



New Jersey Supreme Court rules hypnotically refreshed testimony inadmissible

The hypnotically refreshed testimony of a witness in a criminal trial is generally inadmissible, the New Jersey Supreme Court has ruled on August 10, 2006 in *State of New Jersey v. Clarence M. Moore*.

A woman who was sexually assaulted in her home provided a written statement describing her assailant to police but was unable to provide enough information for a composite sketch. Anticipating that hypnosis might help her to remember her assailant's face, she visited a licensed clinical psychologist. While hypnotized, she stated for the first time that her assailant wore a tan suede jacket with a zipper and was a medium-skinned black man.

Several days later the victim chose the defendant from a photo array. The trial court admitted her hypnotically refreshed testimony at trial. The jury convicted the defendant on all counts.

He appealed, arguing that hypnotically refreshed testimony was unreliable and inadmissible.

The court agreed.

"Although the scientific community has not reached a consensus on the issue, more recent studies reaffirm and strengthen earlier understandings about how hypnosis affects both memory and attitude. We now conclude on the basis of this data that hypnotically refreshed testimony cannot meet the standard of admissibility," the court wrote.

The court noted expert testimony that "hypnosis does not produce more accurate recall but rather instills a false confidence in the hypnotized individual, thereby producing an aura of truthfulness that subverts effective cross-examination, a cornerstone of the adversarial system."

(This article was originally published in *Lawyers USA*, Boston).

www.lawyersusacnline.com
LawyersUSA