

Chapter 1 : 3 Takeaways From Brett Kavanaugh's Testimony

The Senate Judiciary Committee hears testimony from Supreme Court nominee Judge Brett Kavanaugh vs Professor Christine Blasey Ford about her allegations.

Senators sat silently as college professor Christine Blasey Ford relayed what she says Supreme Court nominee Judge Brett Kavanaugh and his friend Mark Judge did to her at a small gathering in . Brett and Mark were visibly drunk I was pushed from behind into a bedroom across from the bathroom. Brett and Mark came into the bedroom and locked the door behind them," Ford said, fighting back tears. Brett groped me and tried to take off my clothes. I tried to yell for help. When I did, Brett put his hand over my mouth to stop me from yelling. It was hard for me to breathe, and I thought that Brett was accidentally going to kill me. Something that you cannot forget," Democratic Sen. Pat Leahy of Vermont asked. Ford, with what degree of certainty do you believe Brett Kavanaugh assaulted you? She said the trauma left lifelong damage: He said the last two weeks had ruined his life. This nomination process has become a national disgrace Since my nomination in July, there has been a frenzy on the left to come up with something " anything " to block my confirmation. This whole two week effort has been a calculated and orchestrated political hit We mean no ill will. If the party described by Dr. Ford happened in the summer of on a weekend night, my calendar shows all but definitively that I was not there," Kavanaugh said. Mitchell, the prosecutor, questioned him, too. I wanted a hearing the day after the allegation came up. I wanted to be here that day," Kavanaugh said, clearly furious.

Chapter 2 : First Public Hearing : Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission

Senate Judiciary Committee chairman Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, on Tuesday rejected the requests from Democrats to delay a key hearing on the nomination of Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court.

My name is Brett Kavanaugh , and this is an even more malarial job interview than the one for The Apprentice. To the Republicans among you, I would say: To the Democrats, I would say: Otherwise what you see is what you get. Where is the justice? What was â€¦ How can â€¦ When is America? Did I say that out loud? Do you like how I ramble? It sounds like something my dentist shot in the country of Africa. So yes, this session is going to be the sexual assault testimony version of The Producers. I coach little league! On the sidelines, right? And if you have, you will have thought: I really want that guy to be in charge of my uterus. Thane â€¦ Se â€¦ Seniquis â€¦ Seniquista. I have a weak stomach. I cannot stress how absolutely irrelevant things that happened in high school are. They are irrelevant, and meaningless. Do you know what I could bench press in high school? I could bench press you, Senator Feinstein. OK, I accept the wheels of justice turn slowly. But did I mention my workouts with Tobin? God, he was such a great quarterback. Thank you for that Senator Graham â€” especially considering that a rape of your certainties has been attempted today. But by the Lord, you held strong. After today, you can call yourself a survivor, sir. Did you ever see The Accused? Day one on the court, I plan to repeal that movie. OK, I need a five-minute bathroom break. I always try to be on the sunrise side of the mountain. Yet people demonised him. God, I wish I could reach out to him now. We are the international gold standard of how justice is served. Such wisdom from a year-old. Like I told her: To conclude, I am under a lot of stress here, which is why I am screaming. I have other cards. But this is the card I am playing today.

Recent Hearing Testimony. The most recent USITC hearing testimony is listed below. Common Alloy Aluminum Sheet from China TA and TA (Final).

Christine Blasey Ford , who has accused Kavanaugh of sexual assault when they were teenagers, both testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Thursday. Ford said during her testimony that she was " percent" sure that Kavanaugh assaulted her, while Kavanaugh said that he was " percent" sure he had not done anything of the kind. The differences are irreconcilable. Here are the major takeaways from the hearing: While there are gaps in her memory -- the exact time and place, how she got home afterward -- her recollection was vivid. Overcome with tears several times, Ford slowly and softly detailed her experience of being pinned to a bed at a high school party as a year old sophomore as she said Kavanaugh put a hand over her mouth to stifle her screams, and his friend Mark Judge stood by, alternately goading him on and telling him to stop. Judge has issued two statements via his attorney denying any recollection of the behavior or incident described by Ford, the most recent one being a letter addressed to Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley and ranking Democrat Sen. Diane Feinstein after the hearing on Thursday. In that letter Judge says he does, "not recall the events described by Dr. I never saw Brett act in the manner Dr. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, a Democrat, who asked what the "strongest" memory she had from her alleged encounter with Kavanaugh. Ford offered compelling and at times scientific explanations about her memory and the long-term impact of the assault, leaving many lawmakers, including concerned Republicans, assessing her story as truthful and credible. Ford, with quiet certainty, answered questions and pushed back against suggestions that perhaps she had misremembered who carried out the assault on her during a high school party. Asked outright if her allegations of assault were a case of "mistaken identity" from over 30 years ago, Ford responded, "Absolutely not. Ford testified that in the years since she has experienced anxiety , phobias and PTSD-like symptoms. In the immediate years following the incident, Ford said she suffered academically and had difficulties forming friendships, particularly with men. Prosecutor Rachel Mitchell had a muted presence in hearings Republicans on the Judiciary Committee had chosen Mitchell to act as special counsel during the hearing, with the expectation that they would yield their time to her to ask the witnesses questions. Mitchell was the only person to question Ford on the Republican side. She had a friendly presence, but her line of questioning was more based on procedure than the core allegation itself. She asked Ford about how she had arrived at the hearing -- Ford, who lives in California, had previously expressed fear of flying , although she acknowledged she took a plane in this instance and also has flown on vacations. And she asked a few questions about who had paid for a polygraph test Ford has taken. She asked Ford about where she lived, and about her relationship with the people involved in her allegations. Although she asked him questions on behalf of Sen. Chuck Grassley and Sen. John Cornyn, the remaining senators each interacted with Kavanaugh personally. Mitchell had been chosen in part because Republicans were wary of what it would look like to have 11 men questioning a female sexual assault victim. I have never sexually assaulted anyone. He slammed Democrats for crafting a "smear" against him as a series of accusers --including some who remained anonymous -- continued to come forward in the days following his initial confirmation hearing. I am an optimistic guy. I always try to be on the sunrise side of the mountain, to be optimistic about the day that is coming," Kavanaugh said. He described how his year-old daughter told his wife, "We should pray for the woman" who accused him. He was asked to provide explanations for the notations on his calendar, his high school yearbook , his activities as a high school student and his penchant for drinking beer. Republicans opted to ask their own questions instead of relying on the appointed outside prosecutor, in order to defend Kavanaugh and launch their own attacks on Democrats. Kavanaugh had aggressive exchanges with senators, often turning the questions back onto them. Asked about his drinking by Sen. I just -- so After the break, however, Kavanaugh apologized for turning the question on her. This is a tough process," he said. Trump tweeted shortly after the hearing concluded, "Judge Kavanaugh showed America exactly why I nominated him. His testimony was powerful, honest, and riveting. Lindsey Graham delivers fiery rebuke of the confirmation process South Carolina Sen. Lindsey Graham condemned his

Democratic colleagues for their handling of the confirmation process, calling what Kavanaugh had experienced a "sham.

Chapter 4 : Supreme Court Nominee Brett Kavanaugh Sexual Assault Hearing Judge Kavanaugh

United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary. You are currently searching within the Nomination of the Honorable Brett M. Kavanaugh to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States section.

Definition[edit] In Daubert, seven members of the Court agreed on the following guidelines for admitting scientific expert testimony: Under Rule , the task of "gatekeeping", or assuring that scientific expert testimony truly proceeds from "scientific knowledge", rests on the trial judge. Concerns about expert testimony cannot be simply referred to the jury as a question of weight. A conclusion will qualify as scientific knowledge if the proponent can demonstrate that it is the product of sound "scientific methodology" derived from the scientific method. The Court defined "scientific methodology" as the process of formulating hypotheses and then conducting experiments to prove or falsify the hypothesis, and provided a set of illustrative factors i. Whether the theory or technique employed by the expert is generally accepted in the scientific community; Whether it has been subjected to peer review and publication; Whether it can be and has been tested; Whether the known or potential rate of error is acceptable; and Whether the research was conducted independent of the particular litigation or dependent on an intention to provide the proposed testimony. Testimony by Experts If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise, if 1 the testimony is based upon sufficient facts or data, 2 the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods, and 3 the witness has applied the principles and methods reliably to the facts of the case. In , Rule was again amended to make the language clearer. The rule now reads: Use[edit] Although the Daubert standard is now the law in federal court and over half of the states, the Frye standard remains the law in some jurisdictions including California, Illinois, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Washington. Even though a Daubert motion is not binding to other courts of law, if something was found untrustworthy by one court, other judges may choose to follow that precedent. In another case in which the defendant was apparently at fault for filing a motion to exclude expert testimony one week before the trial date, the district court denied the motion on that ground, but it advised the defendant that it might conduct its own voir dire of the expert in question before he testified. The defendant ultimately lost that case, following the admission of the disputed expert testimony, and ultimately failed in its appeal. History[edit] Prior to Daubert, relevancy in combination with the Frye test were the dominant standards for determining the admissibility of scientific evidence in Federal courts. Frye is based on a Federal Court of appeals ruling involving the admissibility of polygraph evidence. In Daubert, the Supreme Court ruled that the Frye test was superseded by the Federal Rules of Evidence , specifically Rule governing expert testimony. Rule originally stated in its entirety , If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise. According to a RAND study, post Daubert, the percentage of expert testimony by scientists that was excluded from the courtroom significantly rose. So if more experts are now being excluded, then Daubert has undoubtedly shifted the balance between plaintiffs and defendants and made it more difficult for plaintiffs to litigate successfully. These tactics can range from simply attempting to delay the case to driving up the costs of the litigation forcing settlement. In criminal cases, the prosecution has the burden of proof and uses a host of forensic science methods as evidence to prove their case. But, Daubert motions are rarely made by criminal defendants and when they do, they lose a majority of the challenges. The "Daubert" ruling furthermore admits the possible introduction of non-peer reviewed data and conclusions. This increasingly shifts the burden of scientific judgement onto judges who have not had an education which would enable them to properly evaluate such data. Supreme Court suggested that the following factors be considered: Has the technique been subject to peer review and publication? What is the known or potential rate of error? Has the technique been generally accepted within the relevant scientific community? The Supreme Court explicitly cautioned that the Daubert list should not be regarded by judges as "a definitive checklist or test Mohan ,; [28] R. While the

DOWNLOAD PDF V. 3. HEARING TESTIMONY

Court did note that: Supreme Court did list a number of factors that could be helpful in evaluating the soundness of novel science. The Quebec Court had held that greater liberality should be applied by the Court in receiving pro-defense scientific evidence in a criminal case. The absence of an agreed protocol for the validation of scientific techniques prior to their being admitted in court is entirely unsatisfactory. Judges are not well-placed to determine scientific validity without input from scientists. We recommend that one of the first tasks of the Forensic Science Advisory Council be to develop a "gate-keeping" test for expert evidence. This should be done in partnership with judges, scientists and other key players in the criminal justice system, and should build on the US Daubert test.

Chapter 5 : Kavanaugh hearing: anger and clashes ahead of Senate committee vote | US news | The Guardian

An emotional hearing on Thursday before the Senate Judicial Committee featured testimony on an alleged sexual assault by Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh.

Chapter 6 : Brett Kavanaugh & Dr. Christine Ford Senate Hearing Ends After 8 Hours | calendrierdelascience

As such, the HPC requests written pre-filed testimony from organizations and calls on individuals to testify in-person at the two-day hearing. The pre-filed and in-person testimony helps to inform various research and policy streams, including the HPC's annual cost trends report.

Chapter 7 : Recent Hearing Testimony | USITC

Hearing testimony is the act of giving answers under oath during a court hearing. Anxiety and stress can impact an unemployment case because it debilitates.

Chapter 8 : Christine Blasey Ford, Brett Kavanaugh hearing: The top takeaways - CBS News

Watergate-era White House counsel John Dean said Brett Kavanaugh's testimony doesn't reveal if the judge thinks US v. Nixon was correctly decided.

Chapter 9 : Daubert standard - Wikipedia

The most recent USITC hearing testimony is listed below. To view additional recent testimony, click the link at the bottom of the page.