A bill to be entitled

An act relating to testimony of witnesses; providing a short title; providing standards for opinion testimony by lay witnesses; providing standards for, bases of, and limitations on expert testimony; authorizing expert witness fees; providing requirements for mandatory pretrial hearings; providing requirements for mandatory pretrial disclosure of expert testimony; providing for interpretation and application; providing for interlocutory appeals; specifying standards of review; providing severability; providing application; providing an effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

- Section 1. (1) SHORT TITLE.--This section may be cited as the "Junk Science Elimination Act."
- (2) OPINION TESTIMONY BY LAY WITNESSES.--If a witness is not testifying as an expert, the witness's testimony in the form of opinions or inferences is limited to those opinions or inferences that are:
 - (a) Rationally based on the perception of the witness.
- (b) Helpful to a clear understanding of the witness's testimony or the determination of a fact in issue.
- (c) Not based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge within the scope of subsection (3).
- (3) TESTIMONY BY EXPERTS.--If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact in

Page 1 of 6

HB 1017 2007

understanding the evidence or determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify as to the evidence or fact in the form of an opinion or otherwise if:

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53 54

55

56

- The testimony is based upon sufficient facts or data;
- The testimony is the product of reliable principles (b) and methods; and
- The witness has applied the principles and methods reliably to the facts of the case.
- (4) BASES OF EXPERT TESTIMONY. -- The facts or data in a specific case upon which an expert bases an opinion or inference may be those perceived by or made known to the expert at or before the hearing. If the facts or data are of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject, the facts or data need not be admissible in evidence in order for the opinion or inference to be admitted. Facts or data that are otherwise inadmissible shall not be disclosed to the jury by the proponent of the opinion or inference unless the court determines that the probative value of the facts or data in assisting the jury to evaluate the expert's opinion substantially outweighs the prejudicial effect of disclosing the facts or data.
 - (5) LIMITATIONS ON EXPERT TESTIMONY. --
- (a) A witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may offer expert testimony only with respect to a particular field in which the expert is qualified.
 - (b) An expert witness may receive a reasonable and

Page 2 of 6

customary fee for the rendering of professional services;

however, the testimony of an expert witness shall not be

admitted if any such compensation is contingent upon the outcome

of any claim or case with respect to which the testimony is

being offered.

- (6) MANDATORY PRETRIAL HEARING.--If a witness is testifying as an expert, upon motion of a party the court shall hold a pretrial hearing to determine whether the witness qualifies as an expert and whether the expert's testimony satisfies the requirements of subsections (3), (4), and (5). The court shall allow sufficient time for a hearing and shall rule on the qualifications of the witness to testify as an expert and whether the testimony satisfies the requirements of subsections (3), (4), and (5). The trial court's ruling shall set forth the findings of fact and conclusions of law upon which the order to admit or exclude expert evidence is based. Such ruling shall be issued prior to the commencement of the trial.
 - (7) MANDATORY PRETRIAL DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT TESTIMONY. --
- (a) Regardless of whether any party elects to request a pretrial hearing contemplated in subsection (6), each party shall disclose to all other parties the identity of any person who may be used at trial to provide expert testimony.
- (b) Except as otherwise stipulated or directed by the court, with respect to a witness who is retained or specially employed to provide expert testimony in the case or whose duties as an employee of the party regularly involve providing expert testimony, a disclosure provided under paragraph (a) shall be accompanied by a written report prepared and signed by the

Page 3 of 6

witness. The report shall contain a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed and the basis and reasons for such opinions; the data or other information relied upon by the witness in forming the opinions; any exhibits to be used as a summary of or support for the opinions; the qualifications of the witness, including a list of all publications authored by the witness within the preceding 10 years; the compensation to be paid for the study and testimony; and a listing of any other cases in which the witness has testified as an expert at trial or by deposition within the preceding 4 years.

- (c) The disclosure required under paragraph (a), including the report required under paragraph (b), shall be made at the times and in the sequence directed by the court. In the absence of other directions from the court or stipulation by the parties, the disclosure and report shall be made at least 90 days before the trial date or the date the case is to be ready for trial or, if the evidence is intended solely to contradict or rebut evidence on the same subject matter identified by another party under paragraph (b), within 30 days after the disclosure and report made by the other party.
- (d) A party may depose any person who has been identified as an expert whose opinions may be presented at trial. If a report from the expert is required under paragraph (b), the deposition shall not be conducted until after the report is provided.
- (8) INTERPRETATION.--In interpreting and applying this section:
 - (a) The courts of this state shall follow the opinions of

Page 4 of 6

the United States Supreme Court in Daubert v. Merrell Dow

Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993); General Electric Co.

v. Joiner, 522 U.S. 136 (1997); Kumho Tire Co. Ltd. v.

Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999); Weisgram v. Marley, 528 U.S.

440 (2000); and their progeny.

- (b) The courts of this state may also draw from other precedents binding in the federal courts in this state applying the standards announced by the United States Supreme Court in the cases specified in paragraph (a).
- (9) INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL.--Interlocutory appeal of a ruling on the admissibility of expert evidence shall be available at the discretion of the appellate court. In deciding whether to grant an interlocutory appeal, the court shall consider whether the ruling involved any challenge to the constitutionality of this section, will help prove or disprove criminal liability, or will help establish civil liability at or above \$75,000 if the testimony may be determinative in establishing liability or determining damages. A party's failure to seek interlocutory appeal or an appellate court's decision to deny a motion for interlocutory appeal does not waive a party's right to appeal a ruling on the admissibility of expert evidence after an entry of judgment in the case.
 - (10) STANDARD OF REVIEW. -- For purposes of this section:
- (a) The proper construction of the provisions for admissibility of expert evidence prescribed by this section is a question of law, and a court of appeals shall apply a de novo standard of review in determining whether the trial court fully applied the proper legal standard in considering the

Page 5 of 6

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

141 admissibility of expert evidence.

142143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

- (b) The application of this section to determine the admissibility of expert testimony is a question of fact, and a court of appeals shall apply an abuse of discretion standard in determining whether the trial court properly admitted or excluded particular expert evidence.
- (11) SEVERABILITY.--The provisions of this section are severable. If any portion of this section is declared unconstitutional or the application of any part of this section to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remaining portions of the section and their applicability to any person or circumstance shall remain valid and enforceable.
- Section 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law and shall apply to all actions commenced on or after the effective date and to all actions pending on the effective date for which a trial has not been scheduled or for which a trial has been scheduled to take place at least 90 days after the effective date.