs, X-ray films, video tapes, and motion pictures.

(3) *Original.* An "original" of a writing or recording is the writing or recording itself or any counterpart intended to have the same effect by a person executing or issuing it. An "original" of a photograph includes the negative or, other than with respect to X-ray films, any print therefrom. If data are stored in a computer or similar device, any printout or other output readable by sight, shown to reflect the data accurately, is an "original".

(4) *Duplicate.* A "duplicate" is a counterpart produced by the same impression as the original, or from the same matrix, or by means of photography, including enlargements and miniatures, or by mechanical or electronic rerecording, or by chemical reproduction, or by other equivalent techniques which accurately reproduces the original.

(b) [Reserved]

§ 18.1002 Requirement of original.

To prove the content of a writing, recording, or photograph, the original writing, recording, or photograph is required, except as otherwise provided in these rules, or by rule or regulation prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order, or by Act of Congress.

§ 18.1003 Admissibility of duplicates.

A duplicate is admissible to the same extent as an original unless a genuine question is raised as to the authenticity of the original, or in the circumstances it would be unfair to admit the duplicate in lieu of the original.

§ 18.1004 Admissibility of other evidence of contents.

(a) The original is not required, and other evidence of the contents of a writing, recording, or photograph is admissible if:

(1) *Originals lost or destroyed.* All originals are lost or have been destroyed, unless the proponent lost or destroyed them in bad faith; or

(2) *Original not obtainable.* No original can be obtained by any available judicial process or procedure; or

(3) *Original in possession of opponent.* At a time when an original was under the control of the party against whom offered, that party was put on notice, by the pleading or otherwise, that the contents would be a subject of proof at the hearing, and that party does not produce the original at the hearing; or

(4) *Collateral matters.* The writing, recording, or photograph is not closely related to a controlling issue.

(b) [Reserved].

§ 18.1005. Public records.

The contents of an official record, or of a document authorized to be recorded or filed and actually recorded or filed, including data compilations in any form, if otherwise admissible, may be proved by copy, certified as correct in accordance with § 18.902 or testified to be correct by a witness who has compared it with the original. If a copy which complies with the foregoing cannot be obtained by the exercise of reasonable diligence, then other evidence of the contents may be given.

§ 18.1006. Summaries.

The contents of voluminous writings, recordings, or photographs which cannot conveniently be examined at the hearing may be presented in the form of a chart, summary, or calculation. The originals, or duplicates, shall be made available for examination or copying, or both, by other parties at reasonable time and place. The judge may order that they be produced at the hearing.

§ 18.1007. Testimony or written admission of party.

Contents of writings, recordings, or photographs may be proved by the testimony or deposition of the party against whom offered or by that party's written admission, without accounting for the nonproduction of the original.

§ 18.1008. Functions of the judge.

When the admissibility of other evidence of contents of writings, recordings, or photographs under these rules depends upon the fulfillment of a condition of fact, the question whether the condition has been fulfilled is ordinarily for the judge to determine in accordance with the provisions of § 18.104(a). However, when an issue is raised whether the asserted writing ever existed; or whether another writing, recording, or photograph produced at the hearing is the original; or whether other evidence of contents correctly reflects the contents, the issue is for the judge as trier of fact to determine as in the case of other issues of fact.

Applicability

§ 18.1101. Applicability of rules.

(a) *General provision.* These rules govern formal adversarial adjudications conducted by the United States Department of Labor before a presiding officer.

(1) Which are required by Act of Congress to be determined on the record after opportunity for an administrative agency hearing in accordance with the

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 554, 556 and 557, or

(2) Which by United States Department of Labor regulation are conducted in conformance with the foregoing provisions. "Presiding officer", referred to in these rules as "the judge", means an Administrative Law Judge, an agency head, or other officer who presides at the reception of evidence at a hearing in such an adjudication.

(b) *Rules inapplicable.* The rules (other than with respect to privileges) do not apply in the following situations:

(1) *Preliminary questions of fact.* The determination of questions of fact preliminary to admissibility of evidence when the issue is to be determined by the judge under § 18.104.

(2) *Longshore, black lung, and related acts.* Other than with respect to §§ 18.403, 18.611(a), 18.614 and without prejudice to current practice, hearings held pursuant to the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 901; the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act (formerly the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act) as amended by the Black Lung Benefits Act, 30 U.S.C. 901; and acts such as the Defense Base Act, 42 U.S.C. 1651; the District of Columbia Workmen's Compensation Act, 36 DC Code 501; the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, 43 U.S.C. 1331; and the Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities Act, 5 U.S.C. 8171, which incorporate section 23(a) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by reference.

(c) *Rules inapplicable in part.* These rules do not apply to the extent inconsistent with, in conflict with, or to the extent a matter is otherwise specifically provided by an Act of Congress, or by a rule or regulation of specific application prescribed by the United States Department of Labor pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order.

§ 18.1102. [Reserved.]

§ 18.1103. Title.

These rules may be known as the United States Department of Labor Rules of Evidence and cited as 29 CFR 18.—(1989).

§ 18.1104. Effective date.

These rules are effective thirty days after date of publication with respect to formal adversarial adjudications as specified in § 18.1101 except that with respect to hearings held following an investigation conducted by the United States Department of Labor, these rules shall be effective only where the investigation commenced thirty days after publication.

Appendix—Reporter's Notes

Reporter's Introductory Note

The Rules of Evidence for the United States Department of Labor modify the Federal Rules of Evidence for application in formal adversarial adjudications conducted by the United States Department of Labor. The civil nonjury nature of the hearings and the broad underlying values and goals of the administrative process are given recognition in these rules.

Reporter's Note to § 18.102

In all formal adversarial adjudications of the United States Department of Labor governed by these rules, and in particular such adjudications in which a party appears without the benefit of counsel, the judge is required to construe these rules and to exercise discretion as provided in the rules, see, e.g., § 18.403, to secure fairness in administration and elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay to the end that the truth may be ascertained and the proceedings justly determined, § 18.102. The judge shall also exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of interrogating witnesses and presenting evidence so as to (1) make the interrogation and presentation effective for the ascertainment of the truth, (2) avoid needless consumption of time, and (3) protect witnesses from harassment or undue embarrassment, § 18.611(a).

Reporter's Note to § 18.103

Section 18.103(a) provides that error is not harmless, i.e., a substantial right is affected, unless on review it is determined that it is more probably true than not true that the error did not materially contribute to the decision or order of the court. The more probably true than not true test is the most liberal harmless error standard. See *Haddad v. Lockheed California Corp.*, 720 F.2d 1454, 1458–59 (9th Cir. 1983).

The purpose of a harmless error standard is to enable an appellate court to gauge the probability that the trier of fact was affected by the error. See R. Traynor, [The Riddle of Harmless Error] at 29–30. Perhaps the most important factor to consider in fashioning such a standard is the nature of the particular fact-finding process to which the standard is to be applied. Accordingly, a crucial first step in determining how we should gauge the probability that an error was harmless is recognizing the distinction between civil and criminal trials. See *Kotteakos v. United States*, 328 U.S. 750, 763, 66 S.Ct. 1239, 1247, 90 L.Ed. 1557 (1946); *Valle-Valdez*, 544 F.2d at 914–15. This distinction has two facets, each of which reflects the differing burdens of proof in civil and criminal cases. First, the lower burden of proof in civil cases implies a larger margin of error. The danger of the harmless error doctrine is that an appellate court may usurp the jury's function, by merely deleting improper evidence from the record and assessing the sufficiency of the evidence to support the verdict below. See *Kotteakos*, 328 U.S. at 764–65, 66 S.Ct. at 1247–48; R. Traynor, *supra*, at 18–22. This danger has less practical importance where, as in most civil cases, the jury verdict merely

rests on a more probable than not standard of proof.

The second facet of the distinction between errors in civil and criminal trials involves the differing degrees of certainty owed to civil and criminal litigants. Whereas a criminal defendant must be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, a civil litigant merely has a right to a jury verdict that more probably than not corresponds to the truth.

The term "materially contribute" was chosen as the most appropriate in preference to "substantially swayed". *Kotteakos v. United States*, 328 U.S. 750, 66 S.Ct. 1239, 90 L.Ed. 1557 (1946) or "material effect." *Holloway v. Arkansas*, 435 U.S. 475, 98 S.Ct. 1173, 55 L.Ed.2d 426 (1978). The word "contribute" was employed in *Schneble v. Florida*, 405 U.S. 427, 92 S.Ct. 1056, 31 L.Ed.2d 340 (1972) and *United States v. Hastings*, 461 U.S. 499, 103 S.Ct. 1974, 76 L.Ed.2d 96 (1983).

Error will not be considered in determining whether a substantial right of a party was affected if the evidence was admitted in error following a properly made objection, § 18.103(a)(1), and the judge explicitly states that he or she does not rely on such evidence in support of the decision or order. The judge must explicitly decline to rely upon the improperly admitted evidence. The alternative of simply assuming nonreliance unless the judge explicitly states reliance, goes too far toward emasculating the benefits flowing from rules of evidence.

The question addressed in *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 91 S.Ct. 1420, 28 L.Ed.2d 842 (1971) of whether "substantial evidence" as specified in § 556(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act requires that there be a residuum of legally admissible evidence to support an agency determination is of no concern with respect to these rules; only properly admitted evidence is to be considered in determining whether the "substantial evidence" requirement has been satisfied.

Reporter's Note to § 18.104

As to the standard on review with respect to questions of admissibility generally, section 18.104(a), see *In re Japanese Electronic Products Antitrust Litigation*, 723 F.2d 238, 265-66 (3d Cir. 1983) ("The scope of review of the trial court's trustworthiness determination depends on the basis for the ruling. When the trial court makes § 18.104(a) findings of historical fact about the manner in which a report containing findings was compiled we review by the clearly erroneous standard of Fed.R.Civ.P. 52. But a determination of untrustworthiness, if predicated on factors properly extraneous to such a determination, would be an error of law * * * There is no discretion to rely on improper factors. Such an error of law might, of course, in a given instance be harmless within the meaning of Fed.R.Civ.P. 61. In weighing factors which we consider proper, the trial court exercises discretion and we review for abuse of discretion. Giving undue weight to trustworthiness factors of slight relevance while disregarding factors more significant, for example, might be an abuse of discretion."). Accord, *United States v. Wilson*, 798 F.2d 509 (1st Cir. 1986).

As to the standard on review with respect to relevancy, conditional relevancy and the

exercise of discretion, see, e.g., *United States v. Abel*, 469 U.S. 45, 54, 105 S.Ct. 465, 470, 83 L.Ed.2d 450 (1984) ("A district court is accorded a wide discretion in determining the admissibility of evidence under the Federal Rules. Assessing the probative value of common membership in any particular group, and weighing any factors counselling against admissibility is a matter first for the district court's sound judgment under Rules 401 and 403 and ultimately, if the evidence is admitted, for the trier of fact."); *Alford v. United States*, 282 U.S. 687, 694, 51 S.Ct. 218, 220, 75 L.Ed. 624 (1931) ("The extent of cross-examination with respect to an appropriate subject of inquiry is within the sound discretion of the trial court. It may exercise a reasonable judgment in determining when the subject is exhausted."); *Hill v. Bache Halsey Stuart Shields Inc.*, 790 F.2d 817, 825 (10th Cir. 1986) ("We recognize that a trial court has broad discretion to determine whether evidence is relevant, and its decision will not be reversed on appeal absent a showing of clear abuse of that discretion. *Beacham v. Lee-Norse*, 714 F.2d 1010, 1014 (10th Cir. 1983). The same standard of review applies to a trial court's determination, under Fed.R.Evid. 403, that the probative value of the evidence is outweighed by its potential to prejudice or confuse the jury, or to lead to undue delay. *Id.*").

Reporter's Note to § 18.201

A.P.A. section 556(e) provides that "when an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary." No definition of "official notice" is provided. An administrative agency may take official notice of any adjudicative fact that could be judicially noticed by a court. In addition "the rule is now clearly emerging that an administrative agency may take official notice of any generally recognized technical or scientific facts within the agency's specialized knowledge, subject always to the proviso that the parties must be given adequate advance notice of the facts which the agency proposes to note, and given adequate opportunity to show the inaccuracy of the facts or the fallacy of the conclusions which the agency proposes tentatively to accept without proof. To satisfy this requirement, it is necessary that a statement of the facts noticed must be incorporated into the record. The source material on which the agency relies should, on request, be made available to the parties for their examination." 1 Cooper, State Administrative Law 412-13 (1965). Accord, Uniform Law Commissioners' Model State Administrative Procedure Act section 10(4) (1961) ("Notice may be taken of judicially cognizable facts. In addition, notice may be taken of generally recognized technical or scientific facts within the agency's specialized knowledge. Parties shall be notified either before or during the hearing, or by reference in preliminary reports or otherwise, of the material noticed, including any staff memoranda or data, and they shall be afforded an opportunity to contest the material so noticed. The agency's experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge may be utilized in the

evaluation of the evidence."); Schwartz, Administrative Law § 7.16 at 375 (2d ed. 1984) ("Clearly an agency may take notice of the same kinds of fact of which a court takes judicial notice. It has, however, been recognized that the differences between agencies and courts * * * may justify a broader approach. Under it, an agency may be permitted to take 'official notice' not only of facts that are obvious and notorious to the average man but also of those that are obvious and notorious to an expert in the given field." "A commission that regulates gas companies may take notice of the fact that a well-managed gas company loses no more than 7 percent of its gas through leakage, condensation, expansion, or contraction, where its regulation of gas companies, over the years has made the amount of 'unaccounted for gas' without negligence obvious and notorious to it as the expert in gas regulation. A workers' compensation commission may similarly reject a claim that an inguinal hernia was traumatic in origin where the employee gave no indication of pain and continued work for a month after the alleged accident. The agency had dealt with numerous hernia cases and was as expert in diagnosing them as any doctor would be. Its experience taught it that where a hernia was traumatic in origin, there was immediate discomfort, outward evidences of pain observable to fellow employees, and at least temporary suspension from work. The agency could notice this fact based upon its knowledge as an expert and reject uncontradicted opinion testimony that its own expertise renders unpersuasive."). Compare Uniform Law Commissioners' Model State Administrative Procedure Act section 4-212(f) (1981) ("Official notice may be taken of (i) any fact that could be judicially noticed in the courts of this State, (ii) the record of other proceedings before the agency, (iii) technical or scientific matters within the agency's specialized knowledge, and (iv) codes or standards that have been adopted by an agency of the United States, of this State or of another state, or by a nationally recognized organization or association. Parties must be notified before or during the hearing, or before the issuance of any initial or final order that is based in whole or in part on facts or materials noticed, of the specific facts or material noticed and the source thereof, including any staff memoranda and data, and be afforded an opportunity to contest and rebut the facts or materials so noticed."). Contra Davis, Official Notice, 62 Harv. L. Rev. 537, 539 (1949) ("To limit official notice to facts which are beyond the realm of dispute would virtually emasculate the administrative process. The problem of official notice should not be one of drawing lines between disputable and indisputable facts. Nor should it even be one of weighing the importance of basing decisions upon all available information against the importance of providing full and fair hearings in the sense of permitting parties to meet all materials that influence decision. The problem is the intensely practical one of devising a procedure which will provide both

informed decisions and fair hearings without undue inconvenience or expense.").

Section 18.201 adopts the philosophy of Federal Rule of Evidence 201. The Advisory Committee's Note to Fed.R.Evid. 201 (b) states:

With respect to judicial notice of adjudicative facts, the tradition has been one of caution in requiring that the matter be beyond reasonable controversy. This tradition of circumspection appears to be soundly based, and no reason to depart from it is apparent. As Professor Davis says:

"The reason we use trial-type procedure, I think, is that we make the practical judgment, on the basis of experience, that taking evidence, subject to cross-examination and rebuttal, is the best way to resolve controversies involving disputes of adjudicative facts, that is, facts pertaining to the parties. The reason we require a determination on the record is that we think fair procedure in resolving disputes of adjudicative facts calls for giving each party a chance to meet in the appropriate fashion the facts that come to the tribunal's attention, and the appropriate fashion for meeting disputed adjudicative facts includes rebuttal evidence, cross-examination, usually confrontation, and argument (either written or oral or both). The key to a fair trial is opportunity to use the appropriate weapons (rebuttal evidence, cross-examination, and argument) to meet adverse materials that come to the tribunal's attention." A System of Judicial Notice Based on Fairness and Convenience, in *Perspectives of Law* 69, 93 (1964).

The rule proceeds upon the theory that these considerations call for dispensing with traditional methods of proof only in clear cases. Compare Professor Davis' conclusion that judicial notice should be a matter of convenience, subject to requirements of procedural fairness. *Id.*, 94. Section 18.201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence incorporated the Morgan position on judicial notice. The contrary position, expressed by Wigmore and Thayer, and advocated by Davis, was rejected. See McNaughton, *Judicial Notice—Excerpts Relating to the Morgan-Wigmore Controversy*, 14 *Vand. L. Rev.* 779 (1961) ("They do not differ with respect to the application of the doctrine to 'law'. Nor do they reveal a difference with respect to so-called 'jury notice.' Their difference relates to judicial notice of 'facts.' Here Wigmore, following Thayer, insists that judicial notice is solely to save time where dispute is unlikely and that a matter judicially noticed is therefore only 'prima facie,' or rebuttable, if the opponent elects to dispute it. It is expressed in Thayer and implicit in Wigmore that (perhaps because the matter is rebuttable) judicial notice may be applied not only to indisputable matters but also to matters of lesser certainty. Morgan on the other hand defines judicial notice more narrowly, and his consequences follow from his definition. He limits judicial notice of fact to matters patently indisputable. And his position is that matters judicially noticed are not rebuttable. He asserts that it is wasteful to permit patently indisputable matters to be litigated by way of formal proof and furthermore that it would be absurd to permit

a party to woo a jury to an obviously erroneous finding contrary to the noticed fact. Also, he objects to the Wigmorean conception on the ground that it is really a 'presumption' of sorts attempting to pass under a misleading name. It is, according to Morgan, a presumption with no recognized rules as to how the presumption works, what activates it, and who has the burden of doing how much to rebut it.").

Accordingly, notice that items (ii) and (iv) of the Uniform Law Commissioners' Model State Administrative Procedure Act quoted above are not included as separate items in § 18.201. However codes and standards, (iv), to the extent not subject to reasonable question fall within § 18.201(b)(2). To the extent such codes and standards do not so fall, proof should be required. Official notice of records of other proceedings before the agency would "permit an agency to notice facts contained in its files, such as the revenue statistics contained in the reports submitted to it by a regulated company." Schwartz, *supra* at 377. Once again, to the extent such information is not capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned, § 18.201(b)(2), proof should be required.

Reporter's Note to § 18.301

Section 18.301 does not prevent an administrative agency by either rule, regulation, or common law development from allocating burdens of production and burdens of persuasion in an otherwise permissible manner. See *N.L.R.B. v. Transportation Management Corp.*, 462 U.S. 400, 403 n.7, 103 S.Ct. 2469, 2475 n.7, 76 L.Ed.2d 667 (1983) ("Respondent contends that Federal Rule of Evidence 301 requires that the burden of persuasion rest on the General Counsel. Rule 301 provides:

In all civil actions and proceedings not otherwise provided for by Act of Congress or by these rules, a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption, but does not shift to such party the burden of proof in the sense of the risk of nonpersuasion, which remains throughout the trial upon the party on whom it was originally cast."

The Rule merely defines the term 'presumption.' It in no way restricts the authority of a court or an agency to change the customary burdens of persuasion in a manner that otherwise would be permissible. Indeed, were respondent correct, we could not have assigned to the defendant the burden of persuasion on one issue in *Mt. Healthy City Board of Education v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 97 S.Ct. 568, 50 L.Ed.2d 471 (1977)."

Reporter's Note to § 18.302

The Advisory Committee's Note to Federal Rule of Evidence 302, 56 F.R.D. 118, 211 states:

A series of Supreme Court decisions in diversity cases leaves no doubt of the relevance of *Erie Railroad Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 58 S.Ct. 817, 82 L.Ed. 1188 (1938), to questions of burden of proof. These decisions are *Cities Service Oil Co. v.*

Dunlap, 308 U.S. 208, 60 S.Ct. 201, 84 L.Ed. 196 (1939), *Palmer v. Hoffman*, 318 U.S. 477, 87 L.Ed. 645 (1943), and *Dick v. New York Life Ins. Co.*, 359 U.S. 437, 79 S.Ct. 921, 3 L.Ed.2d 935 (1959). They involved burden of proof, respectively, as to status as bona fide purchaser, contributory negligence, and nonaccidental death (suicide) of an insured. In each instance the state rule was held to be applicable. It does not follow, however, that all presumptions in diversity cases are governed by state law. In each case cited, the burden of proof question had to do with a substantive element of the claim or defense. Application of the state law is called for only when the presumption operates upon such an element. Accordingly the rule does not apply state law when the presumption operates upon a lesser aspect of the case, i.e. "tactical" presumptions.

The situations in which the state law is applied have been tagged for convenience in the preceding discussion as "diversity cases." The designation is not a completely accurate one since *Erie* applies to any claim or issue having its source in state law, regardless of the basis of federal jurisdiction, and does not apply to a federal claim or issue, even though jurisdiction is based on diversity.

Vestal, *Erie R. R. v. Tompkins: A Projection*, 48 *Iowa L.Rev.* 248, 257 (1963); Hart and Wechsler, *The Federal Courts and the Federal System*, 697 (1953); 1A *Moore Federal Practice* p. 0.305[3] (2d ed. 1965); Wright, *Federal Courts*, 217-218 (1963). Hence the rule employs, as appropriately descriptive, the phrase "as to which state law supplies the rule of decision." See A.L.L. Study of the Division of Jurisdiction Between State and Federal Courts, 2344(c), p. 40, P.F.D. No. 1 (1965).

It is anticipated that § 18.302 will very rarely come into play.

Reporter's Note to § 18.403

Rule 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence provides for the exclusion of relevant evidence on the grounds of unfair prejudice. Since all effective evidence is prejudicial in the sense of being damaging to the party against whom it is offered, prejudice which calls for exclusion is given a more specialized meaning: An undue tendency to suggest decision on an improper basis, commonly but not necessarily an emotional one, such as bias, sympathy, hatred, contempt, retribution or horror. Unfair prejudice is not, however, a proper ground for the exclusion of relevant evidence under these rules. Judges have shown over the years the ability to resist deciding matters on such an improper basis. *Accord Gulf States Utilities Co. v. Ecodyne Corp.*, 635 F.2d 517, 519 (5th Cir. 1981). ("The exclusion of this evidence under Rule 403's weighing of probative value against prejudice was improper. This portion of Rule 403 has no logical application to bench trials. Excluding relevant evidence in a bench trial because it is cumulative or a waste of time is clearly a proper exercise of the judge's power, but excluding relevant evidence on the basis of 'unfair prejudice' is a useless procedure. Rule 403 assumes a trial judge is able to discern and weigh the improper inferences that a jury

might draw from certain evidence, and then balance those improprieties against probative value and necessity. Certainly, in a bench trial, the same judge can also exclude those improper inferences from his mind in reaching a decision.")

While § 18.403, like Rule 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, does speak in terms of both confusion of the issues and misleading of the trier of fact, the distinction between such terms is unclear in the literature and in the cases. McCormick, Evidence section 185 at 546 (3d ed. 1984), refers to the probability that certain proof and the answering evidence that it provokes might unduly distract the trier of fact from the main issues. 2 Wigmore, Evidence section 443 at 528-29 (Chadbourn rev. 1979), describes the concept as follows:

In attempting to dispute or explain away the evidence thus offered, new issues will arise as to the occurrence of the instances and the similarity of conditions, new witnesses will be needed whose cross-examination and impeachment may lead to further issues; and that thus the trial will be unduly prolonged, and the multiplicity of minor issues will be such that the jury will lose sight of the main issue, and the whole evidence will be only a mass of confused data from which it will be difficult to extract the kernel of controversy.

Both commentators are clearly describing the notion of confusion of the issues. The notion of confusion of the issues of course applies as well to a reviewing body considering a record in such condition. While a trier of fact or reviewing body confused in the foregoing manner can also be said to have been misled, it is suggested that the concept of misleading refers primarily to the possibility of the trier of fact overvaluing the probative value of a particular item of evidence for any reason other than the emotional reaction associated with unfair prejudice. To illustrate, evidence of the results of a lie detector, even where an attempt is made to explain fully the significance of the results, is likely to be overvalued by the trier of fact. Similarly, the test of *Frye v. United States*, 293 F.1013, 1014 (D.C. Cir. 1923), imposing the requirement with respect to the admissibility of scientific evidence that the particular technique be shown to have gained "general acceptance in the particular field in which it belongs," is an attempt to prevent decision makers from being unduly swayed by unreliable scientific evidence. Demonstrative evidence in the form of a photograph, map, model, drawing or chart which varies substantially from the fact of consequence sought to be illustrated similarly may mislead. Finally, any trier of fact may be misled by the sheer amount of time spent upon a question into believing the issue to be of major importance and accordingly into attaching too much significance to it in its determination of the factual issues involved. While clearly of less import where the judge is the trier of fact and with respect to the state of the record on review, the danger of confusion of the issues or misleading the judge as trier of fact, together with such risks on review, are each of sufficient moment especially when considered in connection with needless

consumption of time to warrant inclusion in § 18.403.

Occasionally evidence is excluded not because distracting side issues will be created but rather because an unsuitable amount of time would be consumed in clarifying the situation. Concerns associated with the proper use of trial time also arise where the evidence being offered is relevant to a fact as to which substantial other evidence has already been introduced, including evidence bearing on the question of credibility, where the evidence itself possesses only minimal probative value, such as evidence admitted as background, or where evidence is thought by the court to be collateral. In recognition of the legitimate concern of the court with expenditures of time, § 18.403 provides for exclusion of evidence where its incremental probative value is substantially outweighed by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence. Roughly speaking undue delay can be argued to refer to delay caused by the failure of the party to be able to produce the given evidence at the appropriate time at trial but only at some later time. Waste of time may be taken to refer to the fact that the evidence possesses inadequate incremental probative value in light of the time its total exploration will consume. Cumulative refers to multiple sources of different evidence establishing the same fact of consequence as well as multiple same sources, such as ten witnesses all testifying to the same speed of the car or the same character of a witness.

Reporter's Note to § 18.501

The Conference Report to Federal Rule of Evidence 501, 1975 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 7098, 7100 states:

Rule 501 deals with the privilege of a witness not to testify. Both the House and Senate bills provide that federal privilege law applies in criminal cases. In civil actions and proceedings, the House bill provides that state privilege law applies "to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision." The Senate bill provides that "in civil actions and proceedings arising under 28 U.S.C. 1332 or 28 U.S.C. 1335, or between citizens of different States and removed under 28 U.S.C. 1441(b) the privilege of a witness, person, government, State or political subdivision thereof is determined in accordance with State law unless with respect to the particular claim or defense, Federal law supplies the rule of decision."

The wording of the House and Senate bills differs in the treatment of civil actions and proceedings. The rule in the House bill applies to evidence that relates to "an element of a claim or defense." If an item of proof tends to support or defeat a claim or defense, or an element of a claim or defense, and if state law supplies the rule of decision for that claim or defense, then state privilege law applies to that item of proof.

Under the provision in the House bill, therefore, state privilege law will usually apply in diversity cases. There may be diversity cases, however, where a claim or defense is based upon federal law. In such instances, federal privilege law will apply to

evidence relevant to the federal claim or defense. See *Sola Electric Co. v. Jefferson Electric Co.*, 317 U.S. 173 (1942).

In nondiversity jurisdiction civil cases, federal privilege law will generally apply. In those situations where a federal court adopts or incorporates state law to fill interstices or gaps in federal statutory phrases, the court generally will apply federal privilege law.

As Justice Jackson has said:

A federal court sitting in a nondiversity case such as this does not sit as a local tribunal. In some cases it may see fit for special reasons to give the law of a particular state highly persuasive or even controlling effect, but in the last analysis its decision turns upon the law of the United States, not that of any state.

D'Oench, Duhme & Co. v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., 315 U.S. 447, 471 (1942) (Jackson, J., concurring). When a federal court chooses to absorb state law, it is applying the state law as a matter of federal common law. Thus, state law does not supply the rule of decision (even though the federal court may apply a rule derived from state decisions), and state privilege law would not apply. See C.A. Wright, Federal Courts 251-252 (2d ed. 1970); *Holmberg v. Armbricht*, 327 U.S. 392 (1946); *DeSylva v. Ballentine*, 351 U.S. 570, 581 (1956); 9 Wright & Miller, Federal Rules and Procedures § 2408.

In civil actions and proceedings, where the rule of decision as to a claim or defense or as to an element of a claim or defense is supplied by state law, the House provision requires that state privilege law apply.

The Conference adopts the House provision.

It is anticipated that the proviso in § 18.501 will very rarely come into play.

Reporter's Note to § 18.601

The Conference Report to Federal Rule of Evidence 601, 1975 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 7051, 7059 states:

Rule 601 deals with competency of witnesses. Both the House and Senate bills provide that federal competency law applies in criminal cases. In civil actions and proceedings, the House bill provides that state competency law applies "to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision." The Senate bill provides that "in civil actions and proceedings arising under 28 U.S.C. 1332 or 28 U.S.C. 1335, or between citizens of different States and removed under 28 U.S.C. 1441(b) the competency of a witness, person, government, State or political subdivision thereof is determined in accordance with State law, unless with respect to the particular claim or defense, Federal law supplies the rule of decision."

The wording of the House and Senate bills differs in the treatment of civil actions and proceedings. The rule in the House bill applies to evidence that relates to "an element of a claim or defense." If an item of proof tends to support or defeat a claim or defense, or an element of a claim or defense, and if state law supplies the rule of decision for that claim or defense, then state competency law applies to that item of proof.

For reasons similar to those underlying its action on Rule 501, the Conference adopts the House provision.

It is anticipated that the proviso to § 18.601 will very rarely come into play.

Reporter's Note to § 18.609

Consistent with the position taken in § 18.403, unfair prejudice is not felt to be a proper reason of the exclusion of relevant evidence in a hearing where the judge is the trier of fact. Sections 18.609 (a) and (b) provide for the use of every prior conviction punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year under the law under which the witness was convicted and every prior conviction involving dishonesty or false statement, regardless of punishment, provided not more than ten years has elapsed since the date of the conviction or the release of the witness from the confinement imposed for that conviction, whichever is the later date. Convictions more than ten years old are felt to be too stale to be admitted to impeach the credibility of a witness testifying in any hearing to which these rules apply.

Reporter's Note to § 18.801

Rule 801(d)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Evidence has been revised in § 18.801(d)(1)(A) to permit the substantive admissibility of all prior inconsistent statements. The added protection of certainty of making and circumstances conducive to trustworthiness provided by the restriction that the prior inconsistent statement be "given under oath subject to the penalty of perjury at a trial, hearing, in other proceeding, or in a deposition" were added by Congress to Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(1)(A) for the benefit of the criminal defendant. See *Graham, Employing Inconsistent Statements for Impeachment and as Substantive Evidence: A Critical Review and Proposed Amendments of Federal Rules of Evidence 801(d)(1)(A)*, 613 and 607, 75 Mich L. Rev. 565 (1977).

Reporter's Note to § 18.802

An "administrative file" is admissible as such to the extent so provided by rule or regulation of the administrative agency prescribed pursuant to statutory authority, or pursuant to executive order, or by Act of Congress. Accordingly, if a program provides for creation of an "administrative file" and for the "administrative file" to be admitted in evidence before a judge presiding at a formal adversarial adjudication governed by these rules, see § 18.1101, the "administrative file" would fall outside the bar of the hearsay rule. Similarly to the extent so provided by Act of Congress or by rule or regulation prescribed by the administrative agency pursuant to statutory authority or pursuant to executive order, such "administrative file" is self-authenticating, § 18.902(10).

Reporter's Note to § 18.803

Section 18.803(24) provides that the "equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness" required to satisfy the "other [reliable] hearsay" exception is that possessed solely by the "aforementioned hearsay exceptions," i.e., §§ 18.803(1)–18.803(24). The hearsay exceptions which follow, i.e., §§ 18.803(25)–18.803(30), rely too

greatly upon necessity and convenience to serve as a basis to judge "equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness."

Section 18.803(25) provides a hearsay exception for the self-authenticating aspect of documents and other items as provided in § 18.902. Out of court statements admitted under § 18.902 for the purpose of establishing that the document or other item offered into evidence is as purported to be are received in evidence to establish the truth of the matter stated, §§ 18.801(a)–(c). Section 18.802 provides that "hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules * * *". Section 18.902 thus operates as a hearsay exception on the limited question of authenticity. Section 18.902 does not, however, purport to create a hearsay exception for matters asserted to be true in the self-authenticating exhibit itself. As a matter of drafting consistency, it is preferable to have a specific hearsay exception in § 18.803 for statements of self-authentication under § 18.902 than to have a hearsay exception exist in these rules not bearing an 18.800 number.

Sections 18.803(26) and 18.803(27) are derived from Rules 4(e) and (f) of the Arizona Uniform Rules of Procedure for Arbitration. Section 18.803(26)(f) is derived from Illinois Supreme Court Rule 90(c)(4).

Sections 18.803(27) and 18.803(28) maintain the common law distinction between a treating physician, i.e., medical treatment, and an examining or nontreating physician, i.e., medical diagnosis. A treating physician provides or acts with a view toward providing medical treatment. An examining physician is one hired with a view toward testifying on behalf of a party and not toward treating a patient. As such, written reports of the examining physician are not felt to be sufficiently trustworthy to be given the preferred treatment of § 18.803(27). Thus a report of a physician made for the purpose of medical treatment, i.e., treating physician, is admissible if the requirements of § 18.803(27) are satisfied. A report of physician prepared with a view toward litigation, i.e., examining physician, satisfying the requirements of § 18.802(28) is also admissible. The reports of a given physician may, of course, fall within either or both categories. Reports of any medical surveillance test the purpose of which is to detect actual or potential impairment of health or functional capacity and autopsy reports fall within § 18.803(28).

Section 18.803(28) is derived from Rule 1613(b)(1) of the California Rules of Court. A summary of litigation experience of the expert is required to assist the evaluation of credibility.

Section 18.803(29) is derived from Rule 1613(b)(2) of the California Rules of Court.

Section 18.803(30) is derived from Rule 1613(b)(3) of the California Rules of Court.

Sections 18.803(28)–18.803(30) each provide that the adverse party may call the declarant of the hearsay statement, if available, as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination. The proviso relating to the calling of witnesses is derived from Rule 1305(b) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Court Procedure Governing Compulsory Arbitration. See also §§ 18.902(12)–18.902(16) *infra*.

These rules take no position with respect to which party must initially bear the cost of lay witness and expert witness fees nor as to the ultimate disposition of such fees. Ordinarily, however, it is anticipated that the adverse party calling the witness should initially pay statutory witness fees, mileage, etc., and reasonable compensation to an expert witness in whatever sum and at such time as the judge may allow. Such witness fees, mileage, etc., and reasonable expert witness compensation should thereafter be charged to the same extent and in like manner as other such costs.

Reporter's Note to § 18.902

Section 18.902(11) is modeled upon Uniform Rule of Evidence 902(11). The requirement of a final certification with respect to a foreign record has been deleted as unnecessary in accordance with the position adopted in 18 U.S.C. 3505 which governs the self-authentication of a foreign record offered in a federal criminal proceeding. The "Comment" to Uniform Rule of Evidence 902(11) states:

Subsection 11 is new and embodies a revised version of the recently enacted federal statute dealing with foreign records of regularly conducted activity, 18 U.S.C. 3505. Under the federal statute, authentication by certification is limited to foreign business records and to use in criminal proceedings. This subsection broadens the federal provision so that it includes domestic as well as foreign records and is applicable in civil as well as criminal cases. Domestic records are presumably no less trustworthy and the certification of such records can more easily be challenged if the opponent of the evidence chooses to do so. As to the federal statute's limitation to criminal matters, ordinarily the rules are more strictly applied in such cases, and the rationale of trustworthiness is equally applicable in civil matters. Moreover, the absence of confrontation concerns in civil actions militates in favor of extending the rule to the civil side as well.

The rule requires that the certified record be made available for inspection by the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the offer to permit the opponent a fair opportunity to challenge it. A fair opportunity to challenge the offer may require that the proponent furnish the opponent with a copy of the record in advance of its introduction and that the opponent have an opportunity to examine, not only the record offered, but any other records or documents from which the offered record was procured or to which the offered record relates. That is a matter not addressed by the rule but left to the discretion of the trial judge.

Sections 18.902 (12) and (13) are derived from Rule 4 (e) and (f) of the Arizona Uniform Rules of Procedure for Arbitration. Section 18.902(12)(f) is derived from Illinois Supreme Court Rule 90(c)(4).

Section 18.902(14) is derived from Rule 1613(b)(1) of the California Rules of Court. A summary of litigation experience of the expert is required to assist the evaluation of credibility.

With respect to §§ 18.902(13) and 18.902(14) as applied to a treating or examining

physician, see Reporter's Note to §§ 18.803(27) and 18.803(28) *supra*.

Section 18.902(15) is derived from Rule 1613(b)(2) of the California Rules of Court. Section 18.902(16) is derived from Rule 1613(b)(3) of the California Rules of Court.

Sections 18.902 (12)-(16) each provide that the adverse party may call the declarant of the hearsay statement, if available, as a witness and examine the witness as if under cross-examination. The proviso relating to the calling of witnesses is derived from Rule 1305(b) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure Governing Compulsory Arbitration.

These rules take no position with respect to which party must initially bear the cost of lay witness and expert witness fees nor as to the ultimate disposition of such fees. Ordinarily, however, it is anticipated that the adverse party calling the witness should initially pay statutory witness fees, mileage, etc., and reasonable compensation to an expert witness in whatever sum and at such time as the judge may allow. Such witness fees, mileage, etc., and reasonable expert witness compensation should thereafter be charged to the same extent and in like manner as other such costs. See also §§ 18.803 (25)-(30) *supra*.

Reporter's Note to § 18.1001

Section 18.1001(3) excludes prints made from X-ray film from the definition of an original. A print made from X-ray film is not felt to be equivalent to the X-ray film itself when employed for purposes of medical treatment or diagnosis.

Reporter's Note to § 18.1101

Section 23(a) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 922, provides as follows:

In making an investigation or inquiry or conducting a hearing the deputy

commissioner or Board shall not be bound by common law or statutory rules of evidence or by technical or formal rules of procedure, except as provided by this chapter; but may make such investigation or inquiry or conduct such hearing in such manner as to best ascertain the rights of the parties.

Declarations of a deceased employee concerning the injury in respect of which the investigation or inquiry is being made or the hearing conducted shall be received in evidence and shall, if corroborated by other evidence, be sufficient to establish the injury. Other acts such as the Defense Base Act, 42 U.S.C. 1651, adopt section 23(a) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by reference. In addition 20 CFR 725.455(b) provides as follows with respect to the Black Lung Benefits Act, 30 U.S.C. 901:

Evidence. The administrative law judge shall at the hearing inquire fully into all matters at issue, and shall not be bound by common law or statutory rules of evidence, or by technical or formal rules of procedure, except as provided by 5 U.S.C. 554 and this subpart. The administrative law judge shall receive into evidence the testimony of the witnesses and parties, the evidence submitted to the Office of Administrative Law Judges by the deputy commissioner under § 725.421, and such additional evidence as may be submitted in accordance with the provisions of this subpart. The administrative law judge may entertain the objections of any party to the evidence submitted under this section.

Section 18.1101(c) provides that these rules do not apply to the extent inconsistent with, in conflict with, or to the extent a matter is otherwise specifically provided for by an Act of Congress or by a rule or regulation of specific application prescribed by the United States Department of Labor pursuant to

statutory authority. Whether section 23(a) and § 725.455(b) are in fact incompatible with these rules, while unlikely for various reasons including their lack of specificity, is nevertheless arguable.

Without regard to section 23(a) and § 725.455(b), various other considerations support the conclusion to exclude hearings under Longshore, Black Lung, and related acts from coverage of these rules at this time. Longshore, Black Lung, and related acts involve entitlements. Claimants in such hearings benefit from proceeding pursuant to the most liberal evidence rules that are consistent with the orderly administration of justice and the ascertainment of truth. Claimants in such hearings on occasion appear *pro se*. While the modifications made by these rules are clearly designed to further liberalize the already liberal Federal Rules of Evidence, it is nevertheless unclear at this time whether even conformity with minimal requirements with respect to the introduction of evidence would present a significant barrier to the successful prosecution of meritorious claims. Rather than speculate as to the impact adoption of these rules would have upon such entitlement programs, it was decided to exclude hearings involving such entitlement programs from coverage of these rules. It is anticipated that application of these rules to hearings involving such entitlement programs will be reconsidered in the future following careful study. Notice that the inapplicability of these rules in such hearings at this time is specifically stated in § 18.1101(b)(2) to be without prejudice to the continuation of current practice with respect to application of rules of evidence in such hearings.

[FR Doc. 90-7740 Filed 4-6-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-20-M