

# Index

- Abuse of process doctrine
    - illegally and improperly obtained evidence and 225
  - Accomplices
    - reliability of evidence 152, 154
  - Admissions *see also* Confessions, evidence of
    - ‘circumstances’ of 189
    - definition 176
    - discretion to exclude 185
    - extended meaning, confusion arising from 190
    - illegally obtained 192, 193–4
    - implied 190
    - New South Wales provisions 185
    - reliability 148, 185, 187–90
    - truth of, s 189(3) UEL and 188–90
    - UEL provisions 176–7, 184–5, 188–9
  - Appeals
    - Barbados 23
    - illegally or improperly obtained evidence 228, 229
    - rational deliberation 71
  - Australian Capital Territory
    - identification evidence 204
    - origins of uniform evidence legislation 1, 2
  - Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC)
    - caution as to significant changes 56–7
    - complaint evidence under UEL regime 110, 113, 130
    - freshness requirement 135
    - memory processes, effects of 113–14, 116, 119
  - draft Evidence Bill 1, 2, 4–6
    - application 30
    - Caribbean UEL statutes, influence on 15, 17, 18–22, 27, 29, 30
    - influences 31
  - Evidence Ordinance 1971 1, 2
  - identification evidence 198
  - improperly or illegally obtained evidence 214, 219
  - objective 5
  - overseas criticism 11
  - precedent 32
  - unreliable evidence, judicial warnings 143, 147
- Barbados *see also* Caribbean region
    - court system 23
    - DNA evidence, admissibility of 24
    - judicial warnings 24, 26–7
    - jurisdiction overview 15
    - legal institutions 23
    - rape shield law 18
    - UEL statutes 15–20
  - Basis rule
    - overview 55–6
  - Bayes’ Theorem
    - probative value, application to 168–9
  - British Psychological Society (BPS)
    - guidelines for memory and the law 115, 116–19
  - British Virgin Islands *see also* Caribbean region
    - jurisdiction overview 15
    - UEL statutes 15
    - history 20
    - understanding 25–6
  - Browne v Dunn*, rule in
    - UEL, coexistence with 53
  - Bunning v Cross* doctrine
    - illegally or improperly evidence 181, 211, 217, 227
  - Canada
    - complaint evidence of children 139–40
    - draft evidence code 10, 11, 30
    - illegally or improperly obtained evidence 11, 211, 212, 213, 214, 220–1, 223, 226, 228
    - law reform 11, 12, 30
  - Caribbean region
    - ALRC influence 15, 17, 18–22, 27, 29, 30
    - Australian UEL scheme, comparison with 22–5
    - court system 23
    - McKinney* rule 26, 28
    - population 15
    - size 15

- Caribbean region (*cont*)
  - subregions 15
  - UEL in 2–3, 15–16, 30
    - case law 22–9
    - origins 16–17
    - statutes 18–22
- Caution
  - origins 179
- Character evidence
  - aspects 232
  - components 232
  - forensic value 232
  - ‘good character’ 244, 247
  - honesty 232
  - New Zealand 233, 237, 244
  - propensity/tendency evidence distinguished 237
  - reputation 240–1, 242
  - truthfulness 232, 233, 237
  - UEL regime 58, 237–8
- Child sexual assault (CSA)
  - characteristics of offence 104–5
  - complaint, evidence of *see* Complaint evidence
  - evidence at trial
    - expert opinion evidence, s 79(2) UEL 121–3, 124
    - hearsay rule, modifications of 120, 135–6
    - types 105
  - health effects 118
  - memory of *see* Memory processes
  - multiple interactions 105, 114
  - standard of proof 164–5
- Children
  - reliability of evidence 149
- Christie* discretion
  - Ireland 11
  - UEL provision 61
- Christmas Island *see also* Indian Ocean Territories
  - jurisdiction overview 29
  - uniform evidence statute 2, 11, 29, 30
- Circumstantial evidence
  - tendency evidence distinguished 165–6
- Cleland* discretion
  - admissibility of confessional evidence 181, 183
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands *see also* Indian Ocean Territories
  - jurisdiction overview 29
  - uniform evidence statute 2, 11, 29, 30
- Codification
  - concerns 35
- Coincidence evidence *see also* Propensity evidence; Tendency evidence
  - accumulation 170, 174
  - admissibility 158, 166
  - Caribbean statutes 21, 26
  - concoction 161
  - CSA trials 105
  - definition 160, 170
  - exclusion of coincidence 166–8
  - forensic evidence 173
  - holistic inference 171, 174
    - credible connections and 160–1
    - ‘improbability of similar lies’ 160, 163
  - individualisation fallacy 167
  - modus operandi* 172–3, 174
  - multiple-allegation scenario 160–1
  - natural forms 161–3, 174
  - probative value 160, 170, 174
  - reasoning 9, 158, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 173
  - similarity requirement 158, 160, 163, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174
  - standard of proof 167–8
  - tendency evidence and
    - distinction 158–9, 174–5
    - mixed inferences 163–4
    - overlap 161, 163, 174
    - subcategory, as 171, 172, 173, 174
  - UEL reforms 48, 58
  - varieties 170–3
- Collateral issues rule
  - credibility evidence 234, 238, 248
  - veracity evidence 239, 241
- Common knowledge rule
  - abolition 55–6, 57
- Common law
  - admissibility of evidence 54–5, 56
  - application 53
  - basis rule 55–6
  - Browne v Dunn*, rule in 53
  - codification 35, 44, 51
  - common knowledge rule 55–6, 57
  - criticism of UEL 50–1
  - IMM v The Queen*, probative value and 60–2, 68–9, 70, 75, 97, 131–2, 161
  - implied abrogation 54–5
  - interpretation guide for UEL 56–60, 62
  - ‘clear words’ indicating change 57, 58
  - piecemeal development 4

- reforms introduced by UEL 57–8
- relationship with UEL 3
- superiority over UEL, alleged 35
  - identification evidence 46–8
  - propensity evidence and evidence of uncharged acts 48–50
- UEL, coexistence with 53–62
- ultimate issue rule 55–6, 57
- ‘Common law’ States
  - extension of UEL to 52
  - identification evidence 47–8
  - propensity evidence 49–50
  - UEL regime, initiatives to join 51–2
- Complaint evidence
  - admissibility where complainant unavailable 136–7
    - children 139–41
    - deceased complainants 137–9
    - elderly persons 139
  - arguments for further reform 133–6
  - Canada 139–40
  - coincidence evidence 162, 163
  - common law 8, 106–7, 126–7, 135, 136
    - criticism 109, 124
  - credibility of complainant 107, 130–1, 1332
  - CSA cases 105, 110, 120–3, 126, 128, 139–41
  - definition 126
  - delay in making 8–9, 107, 119–20, 125–6, 133, 134–5, 150–1
    - CSA cases 105, 110, 120–1, 126, 129–30
    - expert opinion evidence, s 79(2) UEL 121–3, 124, 131
    - length, relevance of 112–13, 129–30
    - reasons 123
      - s 66(2A) UEL, effect of 119–20, 129
  - discretion to exclude 131–3
  - freshness test 106, 108, 109–10, 111, 112, 114, 116, 119–20, 121, 124, 136
    - empirical data not supportive 134–5
  - hearsay rule and 105, 106, 107, 108–9, 120, 126, 135–6
    - justification 133–4
    - s 65 UEL exception 141, 148
    - s 66 UEL exception 108, 124, 127–8, 133, 134, 136
    - United Kingdom 138–9
  - hue-and-cry rule 106, 125, 133
  - judicial warning 107, 127
  - Kilby* direction 107, 127, 132
  - memory and *see* Memory processes
  - New South Wales 110, 122, 129, 132
  - prior consistent statement 131, 133
  - probative value 113, 131–2
  - Queensland 135–6
  - recent complaint rule 125, 126, 135, 141
    - consent and 107, 108, 127
  - reliability 126, 132, 134
  - sexist assumptions and myths 106–7, 125, 133
  - sexual abuse, difficulties in proving 135–6
  - significance 135
  - South Australia 135, 141
  - temporal relationship 112, 114, 125–6, 129, 130
  - tendency evidence 162–3
  - time of disclosure 125, 126, 127
  - UEL approach 107–110, 126
    - admissibility for credit purpose 130–1
    - admissibility for hearsay purpose 127–30
    - discretion 131–3
      - s 66 UEL and ‘fresh in the memory’ 110–13
      - s 66(2A) UEL and delay 119–20, 129
    - Victoria 111, 119, 122, 129–30, 133, 136
    - Western Australia 122, 136
  - Confession rule
    - historical background 178–9
  - Confessions, evidence of
    - Bunning v Cross* doctrine 181, 211, 217, 227
    - caution by police 179, 193, 194
    - Cleland* discretion 181, 183
    - common law developments
      - Pavic* 182–4
      - pre-UEL 179–81
      - Swaffield* 182–4
    - ‘confession of crime’ 178
    - ‘confirmation by subsequent fact’ doctrine 188
    - covert recording 192
    - exclusion 177, 179, 180, 181, 182
    - hearsay exception 178, 184
    - illegally or improperly obtained *see* Illegally or improperly obtained evidence
    - inducements 187–90
      - objective basis 188

- Confessions, evidence of (*cont*)  
*Lee* discretion 181, 183, 184  
 replication in UEL 184, 190–2  
 ‘Mr Big’ operations 192  
 oppression and 186, 187  
 police misconduct and 181, 189  
 ‘previous representation’ 176, 190  
 reliability 189, 190, 191, 192, 194  
 ‘scenario’ cases 192  
 statutory safeguards 177  
 UEL provisions 184–5  
 human rights discourse 186  
 inducement and reliability, s 85 UEL  
 187–90  
*Lee* discretion, replication of 184,  
 190–2  
 Part 3.4 as governing code 192–3  
 relationship between ss 90 and 138  
 UEL 192, 193–4  
 violence, oppression and other like  
 conduct, s 84 UEL 186–7  
 undercover police officers, to 183–4, 192  
 unfairness discretion 183, 194  
 voluntariness 178, 182, 187  
 burden of proof 179, 187  
 discretion to exclude 180  
 meaning 179–80  
 standard of proof 187  
 ‘Confirmation by subsequent fact’ doctrine  
 overview 188  
 Consent  
 recent complaint rule 107, 108, 127  
 Co-offenders  
 reliability of evidence 154, 155  
 Courts  
 High Court’s approach to UEL 13–14  
 interpretive duty 6  
 UEL statutes 15, 18–19  
 history 16–17, 18, 20  
 Credibility evidence  
 accused, in relation to 244–5  
 lack of previous convictions 246–7  
 not testifying 245–6, 249  
 admissibility 231, 233, 239, 241–2, 246,  
 249  
 bolstering 247, 248–9  
 co-defendants, in relation to 245  
 collateral issues rule 234, 238, 248  
 ‘credibility of witness’, definition 231  
 cross-examination 233–4, 239, 241, 242,  
 244–5, 248  
 trigger 245  
 definition 238  
 ‘direct proof of mendacity’ 232  
 ‘indirect proof’ contrasted with 232  
 examples 238  
 exclusionary rules 169, 241, 246  
 expert opinion evidence 247, 248  
 meaning 231, 238  
 ‘moral’ credibility 232, 233, 234  
 previous representations 246, 248  
 ‘probative’ credibility 232, 233, 246  
 probative value 240, 242  
 rebuttal 248–9  
 relevance 232–3  
 reputation 242  
 scope 237–9  
 truthfulness and reliability 238  
 veracity evidence, comparison with  
 230, 238, 249–50  
 Credibility rule  
 application 241–2  
 complaint evidence and 107, 130–1, 132  
 exceptions under UEL 123, 131, 247  
 expert opinion evidence 247  
 prior consistent statement 131  
 Cross-examination  
 co-defendant 245  
 credibility evidence and 233–4, 239,  
 241, 244–5  
 defendant 244–5  
 limitation 239, 242  
 purpose 233–4  
 scope 242  
 Deceased persons  
 complaint evidence 137–9  
 Decision-making  
 rationality and 7  
 Digiboard *see also* Identification evidence  
 overview 47  
 Discretionary rules *see also* Judicial  
 discretion  
 Caribbean statutes 21  
 common law and UEL, coexistence of  
 54  
 criticism 50  
 Displacement effect  
 identification evidence 197, 199  
 DNA evidence  
 Barbados, admissibility in 24  
 Innocence Project findings 198  
 probative value 172  
 tendency evidence, as 172

- Epistemic obligation  
 overview 73
- Epistemic perspective  
 problem of 65, 76, 79
- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)  
 human rights, Articles 3 and 8 213, 218, 221, 222, 223
- Evidence  
 adducing, coexistence of common law and UEL 53  
 admissibility 56  
   fundamental principle 63  
   *Pfennig* threshold 167  
   UEL provisions 'cover the field' 54–5, 56  
   UEL reforms 57–8  
 character *see* Character evidence  
 cogency 227  
 coincidence *see* Coincidence evidence  
 complaints *see* Complaint evidence  
 confessional *see* Confessions, evidence of  
 CSA trials 105  
 discretion and *see* Discretionary rules  
 exclusionary provision 63  
 identification *see* Identification evidence  
 illegally obtained *see* Illegally or improperly obtained evidence  
*modus operandi* 172–3, 174  
 probative value *see* Probative value  
 rationality and *see* Rationality  
 relationship *see* Relationship evidence  
 reputation 240–1, 242  
 tendency *see* Tendency evidence  
 two-tier system 50  
 unreliable *see* Unreliable evidence  
 veracity *see* Veracity evidence
- Evidence law *see also* Uniform Evidence Law (UEL)  
 Australian and overseas provisions contrasted 11–12  
 comparative, lack of 12  
 reform initiatives in 'common law' States 51–2
- Evidence Ordinance 1971  
 origins 1, 2
- Expert opinion evidence  
 admissibility 7, 80, 87, 88, 98  
 basis rule 55–6  
 'blind' examination 100  
 complaint evidence and 131  
   CSA trials 105, 120–3  
 confines 98  
 credibility of witness 247, 248  
 criteria under UEL 80–1, 86, 98–9, 100–1  
   inconsistency of court approach 96  
 'face shape strategy' 86  
 facial mapping 91  
 identification evidence 209  
 limitations 100  
*Makita* requirements 87–8  
 non-scientific domains 100–1  
 other than in primary qualification 95  
 prescriptive model 78  
 validation studies and error rates, reference to 103
- Experts  
*ad hoc* 91–2, 100, 102, 209  
 anatomists 91–2, 100  
*Dasreef* short-cut 88, 91, 97  
 evaluation 99, 101  
 'experience' and 'expertise' 81–6  
   *ad hoc* expertise 102  
   bare experience 97, 100, 101  
   deliberate practice, role of 85  
   feedback, presence and quality of 84–5  
   formal training or study 85  
   limits of experience 97–102  
   performance element 81–2, 97  
   predictability 84  
   relationship between terms 82–4  
   validity 84, 85, 89, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103  
 forensic pathologists 90, 91, 94  
 frailties 100  
 'grandfathering' of traditional forensic sciences 93  
 heuristics and biases 82, 100, 209  
 partisanship 95–6  
 peer evaluation 82  
 proficiency 101, 103  
 'specialised knowledge' 7, 86–7, 88, 89, 101, 102  
   assumption of knowledge 90, 97, 99  
   'common knowledge' distinguished 89  
   evaluation 101, 103  
   'field' 81, 87, 88, 90, 96, 97–8, 99, 101

- Experts (*cont*)  
 ‘specialised knowledge’ (*cont*)  
 High Court approach 89–92, 102  
 ‘knowledge’, meaning and import 89, 100, 102–3  
 role 97  
 specificity 94  
 ‘training, study or experience’, link with 90–1, 93, 95, 97  
 ‘training, study or experience’ 7, 80–1, 86, 87, 88, 103  
 cautious approach 97  
 inadequacy 94–5  
 ‘knowledge’ and 90–1, 93, 95, 97, 99  
 ‘Face shape strategy’  
 overview 86  
 Facial mapping  
 overview 91  
 Fingerprints  
 expert opinion evidence 92–3, 96, 98, 100  
 ‘Fresh in the memory’ *see also* Memory processes  
 complaint evidence 108, 109–11, 120, 128  
 ‘continuous revival’ of memory 112, 119  
 empirical data 134–5  
 ‘fresh’, meaning 109–11, 120  
 s 66 UEL and 110–13, 124, 130, 134  
 hearsay rule and 8, 9  
 influences 119  
 Hearsay  
 admissibility 8  
 child-specific modifications 120  
 complaint evidence and 105, 106, 107, 108–9, 120, 126, 127–30, 133–6, 138–9  
 exception  
 confessional evidence 178, 184  
 first-hand 8, 136  
 non-hearsay purpose 38–9  
 s 66 UEL 108, 124, 136  
 ‘fresh in the memory’ and 8, 9  
 New Zealand 12, 134, 248, 249  
 rationale 133  
 reliability 147–8  
 Saint Kitts and Nevis 20–1  
 United Kingdom 138–9  
 Hearsay statement  
 credibility of maker 232, 233  
 definition 134, 248  
 veracity evidence about maker 239, 248  
 Human rights  
 protection, global comparison 11–12  
 Identification evidence  
 accuracy 76, 77, 200, 203, 207  
 variables affecting 77, 203  
 admissibility 199  
 ALRC report 198  
 audio line-up/parades 206, 207  
 Caribbean statutes 21  
 case law 199–203  
 CCTV footage 208  
 ‘common law’ States, alleged superiority of 47–8  
 comparisons, visual and auditory 208–10  
 court/dock identification 199  
 dangers 195, 197–8, 210  
 digiboard 47  
 displacement effect 197, 199  
 DNA *see* DNA evidence  
 ‘ear witness’ 206  
 errors 204, 209  
 experts and 91–2, 209  
 eyewitness 10, 195, 196–7, 203, 208  
 face recognition software 203  
 ‘face shape strategy’ 86  
 facial mapping 91  
 fairness 199  
 fingerprints 92–3, 96, 98, 100  
 ‘innocence community’ 198  
 Innocence Project 198  
 live line-ups 198, 199, 201–2, 203, 204  
 memory processes 197–8, 203  
 ‘mug shot’, prohibition of 201, 202  
 New Zealand 206  
 photoboard arrays 202, 203–4, 206  
 photographs 47, 199, 200, 201, 202  
 picture 46, 198  
 Queensland 47  
 rationality and reasoning process 75–7  
 reasonableness 199  
 reform 203, 204–5  
 regulation 10, 195  
 reliability 148–9, 199, 201, 204, 206  
 risks 195–6  
 South Australia 46–7  
 spontaneous identification 199, 202, 203, 207  
 Tasmania 48

- UEL regime 46, 196, 197, 198, 210
  - limitations 200–3
- ‘unfair prejudice’, risk of 201, 202, 205
- United Kingdom 203, 204, 207
- United States 204
- visual *see* Visual identification evidence
- voice identification 10, 93, 100, 196, 205–7, 210
  - challenges 206–7
  - warnings 195, 196, 202, 206, 207
  - weak, probative value of 197, 202
  - Western Australia 47
- Identification parade
  - dangers 199–200
  - ‘neutral’ 200
  - ‘reasonableness’ of not holding 199
  - UEL provision 46, 47
  - United Kingdom 199, 203
  - United States 200, 202
  - use 200, 202
- Illegally or improperly obtained evidence
  - abuse of process doctrine and 225
  - ALRC recommendations 214, 219
  - appellate review 228, 229
  - Australian and overseas jurisdictions contrasted 11–12
  - automatic exclusion 221, 222, 228
  - balancing test 214, 227
  - breathalyzer test 216
  - Bunning v Cross* doctrine 181, 211, 217, 227
  - burdens of proof 213–14
    - implications 214–16
  - Canada 11, 211, 212, 213, 214, 220–1, 223, 226, 228
  - confessions or admissions 181, 192, 193
  - discretion to exclude to ensure ‘fairness to the defendant’ 216–18
    - cogency of evidence 227
    - confinement 221–3
    - ‘court-centred integrity’ rationale 219, 220, 221, 227
    - non-epistemic considerations 218–19
    - ‘public attitude integrity’ rationale 220
    - relevant factors 223–7
    - theoretical basis/bases 218–21
    - ‘usual suspects’ 219–20
  - ECHR Articles 3 and 8 213, 218, 221, 222, 223
  - factual determination 215
  - ICC approach 226–7
  - ‘impropriety’ 212
  - New Zealand 11, 212–14, 223, 226, 227, 228
  - overview 211–12
  - rationale of doctrine 225
  - research on court’s approach 214–15
  - s 138 UEL 211
    - common law compared 214
    - considerations 223, 227
    - primary test 214, 223
    - relationship with s 90 UEL 192, 193–4, 216
    - ‘trigger’ for 212–13
  - serious of offence, relevance of 225, 226
  - South Africa 212, 213, 217
  - torture or inhuman or degrading conduct, obtained by 213, 221–22
  - United Kingdom 211, 212, 213, 215–16, 217, 221, 222, 224–5, 228
  - United States 11, 212, 220
- IMM v The Queen*
  - probative value 60–2, 68–9, 70, 75
    - complaint evidence 113, 131–2, 134, 161
    - identification evidence 202
- India
  - Evidence Act 1872* 10, 11, 30
- Indian Ocean Territories
  - law reform 30
  - outsourcing courts 30
  - UEL 2, 11, 30
- Inferences
  - coincidence 160–1, 162, 163, 166, 167–8, 171, 173, 174
  - probative value, relationship with 67–8, 73, 75
  - propensity 161
  - tendency 158–9, 162–3, 164, 166, 168, 171, 174, 175
- Innocence Project
  - eyewitness identification 198
- International Criminal Court (ICC)
  - illegally or improperly obtained evidence, approach to 226–7
- Interpretive theory
  - overview 7
- Intoxication
  - reliability of evidence 149
- Ireland
  - illegally obtained evidence 11
  - law reform 11

- Judicial discretion
  - illegally or improperly obtained
    - evidence 216–21
- Judicial warnings
  - Caribbean region 24, 26–8
  - common law and UEL, coexistence of 53
  - complaint evidence 107, 127
  - counter-productive 144
  - identification evidence 195, 196, 202, 206, 207
  - juror comprehension 144, 145
  - nature and effectiveness 143–5
  - overview 9, 143
  - UEL scheme, criticism of 143
  - unreliable evidence *see* Unreliable evidence
  - Victoria 145
- Jury
  - identification evidence, comparisons of 208–10
  - rational belief formation 73, 74–5, 78
  - reasoning 71, 72
  - role 63, 67, 70, 75, 160
  - warnings to *see* Judicial warnings
- Kilby* direction
  - complaint evidence 107, 127, 132
- Law Reform Commission of Western Australia (LRCWA)
  - criminal and civil justice system, review of 44
  - UEL regime, report on 42
- Lee* discretion
  - admissibility of confessional evidence 181, 183
  - strands 190
  - UEL provision 184, 190–2
- Legal professional privilege
  - loss 59–60
- Legal rules
  - utility 4
- McKinney* rule
  - Caribbean, whether bound 26, 28
- Memory processes *see also* ‘Fresh in the memory’
  - age, relevance of 116–17, 118–19
  - complaint evidence and 113, 120
  - conceptual or semantic memory 115
  - CSA cases, relevance to 113, 116
    - hearsay rule, child-specific modifications to 120–1
    - nature of event, effects of 114, 115–16, 119, 124, 129
  - delay, effect of 116, 117, 119–20
  - emotional arousal, effect of 113, 117
  - episodic memory 115
  - errors 117, 118, 130
  - identification evidence 197–8, 203
  - incomplete 115
  - memory ‘rehearsal’ 116, 117
  - memory schema, script or template 115, 116
  - memory trace strength theory 115
  - misinformation effect 113, 118–19
  - preserving factors 116
  - professional consensus 114–16
    - BPS guidelines 115, 116–19
  - quality 115
  - rates of forgetting 113, 116–17, 119
  - repeated events and 115–16
  - suggestibility 118–19
  - trauma 113
- Mental illness
  - reliability of evidence 149, 150
- Misinformation effect
  - overview 118–19
- Modus operandi* evidence
  - coincidence evidence, subcategory of 172, 174
  - development 173
  - distinctiveness 172
  - esoteric knowledge 173
  - tendency evidence distinguished 173, 174
- National Academy of Sciences (US)
  - identification evidence, report on 196, 202, 203
- New South Wales
  - admissions in criminal proceedings 185
  - complaint evidence 110, 132
    - CSA trials 122, 129
  - enactment of UEL 2, 14
  - identification evidence 204
  - population and size 14
  - rape shield law 18
  - unreliable evidence, s 165 *Evidence Act* and 142–3
- New South Wales Law Reform Commission (NSWLRC)
  - complaint evidence under UEL regime 110, 113
    - memory processes, effects of 113–14, 116, 119



- unreliable evidence, judicial warnings 143
- New Zealand
  - character evidence 233
  - CSA trials
    - complaint evidence of child 140
    - expert opinion evidence 122
  - Evidence Act 2006*
    - enactment 230
    - periodic review 10
  - exclusionary rule 231
  - hearsay rule 12, 134, 248, 249
  - hearsay statement 134, 232, 233, 239, 248
  - illegally or improperly obtained
    - evidence 11, 212–13, 223, 226, 227, 228
  - jurisdiction overview 29
  - Law Commission's Report 55 230
  - uniform evidence statute 29, 31, 230
    - precedent 32
  - veracity evidence *see* Veracity evidence
  - voice identification evidence 206
- Norfolk Island
  - jurisdiction overview 29
  - precedent 32
  - self-government, abolition of 30
  - uniform evidence statute 2, 29, 30
- Northern Territory
  - enactment of UEL 2, 14
    - familiarity of legal profession 40
  - Evidence (National Uniform Legislation) Act 2011* 13
  - population and size 14
- Northern Territory Law Reform
  - Committee (NTLRC)
    - approach to joining UEL regime, QRLC
      - response compared 36–9, 40
      - ALRC work, review of 36–7
      - recommendations 37
      - terms of reference 36
- Pavic v The Queen*
  - admissibility of confessional evidence 182–4
- Pfennig v The Queen*
  - admissibility threshold 167
  - probative value test 48, 49, 58
- Photographs
  - identification evidence 46
- Police
  - caution 179, 193, 194
  - confessions and admissions to undercover officers 183–4, 192
  - misconduct 181, 189
- Prejudice
  - identification evidence 201, 202, 205
  - manner of conceptualising 63
- Previous representation
  - admission, as 190, 246
  - credibility 246, 248
  - definition 176
- Prior consistent statement
  - credibility of complainant 131, 133
- Prior convictions
  - failure to disclose 235
  - lack of, credibility and 246–7
  - veracity evidence 235, 240
- Prior inconsistent statement
  - veracity evidence, whether 236, 240, 248
- Prison informers
  - reliability of evidence 152–3, 155–6
- Privilege
  - legal professional *see* Legal professional privilege
- Probative value
  - admissibility and 158
  - Bayes' Theorem 168–9
  - capability 66–7
  - Caribbean statutes 21
  - coincidence evidence 160, 170, 171, 174
  - complaint evidence 97, 113, 131–2, 161
  - credibility evidence 240, 242
  - determination 168
    - schism in 63–4
  - DNA evidence 172
  - evaluative judgment 68
  - identification evidence 197
  - IMM v The Queen* 60–2, 68–9, 70, 75, 131–2, 161
  - incoherence of current approach 66–9, 76
  - inferences, relationship with 67–8, 73, 75
  - interpretation 7, 48–9, 60–2
  - manner of conceptualising 63
  - meaning 64, 66, 71, 74, 168
  - Pfennig* test 48, 49, 58
  - positive theories 170
  - rationality 64, 67
    - reliability and 68–9, 74–8
  - reputation 240–1

- Probative value (*cont*)  
 requirement 63  
*Shamouil*, taking evidence at its highest  
 66–7, 68, 72  
 ‘significant’ 21, 63  
 ‘substantially outweigh’ 48  
 ‘substantial’, meaning 21  
 tendency evidence 168–70, 171, 174  
 trial judge’s task 63, 64, 65, 66, 67–8, 69,  
 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78  
 UEL regime 48, 58, 60–1, 63, 64, 70, 71,  
 74–8  
 weight of evidence 67, 68, 70, 72, 76  
 XY, locating evidence on scale of  
 probative force 67–8, 69
- Propensity evidence *see also* Coincidence  
 evidence; Tendency evidence; Veracity  
 evidence  
 coincidence reasoning 164  
 ‘common law’ States’ modification  
 49–50  
 credibility evidence distinguished 237  
 New Zealand 12, 233, 246  
 recidivism 169  
 standard of proof 166  
 UEL reforms 58
- Queensland  
 complaint evidence 135–6  
 hearsay evidence, child-specific  
 modifications 120, 136  
 identification evidence 47  
 non-adoption of UEL regime 34  
 political dimension 43  
 reasons 34–6, 40–1
- Queensland Law Reform Committee  
 (QLRC)  
 approach to joining UEL regime, NTLC  
 response compared 36–9, 40  
 purpose 38  
 terms of reference 37–8
- Rape shield law  
 Barbados, adoption in 18
- Rationality  
 appellate court deliberation 71  
 avoidance of mistakes and 73–4  
 basis 75  
 belief formation 72, 73, 74–6  
 rational decision-making distin-  
 guished 70  
 conception 65, 77  
 ‘could rationally affect’ 66  
 credibility and 65  
 descriptive 77–8  
 epistemic 65, 70, 71–4  
 epistemic obligation 73  
 epistemic perspective 65, 76, 79  
 epistemic sophistication 76, 77, 78  
 focus 70, 75  
 identification evidence 75–7  
 models 77–8  
 normative 77  
 norms 65, 66, 77, 79  
 overview 70  
 practical 65, 70–1  
 prescriptive 77, 78  
 ‘rational effect’, meaning 64  
 reliability 69, 72  
 responsiveness to reasons 73  
 test 67  
 theoretical 65, 70, 71  
 UEL regime 74–8
- Recidivism  
 rates 169
- Relationship evidence  
 CSA trials 105
- Relevance  
 basis of admissibility 63  
 Irish law 11
- Reliability  
 New Zealand regime 231  
 rationality, relationship with 68–9, 72  
 UEL regime 74–8, 231  
 veracity distinguished 234–5
- Reputation evidence  
 admissibility 242  
 probative value 240–1
- Saint Kitts and Nevis *see also* Caribbean  
 region  
 hearsay rule 20–1  
 jurisdiction overview 15  
 UEL statutes 15  
 history 20–1
- Saint Lucia *see also* Caribbean region  
 court system 23  
 judicial warnings 27  
 jurisdiction overview 15  
 UEL statutes 15  
 history 17–18, 19
- Sexual abuse  
 difficulties in proving 135–6  
 misconduct evidence 171
- Sexual assault  
 children, of *see* Child sexual assault  
 (CSA)

- complaints *see* Complaint evidence
- Shamouil*
  - probative value, evaluation of 66–7, 72
- Singapore
  - Indian Ocean Territories, application of evidence law in 11, 30
- Solomon Islands *see also* South Pacific
  - jurisdiction overview 29
  - uniform evidence statute 29, 31–2
- South Africa
  - illegally or improperly obtained evidence 212, 213
  - discretion to exclude 217
- South Australia
  - complaint evidence 135
  - hearsay evidence, child-specific
    - modifications 120, 141
  - identification evidence 46–7
  - non-adoption of UEL 34
  - ‘cherry picking’ approach 44–5
  - reasons 35
  - propensity evidence 49
- South Australian Law Reform Institute (SALRI)
  - recommendations for *Evidence Act 1929* 45–6
  - UEL regime, attitude toward 44–5
    - electronic communications law and 45
- South Pacific region
  - UEL in 29–33
  - precedents 32–3
- Standard of proof
  - coincidence evidence 167–8
  - CSA cases 164–5
  - propensity evidence 166
  - tendency evidence 164–6, 175
  - unreliable evidence 153
  - voluntariness of confession 187
- Standing Committee of Attorneys-General
  - uniform statutory evidence law statute 1
- Statutory interpretation
  - criticism 6–7
  - dynamic form 6
  - influences 7–8
  - principles 64, 72
  - rationality and 64, 72
- Swaffield*
  - admissibility of confessional evidence 182–4
- Tasmania
  - identification evidence 48
  - jurisdiction overview 29
  - uniform evidence statute 29
    - divergence from UEL 29–30
    - precedent 32
- Tendency evidence *see also* Coincidence
  - evidence; Propensity evidence
    - admissibility 158, 159
    - Bayes’ Theorem, application of 168–9
    - Caribbean statutes 21, 26
    - circumstantial evidence distinguished 165–6
    - coincidence evidence and
      - distinction 158–9, 174–5
      - mixed inferences 163–4
      - overlap 161, 163, 174
      - subcategory of 171, 172, 173, 174
    - credibility evidence distinguished 237
    - CSA trials 105
    - definition 159
    - distinctiveness 171
    - DNA evidence 172
    - forbidden reasoning 159
    - modus operandi* distinguished 173, 174
    - natural forms 161–3, 174
    - predilection 171
    - probative value 174
      - comparative components of 168–70, 171
    - reasoning 9, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 173, 174
    - sequential inference 159, 171, 174
    - similarity requirement 159, 171
    - standard of proof 164–6, 175
    - UEL reforms 48, 58
- Trauma
  - effects 117–18
- Trials
  - aim 5
  - ‘fair’, determination of 218, 223
- Ultimate issue rule
  - abolition 55–6, 57
- Uniform Evidence Law (UEL)
  - admissibility of evidence 63
  - benefits 3, 42
  - Caribbean region 15–29, 30
  - common law and *see* Common law
  - criticism 50–1
  - development 9–10
  - drafting challenges 6

- Uniform Evidence Law (UEL) (*cont*)
- enactment 2
  - extension to 'common law' States 52
  - failure 3
  - global comparisons 10–12
  - goals 1–2
  - High Court approach 13–14
  - Indian Ocean Territories 2, 11, 30
  - New Zealand 29, 31
  - non-adopting jurisdictions 14, 34, 35
    - political dimension 43–4, 51
    - reasons 34–6, 40–2, 44
  - Norfolk Island 2, 29, 30
  - origins 1
  - precedents 32
  - purpose 57
  - shortcomings 6, 9–10, 12
  - South Pacific region 29–33
  - spread
    - international 2–3
    - national 14
  - stalling 3
  - 'stymied' project 4–10, 34
  - Tasmania, divergence in 29–30
  - 'uniform', whether 2, 13, 15
- United Kingdom
- audio parades 207
  - BPS guidelines for memory and the law 115, 116–19
  - Christie* discretion 11
  - Code D of PACE 199, 205
  - complaint evidence, hearsay and 138–9
  - identification evidence 203, 204, 207
  - identification parades 199, 203
  - illegally or improperly obtained evidence 11, 211, 212, 213, 215–16, 217, 221, 222, 224–5, 228
- United States
- expert evidence
    - PCAST report on fingerprint comparison methods 98, 99
    - 'specialised knowledge' and 89
    - Federal Rules of Evidence*, adoption of 10
  - identification evidence
    - National Academy of Sciences report 196, 202, 203
    - parades 200, 202
  - illegally or improperly obtained evidence 11, 212, 220
- Unreliable evidence
- accomplices 152, 154
  - admissions 148
  - age and health, impact of 149
  - assessment 146–7
  - categories 145, 147–53
  - children 149
  - co-offenders 154, 155
  - delay in complaint 150–1
  - hearsay 147–8
  - identification evidence 148–9
  - intoxication 149
  - judicial warnings 142–3
    - Caribbean statutes 21
    - consistency 143, 146, 147, 149, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157
    - discretion 153
    - formulation of content 154–6, 157
    - inadequacy 154
    - proposals 156–7
      - s 165 *Evidence Act* (NSW) 142–3
      - s 165 UEL and common law influences 145–7
      - s 165A UEL 149
  - mental illness 149, 150
  - predominant approach 147
  - prison informer 152–3, 155–6
  - standard of proof 153
  - subjectivity 151
  - temporary condition affecting witness 149–50
  - 'unreliable', meaning 146
- Veracity evidence *see also* Propensity evidence
- admissibility 239–40, 249
  - collateral issues rule 239, 241
  - credibility evidence, comparison with 230, 231, 249–50
  - defendant, in relation to 243–4
  - challenges to 244
  - disposition to lie 236, 237
  - Evidence Act 2006* (NZ) provisions 233, 239–41, 243–4, 245, 246, 247
  - exclusions 244
  - expert opinion evidence 247
  - extraneous nature 234
  - hearsay statement or representation, maker of 239, 248
  - heightened relevance standard 239, 241, 249
  - overview 12, 230
  - prior convictions 240
    - lack of 246–7
    - undisclosed 235

## INDEX

- prior inconsistent statement 236, 240
- reliability distinguished 234–5
- reputation 240–1
- scope of rule 233–7
- ‘substantially helpful’ criterion 236, 239, 240, 243, 244, 247
- truthfulness 239
- ‘veracity’, meaning 234, 237
- Victoria
  - client legal privilege, loss of 59
  - complaint evidence 111, 119, 133
    - CSA trials 122, 129–30, 136
  - confessional evidence
    - human rights discourse 186
    - pre-UEL 180
  - enactment of UEL 2, 14
  - judicial warnings 145
  - population and size 14
- Victorian Law Reform Commission (VLRC)
  - complaint evidence under UEL regime 110, 113
    - memory processes, effects of 113–14, 116, 119
  - UEL regime, report on 40
  - unreliable evidence, judicial warnings 143, 145
- Visual identification evidence *see also* Identification evidence
  - admissibility 10, 200
  - challenges 207–8
    - meaning 46
    - UEL provisions 46, 198
    - warning 206
  - Walker v Walker*, rule in
    - abolition 57
- Western Australia
  - CSA trials, expert opinion evidence 122
  - hearsay evidence, child-specific
    - modifications 120, 136
  - Law Reform Commission *see* Law Reform Commission of Western Australia (LRCWA)
  - non-adoption of UEL 34
    - change of government, effect of 43–4
    - reasons 35, 41–2, 44
  - propensity evidence 49–50
- Western Australia Parliamentary Committee
  - adoption of UEL regime, response to 41–2
- Witnesses
  - bias 231, 242, 248
  - credibility *see* Credibility evidence; Credibility rule
  - ‘ear witness’ 206
  - examination, UEL reforms 57–8
  - memory *see* Memory processes
- XY
  - probative value, evaluation of 67–8