

PRESIDENT

Michael R. Ricciardulli
 Ruprecht Hart Weeks & Ricciardulli, LLP
 53 Cardinal Drive
 Westfield, NJ 07090
 (908) 232-4800
 (908) 232-4801 Fax
 mricciardulli@rhwlawfirm.com

PRESIDENT ELECT

John E. Hogan, Jr.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Emily A. Kaller
 Matthew J. Tharney
 Chad M. Moore

SECRETARY/TREASURER

John E. Gregory, Jr.

CHAIR/PAST PRESIDENT

Richard J. Williams, Jr.


TRUSTEES

John Anzalone
 Melissa M. Baxter
 E. Drew Britcher
 Bruce W. Clark
 Joseph K. Cobuzio
 Benjamin J. DiLorenzo
 Everett E. Gale, III
 Jodi Anne Hudson
 Richard V. Jones
 John M. Kearney
 Todd J. Leonard
 Joseph V. Leone
 Stephen R. Long
 Stephen C. Matthews
 Gregory B. Noble
 Mary Ann C. O'Brien
 Michelle M. O'Brien
 James J. O'Hara
 Christopher M. Placitella
 Samuel I. Portnoy
 Stephanie G. Reckord
 Wendy A. Reek
 Douglas V. Sanchez
 Matthew A. Schiappa
 Martin P. Schrama
 Edward G. Sponzilli
 Annabelle Steinhacker
 Charles J. Stoa
 Corinne McCann Trainor
 Eugenie A. Voitkevich
 Lawrence C. Weiner
 Sheila Raffery Wiggins
 Michael B. Zerres
 Michael C. Zogby

Parliamentarian
 Edwin R. Matthews

#013

TRIAL ATTORNEYS OF NEW JERSEY

P.O. Box 184
 West Allenhurst, NJ 07711
 Telephone (732) 517-1337
 Fax (732) 531-0397
 e-mail: gwbtanj@aol.com
 www.tanj.org

Executive Director
 Ginny Whipple Berkner

April 17, 2017

Glenn A. Grant, JAD
 Active Administrative Director of the Courts
 Rules, Comments
 Hughes Justice Complex
 P.O. Box 037
 Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0037
 e-mail - comments.mailbox@njcourts.gov

Dear Mr. Grant:


On behalf of the Trial Attorneys of New Jersey ("TANJ"), we have reviewed the proposed changes to the Rules of Evidence in the 2017-2019 Report of the Supreme Court Committee on the Rules of Evidence. We request that you give consideration to our collective input with regard to NJRE 530 and NJRE 608. A Position Statement with TANJ's recommendations are attached. These recommendations were a result of much discussion, contemplation, and input from the many members of our Board of Trustees, which are comprised of trial attorneys from across the state as well as retired Superior Court judges.

ADVISORY BOARD

Hon. Frank M. Ciuffani, Hon. James D. Clyne, Hon. C. Judson Hamlin,
 Hon. John E. Keefe, Sr., Hon. Jack L. Lintner, Hon. Nicholas J. Stroumtsos, Jr.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Ricciardulli". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, sweeping initial "M" and a long, horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael R. Ricciardulli,
President of Trial Attorneys of
New Jersey

TRIAL ATTORNEYS OF NEW JERSEY
Position Statement

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO N.J.R.E. 530 - Waiver of Privilege by Contract or Previous Disclosure; Limitations

Amends Rule to clarify the issue of inadvertent disclosures of privileged materials

The Trial Attorneys of New Jersey ("TANJ") strongly supports the recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 530, which will provide further clarification where there are instances of inadvertent disclosures of privileged materials. The proposed change also aligns the state court procedures with the federal court procedures and, thus, there is an established body of case law to which attorneys may review for guidance when implementing the rule. Many of the current cases which are cited to in *Biunno, Weissbard & Zegas, Current N.J. Rules of Evidence (Gann)*, align well with the recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 530 and, thus, attorneys may continue to use these cases as guidance when implementing the rule.

The recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 530 were reviewed by the Board of Trustees and the Advisory Board Members of TANJ in order to set forth their position on these recommendations. After thorough review of the recommended changes and further discussion held on March 26, 2019, the recommendations of the Supreme Court Committee on the Rules of Evidence dated January 15, 2019 were unanimously approved.

Accordingly, TANJ agrees with the referenced recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 530 and supports their adoption.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO N.J.R.E. 608 - Evidence of Character for Truthfulness or Untruthfulness and Evidence of a Prior False Accusation

Amendments would permit the use of specific instances of conduct to attack or support a witness's credibility

TANJ does not support the recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 608.

The recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 608 were reviewed by the Board of Trustees and the Advisory Board Members in order to set forth their position on these recommendations. After thorough review of the recommended changes and further discussion held on March 26, 2019, the recommendations of the Supreme Court Committee on the Rules of Evidence dated January 15, 2019 were disapproved by more than a two-thirds majority.

TANJ disagrees with the recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 608 primarily for the reasons set forth by the minority of the Supreme Court's Subcommittee which are contained in the "Minority Report" and which raised the specific risks of jury confusion, distraction, and undue prejudice creating "fertile ground for reversible error." The Minority Report also referenced New Jersey's long-standing history disfavoring the use of prior bad acts and the concern that the proposed amendment would deter witnesses from testifying, would encourage attorneys to engage in wide-ranging inquiries of witnesses, and would broadly expand pre-trial discovery without "meaningfully advancing" the jury's search for truth.

The Trial Attorneys of New Jersey had additional concerns that the allowance of inquiry into past dishonest conduct could contribute to more delay as well as inconsistency in the handling of such issues amongst the different counties. Trial management issues would also arise in determining the proper expansion of discovery to identify and obtain information to substantiate or

contradict specific conduct, or to obtain records from third parties to substantiate or rebut the inference to be drawn from specific conduct. For example, TANJ acknowledges that the proposed rule aligns the state court procedure to be more similar to the federal court procedures, however, the federal court has funding for heightened case management opportunities, including detailed case management orders and Magistrate Judge oversight for all cases, which differs from the state court which has varying case management opportunities for different cases. Additional issues would also include concerns of admissibility, remoteness, and timing of further evidential hearings. Lastly, it was also noted that many parties simply do not have sufficient means for such additional detailed discovery.

Accordingly, TANJ disagrees with the recommended changes to N.J.R.E. 608.