
2017 WL 1293843 (V.I.)
Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF the VIRGIN ISLANDS RULES OF EVIDENCE.

PROMULGATION No. 2017-002
April 3, 2017

ORDER OF THE COURT

RHYS S. HODGE, Chief Justice

***1 THIS MATTER** comes before the Court pursuant to the March 28, 2017 recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Rules which, upon review of all comments submitted with respect to the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence, has requested that this Court adopt the rules promulgated on January 18, 2017, subject to slight modifications to Rules 605 and 1101. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence, attached hereto as revised, are **HEREBY ADOPTED**. It is further

ORDERED that, notwithstanding the March 31, 2017 effective date for the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence provided in this Court's January 18, 2017 Order, the amendments to Rules 605 and 1101 of the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence provided for herein **SHALL TAKE EFFECT on Tuesday, April 4, 2017**. The Bench, Bar, and the public are **ADVISED** that all other portions of the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence went into effect on **March 31, 2017**, as previously ordered. It is further

ORDERED that, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 37(b), the Advisory Committee on Rules **MAY CONTINUE TO STUDY** the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence, and suggest amendments thereto, in conjunction with its mandate to continuously monitor all rules of practice and procedure in the courts of the Judicial Branch of the Virgin Islands. It is further

ORDERED that all Rules of the Superior Court inconsistent with the Virgin Islands Rules of Civil Procedure are **HEREBY REPEALED**. It is further

ORDERED that copies of this order be directed to the appropriate parties.

SO ORDERED this 3rd day of April, 2017.

IVE ARLINGTON SWAN Associate Justice

MARIA M. CABRET Associate Justice

Attachment

VIRGIN ISLANDS RULES OF EVIDENCE
Effective March 31, 2017

ARTICLE I
GENERAL PROVISIONS

Rule 101. Scope; Definitions

(a) Scope. These rules apply to proceedings in the courts of the Virgin Islands. The specific courts and proceedings to which the rules apply, along with exceptions, are set out in Rule 1101.

(b) Definitions. In these rules

- (1) "civil case" means a civil action or proceeding;
- (2) "criminal case" includes a criminal proceeding;
- (3) "public office" includes a public agency;
- (4) "record" includes a memorandum, report, or data compilation;
- (5) a "rule prescribed by the Supreme Court" means a rule adopted by the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands under statutory authority; and
- (6) a reference to any kind of written material or any other medium includes electronically stored information.
- (7) "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. *SOURCE: FRE Rule 101 [Added subsection (7) definition of "State" because the FRE refers to a U.S. Code section for definition.]*

Rule 102. Purpose

These rules should be construed so as to administer every proceeding fairly, eliminate unjustifiable expense and delay, and promote the development of evidence law, to the end of ascertaining the truth and securing a just determination.

***2 SOURCE:**

Rule 103. Rulings on Evidence

(a) Preserving a Claim of Error. A party may claim error in a ruling to admit or exclude evidence only if the error affects a substantial right of the party and:

- (1) if the ruling admits evidence, a party, on the record:
 - (A) timely objects or moves to strike; and
 - (B) states the specific ground, unless it was apparent from the context; or

- (2) if the ruling excludes evidence, a party informs the court of its substance by an offer of proof, unless the substance was apparent from the context.

(b) Not Needing to Renew an Objection or Offer of Proof. Once the court rules definitively on the record—either before or at trial—a party need not renew an objection or offer of proof to preserve a claim of error for appeal.

(c) Court’s Statement About the Ruling; Directing an Offer of Proof. The court may make any statement about the character or form of the evidence, the objection made, and the ruling. The court may direct that an offer of proof be made in question and answer form.

(d) Preventing the Jury from Hearing Inadmissible Evidence. To the extent practicable, the court must conduct a jury trial so that inadmissible evidence is not suggested to the jury by any means.

(e) Taking Notice of Plain Error. A court may take notice of a plain error affecting a substantial right, even if the claim of error was not properly preserved.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 103

Rule 104. Preliminary Questions

(a) In General. The court must decide any preliminary question about whether a witness is qualified, a privilege exists, or evidence is admissible. In so deciding, the court is not bound by evidence rules, except those on privilege.

(b) Relevance That Depends on a Fact. When the relevance of evidence depends on whether a fact exists, proof must be introduced sufficient to support a finding that the fact does exist. The court may admit the proposed evidence on the condition that the proof be introduced later.

(c) Conducting a Hearing So That the Jury Cannot Hear It. The court must conduct any hearing on a

preliminary question so that the jury cannot hear it if:

- (1) the hearing involves the admissibility of a confession;
- (2) a defendant in a criminal case is a witness and so requests; or
- (3) justice so requires.

(d) Cross-Examining a Defendant in a Criminal Case. By testifying on a preliminary question, a defendant in a criminal case does not become subject to cross-examination on other issues in the case.

(e) Evidence Relevant to Weight and Credibility. This rule does not limit a party’s right to introduce before the jury evidence that is relevant to the weight or credibility of other evidence.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 104. See Thomas v. People, 60 V.I. 183 (V.I. 2013).

Rule 105. Limiting Evidence That Is Not Admissible Against Other Parties or for Other Purposes

If the court admits evidence that is admissible against a party or for a purpose—but not against another party or for another purpose—the court, on timely request, must restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly.

**3 SOURCE: FRE Rule 105. See Tyson v. People, 59 V.I. 391 (V.I. 2013); Frett v. People, 58 V.I. 492 (V.I. 2013).*

Rule 106. Remainder of or Related Writings or Recorded Statements

If a party introduces all or part of a writing or recorded statement, an adverse party may require the introduction, at that time, of any other part—or any other writing or recorded statement—that in fairness ought to be considered at the same time.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 106

**ARTICLE II
JUDICIAL NOTICE**

Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts

(a) Scope. This rule governs judicial notice of an adjudicative fact only, not a legislative fact.

(b) Kinds of Facts That May Be Judicially Noticed. The court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it:

- (1) is generally known within the trial court’s territorial jurisdiction; or

(2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.

(c) Taking Notice. The court:

- (1) may take judicial notice on its own; or
- (2) must take judicial notice if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the necessary information.

(d) Timing. The court may take judicial notice at any stage of the proceeding.

(e) Opportunity to Be Heard. On timely request, a party is entitled to be heard on the propriety of taking judicial notice and the nature of the fact to be noticed. If the court takes judicial notice before notifying a party, the party, on request, is still entitled to be heard.

(f) Instructing the Jury. In a civil case, the court must instruct the jury to accept the noticed fact as conclusive. In a criminal case, the court must instruct the jury that it may or may not accept the noticed fact as conclusive.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 201. Judicial Notice was previously contained in Subchapter II of Chapter 67, Title 5 which was repealed by section 15(b) of Act No. 7161. This Article II incorporates FRE 201.

See Cianci v. Chaput, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 24, 2016 WL 3460231 (V.I. June 16, 2016); Rodriguez v. Rodriguez-Ramos, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 9, 2016 WL 1058985 (V.I. March 16, 2016); Mapp v. Fawkes, 61 V.I. 521 (V.I. 2014); People ex rel. J.J.J., 59 V.I. 319 (V.I. 2013); People ex rel. J.G., 59 V.I. 347 (V.I. 2013); Berrios-Rodriguez v. Berrios, 58 V.I. 477 (V.I. 2013); Mendez v. Gov't of the Virgin Islands, 56 V.I. 194 (V.I. 2012); Marcelle v. People, 55 V.I. 536 (V.I. 2011); Farrell v. People, 54 V.I. 600 (V.I. 2011).

ARTICLE III PRESUMPTIONS

Rule 301. Presumptions in Civil Actions Generally.

(a) Definitions. In this Article:

- (1) “*Basic fact*” means a fact or group of facts that give rise to a presumption.
- (2) “*Inconsistent presumption*” means that the presumed fact of one presumption is inconsistent with the presumed fact of another presumption.
- (3) “*Presumed fact*” means a fact that is assumed upon the finding of a basic fact.

(4) “*Presumption*” means that when a basic fact is found to exist, the presumed fact is assumed to exist until evidence of the nonexistence of the presumed fact is offered into evidence.

(b) Operation of Presumptions. In a civil case, unless a Virgin Islands statute or these rules provide otherwise, the party against whom a presumption is directed has the burden of producing evidence to rebut the presumption. But this rule does not shift the burden of persuasion, which remains on the party who had it originally. In applying this principle:

- *4 ● if the basic fact is shown, and the opponent offers no proof to rebut the presumed fact, the court will instruct a jury that if it finds the basic fact it may presume the existence of the presumed fact; but
- if the opponent offers proof rebutting the presumed fact, the court may not instruct the jury about the presumption, which has been eliminated from the case.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 301. The Advisory Committee adapted the definitions from URE 301 as being most appropriate for Virgin Islands Rules, and the “bursting bubble” non-burden-of-proof-shifting provision from FRE 301 and the majority of states. The Advisory Committee elected to include the bulleted examples in subdivision (b)—which it believed will be helpful to the Bar in understanding application of presumption doctrines.

See Inniss v. Inniss, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 29, 2016 WL 4413317 (V.I. August 18, 2016); Rodriguez v. Rodriguez-Ramos, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 9, 2016 WL 1058985 (V.I. March 16, 2016); Haynes v. Ottley, 61 V.I. 547 (V.I. 2014); Bryan v. Fawkes, 61 V.I. 416 (V.I. 2014); Rivera-Moreno v. Government of the Virgin Islands, 61 V.I. 279 (V.I. 2014); Island Tile & Marble v. Bertrand, 57 V.I. 596 (V.I. 2012); Bright v. United Corp., 50 V.I. 215 (V.I. 2008).

Rule 302. Applicable Law of Presumptions in Civil Cases.

(a) Choice of Law. In a civil case, Virgin Islands law governs the effect of a presumption regarding a claim or defense for which law of this Territory supplies the rule of decision. Where the court determines that the substantive law of another jurisdiction governs the merits of a claim or defense, the effect of an applicable presumption shall be as provided in the law of that jurisdiction.

(b) Inconsistent presumptions. If applicable presumptions are inconsistent, the presumption founded upon weightier considerations of policy shall be applied.

If considerations of policy are of equal weight, neither presumption applies.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 302 and URE 302, edited. Presumptions were previously contained in Subchapter III of Chapter 67, Title 5, repealed in 2010.

NOTE: while the URE has a sample provision “303” summarizing the limited use of presumptions in criminal cases (codifying in effect the Sandstrom line of cases) this is an issue of constitutional law and the presumption of innocence which the Committee, like the federal rules drafters and those of most states, have left to case law.

ARTICLE IV

RELEVANCE AND ITS LIMITS

Rule 401. Test for Relevant Evidence

Evidence is relevant if:

- (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and
- (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 401. See James v. People, 59 V.I. 866 (V.I. 2013); Castillo v. People, 59 V.I. 240 (V.I. 2013); People v. Todmann, 53 V.I. 431 (V.I. 2010).

Rule 402. General Admissibility of Relevant Evidence

Relevant evidence is admissible unless any of the following provides otherwise:

- the United States Constitution;
- an applicable statute of the Virgin Islands;
- these rules; or
- other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands.

Irrelevant evidence is not admissible.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 402

Rule 403. Excluding Relevant Evidence for Prejudice, Confusion, Waste of Time, or Other Reasons

*5 The court may exclude relevant evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of one or more of the following:

- unfair prejudice;
- confusing the issues;
- misleading the jury;

- undue delay;
- wasting time; or
- needlessly presenting cumulative evidence.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 403, with bullets added for each listed item

See Monelle v. People, 63 V.I. 757 (V.I. 2015); Fahie v. People, 62 V.I. 625 (V.I. 2015); Alexander v. People, 60 V.I. 486 (V.I. 2014); Thomas v. People, 60 V.I. 183 (V.I. 2013); Morton v. People, 59 V.I. 660 (V.I. 2013); Fontaine v. People, 59 V.I. 640 (V.I. 2013); Powell v. People, 59 V.I. 444 (V.I. 2013); Tyson v. People, 59 V.I. 391 (V.I. 2013); Fontaine v. People, 56 V.I. 660 (V.I. 2012); Francis v. People, 56 V.I. 370 (V.I. 2012); Smith v. People, 55 V.I. 957 (V.I. 2011); Phipps v. People, 54 V.I. 543 (V.I. 2011); People v. Todmann, 53 V.I. 431 (V.I. 2010); Nanton v. People, 52 V.I. 466 (V.I. 2009); Mulley v. People, 51 V.I. 404 (V.I. 2009); Phillips v. People, 51 V.I. 258 (V.I. 2009); Corriette v. Morales, 50 V.I. 202 (V.I. 2008).

Rule 404. Character Evidence; Crimes or Other Acts

(a) Character Evidence.

(1) **Prohibited Uses.** Evidence of a person’s character or character trait is not admissible to prove that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character or trait.

(2) **Exceptions for a Defendant or Victim in a Criminal Case.** The following exceptions apply in a criminal case:

(A) a defendant may offer evidence of the defendant’s pertinent trait, and if the evidence is admitted, the prosecutor may offer evidence to rebut it;

(B) subject to the limitations in Rule 412, a defendant may offer evidence of an alleged victim’s pertinent trait, and if the evidence is admitted, the prosecutor may:

(i) offer evidence to rebut it; and

(ii) offer evidence of the defendant’s same trait; and

(C) in a homicide case, the prosecutor may offer evidence of the alleged victim’s trait of peacefulness to rebut evidence that the victim was the first aggressor.

(3) *Exceptions for a Witness.* Evidence of a witness’s character may be admitted under Rules 607, 608, and 609.

(b) Crimes, Wrongs, or Other Acts.

(1) *Prohibited Uses.* Evidence of a crime, wrong, or other act is not admissible to prove a person’s character in order to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in accordance with the character.

(2) *Permitted Uses; Notice in a Criminal Case.* Evidence of a crime, wrong, or other act may be admissible for other purposes, such as addressing issues, if actually contested in the case, concerning motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident—provided that the probative value of such proof, supported by specific facts and circumstances, substantially outweighs its prejudicial effect. On request by a defendant in a criminal case, the prosecutor must:

(A) provide reasonable notice of the general nature of any such evidence that the prosecutor intends to offer at trial; and

(B) do so before trial—or during trial if the court, for good cause, excuses lack of pretrial notice.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 404.

*6 See *James v. People*, 59 V.I. 866 (V.I. 2013); *Morton v. People*, 59 V.I. 660 (V.I. 2013); *Tyson v. People*, 59 V.I. 391 (V.I. 2013); *Christopher v. People*, 57 V.I. 500 (V.I. 2012); *Prosser v. Public Servs. Comm’n.*, 56 V.I. 391 (V.I. 2012); *Carty v. People*, 56 V.I. 345 (V.I. 2012); *Chinnery v. People*, 55 V.I. 508 (V.I. 2011); *Brown v. People*, 54 V.I. 496 (V.I. 2010).

The Advisory Committees adapted FRE 404(b)(2) by clarifying that prior “bad acts” impeachment is subject to exclusion where its prejudicial impact is not outweighed by any probative value of the prior act, and by noting that the identified “issue” to be addressed by prior bad acts proof must be one that is actually contested in the case—otherwise there is no justification for introducing prior actions unrelated to the crime being tried. The balance adopted here is the “reverse Rule 403” balance found in Rule 609—requiring that the probative value must exceed prejudice in order to allow use of the prior act proof.

Rule 405. Methods of Proving Character

(a) By Reputation or Opinion. When evidence of a person’s character or character trait is admissible, it may be proved by testimony about the person’s reputation or by testimony in the form of an opinion. On cross-examination of the character witness, the court may allow an inquiry into relevant specific instances of the person’s conduct.

(b) By Specific Instances of Conduct. When a person’s character or character trait is an essential element of a charge, claim, or defense, the character or trait may also be proved by relevant specific instances of the person’s conduct.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 405.

See *Christopher v. People*, 57 V.I. 500 (V.I. 2012).

Rule 406. Habit; Routine Practice

Evidence of a person’s habit or an organization’s routine practice may be admitted to prove that on a particular occasion the person or organization acted in accordance with the habit or routine practice. The court may admit this evidence regardless of whether it is corroborated or whether there was an eyewitness.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 406

Rule 407. Subsequent Remedial Measures

When measures are taken that would have made an earlier injury or harm less likely to occur, evidence of the subsequent measures is not admissible to prove:

- negligence;
- culpable conduct;
- a defect in a product or its design; or
- a need for a warning or instruction.

But the court may admit this evidence for another purpose, such as impeachment or—if disputed—proving ownership, control, or the feasibility of precautionary measures.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 407.

See *Sealey–Christian v. Sunny Isle Shopping Ctr.*, 52 V.I. 410 (V.I. 2009).

Rule 408. Compromise Offers and Negotiations

(a) Prohibited uses. Evidence of the following is not admissible—on behalf of any party—either to prove or disprove the validity or amount of a disputed claim or to impeach by a prior inconsistent statement or by contradiction:

- (1) furnishing, promising, or offering—or accepting,

promising to accept, or offering to accept—a valuable consideration in compromising or attempting to compromise the claim; and

*7 (2) conduct or a statement made during compromise negotiations about the claim.

(b) Exceptions. The court may admit this evidence for another purpose, such as proving a witness’s bias or prejudice, or negating a contention of undue delay.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 408. See Connor v. People, 59 V.I. 286 (V.I. 2013).

NOTE: For provisions relating to compromise of criminal charges in certain circumstances, see Chapter 341 of Title 5 of the Virgin Islands Code. New federal rule provisions dealing with linked administrative enforcement mechanisms and later criminal prosecutions for administrative violations were omitted as not pertinent to current Virgin Islands practice.

Rule 409. Offers to Pay Medical and Similar Expenses

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

SOURCE: FRE Rule 409

Rule 410. Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements

(a) Prohibited Uses. In a civil or criminal case, evidence of the following is not admissible against the defendant who made the plea or participated in the plea discussions:

- (1) a guilty plea that was later withdrawn;
- (2) a nolo contendere plea;
- (3) a statement made during a proceeding on either of those pleas under [Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11](#) or a comparable state or Virgin Islands procedure; or
- (4) a statement made during plea discussions with an attorney for the prosecuting authority if the discussions did not result in a guilty plea or they resulted in a later-withdrawn guilty plea.

(b) Exceptions. The court may admit a statement described in Rule 410(a)(3) or (4):

- (1) in any proceeding in which another statement made during the same plea or plea discussions has been introduced, if in fairness the statements ought to be considered together; or
- (2) in a criminal proceeding for perjury or false

statement, if the defendant made the statement under oath, on the record, and with counsel present.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 410

Rule 411. Liability Insurance

Evidence that a person was or was not insured against liability is not admissible to prove whether the person acted negligently or otherwise wrongfully. But the court may admit this evidence for another purpose, such as proving a witness’s bias or prejudice or proving agency, ownership, or control.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 412

Rule 412. Sex–Offense Cases: The Victim’s Sexual Behavior or Predisposition

(a) Prohibited Uses. The following evidence is not admissible in a civil or criminal proceeding involving alleged sexual misconduct:

- (1) evidence offered to prove that a victim engaged in other sexual behavior; or
- (2) evidence offered to prove a victim’s sexual predisposition.

(b) Exceptions.

(1) **Criminal Cases.** The court may admit the following evidence in a criminal case:

- (A) evidence of specific instances of a victim’s sexual behavior, if offered to prove that someone other than the defendant was the source of semen, injury, or other physical evidence;
- (B) evidence of specific instances of a victim’s sexual behavior with respect to the person accused of the sexual misconduct, if offered by the defendant to prove consent or if offered by the prosecutor; and

*8 (C) evidence whose exclusion would violate the defendant’s constitutional rights.

(2) **Civil Cases.** In a civil case, the court may admit evidence offered to prove a victim’s sexual behavior or sexual predisposition if its probative value substantially outweighs the danger of harm to any victim and of unfair prejudice to any party. The court may admit evidence of a victim’s reputation only if the victim has placed it in controversy.

(c) Procedure To Determine Admissibility.

(1) **Motion.** If a party intends to offer evidence under Rule 412(b), the party must:

(A) file a motion that specifically describes the evidence and states the purpose for which it is to be offered;

(B) do so at least 14 days before trial unless the court, for good cause, sets a different time;

(C) serve the motion on all parties; and

(D) notify the victim or, when appropriate, the victim's guardian or representative.

(2) **Hearing.** Before admitting evidence under this rule, the court must conduct an in camera hearing and give the victim and parties a right to attend and be heard. Unless the court orders otherwise, the motion, related materials, and the record of the hearing must be and remain sealed.

(d) Definition of "Victim." In this rule, "victim" includes an alleged victim.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 412. See Alexander v. People, 60 V.I. 486 (V.I. 2014).

**ARTICLE V
PRIVILEGES**

Rule 501. Privileges in General

(a) Except as otherwise provided by constitution, the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, 5 V.I.C. Chapter 67, Subchapter V or other statute or by these or other rules properly promulgated by the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands, no person has a privilege to:

- refuse to be a witness;
- refuse to disclose any matter;
- refuse to produce any object or writing; or
- prevent another from being a witness or disclosing any matter or producing any object or writing.

(b) Privileges recognized in this jurisdiction include:

- the attorney-client privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 852;
- mental health provider, physician, and psychotherapist privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 853;
- spousal privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 854;

- marital communications privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 855;

- confidential religious communication privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 856;

- political vote privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 857;

- trade secrets protection as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 858;

- state secret, official information and governmental privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 859; and

- informant privilege as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 860.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 501, URE 501; 5 V.I.C. § 851

Rule 502. Attorney–Client Privilege and Work Product; Limitations on Waiver

The following provisions apply, in the circumstances set out, to disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege, or work-product protection, as provided in 5 V.I.C. § 852, V.I. Rule of Evidence 503, and V.I. Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(3).

(a) **Waiver of privilege by voluntary disclosure.** As provided in 5 V.I.C. § 861, a person upon whom a Virgin Islands statute confers a privilege against disclosure waives the privilege if the person or a predecessor of the person, while holder of the privilege, voluntarily discloses or consents to disclosure of any significant part of the privileged matter. This section does not apply if the disclosure itself is privileged.

*9 (b) **Privileged matter disclosed under compulsion or without opportunity to claim privilege.** As provided in 5 V.I.C. § 862, a claim of privilege is not defeated by a disclosure which was (1) compelled erroneously or (2) made without opportunity to claim the privilege.

(c) Scope of Intentional Waiver by Disclosure Made in a Virgin Islands or Federal Proceeding or to a Virgin Islands or Federal Governmental Office or Agency.

When the disclosure is made in a Virgin Islands or federal proceeding or to a Virgin Islands or federal governmental office or agency and waives the attorney-client privilege or work-product protection, the waiver extends to an undisclosed communication or information in a Virgin Islands, federal or state proceeding only if:

(1) the waiver is intentional;

(2) the disclosed and undisclosed communications or information concern the same subject matter; and

(3) they ought in fairness to be considered together.

(d) Inadvertent Disclosure. When made in a Virgin Islands or federal proceeding or to a Virgin Islands or federal governmental office or agency, a disclosure does not operate as a waiver of privilege or work product protections in a Virgin Islands, federal or state proceeding if:

- (1) the disclosure is inadvertent;
- (2) the holder of the privilege or protection took reasonable steps to prevent disclosure; and
- (3) the holder promptly took reasonable steps to rectify the error, including (if applicable) following Virgin Islands Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5)(B).

(e) Disclosure Made in a State Proceeding. When a disclosure is made in a state proceeding and is not the subject of a state-court order concerning waiver, the disclosure does not operate as a waiver in a Virgin Islands proceeding if the disclosure:

- (1) would not be a waiver under this rule if it had been made in a Virgin Islands proceeding; or
- (2) is not a waiver under the law of the State where the disclosure occurred.

(f) Controlling Effect of a Court Order. A Virgin Islands or federal court may order that the privilege or protection is not waived by disclosure connected with the litigation pending before the court—in which event the disclosure is also not a waiver in any other Virgin Islands, federal or state proceeding.

(g) Controlling Effect of a Party Agreement. An agreement on the effect of disclosure in a Virgin Islands or federal proceeding is binding only on the parties to the agreement, unless it is incorporated into a court order.

(h) Controlling Effect of This Rule. Notwithstanding [Rules 101](#) and [1101](#), this rule applies to proceedings in the Virgin Islands and to court-mandated arbitration proceedings, in the circumstances set out in the rule.

(i) Definitions. In this rule:

- (1) “*attorney-client privilege*” means the protection that applicable law provides for confidential attorney-client communications; and
- (2) “*work-product protection*” means the protection that applicable law provides for tangible material (or its intangible equivalent) prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial.”

SOURCE: FRE Rule 502. This provision has been adopted in the federal courts and many other jurisdictions because of the concerns over document production errors in “heavy discovery” cases and the possibility of inadvertent disclosure of paper and electronic records. Provisions of existing Virgin Islands privilege-waiver statutes are incorporated at the outset of this Rule.

ARTICLE VI WITNESSES

Rule 601. Competency to Testify in General

***10** Every person is competent to be a witness unless a statute of the Virgin Islands or these rules provide otherwise.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 601

Rule 602. Need for 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 Rule 703, relating to opinion testimony by expert witnesses.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 602.

See Thomas v. People, 60 V.I. 183 (V.I. 2013); Nicholas v. People, 56 V.I. 718 (V.I. 2012).

Rule 603. Oath or Affirmation to Testify Truthfully

Before testifying, a witness must give an oath or affirmation to testify truthfully. It must be in a form designed to impress that duty on the witness’s conscience.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 603

Rule 604. Interpreter

An interpreter must be qualified and must give an oath or affirmation to make a true translation.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 604. See Phillips v. People, 51 V.I. 258 (V.I. 2009).

Rule 605. Judge’s Competency as a Witness

The judge presiding over a case may not testify as a witness at the trial of that case. A party need not object to preserve the issue.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 605

Rule 606. Juror’s Competency as a Witness

(a) At the Trial. A juror may not testify as a witness before the other jurors at the trial. If a juror is called to testify, the court must give a party an opportunity to object outside the jury’s presence.

(b) During an Inquiry into the Validity of a Verdict or Indictment.

(1) **Prohibited Testimony or Other Evidence.** During an inquiry into the validity of a verdict or indictment, a juror may not testify about any statement made or incident that occurred during the jury’s deliberations; the effect of anything on that juror’s or another juror’s vote; or any juror’s mental processes concerning the verdict or indictment. The court may not receive a juror’s affidavit or evidence of a juror’s statement on these matters.

(2) **Exceptions.** A juror may testify about whether:

- (A) extraneous prejudicial information was improperly brought to the jury’s attention;
- (B) an outside influence was improperly brought to bear on any juror; or
- (C) a mistake was made in entering the verdict on the verdict form.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 606.

See Thomas v. People, 60 V.I. 688 (V.I. 2014); Thomas v. People, 56 V.I. 647 (V.I. 2012).

Rule 607. Who May Impeach a Witness

Any party, including the party that called the witness, may attack the witness’s credibility.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 607

NOTE: Subject to the provisions of Rule 403, the credibility of a witness may be impeached by any party, including the party calling the witness, with any proof that is relevant to the witness’s credibility. Impeachment may be undertaken, among other means, by:

- introduction of evidence of the witness’s bad general reputation for the traits of truth and veracity, as provided in Rule 608(a) and (b);
- evidence of prior conviction, as provided in Rule 609;
- evidence of bias for or prejudiced against a party. Extrinsic evidence of such bias or prejudice may be admitted.

**11 • prior inconsistent statements as provided in Rules 613 and 801;*

- any other evidence which is probative on the issue of credibility because of a logical tendency to convince the trier of fact that the witness’s perception, memory, or narration is defective or impaired, or that the sincerity or veracity of the witness is questionable.

A witness may also be contradicted by testimony or other evidence.

Rule 608. A Witness’s Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness

(a) Reputation or Opinion Evidence. A witness’s credibility may be attacked or supported by testimony about the witness’s reputation for having a character for truthfulness or untruthfulness, or by testimony in the form of an opinion about that character. But evidence of truthful character is admissible only after the witness’s character for truthfulness has been attacked.

(b) Specific Instances of Conduct.

Except for a criminal conviction under Rule 609, extrinsic evidence is not admissible to prove specific instances of a witness’s conduct in order to attack or support the witness’s character for truthfulness. But the court may, on cross-examination, allow them to be inquired into if they are probative of the character for truthfulness or untruthfulness of:

- (1) the witness; or
- (2) another witness whose character the witness being cross-examined has testified about.

By testifying on another matter, a witness does not waive any privilege against self-incrimination for testimony that relates only to the witness’s character for truthfulness.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 608

Rule 609. Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction

(a) In General. The following rules apply to attacking a witness’s character for truthfulness by evidence of a criminal conviction:

- (1) for a crime that, in the convicting jurisdiction, was punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than

one year, the evidence:

(A) must be admitted, subject to [Rule 403](#), in a civil case or in a criminal case in which the witness is not a defendant; and

(B) must be admitted in a criminal case in which the witness is a defendant, if the probative value of the evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect to that defendant; and

(2) for any crime regardless of the punishment, the evidence must be admitted if the court can readily determine that establishing the elements of the crime required proving—or the witness’s admitting—a dishonest act or false statement.

(b) Limit on Using the Evidence After 10 Years. This subdivision (b) applies if more than 10 years have passed since the witness’s conviction or release from confinement for it, whichever is later. Evidence of the conviction is admissible only if:

(1) its probative value, supported by specific facts and circumstances, substantially outweighs its prejudicial effect; and

(2) the proponent gives an adverse party reasonable written notice of the intent to use it so that the party has a fair opportunity to contest its use.

(c) Effect of a Pardon, Annulment, or Certificate of Rehabilitation. Evidence of a conviction is not admissible if:

*12 (1) the conviction has been the subject of a pardon, annulment, certificate of rehabilitation, or other equivalent procedure based on a finding that the person has been rehabilitated, and the person has not been convicted of a later crime punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than 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 a juvenile adjudication is admissible under this rule only if:

(1) it is offered in a criminal case;

(2) the adjudication was of a witness other than the defendant;

(3) an adult’s conviction for that offense would be

admissible to attack the adult’s credibility; and

(4) admitting the evidence is necessary to fairly determine guilt or innocence.

(e) Pendency of an Appeal. A conviction that satisfies this rule is admissible even if an appeal is pending. Evidence of the pendency is also admissible.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 609.

See Construction Technicians v. Zurich American Insurance Co., 61 V.I. 153 (V.I. 2014); Better Building Maintenance of the Virgin Islands v. Lee, 60 V.I. 740 (V.I. 2014); Simmonds v. People, 59 V.I. 480 (V.I. 2013); Powell v. People, 59 V.I. 444 (V.I. 2013); Tyson v. People, 59 V.I. 391 (V.I. 2013).

Rule 610. Religious Beliefs or Opinions

Evidence of a witness’s religious beliefs or opinions is not admissible to attack or support the witness’s credibility.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 610

Rule 611. Mode and Order of Examining Witnesses and Presenting Evidence

(a) Control by the Court; Purposes. The court should exercise reasonable control over the mode and order of examining witnesses and presenting evidence so as to:

(1) make those procedures effective for determining the truth;

(2) avoid wasting time; and

(3) protect witnesses from harassment or undue embarrassment.

(b) Scope of Cross-Examination. Cross-examination should not go beyond the subject matter of the direct examination and matters affecting the witness’s credibility. The court may allow inquiry into additional matters as if on direct examination.

(c) Leading Questions. Leading questions should not be used on direct examination except as necessary to develop the witness’s testimony. Ordinarily, the court should allow leading questions:

(1) on cross-examination; and

(2) when a party calls a hostile witness, an adverse party, or a witness identified with an adverse party.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 611; 5 V.I.C. § 731—§ 736.

Rule 612. Writing Used to Refresh a Witness's Memory

(a) Scope. This rule gives an adverse party certain options when a witness uses a writing to refresh memory:

- (1) while testifying; or
- (2) before testifying, if the court decides that justice requires the party to have those options.

(b) Adverse Party's Options; Deleting Unrelated Matter. An adverse party is entitled to have the writing produced at the hearing, to inspect it, to cross-examine the witness about it, and to introduce in evidence any portion that relates to the witness's testimony. If the producing party claims that the writing includes unrelated matter, the court must examine the writing in camera, delete any unrelated portion, and order that the rest be delivered to the adverse party. Any portion deleted over objection must be preserved for the record.

(c) Failure to Produce or Deliver the Writing. If a writing is not produced or is not delivered as ordered, the court may issue any appropriate order. But if the prosecution does not comply in a criminal case, the court must strike the witness's testimony or—if justice so requires—declare a mistrial.

**13 SOURCE: FRE Rule 612—modified to exclude reference to 18 USC section 3500 which is not applicable to Virgin Islands courts. See 5 V.I.C. § 737.*

Rule 613. Witness's Prior Statement

(a) Showing or Disclosing the Statement During Examination. When examining a witness about the witness's prior statement, a party need not show it or disclose its contents to the witness. But the party must, on request, show it or disclose its contents to an adverse party's attorney.

(b) Extrinsic Evidence of a Prior Inconsistent Statement. Extrinsic evidence of a witness's prior inconsistent statement is admissible only if the witness is given an opportunity to explain or deny the statement and an adverse party is given an opportunity to examine the witness about it, or if justice so requires. This subdivision (b) does not apply to an opposing party's statement under Rule 801(d)(2).

SOURCE: FRE Rule 613. See Canton v. People, 61 V.I. 511 (V.I. 2014).

Rule 614. Court's Calling or Examining a Witness

(a) Calling. The court may call a witness on its own or at a party's request. Each party is entitled to cross-examine the witness.

(b) Examining. The court may examine a witness

regardless of who calls the witness.

(c) Objections. A party may object to the court's calling or examining a witness either at that time or at the next opportunity when the jury is not present.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 614

Rule 615. Excluding Witnesses

(a) Exclusion and Right to Remain in the Courtroom.

At a party's request, the court must order prospective witnesses, including police officers and other investigators, excluded so that they cannot hear other witnesses' testimony. Or the court may do so on its own. But this rule does not authorize excluding:

- (1) a party who is a natural person;
- (2) an officer or employee of a party that is not a natural person, after being designated as the party's representative by its attorney;
- (3) a person whose presence a party shows to be essential to presenting the party's claim or defense;
- (4) a person authorized by statute to be present, or
- (5) an attorney alleged in a habeas corpus proceeding to have acted ineffectively.

(b) Expert Witnesses. An expert witnesses who will testify in the case shall not be excluded from the courtroom unless the court, in the exercise of its discretion, directs that the witness be excluded for part or all of the proceedings prior to the expert's testimony.

(c) Separation of Witnesses. The court may also order that each excluded witness be kept separate from all other witnesses.

SOURCE: 5 V.I.C. § 738; FRE Rule 615 is followed in subdivision (a) except that the phrase "including police officers and other investigators" has been added, and subdivision (5) has been added.

NOTE: subdivisions (b) and (c) were added by the Advisory Committee to assure that the preset expectation is that expert witnesses will be allowed to be present in the courtroom unless the trial judge determines that—in a particular circumstance—the experts should remain outside the courtroom prior to their testimony. Several jurisdictions have the subpart (c) provision noting the authority of the judge to require that witnesses be kept separate from one another prior to testifying.

ARTICLE VII
OPINIONS AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

Rule 701. Opinion Testimony by Lay Witnesses

*14 If a witness is not testifying as an expert, testimony in the form of an opinion is limited to one that is:

- (a) rationally based on the witness's perception;
- (b) helpful to clearly understanding the witness's testimony or to determining a fact in issue; and
- (c) not based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of Rule 702.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 701.

See Charles v. People, 60 V.I. 823 (V.I. 2014); Jackson-Flavius v. People, 57 V.I. 716 (V.I. 2012); Ritter v. People, 51 V.I. 354 (V.I. 2009).

Rule 702. Testimony by Expert Witnesses

A witness who is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or otherwise if:

- (a) the expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;
- (b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;
- (c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and
- (d) the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 702.

See Antilles School, Inc. v. Lembach, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 7, 2016 WL 948969 (V.I. March 14, 2016); Hodge v. Bluebeard's Castle, Inc., 62 V.I. 671 (V.I. 2015); Virgin Islands Waste Management Auth. v. Bovoni Investments, 61 V.I. 355 (V.I. 2014); Suarez v. Government of the Virgin Islands, 56 V.I. 754 (V.I. 2012); People v. Todmann, 53 V.I. 431 (V.I. 2010); Ritter v. People, 51 V.I. 354 (V.I. 2009).

Rule 703. Bases of an Expert's Opinion Testimony

An expert may base an opinion on facts or data in the case that the expert has been made aware of or personally observed. If experts in the particular field would reasonably rely on those kinds of facts or data in forming an opinion on the subject, they need not be admissible for the opinion to be admitted. But if the facts or data would otherwise be inadmissible, the proponent of the opinion

may disclose them to the jury only if their probative value in helping the jury evaluate the opinion substantially outweighs their prejudicial effect.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 703

Rule 704. Opinion on an Ultimate Issue Not Automatically Objectionable

An opinion is not objectionable just because it embraces an ultimate issue.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 704. 14 V.I.C. § 14(4).

Rule 705. Disclosing the Facts or Data Underlying an Expert's Opinion

Unless the court orders otherwise, an expert may state an opinion—and give the reasons for it—without first testifying to the underlying facts or data. But the expert may be required to disclose those facts or data on cross-examination.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 705

Rule 706. Court-Appointed Expert Witnesses

(a) **Appointment Process.** On a party's motion or on its own, the court may order the parties to show cause why expert witnesses should not be appointed and may ask the parties to submit nominations. The court may appoint any expert that the parties agree upon and any of its own choosing. But the court may only appoint someone who consents to act.

(b) **Expert's Role.** The court must inform the expert of the expert's duties. The court may do so in writing and have a copy filed with the clerk or may do so orally at a conference in which the parties have an opportunity to participate. The expert:

*15 (1) must advise the parties of any findings the expert makes;

(2) may be deposed by any party;

(3) may be called to testify by the court or any party; and

(4) may be cross-examined by any party, including the party that called the expert.

(c) **Compensation.** The expert is entitled to a reasonable compensation, as set by the court. The compensation is payable as follows:

(1) in a criminal case or in a civil case involving just compensation under the Fifth Amendment, from any funds that are provided by law; and

(2) in any other civil case, by the parties in the proportion and at the time that the court directs—and

the compensation is then charged like other costs.

(d) Disclosing the Appointment to the Jury. The court may authorize disclosure to the jury that the court appointed the expert.

(e) Parties' Choice of Their Own Experts. This rule does not limit a party in calling its own experts.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 706

ARTICLE VIII HEARSAY

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

(a) Statement. “Statement” means a person’s oral assertion, written assertion, or nonverbal conduct, if the person intended it as an assertion.

(b) Declarant. “Declarant” means the person who made the statement.

(c) Hearsay. “Hearsay” means a statement that:

- (1) the declarant does not make while testifying at the current trial or hearing; and
- (2) a party offers in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted in the statement.

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

(1) *A Declarant–Witness’s Prior Statement.* The declarant testifies and is subject to cross-examination about a prior statement, and the statement:

(A) is inconsistent with the declarant’s testimony and was given under penalty of perjury at a trial, hearing, or other proceeding or in a deposition;

(B) is consistent with the declarant’s testimony and is offered:

(i) to rebut an express or implied charge that the declarant recently fabricated it or acted from a recent improper influence or motive in so testifying; or

(ii) to rehabilitate the declarant’s credibility as a witness when attacked on another ground; or

(C) identifies a person as someone the declarant perceived earlier.

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

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

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

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

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

(E) was made by the party’s coconspirator during and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

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

SOURCE: FRE Rule 801.

See Ventura v. People, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 15, 2016 WL 2604525 V.I. May 4, 2016); Woodrup v. People, 63 V.I. 696 (V.I. 2015); Canton v. People, 61 V.I. 511 (V.I. 2014); Williams v. People, 59 V.I. 1043 (V.I. 2013); Simmonds v. People, 59 V.I. 480 (V.I. 2013); LeBlanc v. People, 56 V.I. 536 (V.I. 2012); Ramirez v. People, 56 V.I. 409 (V.I. 2012).

Rule 802. The Rule Against Hearsay

*16 Hearsay is not admissible unless any of the following provides otherwise:

- a Virgin Islands statute;
- these rules; or
- other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 802

Rule 803. Exceptions to the Rule Against Hearsay—Regardless of Whether the Declarant Is Available as a Witness

The following are not excluded by the rule against hearsay, regardless of whether the declarant is available as a witness:

(1) Present Sense Impression. A statement describing or explaining an event or condition, made while or immediately after the declarant perceived it.

(2) Excited Utterance. A statement relating to a startling event or condition, made while the declarant was under

the stress of excitement that it caused.

(3) Then-Existing Mental, Emotional, or Physical Condition. A statement of the declarant's then-existing state of mind (such as motive, intent, or plan) or emotional, sensory, or physical condition (such as mental feeling, pain, or bodily health), but not including a statement of memory or belief to prove the fact remembered or believed unless it relates to the validity or terms of the declarant's will.

(4) Statement Made for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment A statement that:

- (A) Is Made for—and Is Reasonably Pertinent To—Medical Diagnosis or Treatment; and
- (B) describes medical history; past or present symptoms or sensations; their inception; or their general cause.

(5) Recorded Recollection A record that:

- (A) is on a matter the witness once knew about but now cannot recall well enough to testify fully and accurately;
- (B) was made or adopted by the witness when the matter was fresh in the witness's memory; and
- (C) accurately reflects the witness's knowledge.

If admitted, the record may be read into evidence but may be received as an exhibit only if offered by an adverse party.

(6) Records of a Regularly Conducted Activity. A record of an act, event, condition, opinion, or diagnosis if:

- (A) the record was made at or near the time by—or from information transmitted by—someone with knowledge;
- (B) the record was kept in the course of a regularly conducted activity of a business, organization, occupation, or calling, whether or not for profit;
- (C) making the record was a regular practice of that activity;
- (D) all these conditions are shown by the testimony of the custodian or another qualified witness, or by a certification that complies with Rule 902(11) or (12) or with a statute permitting certification; and
- (E) the opponent does not show that the source of information or the method or circumstances of

preparation indicate a lack of trustworthiness.

(7) Absence of a Record of a Regularly Conducted Activity. Evidence that a matter is not included in a record described in paragraph (6) if:

- (A) the evidence is admitted to prove that the matter did not occur or exist;
- (B) a record was regularly kept for a matter of that kind; and
- (C) the opponent does not show that the possible source of the information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.

***17 (8) Public Records.** A record or statement of a public office if:

- (A) it sets out:
 - (i) the office's activities;
 - (ii) a matter observed while under a legal duty to report, but not including, in a criminal case, a matter observed by law-enforcement personnel; or
 - (iii) in a civil case or against the government in a criminal case, factual findings from a legally authorized investigation; and
- (B) the opponent does not show that the source of information or other circumstances indicate a lack of trustworthiness.

(9) Public Records of Vital Statistics. A record of a birth, death, or marriage, if reported to a public office in accordance with a legal duty.

(10) Absence of a Public Record. Testimony—or a certification under Rule 902—that a diligent search failed to disclose a public record or statement if:

- (A) the testimony or certification is admitted to prove that
 - (i) the record or statement does not exist; or
 - (ii) a matter did not occur or exist, if a public office regularly kept a record or statement for a matter of that kind; and
- (B) in a criminal case, a prosecutor who intends to offer a certification provides written notice of that intent at least 14 days before trial, and the defendant does not object in writing within 7 days of receiving the notice—unless the court sets a different time for the

notice or the objection.

(11) Records of Religious Organizations Concerning Personal or Family History. A statement of birth, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, death, relationship by blood or marriage, or similar facts of personal or family history, contained in a regularly kept record of a religious organization.

(12) Certificates of Marriage, Baptism, and Similar Ceremonies. A statement of fact contained in a certificate:

(A) made by a person who is authorized by a religious organization or by law to perform the act certified;

(B) attesting that the person performed a marriage or similar ceremony or administered a sacrament; and

(C) purporting to have been issued at the time of the act or within a reasonable time after it.

(13) Family Records. A statement of fact about personal or family history contained in a family record, such as a Bible, genealogy, chart, engraving on a ring, inscription on a portrait, or engraving on an urn or burial marker.

(14) Records of Documents That Affect an Interest in Property. The record of a document that purports to establish or affect an interest in property if:

(A) the record is admitted to prove the content of the original recorded document, along with its signing and its delivery by each person who purports to have signed it;

(B) the record is kept in a public office; and

(C) a statute authorizes recording documents of that kind in that office.

(15) Statements in Documents That Affect an Interest in Property. A statement contained in a document that purports to establish or affect an interest in property if the matter stated was relevant to the document's purpose—unless later dealings with the property are inconsistent with the truth of the statement or the purport of the document.

***18 (16) Statements in Ancient Documents.** A statement in a document that is at least 20 years old and whose authenticity is established.

(17) Market Reports and Similar Commercial Publications. Market quotations, lists, directories, or other compilations that are generally relied on by the

public or by persons in particular occupations.

(18) Statements in Learned Treatises, Periodicals, or Pamphlets. A statement contained in a treatise, periodical, or pamphlet if:

(A) the statement is called to the attention of an expert witness on cross-examination or relied on by the expert on direct examination; and

(B) the publication is established as a reliable authority by the expert's admission or testimony, by another expert's testimony, or by judicial notice.

If admitted, the statement may be read into evidence but not received as an exhibit.

(19) Reputation Concerning Personal or Family History. A reputation among a person's family by blood, adoption, or marriage—or among a person's associates or in the community—concerning the person's birth, adoption, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, death, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, or similar facts of personal or family history.

(20) Reputation Concerning Boundaries or General History. A reputation in a community—arising before the controversy—concerning boundaries of land in the community or customs that affect the land, or concerning general historical events important to that community, state, or nation.

(21) Reputation Concerning Character. A reputation among a person's associates or in the community concerning the person's character.

(22) Judgment of a Previous Conviction. Evidence of a final judgment of conviction if:

(A) the judgment was entered after a trial or guilty plea, but not a nolo contendere plea;

(B) the conviction was for a crime punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than a year;

(C) the evidence is admitted to prove any fact essential to the judgment; and

(D) when offered by the prosecutor in a criminal case for a purpose other than impeachment, the judgment was against the defendant.

The pendency of an appeal may be shown but does not affect admissibility.

(23) Judgments Involving Personal, Family, or General History, or a Boundary. A judgment that is

admitted to prove a matter of personal, family, or general history, or boundaries, if the matter:

- (A) was essential to the judgment; and
- (B) could be proved by evidence of reputation.

(24) [Other Exceptions.] [Reserved.]

SOURCE: *FRE Rule 803*.

See *Cascen v. People*, 60 V.I. 392 (V.I. 2014).

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

(a) **Criteria for Being Found Unavailable.** A declarant is considered to be unavailable as a witness if the declarant:

- (1) is exempted from testifying about the subject matter of the declarant’s statement because the court rules that a privilege applies;
- (2) refuses to testify about the subject matter despite a court order to do so;
- (3) testifies to not remembering the subject matter;
- (4) cannot be present or testify at the trial or hearing because of death or a then-existing infirmity, physical illness, or mental illness; or

*19 (5) is absent from the trial or hearing and the statement’s proponent has not been able, by process or other reasonable means, to procure:

- (A) the declarant’s attendance, in the case of a hearsay exception under Rule 804(b)(1) or (6); or
- (B) the declarant’s attendance or testimony, in the case of a hearsay exception under Rule 804(b)(2), (3), or (4).

But this subdivision (a) does not apply if the statement’s proponent procured or wrongfully caused the declarant’s unavailability as a witness in order to prevent the declarant from attending or testifying.

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

- (1) **Former Testimony.** Testimony that:
 - (A) was given as a witness at a trial, hearing, or lawful deposition, whether given during the current

proceeding or a different one; and

(B) is now offered against a party who had—or, in a civil case, whose predecessor in interest had—an opportunity and similar motive to develop it by direct, cross-, or redirect examination.

(2) **Statement Under the Belief of Imminent Death.** In a prosecution for homicide or in a civil case, a statement that the declarant, while believing the declarant’s death to be imminent, made about its cause or circumstances.

(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) is supported by corroborating circumstances that clearly indicate its trustworthiness, if it is offered in a criminal case as one that tends to expose the declarant to criminal liability.

(4) **Statement of Personal or Family History.** A statement about:

(A) the declarant’s own birth, adoption, legitimacy, ancestry, marriage, divorce, relationship by blood, adoption, or marriage, or similar facts of personal or family history, even though the declarant had no way of acquiring personal knowledge about that fact; or

(B) another person concerning any of these facts, as well as death, if the declarant was related to the person by blood, adoption, or marriage or was so intimately associated with the person’s family that the declarant’s information is likely to be accurate.

(5) [Other Exceptions.] [Reserved.]

(6) **Statement Offered Against a Party That Wrongfully Caused the Declarant’s Unavailability.** A statement offered against a party that wrongfully caused—or acquiesced in wrongfully causing—the declarant’s unavailability as a witness, and did so intending that result.

SOURCE: *FRE Rule 804*.

See *Rawlins v. People*, 61 V.I. 593 (V.I. 2014).

Rule 805. Hearsay Within Hearsay

Hearsay within hearsay is not excluded by the rule against hearsay if each part of the combined statements conforms with an exception to the rule.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 805

Rule 806. Attacking and Supporting the Declarant's Credibility

When a hearsay statement—or a statement described in [Rule 801\(d\)\(2\)\(C\), \(D\), or \(E\)](#)—has been admitted in evidence, the declarant's credibility may be attacked, and then supported, by any evidence that would be admissible for those purposes if the declarant had testified as a witness. The court may admit evidence of the declarant's inconsistent statement or conduct, regardless of when it occurred or whether the declarant had an opportunity to explain or deny it. If the party against whom the statement was admitted calls the declarant as a witness, the party may examine the declarant on the statement as if on cross-examination.

**20 SOURCE: FRE Rule 806*

Rule 807. Residual Exception

(a) In General. Under the following circumstances, a hearsay statement is not excluded by the rule against hearsay even if the statement is not specifically covered by a hearsay exception in [Rule 803](#) or [804](#):

- (1) the statement has equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness;
- (2) it is offered as evidence of a material fact;
- (3) it is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence that the proponent can obtain through reasonable efforts; and
- (4) admitting it will best serve the purposes of these rules and the interests of justice.

(b) Notice. The statement is admissible only if, before the trial or hearing, the proponent gives an adverse party reasonable notice of the intent to offer the statement and its particulars, including the declarant's name and address, so that the party has a fair opportunity to meet it.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 807.

See Woodrup v. People, 63 V.I. 696 (V.I. 2015).

ARTICLE IX**AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTIFICATION****Rule 901. Authenticating or Identifying Evidence**

(a) In General. To satisfy the requirement of authenticating or identifying an item of evidence, the proponent must produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is.

(b) Examples. The following are examples only—not a complete list—of evidence that satisfies the requirement:

- (1) *Testimony of a Witness with Knowledge.* Testimony that an item is what it is claimed to be.
- (2) *Nonexpert Opinion About Handwriting.* A nonexpert's opinion that handwriting is genuine, based on a familiarity with it that was not acquired for the current litigation.
- (3) *Comparison by an Expert Witness or the Trier of Fact.* A comparison with an authenticated specimen by an expert witness or the trier of fact.
- (4) *Distinctive Characteristics and the Like.* The appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics of the item, taken together with all the circumstances.
- (5) *Opinion About a Voice.* An opinion identifying a person's voice—whether heard firsthand or through mechanical or electronic transmission or recording—based on hearing the voice at any time under circumstances that connect it with the alleged speaker.
- (6) *Evidence About a Telephone Conversation.* For a telephone conversation, evidence that a call was made to the number assigned at the time to:
 - (A) a particular person, if circumstances, including self-identification, show that the person answering was the one called; or
 - (B) a particular business, if the call was made to a business and the call related to business reasonably transacted over the telephone.
- (7) *Evidence About Public Records.* Evidence that:
 - (A) a document was recorded or filed in a public office as authorized by law; or
 - (B) a purported public record or statement is from the office where items of this kind are kept.

(8) **Evidence About Ancient Documents or Data Compilations.** For a document or data compilation, evidence that it:

(A) is in a condition that creates no suspicion about its authenticity;

*21 (B) was in a place where, if authentic, it would likely be; and

(C) is at least 20 years old when offered.

(9) **Evidence About a Process or System.** Evidence describing a process or system and showing that it produces an accurate result.

(10) **Methods Provided by a Statute or Rule.** Any method of authentication or identification allowed by a statute or by a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court.

SOURCE: *FRE Rule 901.*

See *Gumbs v. People*, 2016 V.I. Supreme LEXIS 12, 2016 WL 1713600 (V.I. April 26, 2016); *James v. People*, 60 V.I. 311 (V.I. 2013); *George v. People*, 59 V.I. 368 (V.I. 2013); *Blyden v. People*, 53 V.I. 637 (V.I. 2010); *Bowry v. People*, 52 V.I. 264 (V.I. 2009).

Rule 902. Evidence That Is Self-Authenticating

The following items of evidence are self-authenticating; they require no extrinsic evidence of authenticity in order to be admitted:

(1) **Domestic Public Documents That Are Sealed and Signed.** A document that bears:

(A) a seal purporting to be that of the United States; any state, district, commonwealth, territory, or insular possession of the United States; the former Panama Canal Zone; the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; a political subdivision of any of these entities; or a department, agency, or officer of any entity named above; and

(B) a signature purporting to be an execution or attestation.

(2) **Domestic Public Documents That Are Not Sealed But Are Signed and Certified.** A document that bears no seal if:

(A) it bears the signature of an officer or employee of an entity named in Rule 902(1)(A); and

(B) another public officer who has a seal and official

duties within that same entity certifies under seal—or its equivalent—that the signer has the official capacity and that the signature is genuine.

(3) **Foreign Public Documents.** A document that purports to be signed or attested by a person who is authorized by a foreign country's law to do so. The document must be accompanied by a final certification that certifies the genuineness of the signature and official position of the signer or attester—or of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness relates to the signature or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness relating to the signature or attestation. The certification may be made by a secretary of a United States embassy or legation; by a consul general, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States; or by a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the United States. If all parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to investigate the document's authenticity and accuracy, the court may, for good cause, either:

(A) order that it be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification; or

(B) allow it 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 a copy of a document that was recorded or filed in a public office as authorized by law—if the copy is certified as correct by:

(A) the custodian or another person authorized to make the certification; or

*22 (B) a certificate that complies with Rule 902(1), (2), or (3), a statute, or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court.

(5) **Official Publications.** A book, pamphlet, or other publication purporting to be issued by a public authority.

(6) **Newspapers and Periodicals.** Printed material purporting to be a newspaper or periodical.

(7) **Trade Inscriptions and the Like.** An inscription, sign, tag, or label purporting to have been affixed in the course of business and indicating origin, ownership, or control.

(8) **Acknowledged Documents.** A document accompanied by a certificate of acknowledgment that is lawfully executed by a notary public or another officer who is authorized to take acknowledgments.

(9) Commercial Paper and Related Documents. Commercial paper, a signature on it, and related documents, to the extent allowed by general commercial law.

(10) Presumptions Under a Statute. A signature, document, or anything else that a statute declares to be presumptively or prima facie genuine or authentic.

(11) Certified Domestic Records of a Regularly Conducted Activity. The original or a copy of a domestic record that meets the requirements of [Rule 803\(6\)\(A\)-\(C\)](#), as shown by a certification of the custodian or another qualified person that complies with a statute or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court. Before the trial or hearing, the proponent must give an adverse party reasonable written notice of the intent to offer the record—and must make the record and certification available for inspection—so that the party has a fair opportunity to challenge them.

(12) Certified Foreign Records of a Regularly Conducted Activity. In a civil case, the original or a copy of a foreign record that meets the requirements of Rule 902(11), modified as follows: the certification, rather than complying with a statute or Supreme Court rule, must be signed in a manner that, if falsely made, would subject the maker to a criminal penalty in the country where the certification is signed. The proponent must also meet the notice requirements of Rule 902(11).

SOURCE: FRE Rule 902

Rule 903. Subscribing Witness’s Testimony

A subscribing witness’s testimony is necessary to authenticate a writing only if required by the law of the jurisdiction that governs its validity.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 903

ARTICLE X

**CONTENTS OF WRITINGS,
RECORDINGS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS**

Rule 1001. Definitions That Apply to This Article

In this article:

(a) “writing” consists of letters, words, numbers, or their equivalent set down in any form.

(b) “recording” consists of letters, words, numbers, or their equivalent recorded in any manner.

(c) “*photograph*” means a photographic image or its equivalent stored in any form.

(d) An “*original*” of a writing or recording means the writing or recording itself or any counterpart intended to have the same effect by the person who executed or issued it. For electronically stored information, “original” means any printout—or other output readable by sight—if it accurately reflects the information. An “original” of a photograph includes the negative or a print from it.

(e) A “*duplicate*” means a counterpart produced by a mechanical, photographic, chemical, electronic, or other equivalent process or technique that accurately reproduces the original.

***23 SOURCE: FRE Rule 1001.**

See Ostalaza v. People, 58 V.I. 531 (V.I. 2013).

Rule 1002. Requirement of the Original

An original writing, recording, or photograph is required in order to prove its content unless these rules or a statute provides otherwise.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1002

Rule 1003. Admissibility of Duplicates

A duplicate is admissible to the same extent as the original unless a genuine question is raised about the original’s authenticity or the circumstances make it unfair to admit the duplicate.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1003

Rule 1004. Admissibility of Other Evidence of Content

An original is not required and other evidence of the content of a writing, recording, or photograph is admissible if:

(a) all the originals are lost or destroyed, and not by the proponent acting in bad faith;

(b) an original cannot be obtained by any available judicial process;

(c) the party against whom the original would be offered had control of the original; was at that time put on notice, by pleadings or otherwise, that the original would be a subject of proof at the trial or hearing; and fails to produce it at the trial or hearing; or

(d) the writing, recording, or photograph is not closely related to a controlling issue.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1004.

See Ostalaza v. People, 58 V.I. 531 (V.I. 2013).

Rule 1005. Copies of Public Records to Prove Content

The proponent may use a copy to prove the content of an

official record—or of a document that was recorded or filed in a public office as authorized by law—if these conditions are met: the record or document is otherwise admissible; and the copy is certified as correct in accordance with [Rule 902\(4\)](#) or is testified to be correct by a witness who has compared it with the original. If no such copy can be obtained by reasonable diligence, then the proponent may use other evidence to prove the content.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1005

Rule 1006. Summaries to Prove Content

The proponent may use a summary, chart, or calculation to prove the content of voluminous writings, recordings, or photographs that cannot be conveniently examined in court. The proponent must make the originals or duplicates available for examination or copying, or both, by other parties at a reasonable time and place. And the court may order the proponent to produce them in court.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1006

Rule 1007. Testimony or Statement of a Party to Prove Content

The proponent may prove the content of a writing, recording, or photograph by the testimony, deposition, or written statement of the party against whom the evidence is offered. The proponent need not account for the original.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1007

Rule 1008. Functions of the Court and Jury

Ordinarily, the court determines whether the proponent has fulfilled the factual conditions for admitting other evidence of the content of a writing, recording, or photograph under [Rule 1004](#) or [1005](#). But in a jury trial, the jury determines—in accordance with [Rule 104\(b\)](#)—any issue about whether:

(a) an asserted writing, recording, or photograph ever existed;

*24 (b) another one produced at the trial or hearing is the original; or

(c) other evidence of content accurately reflects the content.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1008

ARTICLE XI

APPLICATION, AMENDMENTS, TITLE & CITATION

Rule 1101. Applicability of the Rules

(a) **To Courts and Judges.** These rules apply to proceedings before:

- the Superior Court of the Virgin Islands;

- the Superior Court magistrate judges; and
- the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands.

(b) **To Cases and Proceedings.** These rules apply in:

- civil cases and proceedings;
- criminal cases and proceedings; and
- contempt proceedings, except those in which the court may act summarily.

(c) **Rules on Privilege.** The rules on privilege apply to all stages of a case or proceeding.

(d) **Exceptions.** These rules—except for those on privilege—do not apply to the following:

- (1) the court’s determination, under [Rule 104\(a\)](#), on a preliminary question of fact governing admissibility;
- (2) grand jury proceedings; and
- (3) miscellaneous proceedings such as:
 - extradition or rendition;
 - issuing an arrest warrant, criminal summons, or search warrant;
 - a preliminary examination in a criminal case;
 - suppression hearings in criminal cases;
 - sentencing;
 - granting or revoking probation or supervised release; and
 - considering whether to release on bail or otherwise.

(e) **Other Statutes and Rules.** A Virgin Islands statute or a rule prescribed by the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands may provide for admitting or excluding evidence independently from these rules.

SOURCE: FRE Rule 1101, adapted in light of Virgin Islands law.

Rule 1102. Amendments

These rules may be amended by the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands pursuant to the authority provided in [4 V.I.C. § 32\(f\)\(2\)](#).

SOURCE: New, in accord with Act 7888 and other Virgin Islands law.

Rule 1103. Title & Citation

These rules may be cited as the Virgin Islands Rules of Evidence, or “V.I.R.E.”.

SOURCE: New.

All Citations

2017 WL 1293843

NOTE: This is a short excerpt from the full opinion

2016 WL 948969 (V.I.)
Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands.

ANTILLES SCHOOL, INC.,
Appellant/Defendant,
v.
Jamie LEMBACH, Appellee/Plaintiff.

S. Ct. Civ. No. 2015–0039
Argued: October 13, 2015
Filed: March 14, 2016

OPINION OF THE COURT

[HODGE](#), Chief Justice.

Expert Testimony

* * *

1. *Standard for Expert Testimony in Virgin Islands Courts*

Before reaching the merits of Antilles School’s claim, we must ascertain the legal standard that governs admission of expert testimony in proceedings in the Superior Court of the Virgin Islands. On April 7, 2010, the Governor signed Act No. 7161 into law, of which section 15 reads, in pertinent part, that “Title 5, Virgin Islands Code, chapter 67, Admissibility of Evidence, Uniform Rules of Evidence, is hereby repealed and replaced with the Federal Rules of Evidence, Pub.L. [No.] 93–595, § 1, January 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1926, and all subsequent amendments thereto.” Act No. § 7161, § 15(b) (V.I. Reg. Sess. 2010). . . . this Court has already adopted the same standard as [Federal Rule of Evidence 702](#), which provides that

*7 A witness who is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or otherwise if:

- (a) the expert’s scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;
- (b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;

(c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and

**416 (d) the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

[Alexander v. People](#), 60 V.I. 486, 507 (V.I. 2014) (quoting [FED. R. EVID. 702](#)).

In its September 12, 2014 opinion, the Superior Court acknowledged that the standard set forth in [Federal Rule of Evidence 702](#) governed Antilles School’s motion to preclude Mackay from testifying as an expert. The Superior Court recognized that the United States Supreme Court, in [Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.](#), 509 U.S. 579 (1993), established a standard for admitting expert testimony in federal courts under [Rule 702](#). In that case, the United States Supreme Court instructed the lower federal courts that under [Rule 702](#),

[a] trial judge must determine at the outset ... whether the expert is proposing to testify to (1) scientific knowledge that (2) will assist the trier of fact to understand or determine a fact in issue. This entails a preliminary assessment of whether the reasoning or methodology underlying the testimony is scientifically valid and of whether that reasoning or methodology properly can be applied to the facts in issue.

[Daubert](#), 509 U.S. at 592–93. To determine whether an expert’s opinion is based on reliable reasoning or methodology, the United States Supreme Court listed several non-exhaustive factors to consider, including whether the opinion can be (and has been) tested, whether the theory or technique has been subjected to peer review and publication, what the known or potential rate of error is, and the existence and maintenance of standards controlling the technique’s operation.⁶ *Id.* at 593–94.

The Superior Court, however, declined to apply the *Daubert* factors to this case. In doing so, the Superior Court found “that several of the *Daubert* factors are inapplicable to Mackay’s proposed testimony,” and that “the *Daubert* factors ... have not been explicitly applied to evaluate the methodology of a safety engineer.” (J.A. 32–33.) In doing so, it relied **417 on [Liriano v. Hobart Corp.](#), 949 F.Supp. 171 (S.D.N.Y. 1996), for the proposition that “some [c]ourts ... have even eliminated

the application of the *Daubert* factors entirely where an expert's opinion is based solely on personal experience and training rather than on a specific scientific methodology." (J.A. 33.) After considering case law from other jurisdictions, the Superior Court also determined that it is "reasonable and consistent with Virgin Islands public policy to apply the 'general acceptance' standard" adopted by *Frye v. United States*, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923), which *Daubert* had expressly overruled for practice in the federal courts.

*8 In its appellate brief, Antilles School states that "the trial court declined to apply the *Daubert* factors," "[i]nstead ... cited the *Frye* 'general acceptance' test, and one 19-year old case from New York, *Liriano*," and asserts "[t]hat ruling was an error of law." (Appellant's Br. 25.) To support its claim that the Superior Court erred when it failed to apply *Daubert*, Antilles School cites to absolutely no authority, apparently believing that it is self-evident that the Superior Court is bound to follow every pronouncement from the United States Supreme Court, regardless of the context. Surprisingly, Lembach also does not address the issue of the applicable legal standard, apparently because he believes that this Court already adopted the *Daubert* standard in *People v. Todmann*, 53 V.I. 431 (V.I. 2010), and *Suarez v. Gov't of the V.I.*, 56 V.I. 754 (V.I. 2012).

Lembach is correct that this Court cited to *Daubert* in its *Todmann* and *Suarez* decisions. However, neither of these cases interpreted [Federal Rule of Evidence 702](#). Rather, both decisions were controlled by the former [5 V.I.C. § 911](#), a local statute governing admission of expert testimony that was subsequently repealed by Act No. 7191, because the pertinent evidentiary decisions had been made by the Superior Court prior to repeal of [section 911](#). *Suarez*, 56 V.I. at 761 & n.4 ("[B]ecause *Suarez* was tried while [5 V.I.C. §§ 771–956](#) were in force, it is to those sections we turn in this appeal."); *Todmann*, 53 V.I. at 439 ("[A]s [5 V.I.C. § 911\(2\)](#) represents a law of the Virgin Islands, this Court has no choice but to apply that statute, which reflects the 1953 version of the URE, until such time as the Legislature repeals or amends [5 V.I.C. §§ 771–956](#)."). Significantly, in *Todmann*, this Court cited to *Daubert* for the sole purpose of illustrating that one of the requirements of [Federal Rule of Evidence 702](#)—that the expert testimony assist the trier of fact—that had been omitted from [section 911](#) was "equivalent to a requirement of relevance," **418 which was already codified in [5 V.I.C. § 777\(f\)](#). *Todmann*, 53 V.I. at 439–40. Likewise, *Suarez* cited to *Daubert*—and *Todmann*—for this same narrow proposition. *Suarez*, 56 V.I. at 761. And while this Court has cited to *Daubert* in more recent cases for other propositions of law,⁷ it has never held that *Daubert* applies in Virgin Islands courts to the exclusion of other approaches.

* * *

Consequently, the Superior Court properly acknowledged that *Daubert*'s applicability to the Virgin Islands was an issue of first impression that required analysis.

We also conclude that the Superior Court correctly recognized that it is not bound to mechanically follow every precedent from the United States Supreme Court. Clearly, state and territorial courts must follow, as binding precedent, decisions of the United States Supreme Court that interpret the United States Constitution, federal statutes, and federal treaties. See *Chesapeake & O. Ry. Co. v. Martin*, 283 U.S. 209, 221 (1931). As explained above, the Federal Rules of Evidence do not apply in the Virgin Islands Superior Court because adherence to them has been mandated by Congress or is required by the United States Constitution; on the contrary, Congress, through the Revised Organic Act of 1954, provided that "[t]he rules governing the practice and procedure of the courts established by local law ... shall be governed by local law or the rules promulgated by those courts." 48 U.S.C. § 11(c). Consequently, "[a]ny authority the federal rules have over territorial courts is a function of territorial law," not federal law. **419 *In re Richards*, 213 F.3d 773, 787 n.4 (3d Cir. 2000). As such, even though "the Legislature enacted each and every one of the Federal Rules of Evidence as the evidentiary rules for the Virgin Islands local courts without qualification," *Simmonds v. People*, 59 V.I. 480, 500 (V.I. 2013), neither this Court nor the Superior Court is required to follow the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Federal Rules of Evidence as binding precedent, since the interpretation of Virgin Islands evidentiary rules remains a question of Virgin Islands law even if the local rule that has been adopted is word-for-word identical to a federal rule. See *Webb v. Nashville Area Habitat for Humanity, Inc.*, 346 S.W.3d 422, 430 (Tenn. 2011) (refusing to follow United States Supreme Court's interpretation of [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12\(b\)\(6\)](#) in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), even though the language of "the state and federal rules are identical") (citing *Harris v. Chern*, 33 S.W.3d 741, 745 n.2 (Tenn. 2000)); *Madrid v. Village of Chama*, 283 P.3d 871, 876 (N.M. Ct. App. 2012) (same); *State v. Fuller*, 374 N.W.2d 722, 727 (Minn. 1985) ("[A] decision of the United States Supreme Court interpreting a comparable provision of the federal constitution that ... is textually identical to a provision of our constitution, is of inherently persuasive, although not necessarily compelling, force.").

Nevertheless, while the Superior Court was not required to follow *Daubert*, we conclude that the *Daubert* standard represents the soundest rule for the Virgin Islands. In the 22 years since the United States Supreme Court issued *Daubert*, the overwhelming majority of state courts voluntarily abolished the *Frye* standard in favor of *Daubert*.⁸ See **421 29 CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT & VICTOR JAMES GOLD, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 6266 (1997) (collecting cases). Although “application of the *Daubert* approach to exclude evidence has been criticized as a misappropriation of the jury’s responsibilities,” *Bunting v. Jamieson*, 984 P.2d 467, 472 (Wyo. 1999), and for “necessitat[ing] that trial judges be ‘amateur scientists,’ ” *Howerton v. Arai Helmet, Ltd.*, 597 S.E.2d 674, 691 (N.C. 2004) (quoting *Goeb v. Tharaldson*, 615 N.W.2d 800, 912–13 (Minn. 2000)), we conclude that the *Frye* standard is even more problematic, since it is “unduly conservative” and the requirement of general acceptance ignores the historical truth “that

scientific pioneers and dissenters are occasionally right.” *State v. Porter*, 698 A.2d 739, 749–50 (Conn. 1997). Importantly, while strict adherence to the *Daubert* framework may result in relevant expert testimony being wrongfully excluded, the *Frye* standard poses an even greater risk of evidence being unjustly excluded, since it may be “easily manipulated by courts when deciding whether or not to admit certain evidence” due to “[t]he lack of a definitional framework for [the key concepts under that test of] ‘field’ and ‘general acceptance.’ ” *State v. Coon*, 974 P.2d 386, 397 (Alaska 1999). Consequently, we join the vast majority of jurisdictions in holding that the more liberal *Daubert* standard should govern the admission of expert testimony in the Virgin Islands.