

## Research Topic Guide – Cell Phone Evidence

This is a great place to begin your research because all PLI publications are secondary sources that contain expert analyses of today's legal controversies. Our publications, form templates, and program transcripts provide users with authoritative background information, as well as insights into the positions of leading practitioners from law firms, corporations, government, and academia.

**Scenario:** After hearing about the use of cell phone evidence in several high-profile trials, a legal researcher is interested in learning more about using cell phone records as trial evidence.

**Search:** "Cell phone" /s evidence

**Results:** Search results include publications and program transcripts such as:

- Consumer Financial Services Answer Book
- Current Developments in Federal Civil Practice
- Electronic Discovery Deskbook (3rd Edition)
- Electronic Information in Criminal Investigations & Prosecutions
- Nuts & Bolts of Electronic Discovery
- Social Media and the Law
- Supreme Court and Informational Privacy: Bringing the Fourth Amendment into the 21st Century
- Supreme Court Review
- Trial Evidence Brought to Life: Illustrations from Famous Trials, Film and Fiction
- Understanding the Securities Laws

**Expert contributors to PLI materials on this topic:**

Professor Karen Blum – Suffolk Law School

Professor Randy Hertz – NYU Law School

Richard Raysman – Paul Hastings LLP

The screenshot shows the PLI PLUS website interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with links for Logout, Help, My Account, Contact Us, and Go to PLI.edu. Below this is a search bar containing the query "Cell phone" /s evidence. The search results are displayed in a list format. The first result is titled "Chapter 20, Paul Hastings, Stay Current, Client Alert, District Court Holds That Rule 10b-5 Insider Trading Provisions Apply to Credit Default Swap (CDS) Contracts (July 2010)". The author is Douglas Koff, published in July 2015. The snippet of the article text reads: "... But because both Rorech and Negrin testified at trial that they could not recall the substance of the cell phone conversations at issue, the SEC had no evidence of what was actually said on those calls. In rejecting the SEC's argument that the circumstantial evidence surrounding the cell phone calls permitted the court to draw an inference of wrongdoing, the court focused on the fact that Rorech, as a salesman for the underwriter for the VNU transaction, was properly speaking to potential investors at the time about interest in a possible bond offering."