Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals Clarifies Application of The Hearsay Exception For Statements Made In Connection With Medical Diagnosis or Treatment

By Jeffrey H. Chilton

The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has recommended for full text publication a decision with far reaching potential ramifications on the issue of what constitutes an exception to the hearsay rule regarding statements made for medical diagnosis or treatment. The case is Field et. al. v. Trigg County Hospital et. al. F.3d (6th Cir., 2004) (Docket No. 02-6440/6517, rel'd 10/15/04).

This case provides a detailed analysis of Fed. R. Evid. 803(4), which states, in pertinent part, that the following statements are not excluded by the hearsay rule:

Statements made for the purposes of medical diagnosis or treatment describing medical history, past or present symptoms, pain or sensations, or the inception or general character of the cause or external source thereof insofar as reasonably pertinent to diagnosis or treatment.

The applicable Michigan rule of evidence for state court cases, MRE 803(4), is similar.

The factual background of the *Field* decision involved a claimed failure on the part of an emergency room physician to adequately diagnose and treat a venomous wound from the bite of a copperhead snake. The plaintiff's right foot was eventually surgically amputated. The trial led to a jury verdict in favor of the defendant

SECREST WARDLE NOTES:

Defendants, their counsel and insurers should determine early in discovery what, if any, statements from other health care professionals to the defendant physician or hospital support the medical care rendered. Such statements are not an exception to the hearsay rule when made to the defendant physician or medical institution staff. Consideration should be made to preserving such favorable testimony by way of sworn affidavit, de bene esse deposition or witness appearance at trial itself.

CONTINUED...

physician and hospital. During trial, over objection, the court allowed the defendant physician to testify regarding the substance of a teleconference he had with two physicians from Vanderbilt University Medical Center regarding the medical treatment of plaintiff's condition.

In *Field*, the Sixth Circuit vacated the verdict in favor of the defendant and has remanded the case for a new trial. In clarifying the exception to the hearsay rule for statements made as part of medical diagnosis and treatment, the Court stated that the rationale behind this exception is that statements made by an individual to physicians for purposes of diagnosis or treatment are considered exceptionally trustworthy because the declarant has a strong motive to tell the truth in order to receive proper care. As such, the exception to this hearsay rule is limited to statements made by the one actually seeking medical care and does not apply to statements between health care professionals regarding the patient's care. Having determined that the statements made to the defendant doctor by the physicians at Vanderbilt University regarding the plaintiff were impermissible hearsay, the Sixth Circuit concluded that a new trial was necessary in that the admission of such statements was highly prejudicial and were more than mere harmless error.

In light of this decision, careful consideration should be made by health care professionals, medical institutions and their counsel and insurers to determine early in a case whether there exists any contact with other health care professionals which support the defense of any particular matter. When such contact exists in a factual record, all necessary steps should be taken to preserve such testimony through sworn affidavit, de bene esse deposition or arranging for a live appearance at trial.

CONTACT US

Farmington Hills

30903 Northwestern Highway, P.O. Box 3040 Farmington Hills, MI 48333-3040 Tel: 248-851-9500 Fax: 248-851-2158

Mt. Clemens

94 Macomb Place, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-5651 Tel: 586-465-7180 Fax: 586-465-0673

Lansing

6639 Centurion Drive, Ste. 130, Lansing, MI 48917 Tel: 517-886-1224 Fax: 517-886-9284

Grand Rapids

1550 East Beltline, S.E., Ste. 305, Grand Rapids, MI 49506-4361 Tel: 616-285-0143 Fax: 616-285-0145

Champaign, IL

2919 Crossing Court, Ste. 11, Champaign, IL 61822-6183 Tel: 217-378-8002 Fax: 217-378-8003

www.secrestwardle.com



Copyright 2004 Secrest, Wardle, Lynch, Hampton, Truex and Morley, P.C.

This newsletter is published for the purpose of providing information and does not constitute legal advice and should not be considered as such. This newsletter or any portion of this newsletter is not to be distributed or copied without the express written consent of Secrest Wardle.

CONTRIBUTORS

Professional Liability Practice Group Chair Mark E. Morley

Medical Malpractice Practice Group Chair Jeffrey H. Chilton

Nursing Homes / Assisted Living Practice Group Chair Lisa Anstess

Editor

Carina Carlesimo

We welcome your questions and comments.

OTHER MATERIALS

If you would like to be on the distribution list for Vital Signs, or for newsletters pertaining to any of our other practice groups, please contact Secrest Wardle Marketing at ccarlesimo@secrestwardle.com, or 248-539-2850.

Other newsletters include:

Benchmarks – Navigating the hazards of legal malpractice
Blueprints – Mapping legal solutions for the construction industry
Boundaries – A guide for property owners and insurers in a litigious society
Community Watch – Breaking developments in governmental litigation
Fair Use – Protecting ideas in a competitive world
In the Margin – Charting legal trends affecting businesses
Industry Line– Managing the hazards of environmental toxic and tort litigation
Landowners' Alert – Defense strategies for property owners and managers
No-Fault Newsline – A road map for motor vehicle insurers and owners
On the Job – Tracking developments in employment law

On the Beat – Responding to litigation affecting law enforcement State of the Art – Exploring the changing face of product liability Structures – A framework for defending architects and engineers