

Judicial Officers' Fraud and Corruption Workshop

Federated States of Micronesia

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Similarities and difference of provisions across all jurisdictions

Chapter 2: Federated States of Micronesia - Summary of Elements of the Offences

Chapter 3: Federated States of Micronesia - Elements of the Defences

Chapter 4: Evidentiary issues

Annex A: Offence provision/s by jurisdictions

Annex B: Evidence provision/s and rules by jurisdictions

Chapter 1: Similarities and differences of provisions across all jurisdictions

This chapter outlines the similarities and differences between fraud and corruption offences across PJIP partner court jurisdictions. The two most prevalent fraud and corruption offence categories defined by the region¹ are: fraud and bribery.

Fraud

In most jurisdictions, the Fraud regime is complex and there is significant overlap with various other provisions. The provisions annexed below are those with which a public officer could be charged, who embezzled public funds. Six jurisdictions (Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, and Tonga) have provisions that specifically target fraud or embezzlement by public servants. In the other six jurisdictions, recourse must be had to general provisions (present in all jurisdictions) dealing with fraudulent misappropriation of property. These offences may be variously referred to as “theft”, “cheating”, “obtaining by false pretences”, “obtaining by deception”, or “fraudulent conversion”. Palau is the only jurisdiction to have a specific offence of theft of government property that can be committed by a private individual.

Kiribati and Solomon Islands have identical provisions dealing with the following:

- Frauds and breaches of trust by persons employed in the public service²
- Theft, including taking by trickery or despite knowledge of a mistake on the part of the person defrauded
- Larceny and embezzlement by public servants
- Obtaining by false pretences

Vanuatu has provisions dealing with theft and obtaining by false pretences which are substantially similar to those in the three aforementioned jurisdictions. However, it lacks any provisions dealing specifically with frauds by public servants. The other eight jurisdictions have substantially different regimes.

¹ As outlined in the PJIP Judicial Officer Needs Assessment Survey Report, June 2022

² Fiji has a similarly worded provision



There is a degree of practical commonality among the fraudulent misappropriation or theft offences in all jurisdictions. There are three main elements of which most jurisdictions include at least two. These are that the taking of a thing is done:

- Dishonestly, or by fraud or deceit;
- Without a good faith claim of right (some jurisdictions (Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, and Nauru) merely include the weaker proposition that the property belongs to another); and
- With intent to permanently deprive the owner of the thing.

Kiribati, Nauru, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu include all three elements; Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa and Tokelau include the first and third; and Papua New Guinea and Federated States of Micronesia include the second and third.

Bribery

All jurisdictions except Nauru focus on bribery in official and political matters, with relevant bribery being bribery of public officials to act in a certain way in the course of their official duties. Nauru, by contrast, focuses on the dishonest provision/receipt of a bribe with the intention of gaining/providing a favour. All jurisdictions address both directions of bribery, that is, provision and receipt. Papua New Guinea and Fiji both have provisions that address bribery of judicial officials. The most detailed provision is that in the Marshall Islands. Fiji also has specific bribery legislation.³

Offence provision/s by jurisdictions

Unless otherwise specified, all references to statutory provisions are to the following Crimes Acts:

- **Federated States of Micronesia:** [Code of the Federated States of Micronesia](#) ;
- **Fiji:** [CRIMES ACT 2009 - Laws of Fiji](#); [Prevention of Bribery Act 2007](#) (For offences committed prior to 1/2/2010 see [Laws of Fiji Chapter 17 \(Penal Code\)](#));
- **Kiribati:** [Penal Code 1977](#);
- **Nauru:** [Crimes Act 2016](#);
- **Palau:** [Penal Code of the Republic of Palau](#);
- **Papua New Guinea:** [Criminal Code Act 1974](#);
- **Republic of Marshall Islands:** [Marshall Islands Revised Code 2014 Title 31 Chapter 1](#);
- **Samoa:** [Crimes Act 2013](#);
- **Solomon Islands:** [Penal Code 1963](#);
- **Tokelau:** [Crimes, Procedure and Evidence Rules 2003](#)
- **Tonga:** [Laws of Tonga Chapter 18 \(Criminal Offences\)](#)
- **Vanuatu:** [Penal Code 1977](#)

	Fraud	Bribery
Federated States of Micronesia	s 601(9) s 602	s 516
Fiji	ss 4, 200, 290, 291, 292, 293, 317, 318, 319(1)(b), 323, 324, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330	s 4, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138 Prevention of Bribery Act ss 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
Kiribati	ss 121, 251, 266	s 85

³ Prevention of Bribery Act 2007



Nauru	ss150, 153, 166-168, 179	s 173
Palau	ss 2600, 2614, 2615	s 4100
Papua New Guinea	s406, s365 s 383A, s403, s404, s405	ss 87, 97B, 119, 120
Republic of Marshall Islands	ss 223.0, 223.3, 240.7	s 240.0 s 240.1
Samoa	s 172	s 138
Solomon Islands	ss 129, 258, 273, 308	s 91
Tokelau	ss 27, 31, 73(1)	s 72 (1), 72 (2)
Tonga	ss 53, 143, 144, 145	ss 50, 51
Vanuatu	ss 122, 123, 124, 125	s 73



Chapter 2: Federated States of Micronesia - Legislative Provisions and Elements of the Offences

Under the two offence categories, the below offences pursuant to the [Code of the Federated States of Micronesia Title 11](#), have been identified as falling within the scope of “*corruption*”. Power is used corruptly if it has been “used to obtain some private advantage or for any purpose foreign to the Power”.⁴ For the purposes of this program, “*corruption*” refers to the abuse of entrusted power by public servants, with particular reference to the dishonest pursuit of gain. ALTERNATIVELY: we have used this term in its generic meaning opposed, to its legal connotation.

Fraud: s 602. Theft.

A person commits the crime of theft if he or she commits theft of any property or service in which a person has any legal, equitable, or possessory interest.

[...]

Fraud: s 601. Definitions.

(9) Theft by Deception

- (a) A person commits theft if he purposely obtains property of another by deception. A person deceives if he purposely:
 - (i) creates or reinforces a false impression, including false impressions as to law, value, intention, or other state of mind, but deception as to a person's intention to perform a promise shall not be inferred from the fact alone that he did not subsequently perform the promise;
 - (ii) prevents another from acquiring information which would affect his judgment of a transaction;
 - (iii) fails to correct a false impression which the deceiver previously created or reinforced, or which the deceiver knows to be influencing another to whom he stands in a fiduciary or confidential relationship; or
 - (iv) fails to disclose a known lien, adverse claim, or other legal impediment to the enjoyment of property which he transfers or encumbers in consideration for the property obtained, whether such impediment is or is not valid, or is or is not a matter of official record.
- (b) The term "deceive" does not, however, include falsity as to matters having no pecuniary significance, or puffing by statements unlikely to deceive ordinary persons in the group addressed.

Bribery: s 516. Bribery in official and political matters.

- (1) A person commits the crime of bribery if he or she offers, confers, or agrees to confer upon another, or solicits, accepts, or agrees to accept from another:
 - (a) any pecuniary benefit as consideration for the recipient's decision, opinion, recommendation, vote, or other exercise of discretion as a public official, or as a voter in any election, referendum, or plebiscite of the Federated States of Micronesia;
 - (b) any benefit as consideration for the recipient's decision, vote, recommendation, or other exercise of official discretion as a public official in a judicial or administrative proceeding; or

⁴ *State v Gamato* [2021] PGNC 485, 136 (Berrigan J).



- (c) any benefit as consideration for a violation of a known legal duty as a public official.
- (2) For the purpose of this section, “public servant” or “public official” includes, in addition to those persons who are defined as such under section 104 of this title, persons who have been elected, appointed, hired or designated to become a public official although not yet occupying that position.
- (3) A person convicted under this section shall be imprisoned for not more than ten years, and shall be disqualified from holding any position in the National Government.

Partner Court / Topic	Fraud	Bribery
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA	<i>Code of the Federated State of Micronesia Title 11</i>	
Legislative Provisions	s 601(9) Theft by Deception	s 516 Bribery in official and political matters
Elements of the Offence	s 601(9) Theft by Deception 1. A obtains property of another 2. A does so purposefully 3. A does so by deception (definition of by deception refer to (s 601(9) i-iv))	s 516 Bribery in official and political matters 1. A offers to X any pecuniary benefit 2. X is a public official or voter 3. Such benefit is offered as consideration for either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • X's exercise of discretion in their capacity as a public official or voter; or • If X is a public official: X's violation as a public official of a known legal duty ALTERNATIVELY 1. A agrees to accept any pecuniary benefit from X 2. A is a public official or voter 3. A agrees to accept as consideration for either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A's exercise of discretion in their capacity as a public official or voter; or • If A is a public official: A's violation as a public official of a known legal duty



Chapter 3: Federated States of Micronesia Elements of the Defences

Under the two offence categories, the below common defences have been identified across each jurisdiction. The **offence** is highlighted by **orange font**; the **common defence** is identified by **pink font** and the **elements of the defence** in **blue font**.

Fraud	Bribery
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA	
<p>Common defences</p> <p>s 107 (self-defence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - used no more force than is necessary to protect oneself, family, home and property from an intruder and to expel the intruder. - able to use a dangerous weapon to protect oneself (but not use weapon in deadly fashion or no more force than would be reasonably necessary) <p>s 108 (customary law)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - customary law is recognised and considered by the national Courts. 	
<p>s 601(9) (theft by deception)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where there is falsity as to matters that have no pecuniary significance - no offence where there is puffing by statements unlikely to deceive ordinary persons in the group addressed 	<p>s 516 (bribery in official and political matters)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No express defences



Chapter 4: Evidentiary issues

From the PJIP needs assessment and ongoing discussions with Partner Courts, the following evidentiary issues were identified. A summary of the similarities and differences between the jurisdictions are discussed below.

Exceptions to Hearsay – Bankers’ books & business records

In all jurisdictions, there are statutory or common law exceptions to the rule against hearsay evidence. Most jurisdictions (Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Fiji and Papua New Guinea) have statutory provisions pertaining to the admissibility of business records or bankers’ books. In six jurisdictions (Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga) these provisions are framed as exceptions to the rule against hearsay evidence. In Fiji and Papua New Guinea, the relevant legislation contains provisions regarding the admissibility of trade or business records more generally. However, it is likely that hearsay evidence would be admitted pursuant to these provisions.

The Federated States of Micronesia, Palau and the Republic of Marshall Islands have provisions which are almost identical. For the exception to apply to business records, two conditions must be established by the testimony of the custodian of the records, another qualified witnesses or, in the Republic of Marshall Islands only, a permitted certificate submitted to the court. First, the records were kept in the course of a regularly conducted business activity. Second, it was the regular practice of that business to make those records. Similar conditions are required in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga.

In addition to these requirements, three jurisdictions (Fiji, Tonga, and Samoa) specify that witnesses must not be available before the business records can be admitted. In Fiji, the person who supplied the statement in the record must be either dead, unfit to give evidence as a witness, missing or cannot be reasonably expected to have any recollection of the matters dealt contained in the record. Samoa’s legislation contains similar provisions and two additional alternatives. Specifically, that the Judge may consider first, that the witness would not be useful to the proceedings as the person cannot be reasonably expected to recollect the matters dealt with in the record or secondly, it would cause undue expense or delay if the person were required to be a witness.

Papua New Guinea’s provisions specify that the court is not required to admit business records if, having regarding to all of the relevant circumstances, it would not be in the interests of justice to do so. Papua New Guinea also has provisions in relation to bankers’ books; however, the legislation does not specify any rules in relation to admissibility of hearsay evidence.

We have been unable to identify any relevant statutory provisions in Tokelau and Vanuatu. Consequently, in these jurisdictions hearsay contained in business records is not admissible because there is no such exception at common law.⁵

⁵ Further research into the case law will need to be undertaken to determine the position adopted in each jurisdiction.



Expert Evidence

In all jurisdictions, expert opinion evidence is admissible as an exception to the rule against the admissibility of opinion evidence. Generally, expert opinion testimony is admissible at common law if the witness is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training or education and the expert's opinion will assist the court to understand a fact or issue relevant to the matter. Some jurisdictions (Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau and Tonga) have provisions in their statutes or court rules pertaining to the qualification of experts or competency of witnesses more generally. In these jurisdictions, except Tokelau, the common law exception is codified in the relevant statute (Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga) or court rules (Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands).

In the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau and Republic of Marshall Islands the specific rules are almost identical. In those jurisdictions, a court may require an expert to disclose underlying facts or data prior to testifying or during cross-examination. Facts or data which an expert relies upon to form an opinion do not need to be admitted as evidence if that evidence is of a type reasonably relied upon by experts in the particular field in forming opinions or inferences upon the subject. Testimony which is admissible is not objectionable if it relies upon a contested fact which is to be determined by the ultimate decision maker. In the Republic of Marshall Islands and Palau, facts or data which are relied on by an expert that are inadmissible do not need to be disclosed to the jury unless the court determines that the probative value of evidence, in assisting the jury to evaluate the expert's opinion, substantially outweighs their prejudicial effect.

We have been unable to identify any relevant statutory provisions in Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Tokelau and Vanuatu. However, it is our understanding that the common law exception exists in all of these jurisdictions.⁶

Evidence Admissible Against Co-accused Defendants

Two jurisdictions (Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu) contain statutory provisions regarding accessorial liability. We have been unable to identify provisions in nine jurisdictions (Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau and Tonga).⁷

Regarding the admissibility of evidence against a co-accused, the common law position applies in most jurisdictions.⁸ At common law, the co-conspirator's rule permits acts or statements of a co-accused in furtherance of a conspiracy to be admissible against a co-accused.

We have been able to identify provisions in five jurisdictions (Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga).

The Solomon Islands and Samoa have provisions which specify that the common law position in relation to the admissibility of statements by co-conspirators prevails. In the Solomon Islands, this is only in relation to confessions. The statute also provides that a co-accused is considered a competent and compellable witness. They may also offer propensity evidence only if that evidence is relevant to the defence raised or proposed to be raised by the accused.

⁶ Further research into the case law will need to be undertaken to determine the position adopted in each jurisdiction.

⁷ Further research into the case law will need to be undertaken to determine the position adopted in each jurisdiction.

⁸ Further research into the case law will need to be undertaken to determine the position adopted in each jurisdiction.



Comparatively, in Papua New Guinea, a person charged with an offence shall not be called as a witness in any legal proceedings in connection with the offence. Notwithstanding this, where a person charged with an offence is a witness they may be asked any questions in cross-examination.

Electronic Evidence

We have been unable to identify any provisions regarding the evidentiary rules applicable to electronic evidence generally in all jurisdictions except for Papua New Guinea and Tonga. In Papua New Guinea, the *Electronic Transactions Acts 2021* specifies that the evidential requirements of admissibility and weight provided by the *Evidence Act* apply to electronic records or data messages. In Tonga, the *Evidence Act* contains provisions regarding the admissibility, standards and authentication of electronic evidence generally.

Some jurisdictions specify that forms of evidence include electronic records or documents stored electronically. The Federated States of Micronesia, Palau and Republic of Marshall Islands specify that writings and records includes electronic recordings. In Samoa, the meaning of ‘documents’ includes ‘information electronically recorded or stored, and information derived from that information’. In Kiribati, the *Evidence Act 2003* contains a provision regarding the ‘[a]dmissibility of statements produced by computers’.

Some jurisdictions have specific evidentiary rules or exceptions in relation to electronic evidence. For example, in the Solomon Islands section 122(1) of the *Evidence Act 2009* provides that the hearsay rule does not apply to a representation contained in a document recording a message that has been transmitted by electronic mail, fax, telegram, letter gram or telex.

Relevance of Evidence

Five jurisdictions (Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tonga) have provisions in either their statutes or court rules regarding the relevancy of evidence. In all of these jurisdictions relevant evidence is generally admissible.

In the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau and Republic of Marshall Islands, relevant evidence is defined as ‘evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence’. Comparatively, in Tonga, any evidence which is admissible under the relevant provisions is deemed relevant.

Some jurisdictions (Papua New Guinea and Samoa) specify in their statutes that the relevancy of evidence can be questioned during later stages of criminal proceedings, such as during cross-examination or following the end of submissions.



Unless otherwise specified, all references to statutory provisions and rules are to the following:

- **Federated States of Micronesia:**
 - [Code of the Federated State of Micronesia Title 6, Chapter 13 - Evidence](#)
 - [Rules of Evidence for the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of the Federated States of Micronesia](#)
- **Fiji:**
 - [Evidence Act 1944](#)
- **Kiribati:**
 - [Evidence Act 2003](#)
- **Nauru:**
 - [Criminal Procedure \(Amendment\) Act 2020](#)
- **Palau:**
 - [Rules of Evidence for the Courts of the Republic of Palau](#)
- **Papua New Guinea:**
 - [Evidence Act 1975](#)
 - [Electronic Transactions Act 2021](#)
 - [Criminal Practice Rules – Fraud & Corruption Related Offences 2013](#)
- **Republic of Marshall Islands:**
 - [Title 28 – Evidence Act of 1989](#)
- **Samoa:**
 - [Evidence Act of 2015](#)
- **Solomon Islands:**
 - [Evidence Act 2009](#)
- **Tokelau:**
 - [Crimes, Procedure and Evidence Rules 2003](#)
- **Tonga:**
 - [Evidence Act 2020](#)
- **Vanuatu:**
 - [Chapter 136 - Criminal Procedure Code](#)

	Exceptions to Hearsay	Expert Evidence	Evidence Against Co-accused	Electronic Evidence	Relevance of Evidence
Federated States of Micronesia	Rules 801, 802, 803	Rules 601, 602, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706	N/A	Rule 1001	Rules 401, 402, 403
Fiji	s 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kiribati	ss 32, 33, 34	N/A	N/A	s 28	N/A
Nauru	ss147A, 176	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Palau	Rules 801, 802, 803	Rules 702, 703, 704, 705	N/A	Rule 1001	Rules 401, 402, 403



Papua New Guinea	s61, 91, 92, 93, 94 (Evidence Act)	N/A	s 9, 14 (Evidence Act)	s 12 (Electronic Transactions Act) ss 64, 65, 66, 67 (Evidence Act)	s 26 (Evidence Act)
Republic of Marshall Islands	s3 Rules 803, 902	s3 Rules 702, 703, 704, 705	N/A	s3 Rule 1001.	s3 Rules 104, 401, 402, 403
Samoa	ss 9, 10, 11	ss 2, 16	s 6	s 2	s 70, 83
Solomon Islands	ss 102, 103, 117, 118, 120	ss 24, 30, 129, 130	s 39, 40, 172	s 122	ss 20, 21, 22
Tokelau	ss 163, 175	ss 164, 175	s 175	N/A	N/A
Tonga	ss 88, 89	s24, 25	s 4	ss 2, 54A, 54C, 54D, 54E, 54F	s 14
Vanuatu	N/A	s86	N/A	N/A	N/A

Exceptions to Hearsay – Bankers’ books & business records

Rule 801. Definitions

The following definitions apply under this article:

- (a) **Statement.** A "statement" is (1) an oral or written assertion or (2) nonverbal conduct of a person, if it is intended by him as an assertion.
- (b) **Declarant.** A "declarant" is a person who makes a statement.
- (c) **Hearsay.** "Hearsay" is a statement, other than one made by the declarant while testifying at the trial or hearing, offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted.
- (d) **Statements which are not hearsay.** A statement is not hearsay if--
 - (1) **Prior statement by witness.** The declarant testifies at the trial or hearing and is subject to cross-examination concerning the statement, and the statement is (A) inconsistent with his testimony, and was given under oath subject to the penalty of perjury at a trial, hearing, or other proceeding, or in a deposition, or (B) consistent with his testimony and is offered to rebut an express or implied charge against him of recent fabrication or improper influence or motive, or (C) one of identification of a person made after perceiving him; or
 - (2) **Admission by party-opponent.** The statement is offered against a party and is (A) his own statement, in either his individual or a representative capacity or (B) a statement of which he has manifested his adoption or belief in its truth, or (C) a statement by a person authorized by him to make a statement concerning the subject, or (D) a statement by his agent or servant concerning a matter within the scope of his agency or employment, made during the existence of the relationship, or (E) a statement by a co conspirator of a party during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

Rule 802. Hearsay Rule.

Hearsay is not admissible except as provided by these rules or by other rules prescribed by the Chief Justice pursuant to Article XI of the Constitution, or by statute enacted by the Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia.

Rule 803. Hearsay Exceptions; Availability of Declarant Immaterial.

The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule, even though the declarant is available as a witness:

- (1) Records of regularly conducted activity. A memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, in any form, of acts, events, conditions, opinions, or diagnoses, made at or near the time of, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge, if kept in the course of a regularly conducted business activity, and if it was the regular practice of that business activity to make the memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, all as shown by the testimony of the custodian or other qualified witness, unless the source of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trust-worthiness. The term "business" as used in this paragraph includes business, institution, association, profession, occupation, and calling of every kind, whether or not conducted for profit.
- (2) Absence of entry in records kept in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (6). Evidence that matter is not included in the memoranda reports, records, or data compilations, in any form, kept in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (6), to prove the nonoccurrence or nonexistence of the matter, if the matter was of a kind of which a memorandum, report, record, or data compilation was regularly made and preserved unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness.
- (3) Public records and reports. Records, reports, statements, or data compilations, in any form, of public offices or agencies, setting forth (A) the activities of the office or agency, or (B) matters observed pursuant to duty imposed by law as to which matters there was a duty to report, excluding, however, in criminal cases matters observed by police officers and other law enforcement personnel, or (C) in civil actions and proceedings and against the Government in criminal cases, factual findings resulting from an investigation made pursuant to authority granted by law, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness.

...

- (17) Market reports, commercial publications. Market quotations, tabulations, lists, directories, or other published compilations, generally used and relied upon by the public or by persons in particular occupations.

...

- (24) Other exceptions. A statement not specifically covered by any of the foregoing exceptions but having equivalent circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness, if the court determines that (A) the statement is offered as evidence of a material fact; (B) the statement is more probative on the point for which it is offered than any other evidence which the proponent can procure through reasonable efforts; and (C) the general purposes of these rules and the interests of justice will best be served by admission of the statement into evidence. However, a statement may not be admitted under this exception unless the proponent of it makes known to the adverse party sufficiently in advance of the trial or hearing to provide the adverse party with a fair opportunity to prepare to meet it, his intention to offer the statement and the particulars of it, including the name and address of the declarant.



Expert Evidence

Rule 601. General Rule of Competency.

Every person is competent to be a witness except as otherwise provided in these Rules. However, in civil actions and proceedings, with respect to an element of a claim or defense as to which State law supplies the rule of decision, the competency of a witness shall be determined in accordance with State law.

Rule 602. Lack of Personal Knowledge.

A witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that he has personal knowledge of the matter. Evidence to prove personal knowledge may, but need not, consist of the testimony of the witness himself. This rule is subject to the provisions of **rule 703**, relating to opinion testimony by expert witnesses.

Rule 702. Testimony by Experts.

If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge, including the knowledge of experts on local tradition and custom, 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.

Rule 703. Bases of Opinion Testimony by Experts.

The facts or data in the particular case upon which an expert bases an opinion or inference **may** be those perceived by or made known to him at or before the hearing. If 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.

Rule 704. Opinion on Ultimate Issue.

Testimony in the form of an opinion or inference otherwise admissible is not objectionable because it embraces an ultimate issue to be decided by the trier of fact.

Rule 705. Disclosure of Facts of Data Underlying Expert Opinion.

The expert may testify in terms of opinion or inference and give his reasons therefore without prior disclosure of the underlying facts or data, unless the court requires otherwise. The expert may in any event be required to disclose the underlying facts or data on cross-examination.

Rule 706. Court Appointed Experts.

- (a) Appointment. The court may on its own motion or on the motion of any party enter an order to show cause why expert witnesses should not be appointed, and may request the parties to submit nominations. The court may appoint any expert witnesses agreed upon by the parties, and may appoint expert witnesses of its own selection. An expert witness shall not be appointed by the court unless he consents to act. A witness so appointed shall be informed of his duties by the court in writing, a copy of which shall be filed with the clerk, or at a conference in which the parties shall have opportunity to participate. A witness so appointed shall advise the parties of his findings, if any; his deposition may be taken by any party; and he may be called to testify by the court or any party. He shall be subject to cross-examination by each party, including a party calling him as a witness.



...

- (d) Parties' experts of own selection. Nothing in this rule limits the parties in calling expert witnesses of their own selection.

Evidence Admissible Against Co-accused Defendants

At the time research was undertaken, we have been unable to identify relevant provisions regarding the *Evidence Admissible Against Co-accused Defendants* within the *Code of the Federated State of Micronesia* and the *Rules of Evidence for the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of the Federated States of Micronesia*.

Electronic Evidence

Rule 1001. Definitions.

For purposes of this article the following definitions are applicable:

- (1) Writings and records. "writings" and "recordings" consist of letters, words, or numbers, or their equivalent, set down by handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, magnetic impulse, mechanical or electronic recording, or other form of data compilation.

Relevancy of Evidence

Rule 401. Definition of "Relevant Evidence"

"Relevant evidence" means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.

Rule 402. Relevant Evidence Generally Admissible; Irrelevant Evidence Inadmissible

All relevant evidence is admissible, except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia, by Act of Congress, by these rules, or by other rules prescribed by the Chief Justice pursuant to Article XI of the Constitution. Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible.

Rule 403. Exclusion of Relevant Evidence on Grounds of Prejudice, Confusion or Waste of Time

Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.

