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**Admission into Evidence Court Cases Research**

1. What is the main difference between the rulings of *Frye v. United States* and *Daubert v.* *Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*?
2. After the ruling of *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, judges had to view the evidence at pretrial hearings to determine if the evidence could be admitted as reliable evidence. List the five Daubert factors that judges need to consider in order to admit the evidence.
3. If handwriting evidence was not yet considered to be scientific evidence at the time of *United* *States v. Starzecpyzel*, how was it admissible as reliable evidence?
4. How did the ruling in *Kumho Tire v. Carmichael* affect how expert witness testimony would be accepted?
5. In *United States v. Prime*, the court viewed handwriting analysis testimony differently from how it was viewed back in 1993. What are some of the reasons that the court now considered handwriting analysis as better able to meet the Dauber factors? What had changed?

|  |
| --- |
| **Important Court Cases in Acceptance of Evidence** |
| **Case** | **Date** | **Case****Number** | **Summary of Case and Decision** | **Notes on Impact** |
| *Frye v. United States* |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1993 | 509 US579, 113S.Ct 2786.125 L. Ed.2d 469 |  | Created “gate- keeping” role for judges.Expert Witnesses meant hearsay was allowed in court of law. |
|  | 1995 | 880F. Supp.1027(S.D.N.Y. 1995) | Determined handwriting analysis did not meet Daubert factors, but it found handwriting analysis to be considered as technical and admissible.  | Did not meet Daubert because: |
| *Kumho Tire v. Carmichael* |  | 526 U.S.137, 119S.Ct. 1167,143 L. Ed.2d 238 (1999)  |  |  |
| *United States v. Prime* | 2002 |  |  | Handwriting experts recognized by Scotland Yard and the FBI. Forensics courses with handwriting analysis offered by 15 universities. |