

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

JOHN D. BATES
CHAIR

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

JAY S. BYBEE
APPELLATE RULES

DENNIS R. DOW
BANKRUPTCY RULES

ROBERT M. DOW, JR.
CIVIL RULES

RAYMOND M. KETHLEDGE
CRIMINAL RULES

PATRICK J. SCHILTZ
EVIDENCE RULES

MEMORANDUM

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

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

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

DATE: May 15, 2022

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules (the “Committee”) met in Washington, D.C., on May 6, 2021. At the meeting the Committee discussed and gave final approval to three proposed amendments that had been released for public comment. The Committee also considered and approved six proposed amendments with the recommendation that they be released for public comment.

The Committee made the following determinations at the meeting:

* * * * *

● It unanimously approved proposals to amend Rules 611 * * * * *, 613(b), 801(d)(2), 804(b)(3), and 1006, and recommends to the Standing Committee that these proposed amendments be released for public comment.

A full description of all of these matters can be found in the draft minutes of the Committee meeting, attached to this Report. The proposed amendments can also be found as attachments to this Report.

II. Action Items

* * * * *

D. Possible Amendment to Rule 611 on Illustrative Aids, for Release for Public Comment

At the Spring meeting, the Committee unanimously approved a proposal to add a new Rule 611(d) to regulate the use of illustrative aids at trial. The distinction between “demonstrative evidence” (admitted into evidence and used substantively to prove disputed issues at trial) and “illustrative aids” (not admitted into evidence but used solely to assist the jury in understanding other evidence) is sometimes a difficult one to draw, and is a point of confusion in the courts. In addition, the standards for allowing illustrative aids to be presented --- and particularly whether illustrative aids may be used by the jury during deliberations --- are not made clear in the case law. The Committee has determined that it would be useful to set forth uniform standards to regulate the use of illustrative aids, and in doing so clarify the distinction between illustrative aids and demonstrative evidence.

The proposed amendment would distinguish illustrative aids --- presentations that are not evidence but offered only to help the factfinder understand evidence --- from demonstrative evidence offered to prove a fact. The amendment would allow illustrative aids to be used at trial after the court balances the utility of the aid against the risk of unfair prejudice, confusion, and delay.

Because illustrative aids are not evidence, adverse parties do not receive pretrial discovery of such aids. The proposed rule would require notice to be provided, unless the court for good cause orders otherwise. The Committee determined that advance notice is important so that the court can rule on whether the aid has sufficient utility before it is displayed to the jury. (After all, you can’t unring a bell.) The Committee Note recognizes that the timing of the notice will depend on the circumstances.

Finally, because illustrative aids are not evidence, the proposed rule provides that the aids should not be allowed into the jury room during deliberations, unless the court orders otherwise.

The Committee Note specifies that if the court does allow an illustrative aid to go to the jury room, the court should instruct the jury that the aid is not evidence.

It is important to note that the proposed rule is not intended to regulate PowerPoints or other aids that an attorney uses merely to guide the jury through an opening or closing argument. Again, illustrative aids assist the jury in understanding *evidence*; something that assists the jury in following an *argument* is therefore not an illustrative aid.

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

At the Spring 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to add Rule 611(d) to regulate the use of illustrative aids at a trial. The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be released for public comment.

The proposed amendment to add Rule 611(d), together with the proposed Committee Note, is attached to this Report.

E. Proposed Amendment to Rule 1006, for Release for Public Comment¹

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

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

The proposal to amend Rule 1006 dovetails with the proposal to establish a rule on illustrative aids, discussed above. These two rules serve to distinguish a summary of voluminous evidence (which is itself evidence and governed by Rule 1006) from a summary that is designed to help the trier of fact understand evidence that has already been presented (which is not itself evidence and would be governed by new Rule 611(d)). The proposed amendment to Rule 1006 would clarify that a summary is admissible whether or not the underlying evidence has been

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

admitted. The Committee believes that the proposed amendment will provide substantial assistance to courts and litigants in navigating this confusing area.

At the Spring 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 1006. The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be released for public comment.

The proposed amendment to Rule 1006, together with the proposed Committee Note, is attached to this Report.

* * * * *

G. Proposed Amendment to Rule 613(b), for Release for Public Comment.

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

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

* * * * *

At the Spring 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 613(b). The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be released for public comment.

The proposed amendment to Rule 613(b), together with the proposed Committee Note, is attached to this Report.

H. Proposed Amendment to Rule 801(d)(2) Governing Successors-in-Interest, for Release for Public Comment

Rule 801(d)(2) provides a hearsay exemption for statements of a party opponent. Courts are split about the applicability of this exemption in the following situation: a declarant makes a statement that would have been admissible against him as a party-opponent, but he is not the party-opponent because his claim or defense has been transferred to another (either by agreement or by operation of law), and it is the transferee that is the party-opponent. Some circuits would permit the statements made by the declarant to be offered against the successor as a party-opponent statement under Rule 801(d)(2), while others would foreclose admissibility because the statement was made by one who is technically not the party-opponent in the case.

At its Spring, 2002 meeting, after previous discussion, the Committee determined that the dispute in the courts about the admissibility of party-opponent statements against successors should be resolved by a rule amendment, because the problem arises with some frequency in a variety of successor/predecessor situations (most commonly, decedent and estate in a claim brought for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983). The Committee unanimously determined that the appropriate result should be that a hearsay statement should be admissible against the successor-in-interest. The Committee reasoned that admissibility was fair when the successor-in-interest is standing in the shoes of the declarant --- because the declarant is in substance the party-opponent. Moreover, a contrary rule results in random application of Rule 801(d)(2), and possible strategic action, such as assigning a claim in order to avoid admissibility of a statement. The Committee approved the following addition to Rule 801(d)(2):

If a party's claim or potential liability is directly derived from a declarant or the declarant's principal, a statement that would be admissible against the declarant or the principal under this rule is also admissible against the party.

The proposed Committee Note would emphasize that to be admissible against the successor, the declarant must have made the statement before the transfer of the claim or defense.

At its Spring 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 801(d)(2). The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be released for public comment.

The proposed amendment to Rule 801(d)(2), together with the proposed Committee Note, is attached to this Report.

I. Proposed Amendment to the Rule 804(b)(3) Corroborating Circumstances Requirement, for Release for Public Comment

Rule 804(b)(3) provides a hearsay exception for declarations against interest. In a criminal case in which a declaration against penal interest is offered, the rule requires that the proponent provide “corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate the trustworthiness” of the statement. There is a dispute in the courts about the meaning of the “corroborating circumstances” requirement. Most federal courts consider both the inherent guarantees of trustworthiness underlying a particular declaration against interest as well as independent evidence corroborating (or refuting) the accuracy of the statement. But some courts do not permit inquiry into independent evidence --- limiting judges to consideration of the inherent guarantees of trustworthiness surrounding the statement. This latter view --- denying consideration of independent corroborative evidence --- is inconsistent with the 2019 amendment to Rule 807 (the residual exception), which requires courts to look at corroborative evidence in determining whether a hearsay statement is sufficiently trustworthy under that exception. The rationale is that corroborative evidence can shore up concerns about the potential unreliability of a statement --- a rationale that is applied in many other contexts, such as admissibility of co-conspirator hearsay, and tips from informants in determining probable cause.

At its Spring, 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved an amendment to Rule 804(b)(3) that would parallel the language in Rule 807, and require the court to consider the presence or absence of corroborating evidence in determining whether “corroborating circumstances” exist. The proposed language for the amendment, which is recommended for release for public comment, is as follows:

Rule 804(b)(3) Statement Against Interest.

A statement that:

(A) A reasonable person in the declarant’s position would have made only if the person believed it to be true because, when made, it was so contrary to the declarant’s proprietary or pecuniary interest or had so great a tendency to invalidate the declarant’s claim against someone else or to expose the declarant to civil or criminal liability; and

(B) if offered in a criminal case as one that tends to expose the declarant to criminal liability, the court finds it is supported by corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate trustworthiness --- after considering the totality of circumstances under which it was made and evidence, if any, corroborating it. ~~if offered in a criminal case as one that tends to expose the declarant to criminal liability.~~

The Committee believes that it is important to rectify the dispute among the circuits about the meaning of “corroborating circumstances” and that requiring consideration of corroborating evidence not only avoids inconsistency with the residual exception, but is also supported by logic and by the legislative history of Rule 804(b)(3).

Excerpt from the May 15, 2022 Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

At its Spring 2022 meeting, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Rule 80(4)(b)(3). The Committee recommends that the proposed amendment, and the accompanying Committee Note, be released for public comment.

The proposed amendment to Rule 804(b)(3), together with the proposed Committee Note, is attached to this Report.

* * * * *

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE¹**

1 **Rule 611. Mode and Order of Examining Witnesses**
2 **and Presenting Evidence**

3 * * * * *

4 **(d) Illustrative Aids.**

5 **(1) Permitted Uses.** The court may allow a party
6 to present an illustrative aid to help the finder of fact
7 understand admitted evidence if:

8 **(A) its utility in assisting comprehension**
9 is not [substantially] outweighed by
10 the danger of unfair prejudice,
11 confusing the issues, misleading the
12 jury, undue delay, or wasting time;
13 and

14 **(B) all parties are given notice and a**
15 reasonable opportunity to object to its

¹ New material is underlined in red.

- 16 use, unless the court, for good cause,
17 orders otherwise.
- 18 **(2) Use in Jury Deliberations.** An illustrative aid
19 must not be provided to the jury during
20 deliberations unless:
- 21 **(A) all parties consent; or**
22 **(B) the court, for good cause, orders**
23 **otherwise.**
- 24 **(3) Record.** When practicable, an illustrative aid
25 that is used at trial must be entered into the
26 record.

Committee Note

The amendment establishes a new subdivision within Rule 611 to provide standards for the use of illustrative aids. The new rule is derived from Maine Rule of Evidence 616. The term “illustrative aid” is used instead of the term “demonstrative evidence,” as that latter term is vague and has been subject to differing interpretation in the courts. “Demonstrative evidence” is a term better applied to substantive evidence offered to prove, by demonstration, a disputed fact.

Writings, objects, charts, or other presentations that are used during the trial to provide information to the factfinder thus fall into two separate categories. The first category is evidence that is offered to prove a disputed fact; admissibility of such evidence is dependent upon satisfying the strictures of Rule 403, the hearsay rule, and other evidentiary screens. Usually the jury is permitted to take this substantive evidence to the jury room, to study it, and to use it to help determine the disputed facts.

The second category—the category covered by this rule—is information that is offered for the narrow purpose of helping the factfinder to understand what is being communicated to them by the witness or party presenting evidence. Examples include blackboard drawings, photos, diagrams, powerpoint presentations, video depictions, charts, graphs, and computer simulations. These kinds of presentations, referred to in this rule as “illustrative aids,” have also been described as “pedagogical devices” and sometimes (and less helpfully) “demonstrative presentations”—that latter term being unhelpful because the purpose for presenting the information is not to “demonstrate” how an event occurred but rather to help the finder of fact understand evidence that is being or has been presented.

A similar distinction must be drawn between a summary of voluminous, admissible information offered to prove a fact, and a summary of evidence that is offered solely to assist the trier of fact in understanding the evidence. The former is subject to the strictures of Rule 1006. The latter is an illustrative aid, which the courts have previously regulated pursuant to the broad standards of Rule 611(a), and

which is now to be regulated by the more particularized requirements of this Rule 611(d).

While an illustrative aid is by definition not offered to prove a fact in dispute, this does not mean that it is free from regulation by the court. Experience has shown that illustrative aids can be subject to abuse. It is possible that the illustrative aid may be prepared to distort the evidence presented, to oversimplify, or to stoke unfair prejudice. This rule requires the court to assess the value of the illustrative aid in assisting the trier of fact to understand the evidence. *Cf.* Fed. R. Evid. 703; *see* Adv. Comm. Note to the 2000 amendment to Rule 703. Against that beneficial effect, the court must weigh most of the dangers that courts take into account in balancing evidence offered to prove a fact under Rule 403—one particular problem being that the illustrative aid might appear to be substantive demonstrative evidence of a disputed event. If those dangers [substantially] outweigh the value of the aid in assisting the trier of fact, the trial court should exercise its discretion to prohibit—or modify—the use of the illustrative aid. And if the court does allow the aid to be presented at a jury trial, the adverse party may ask to have the jury instructed about the limited purpose for which the illustrative aid may be used. *Cf.* Rule 105.

One of the primary means of safeguarding and regulating the use of illustrative aids is to require advance disclosure. Ordinary discovery procedures concentrate on the evidence that will be presented at trial, so illustrative aids are not usually subject to discovery. Their sudden appearance may not give sufficient opportunity for analysis by other parties, particularly if they are complex. The amendment therefore provides that illustrative aids prepared for use in court must be disclosed in advance in order to

allow a reasonable opportunity for objection—unless the court, for good cause, orders otherwise. The rule applies to aids prepared either before trial or during trial before actual use in the courtroom. But the timing of notice will be dependent on the nature of the illustrative aid. Notice as to an illustrative aid that has been prepared well in advance of trial will differ from the notice required with respect to a handwritten chart prepared in response to a development at trial. The trial court has discretion to determine when and how notice is provided.

Because an illustrative aid is not offered to prove a fact in dispute, and is used only in accompaniment with testimony or presentation by the proponent, the amendment provides that illustrative aids are not to go to the jury room unless all parties consent or the court, for good cause, orders otherwise. The Committee determined that allowing the jury to use the aid in deliberations, free of the constraint of accompaniment with witness testimony or party presentation, runs the risk that the jury may misinterpret the import, usefulness, and purpose of the illustrative aid. But the Committee concluded that trial courts should have some discretion to allow the jury to consider an illustrative aid during deliberations; that discretion is most likely to be exercised in complex cases, or in cases where the jury has requested to see the illustrative aid. If the court does exercise its discretion to allow the jury to review the illustrative aid during deliberations, the court must upon request instruct the jury that the illustrative aid is not evidence and cannot be considered as proof of any fact.

While an illustrative aid is not evidence, if it is used at trial it must be marked as an exhibit and made part of the record, unless that is impracticable under the circumstances.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE¹**

1 **Rule 613. Witness's Prior Statement**

2 * * * * *

3 **(b) Extrinsic Evidence of a Prior Inconsistent**
4 **Statement. Unless the court orders otherwise,**
5 ~~Extrinsic~~ evidence of a witness's prior inconsistent
6 statement ~~is admissible only if~~ **may not be admitted**
7 **until after** the witness is given an opportunity to
8 explain or deny the statement and an adverse party is
9 given an opportunity to examine the witness about it;
10 ~~or if justice so requires.~~ This subdivision (b) does not
11 apply to an opposing party's statement under
12 Rule 801(d)(2).

Committee Note

 Rule 613(b) has been amended to require that a witness receive an opportunity to explain or deny a prior inconsistent statement *prior* to the introduction of extrinsic evidence of the statement. This requirement of a prior

¹ New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

foundation is consistent with the common law approach to prior inconsistent statement impeachment. *See, e.g., Wammock v. Celotex Corp.*, 793 F.2d 1518, 1521 (11th Cir. 1986) (“Traditionally, prior inconsistent statements of a witness could not be proved by extrinsic evidence unless and until the witness was first confronted with the impeaching statement.”). The original rule imposed no timing preference or sequence, however, and permitted an impeaching party to introduce extrinsic evidence of a witness’s prior inconsistent statement before giving the witness the necessary opportunity to explain or deny it. This flexible timing can create problems concerning the witness’s availability to be recalled, and lead to disputes about which party bears responsibility for recalling the witness to afford the opportunity to explain or deny. Further, recalling a witness solely to afford the requisite opportunity to explain or deny a prior inconsistent statement may be inefficient. Finally, trial judges may find extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement unnecessary in some circumstances where a witness freely acknowledges the inconsistency when afforded an opportunity to explain or deny. Affording the witness an opportunity to explain or deny a prior inconsistent statement before introducing extrinsic evidence of the statement avoids these difficulties. The prior foundation requirement prevents unfair surprise; gives the target of the impeaching evidence a timely opportunity to explain or deny the alleged inconsistency; promotes judges’ efforts to conduct trials in an orderly manner; and conserves judicial resources.

The amendment preserves the trial court’s discretion to delay an opportunity to explain or deny until after the introduction of extrinsic evidence in appropriate cases, or to dispense with the requirement altogether. A trial judge may decide to delay or even forgo a witness’s opportunity to explain or deny a prior inconsistent statement in certain

circumstances, such as when the failure to afford the prior opportunity was inadvertent and the witness may be afforded a subsequent opportunity, or when a prior opportunity was impossible because the witness's statement was not discovered until after the witness testified.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE¹**

1 **Rule 801. Definitions That Apply to This Article;**
2 **Exclusions from Hearsay**

3 * * * * *

4 **(d) Statements That Are Not Hearsay.** A statement
5 that meets the following conditions is not hearsay:

6 * * * * *

7 **(2) *An Opposing Party's Statement.*** The
8 statement is offered against an opposing
9 party and:

10 **(A)** was made by the party in an
11 individual or representative capacity;

12 **(B)** is one the party manifested that it
13 adopted or believed to be true;

¹ New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

14 (C) was made by a person whom the party
15 authorized to make a statement on the
16 subject;

17 (D) was made by the party's agent or
18 employee on a matter within the
19 scope of that relationship and while it
20 existed; or

21 (E) was made by the party's
22 coconspirator during and in
23 furtherance of the conspiracy.

24 The statement must be considered but does not by itself
25 establish the declarant's authority under (C); the existence or
26 scope of the relationship under (D); or the existence of the
27 conspiracy or participation in it under (E).

28 If a party's claim or potential liability is directly
29 derived from a declarant or the declarant's principal, a
30 statement that would be admissible against the declarant or

- 31 the principal under this rule is also admissible against the
32 party.

Committee Note

The rule has been amended to provide that when a party stands in the shoes of a declarant or the declarant's principal, hearsay statements made by the declarant or principal are admissible against the party. For example, if an estate is bringing a claim for damages suffered by the decedent, any hearsay statement that would have been admitted against the decedent as a party-opponent under this rule is equally admissible against the estate. Other relationships that would support this attribution include assignor/assignee and debtor/trustee when the trustee is pursuing the debtor's claims. The rule is justified because if the party is standing in the shoes of the declarant or the principal, the party should not be placed in a better position as to the admissibility of hearsay than the declarant or the principal would have been. A party that derives its interest from a declarant or principal is ordinarily subject to all the substantive limitations applicable to them, so it follows that the party should be bound by the same evidence rules as well.

Reference to the declarant's principal is necessary because the statement may have been made by the agent of the person or entity whose rights or obligations have been succeeded to by the party against whom the statement is offered.

The rationale of attribution does not apply, and so the hearsay statement would not be admissible, if the declarant makes the statement after the rights or obligations have been transferred, by contract or operation of law, to the party against whom the statement is offered.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE¹**

1 **Rule 804.** **Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay—**
2 **When the Declarant Is Unavailable as a**
3 **Witness**

4 * * * * *

5 **(b)** **The Exceptions.** * * *

6 **(3)** ***Statement Against Interest.*** A statement that:

7 **(A)** a reasonable person in the declarant’s
8 position would have made only if the
9 person believed it to be true because,
10 when made, it was so contrary to the
11 declarant’s proprietary or pecuniary
12 interest or had so great a tendency to
13 invalidate the declarant’s claim
14 against someone else or to expose the
15 declarant to civil or criminal liability;
16 and

¹ New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

17 **(B)** if offered in a criminal case as one
18 that tends to expose the declarant to
19 criminal liability, is supported by
20 corroborating circumstances that
21 clearly indicate its trustworthiness;~~if~~
22 ~~offered in a criminal case as one that~~
23 ~~tends to expose the declarant to~~
24 ~~criminal liability~~ after considering
25 the totality of circumstances under
26 which it was made and evidence, if
27 any, corroborating it.

Committee Note

Rule 804(b)(3)(B) has been amended to require that in assessing whether a statement is supported by corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate its trustworthiness, the court must consider not only the totality of the circumstances under which the statement was made, but also any evidence corroborating or contradicting it. While most courts have considered corroborating evidence, some courts have refused to do so. The rule now provides for a uniform approach, and recognizes that the existence or absence of corroboration is relevant to, but not dispositive of, whether a statement that tends to expose the declarant to

criminal liability should be admissible under this exception when offered in a criminal case. A court evaluating the admissibility of a third-party confession to a crime, for example, must consider not only circumstances such as the timing and spontaneity of the statement and the third-party declarant's likely motivations in making it. It must also consider corroborating information, if any, supporting the statement, such as evidence placing the third party in the vicinity of the crime. Courts must also consider evidence that contradicts the declarant's account.

The amendment is consistent with the 2019 amendment to Rule 807 that requires courts to consider corroborating evidence in the trustworthiness inquiry under that provision. It is also supported by the legislative history of the corroborating circumstances requirement in Rule 804(b)(3). *See* 1974 House Judiciary Committee Report on Rule 804(b)(3) (adding "unless corroborating circumstances clearly indicate the trustworthiness of the statement" language and noting that this standard would change the result in cases like *Donnelly v. United States*, 228 U.S. 243 (1912), that excluded a third-party confession exculpating the defendant despite the existence of independent evidence demonstrating the accuracy of the statement).

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE¹**

1 **Rule 1006. Summaries to Prove Content**

2 **(a) Summaries of Voluminous Materials Admissible**

3 **as Evidence.** The ~~proponent~~court may admit as
4 evidence~~use~~ a summary, chart, or calculation to
5 prove the content of voluminous writings,
6 recordings, or photographs that cannot be
7 conveniently examined in court, whether or not they
8 have been introduced into evidence.

9 **(b) Procedures.** The proponent must make the
10 underlying originals or duplicates available for
11 examination or copying, or both, by other parties at
12 a reasonable time and place. And the court may
13 order the proponent to produce them in court.

¹ New material is underlined in red; matter to be omitted is lined through.

- 14 (c) Illustrative Aids Not Covered. A summary, chart,
15 or calculation that functions only as an illustrative
16 aid is governed by Rule 611(d).

Committee Note

Rule 1006 has been amended to correct misperceptions about the operation of the Rule by some courts. Some courts have mistakenly held that a Rule 1006 summary is “not evidence” and that it must be accompanied by limiting instructions cautioning against its substantive use. But the purpose of Rule 1006 is to permit alternative proof of the content of writings, recordings, or photographs too voluminous to be conveniently examined in court. To serve their intended purpose, therefore, Rule 1006 summaries must be admitted as substantive evidence and the rule has been amended to clarify that a party may offer a Rule 1006 summary “as evidence.” The court may not instruct the jury that a summary admitted under this rule is not to be considered as evidence.

Rule 1006 has also been amended to clarify that a properly supported summary may be admitted into evidence whether or not the underlying voluminous materials reflected in the summary have been admitted. Some courts have mistakenly held that the underlying voluminous writings or recordings themselves must be admitted into evidence before a Rule 1006 summary may be used. Because Rule 1006 allows alternate proof of materials too voluminous to be conveniently examined during trial proceedings, admission of the underlying voluminous materials is not required and the amendment so states. Conversely, there are courts that deny resort to a properly

supported Rule 1006 summary because the underlying writings or recordings – or a portion of them – *have been* admitted into evidence. Summaries that are otherwise admissible under Rule 1006 are not rendered inadmissible because the underlying documents have been admitted, in whole or in part, into evidence. In most cases, a Rule 1006 chart may be the only evidence the trier of fact will examine concerning a voluminous set of documents. In some instances, the summary may be admitted in addition to the underlying documents.

A summary admissible under Rule 1006 must also pass the balancing test of Rule 403. For example, if the summary does not accurately reflect the underlying voluminous evidence, or if it is argumentative, its probative value may be substantially outweighed by the risk of unfair prejudice or confusion.

Although Rule 1006 refers to materials too voluminous to be examined “in court” and permits the trial judge to order production of underlying materials “in court,” the rule applies to virtual proceedings just as it does to proceedings conducted in person in a courtroom.

The amendment draws a distinction between summaries of voluminous, admissible information offered to prove a fact, and summaries of evidence offered solely to assist the trier of fact in understanding the evidence. The former are subject to the strictures of Rule 1006. The latter are illustrative aids, which are now regulated by Rule 611(d).

§ 440 Procedures for Committees on Rules of Practice and Procedure

This section contains the "Procedures for the Judicial Conference's Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure and Its Advisory Rules Committees," last amended in September 2011. JCUS-SEP 2011, p. 35.

§ 440.10 Overview

The Rules Enabling Act, [28 U.S.C. §§ 2071–2077](#), authorizes the Supreme Court to prescribe general rules of practice and procedure and rules of evidence for the federal courts. Under the Act, the Judicial Conference must appoint a standing committee, and may appoint advisory committees to recommend new and amended rules. Section 2073 requires the Judicial Conference to publish the procedures that govern the work of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the "Standing Committee") and its advisory committees on the Rules of Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, and Criminal Procedure and on the Evidence Rules. See [28 U.S.C. § 2073\(a\)\(1\)](#). These procedures do not limit the rules committees' authority. Failure to comply with them does not invalidate any rules committee action. Cf. [28 U.S.C. § 2073\(e\)](#).

§ 440.20 Advisory Committees

§ 440.20.10 Functions

Each advisory committee must engage in "a continuous study of the operation and effect of the general rules of practice and procedure now or hereafter in use" in its field, taking into consideration suggestions and recommendations received from any source, new statutes and court decisions affecting the rules, and legal commentary. See [28 U.S.C. § 331](#).

§ 440.20.20 Suggestions and Recommendations

Suggestions and recommendations on the rules are submitted to the Secretary of the Standing Committee at the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. The Secretary will acknowledge the suggestions or recommendations and refer them to the appropriate advisory committee. If the Standing Committee takes formal action on them, that action will be reflected in the Standing Committee's minutes, which are posted on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#).

§ 440.20.30 Drafting Rule Changes

(a) Meetings

Each advisory committee meets at the times and places that the chair designates. Advisory committee meetings must be open to the public, except when the committee — in open session and with a majority present — determines that it is in the public interest to have all or part of the meeting closed and states the reason. Each meeting must be preceded by notice of the time and place, published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#), sufficiently in advance to permit interested persons to attend.

(b) Preparing Draft Changes

The reporter assigned to each advisory committee should prepare for the committee, under the direction of the committee or its chair, draft rule changes, committee notes explaining their purpose, and copies or summaries of written recommendations and suggestions received by the committee.

(c) Considering Draft Changes

The advisory committee studies the rules' operation and effect. It meets to consider proposed new and amended rules (together with committee notes), whether changes should be made, and whether they should be submitted to the Standing Committee with a recommendation to approve for publication. The submission must be accompanied by a written report explaining the advisory committee's action and its evaluation of competing considerations.

§ 440.20.40 Publication and Public Hearings

(a) Publication

Before any proposed rule change is published, the Standing Committee must approve publication. The Secretary then arranges for printing and circulating the proposed change to the bench, bar, and public. Publication should be as wide as possible. The proposed change must be published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#). The Secretary must:

- (1) notify members of Congress, federal judges, and the chief justice of each state's highest court of the proposed change, with a link to the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#); and
- (2) provide copies of the proposed change to legal-publishing firms with a request to timely include it in publications.

(b) Public Comment Period

A public comment period on the proposed change must extend for at least six months after notice is published in the *Federal Register*, unless a shorter period is approved under paragraph (d) of this section.

(c) Hearings

The advisory committee must conduct public hearings on the proposed change unless eliminating them is approved under paragraph (d) of this section or not enough witnesses ask to testify at a particular hearing. The hearings are held at the times and places that the advisory committee's chair determines. Notice of the times and places must be published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#). The hearings must be transcribed. Whenever possible, a transcript should be produced by a qualified court reporter.

(d) Expedited Procedures

The Standing Committee may shorten the public comment period or eliminate public hearings if it determines that the administration of justice requires a proposed rule change to be expedited and that appropriate notice to the public can still be provided and public comment obtained. The Standing Committee may also eliminate public notice and comment for a technical or conforming amendment if the Committee determines that they are unnecessary. When an exception is made, the chair must advise the Judicial Conference and provide the reasons.

§ 440.20.50 Procedures After the Comment Period

(a) Summary of Comments

When the public comment period ends, the reporter must prepare a summary of the written comments received and of the testimony presented at public hearings. If the number of comments is very large, the reporter may summarize and aggregate similar individual comments, identifying the source of each one.

(b) Advisory Committee Review; Republication

The advisory committee reviews the proposed change in light of any comments and testimony. If the advisory committee makes substantial changes, the proposed rule should be republished for an additional period of public comment unless the advisory committee determines that republication would not be necessary to achieve adequate public comment and would not assist the work of the rules committees.

(c) Submission to the Standing Committee

The advisory committee submits to the Standing Committee the proposed change and committee note that it recommends for approval. Each submission must:

- (1) be accompanied by a separate report of the comments received;
- (2) explain the changes made after the original publication; and
- (3) include an explanation of competing considerations examined by the advisory committee.

§ 440.20.60 Preparing Minutes and Maintaining Records

(a) Minutes of Meetings

The advisory committee's chair arranges for preparing the minutes of the committee meetings.

(b) Records

The advisory committee's records consist of:

- written suggestions received from the public;
- written comments received from the public on drafts of proposed rules;
- the committee's responses to public suggestions and comments;
- other correspondence with the public about proposed rule changes;
- electronic recordings and transcripts of public hearings (when prepared);
- the reporter's summaries of public comments and of testimony from public hearings;
- agenda books and materials prepared for committee meetings;
- minutes of committee meetings;
- approved drafts of rule changes; and
- reports to the Standing Committee.

(c) Public Access to Records

The records must be posted on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#), except for general public correspondence about proposed rule changes and electronic recordings of hearings when transcripts are prepared. This correspondence and archived records are maintained by the AO and are available for public inspection. Minutes of a closed meeting may be made available to the public but with any deletions necessary to avoid frustrating the purpose of closing the meeting under § 440.20.30(a).

§ 440.30 Standing Committee

§ 440.30.10 Functions

The Standing Committee's functions include:

- (a) coordinating the work of the advisory committees;
- (b) suggesting proposals for them to study;
- (c) considering proposals they recommend for publication for public comment; and
- (d) for proposed rule changes that have completed that process, deciding whether to accept or modify the proposals and transmit them with its own recommendation to the Judicial Conference, recommit them to the advisory committee for further study and consideration, or reject them.

§ 440.30.20 Procedures

(a) Meetings

The Standing Committee meets at the times and places that the chair designates. Committee meetings must be open to the public, except when the Committee — in open session and with a majority present — determines that it is in the public interest to have all or part of the meeting closed and states the

reason. Each meeting must be preceded by notice of the time and place, published in the *Federal Register* and on the [judiciary's rulemaking website](#), sufficiently in advance to permit interested persons to attend.

(b) Attendance by the Advisory Committee Chairs and Reporters

The advisory committees' chairs and reporters should attend the Standing Committee meetings to present their committees' proposed rule changes and committee notes, to inform the Standing Committee about ongoing work, and to participate in the discussions.

(c) Action on Proposed Rule Changes or Committee Notes

The Standing Committee may accept, reject, or modify a proposed change or committee note, or may return the proposal to the advisory committee with instructions or recommendations.

(d) Transmission to the Judicial Conference

The Standing Committee must transmit to the Judicial Conference the proposed rule changes and committee notes that it approves, together with the advisory committee report. The Standing Committee's report includes its own recommendations and explains any changes that it made.

§ 440.30.30 Preparing Minutes and Maintaining Records

(a) Minutes of Meetings

The Secretary prepares minutes of Standing Committee meetings.

(b) Records

The Standing Committee's records consist of:

- the minutes of Standing Committee and advisory committee meetings;
- agenda books and materials prepared for Standing Committee meetings;
- reports to the Judicial Conference; and
- official correspondence about rule changes, including correspondence with advisory committee chairs.

(c) Public Access to Records

The records must be posted on the judiciary's rulemaking website, except for official correspondence about rule changes. This correspondence and archived records are maintained by the AO and are available for public inspection. Minutes of a closed meeting may be made available to the public but with any deletions necessary to avoid frustrating the purpose of closing the meeting under § 440.30.20(a).

Last revised (Transmittal 01-026) May 27, 2022

RULES COMMITTEES — CHAIRS AND REPORTERS

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (Standing Committee)

Chair

Honorable John D. Bates
United States District Court
Washington, DC

Reporter

Professor Catherine T. Struve
University of Pennsylvania Law School
Philadelphia, PA

Secretary to the Standing Committee

H. Thomas Byron III, Esq.
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Rules Committee Staff
Washington, DC

Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules

Chair

Honorable Jay S. Bybee
United States Court of Appeals
Las Vegas, NV

Reporter

Professor Edward Hartnett
Seton Hall University School of Law
Newark, NJ

Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules

Chair

Honorable Dennis R. Dow
United States Bankruptcy Court
Kansas City, MO

Reporter

Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC

Associate Reporter

Professor Laura B. Bartell
Wayne State University Law School
Detroit, MI

RULES COMMITTEES — CHAIRS AND REPORTERS

Advisory Committee on Civil Rules

Chair

Honorable Robert M. Dow, Jr.
United States District Court
Chicago, IL

Reporter

Professor Edward H. Cooper
University of Michigan Law School
Ann Arbor, MI

Associate Reporter

Professor Richard L. Marcus
University of California
Hastings College of Law
San Francisco, CA

Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules

Chair

Honorable Raymond M. Kethledge
United States Court of Appeals
Ann Arbor, MI

Reporter

Professor Sara Sun Beale
Duke University School of Law
Durham, NC

Associate Reporter

Professor Nancy J. King
Vanderbilt University Law School
Nashville, TN

Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

Chair

Honorable Patrick J. Schiltz
United States District Court
Minneapolis, MN

Reporter

Professor Daniel J. Capra
Fordham University School of Law
New York, NY

**COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
(Standing Committee)**

Chair	Reporter
Honorable John D. Bates United States District Court Washington, DC	Professor Catherine T. Struve University of Pennsylvania Law School Philadelphia, PA

Members

Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq. Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP San Francisco, CA	Honorable Jesse M. Furman United States District Court New York, NY
Robert J. Giuffra, Jr., Esq. Sullivan & Cromwell LLP New York, NY	Honorable Frank M. Hull United States Court of Appeals Atlanta, GA
Honorable William J. Kayatta, Jr. United States Court of Appeals Portland, ME	Peter D. Keisler, Esq. Sidley Austin, LLP Washington DC
Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl Superior Court of the State of California Los Angeles, CA	Dean Troy A. McKenzie New York University School of Law New York, NY
Honorable Patricia A. Millett United States Court of Appeals Washington, DC	Honorable Lisa O. Monaco Deputy Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
Honorable Gene E.K. Pratter United States District Court Philadelphia, PA	Kosta Stojilkovic, Esq. Wilkinson Stekloff LLP Washington, DC
Honorable Jennifer G. Zips United States District Court Tucson, AZ	

Consultants

Professor Daniel R. Coquillette Boston College Law School Newton Centre, MA	Professor Bryan A. Garner LawProse, Inc. Dallas, TX
---	---

**COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
(Standing Committee)**

Consultants (continued)

Professor Joseph Kimble
Thomas M. Cooley Law School
Lansing, MI

Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr., Esq.
Bethesda, MD

Secretary to the Standing Committee

H. Thomas Byron III, Esq.
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Rules Committee Staff
Washington, DC

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPELLATE RULES

Chair	Reporter
-------	----------

Honorable Jay S. Bybee United States Court of Appeals Las Vegas, NV	Professor Edward Hartnett Seton Hall University School of Law Newark, NJ
---	--

Members	
---------	--

Honorable Leondra R. Kruger Supreme Court of California San Francisco, CA	Honorable Carl J. Nichols United States District Court Washington, DC
Honorable Elizabeth Prelogar Solicitor General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC	Professor Stephen E. Sachs Harvard Law School Cambridge, MA
Danielle Spinelli, Esq. Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP Washington DC	Honorable Paul J. Watford United States Court of Appeals Pasadena, CA
Honorable Richard C. Wesley United States Court of Appeals Geneseo, NY	Lisa B. Wright, Esq. Office of the Federal Public Defender Washington, DC

Liaisons	
----------	--

Honorable Bernice B. Donald (<i>Bankruptcy</i>) United States Court of Appeals Memphis, TN	Honorable Frank M. Hull (<i>Standing</i>) United States Court of Appeals Atlanta, GA
---	---

Clerk of Court Representative

Molly Dwyer, Esq.
Clerk
United States Court of Appeals
San Francisco, CA

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Dennis R. Dow United States Bankruptcy Court Kansas City, MO	Professor S. Elizabeth Gibson University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, NC
	Associate Reporter
	Professor Laura B. Bartell Wayne State University Law School Detroit, MI
Members	
Honorable Thomas L. Ambro United States Court of Appeals Wilmington, DE	Honorable Rebecca B. Connelly United States Bankruptcy Court Harrisonburg, VA
Honorable Bernice B. Donald United States Court of Appeals Memphis, TN	Honorable David A. Hubbert Deputy Assistant Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
Honorable Ben Kahn United States Bankruptcy Court Greensboro, NC	Honorable Marcia S. Krieger United States District Court Denver, CO
Honorable Catherine P. McEwen United States Bankruptcy Court Tampa, FL	Debra L. Miller, Esq. Chapter 13 Bankruptcy Trustee South Bend, IN
Honorable J. Paul Oetken United States District Court New York, NY	Jeremy L. Retherford, Esq. Balch & Bingham LLP Birmingham, AL
Damian S. Schaible, Esq. Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP New York, NY	Professor David A. Skeel University of Pennsylvania Law School Philadelphia, PA
Tara Twomey, Esq. National Consumer Bankruptcy Rights Center San Jose, CA	Honorable George H. Wu United States District Court Los Angeles, CA

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY RULES

Liaisons

Ramona D. Elliott, Esq.
(U.S. Trustees)
Executive Office for U.S. Trustees
Washington, DC

Honorable Laurel M. Isicoff
*(Committee on the Administration of the
Bankruptcy System)*
United States Bankruptcy Court
Miami, FL

Honorable William J. Kayatta, Jr.
(Standing)
United States Court of Appeals
Portland, ME

Clerk of Court Representative

Kenneth S. Gardner
Clerk
United States Bankruptcy Court
Denver, CO

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Robert M. Dow, Jr. United States District Court Chicago, IL	Professor Edward H. Cooper University of Michigan Law School Ann Arbor, MI
	Associate Reporter
	Professor Richard L. Marcus University of California Hastings College of the Law San Francisco, CA
Members	
Honorable Cathy Bissoon United States District Court Pittsburgh, PA	Honorable Jennifer C. Boal United States District Court Boston, MA
Honorable Brian M. Boynton Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC	David J. Burman, Esq. Perkins Coie LLP Seattle, WA
Honorable David C. Godbey United States District Court Dallas, TX	Honorable Kent A. Jordan United States Court of Appeals Wilmington, DE
Honorable Sara Lioi United States District Court Akron, OH	Honorable R. David Proctor United States District Court Birmingham, AL
Honorable Robin L. Rosenberg United States District Court West Palm Beach, FL	Joseph M. Sellers, Esq. Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC Washington, DC
Dean A. Benjamin Spencer William & Mary Law School Williamsburg, VA	Ariana J. Tadler, Esq. Tadler Law LLP Manhasset, NY
Helen E. Witt, Esq. Kirkland & Ellis LLP Chicago, IL	

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RULES

Liaisons

Peter D. Keisler, Esq.
(Standing)
Sidley Austin, LLP
Washington DC

Honorable Catherine P. McEwen
(Bankruptcy)
United States Bankruptcy Court
Tampa, FL

Clerk of Court Representative

Carmelita Reeder Shinn, Esq.
Clerk
United States District Court
Oklahoma City, OK

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Chair	Reporter
Honorable Raymond M. Kethledge United States Court of Appeals Ann Arbor, MI	Professor Sara Sun Beale Duke Law School Durham, NC
	Associate Reporter
	Professor Nancy J. King Vanderbilt University Law School Nashville, TN
Members	
Honorable Andre Birotte, Jr. United States District Court Los Angeles, CA	Honorable Jane Boyle United States District Court Dallas, TX
Honorable Timothy Burgess United States District Court Anchorage, AK	Honorable Robert J. Conrad, Jr. United States District Court Charlotte, NC
Dean Roger A. Fairfax, Jr. American University Washington College of Law Washington, DC	Honorable Michael J. Garcia New York State Court of Appeals Albany, NY
Lisa Hay, Esq. Federal Public Defender Portland, OR	Honorable Bruce J. McGiverin United States District Court San Juan, PR
Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen United States Court of Appeals Pasadena, CA	Honorable Kenneth A. Polite Assistant Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
Catherine M. Recker, Esq. Welsh & Recker PC Philadelphia, PA	Susan M. Robinson, Esq. Thomas Combs & Spann PLLC Charleston, WV

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL RULES

Liaisons

Honorable Jesse M. Furman
(*Standing*)
United States District Court
New York, NY

Clerk of Court Representative

Angela E. Noble, Esq.
Clerk
United States District Court
Miami, FL

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EVIDENCE RULES

Chair	Reporter
-------	----------

Honorable Patrick J. Schiltz United States District Court Minneapolis, MN	Professor Daniel J. Capra Fordham University School of Law New York, NY
---	---

Members

Honorable James P. Bassett New Hampshire Supreme Court Concord, NH	Honorable John P. Carlin Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General (ex officio) United States Department of Justice Washington, DC
--	--

Honorable Shelly Dick United States District Court Baton Rouge, LA	Traci L. Lovitt, Esq. Jones Day Boston, MA
--	--

Honorable Thomas D. Schroeder United States District Court Winston Salem, NC	Arun Subramanian, Esq. Susman Godfrey L.L.P. New York, NY
--	---

Honorable Richard J. Sullivan United States Court of Appeals New York, NY	Rene L. Valladares, Esq. Office of the Federal Public Defender Las Vegas, NV
---	--

Consultants

Professor Liesa Richter
University of Oklahoma School of Law
300 Timberdell Road
Norman, OK

Liaisons

Honorable Robert J. Conrad, Jr. (<i>Criminal</i>) United States District Court Charlotte, NC	Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl (<i>Standing</i>) Superior Court of the State of California Los Angeles, CA
---	--

Honorable Sara Lioi
(*Civil*)
United States District Court
Akron, OH



UNITED STATES COURTS

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure
Judicial Conference of the United States
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building
Washington, DC 20544
uscourts.gov