

State	Mirrored FRE Rule	Case	Notes
Arizona	Ariz. R. Evid. 902(13), (14)	N/A	Ariz. R. Evid. 902(13) appears in 1 opening brief (July 2018); Ariz. R. Evid. 902(14) appears in 1 opening brief (Jan. 2019) -- but neither case has been decided
Illinois	Ill. R. Evid. 902(12), (13)	N/A	"What's Not to 'Like'?" Karrison, 106 Ill. B.J. 28 (Nov. 2018) -- law review article on new addition to Illinois rules (summary of how they work, some guidance for attorneys) "Mining Metadata: The Gold Standard for Authenticating Social Media Evidence in Illinois" Greene, 68 DePaul L. Rev. 103 -- another law review article, arguing new Federal Rules "streamline the process of authenticating certain digital evidence" but do not "resolve one of the central issues concerning social media evidence -- proving authorship"
North Dakota	N.D. R. Evid. 902(13), (14)	N/A	Nothing has cited North Dakota's new rules (they went into effect March 2019)
Utah	Utah R. Evid. 902(13), (14)	N/A	Nothing has cited Utah's new rules
Wyoming	Wy. R. Evid. 902(a)(13), (14)	N/A	Nothing has cited Wyoming's new rules (they went into effect August 1, 2019)

Federal Circuit	FRE Rule	Notes
<b>United States v. Zuschlag, 2018 WL 2669957 (D. Me. June 4, 2018)</b>	902(13)	not very helpful; cites to FRE 902(13) once when referring to government's argument in response to defendants' claim that they can't admit into evidence info from a Regional Transportation Program computer database; court concludes that defendants' "mere assertion" does not establish substantial prejudice, but no "ruling" or big conclusion on FRE
<b>State v. Brown, 818 S.E.2d 735 (S.C. 2018)</b>	902(13)	State case (South Carolina Supreme Court) that cites FRE 902(13) as persuasive authority to support its holding that the State needed to present evidence describing the process/system used to produce the GPS records and showing that the process/system produces an accurate result in order to authenticate the GPS records in the case (officer's testimony that the information was accurate and used "in court all the time" was insufficient to authenticate GPS records)
<b>United States v. Razo-Quiroz, 2019 WL 3035556 (E.D. Cal. July 11, 2019)</b>	902(13)	not that informative; case involved a few pretrial motions, including government's motion for pretrial authentication of various items (relevant here phone extractions, Facebook extractions); government provided notice pursuant to FRE 902(11) and 902(13) that certain evidence had been certified by 7 records custodians; defendant initially argued that government's notice failed to identify specific exhibits and was inadequate because defendants didn't have opportunity to assess whether they objected to authenticity or not. However, at this hearing, both parties were directed to meet to try to stipulate to authentication of the documents and the motion for pretrial authentication was set for July 1, 2019. i.e., court does not decide or analyze really anything regarding FRE 902(13)

<b>NONE</b>	902(14)	<b>Found no cases discussing FRE 902(14) as of Sept. 23, 2019</b>	
<b>Appellate Briefs</b>	902(13)	902(13) has been cited in 7 federal appellate briefs (ranging Nov. 2018 - July 2019)	<i>These cases may be interesting to follow for potential analysis on the new rules</i>
<b>Appellate Briefs</b>	902(14)	902(14) has been cited in 3 federal appellate briefs (ranging Feb. 2018 - July 2019)	

### Additional helpful sources

<b>Practical Considerations When Using New Evidence Rule 902(13) to Self-Authenticate Electronically Generated Evidence in Criminal Cases, Levy &amp; Haried, 67 DOJ J. Fed. L. &amp; Prac. 81 (Feb. 2019)</b>	Haried is same author as print-out article: "How two new rules for self authentication will save you time and money"	interesting article describing potential challenges and strategies that attorneys should think about regarding the new rules; good examples
<b>New Evidence Rules and Artificial Intelligence, Hon. Paul W. Grimm, 45 No. 1 Litigation 6 (2018)</b>		provides nice overview of the rules (and how to distinguish the two); emphasizes importance of carefully drafting the certification, including who makes it, "to ensure that it is as comprehensive as the testimony that would have to be offered at trial to meet the authentication requirement."
<b>Something Old and Something New: Exploring the Recent Amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence, Lampley, 57 Washburn L.J. 519 (2018)</b>		explains the potential Confrontation Clause issue that may arise with the new rules



