

#### ARTICLES

PROCEDURAL ISSUES UNDER DAUBERT
Judge Harvey Brown

From Colorado to Alaska by Way of Cincinnati: On Romer, Equality Foundation, and the Constitutionality of Referenda  $Mark\ Strasser$ 

## **ESSAY**

THE  $\it Miranda$  Debate: Questions Past, Present, and Future  $\it Laurie \ Magid$ 

### **COMMENTS**

A CONCILIATORY APPROACH TO WORKPLACE HARASSMENT:

BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC. V. ELLERTH

AND FARAGHER V. CITY OF BOCA RATON

Richelle Wise Kidder

THE FINAL PIECE OF THE SEAT BELT EVIDENCE PUZZLE  $Peter\ Scaff$ 

EASTERN PHILOSOPHY: A CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT FOR FULL STRANDED COST RECOVERY BY DEREGULATED ELECTRIC UTILITIES  $Bentzion\ S.\ Turin$ 

HATE CRIME LEGISLATION: A POLICY ANALYSIS

Craig L. Uhrich

#### NOTE

AFTER COLLEGE SAVINGS V. FLORIDA PREPAID,
ARE STATES SUBJECT TO SUIT FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT?:
THE COPYRIGHT REMEDY CLARIFICATION ACT AND
CHAVEZ V. ARTE PUBLICO PRESS
Peter Bray

COPYRIGHT 1999

BY THE HOUSTON LAW REVIEW

# HOUSTON LAW REVIEW

# **CONTENTS**

ARTICLES	
PROCEDURAL ISSUES UNDER DAUBERTJudge Harvey Brown	1133
FROM COLORADO TO ALASKA BY WAY OF CINCINNATI: ON ROMER, EQUALITY FOUNDATION, AND THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF REFERENDA	1193
ESSAY	
THE MIRANDA DEBATE:  QUESTIONS PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURELaurie Magid	1251
COMMENTS	
A CONCILIATORY APPROACH TO WORKPLACE HARASSMENT:  BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES, INC. V. ELLERTH  AND FARAGHER V. CITY OF BOCA RATON	1315
THE FINAL PIECE OF THE SEAT BELT EVIDENCE PUZZLEPeter Scaff	1371
EASTERN PHILOSOPHY: A CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT FOR FULL STRANDED COST RECOVERY BY DEREGULATED ELECTRIC UTILITIES	1411
HATE CRIME LEGISLATION: A POLICY ANALYSIS Craig L. Uhrich	1467
Note	
AFTER COLLEGE SAVINGS V. FLORIDA PREPAID, ARE STATES SUBJECT TO SUIT FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT?: THE COPYRIGHT REMEDY CLARIFICATION ACT AND	

CHAVEZ V. ARTE PUBLICO PRESS ......Peter Bray 1531

	G.	Admissibility vs. Sufficiency	
	H.	Appellate Review	1158
	<i>I</i> .	Court-Appointed Experts	1168
	J.	Summary Experts	1169
III.	A R	ESPONSE TO CRITICISMS OF JUDICIAL	
	GAT	TEKEEPING	1170
	$\boldsymbol{A}$ .	Distrust of Jurors	
	В.	Judges Are Ill-Equipped to Act As Gatekeepers.	1175
	C.	Increased Litigation Costs	1177
	D.	Daubert and Justice	1179
	E.	Conclusion	1181
IV.	ΑP	ROPOSED PROCEDURE: USE A REBUTTABLE	
		SUMPTION BASED UPON GENERAL ACCEPTANCE	1186
V.	Con	ICLUSION	1190

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Expert testimony is admissible only if it can pass eight different gates. Five of these gates are an outgrowth of *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*<sup>1</sup> and are intended to ensure that the expert's opinion is reliable.<sup>2</sup> Reliability requires an examination of the expert's methodology, the foundational data and assumptions utilized by the expert, and the reasoning process used by the expert to apply that methodology or foundational data to the facts of the case.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the substantive challenges created by *Daubert* and its progeny, there is a number of developing procedural issues. These issues are addressed in Part II of this Article and include the burden of demonstrating the admissibility of expert testimony,<sup>4</sup> the timing of expert challenges, and the types of evidence that may be used in a hearing on the challenge to the expert. Part II will also identify some traps for the unwary. With regard to foundational reliability, for example, when an expert's opinion is based upon information obtained outside the courtroom, the opinion can be properly objected to if the data is

<sup>1. 509</sup> U.S. 579 (1993).

<sup>2.</sup> See generally E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Robinson, 923 S.W.2d 549 (Tex. 1995).

<sup>3.</sup> See Judge Harvey Brown, Eight Gates for Expert Witnesses, 36 HOUS. L. REV. 743, 748-49, 814 (1999).

<sup>4.</sup> See Daubert, 509 U.S. at 596; Robinson, 923 S.W.2d at 557.