
Tips & Tricks for Effective Cross-Examination and Witness Impeachment

Chari L. Kelly

The following is based on an oral presentation given by the Honorable Chari L. Kelly at the Conquering the Courtroom: Practical Techniques to Elevate Your Courtroom Success, held in Austin, Texas on January 22, 2026. Her presentation and oral remarks have been adapted and edited for readability.

Cross-examination is what we all imagine when we think about trial advocacy: a sharp, effective, even “sexy” moment in the courtroom. But its purpose is often misunderstood. The goal of cross-examination is to argue your case through the witness. You are not arguing with the witness. That distinction matters.

The Aims of Cross-Examination

Cross-examination should be guided by three core aims.

First, obtain agreements. This is often your only opportunity to put helpful facts into the record through the opposing witness. You should identify what information the witness can give you that advances your theory of the case and secure those admissions clearly and efficiently.

Second, limit testimony. Not every witness will help your case, and many will attempt to expand their testimony to hurt your case. Your role is to demonstrate that their testimony either does not matter or does not contradict your theory.

Third, impeach credibility. This is a direct attack on the reliability or consistency of the witness. It must be done carefully and methodically.

The Structure of Effective Cross-Examination

A well-executed cross-examination is controlled, deliberate, and tightly structured. It is not a line-by-line retelling of the witness’s deposition, instead it should be laser-focused on the areas that are helpful to your case. Every question should be leading, seven words or less, and focused on one discrete fact.

Leading questions allow you to maintain control. When you ask open-ended questions, you surrender that control. Questions that are short and contain one fact made it hard for the witness to argue with you. In my experience the longer the question, the longer the answer. Ideally, you want to get your witness into a rhythm of yes or no answers. You should put innocuous questions

up front, before they have the urge to argue with you as the cross goes on and becomes potentially more heated.

A great cross-examination requires a lot of preparation. Plan your questions and divide them by topical area. For each question, put a reference to any enforcement tool you may have, such as a page and line number from a deposition. If you do this, then you will immediately know if you can impeach your witness effectively with a prior statement or if you were making an inference during your questioning. Remember, cross-examination is not the place to explore. It is the place to confirm. This also means knowing when to stop. You are unlikely to “win” your case by a cross-examination, particularly one of a credible expert. Instead, you should get what you can and get out. Less is often more.

The Mechanics of Impeachment

Impeachment occurs when someone says something different than before or they try to avoid a prior statement with “I don’t know.” Refreshment occurs when a witness says “I don’t remember.” Most lawyers don’t appreciate the distinction and start an impeachment with “Do you remember saying X at your deposition?” That approach is technically incorrect and misses the opportunity for a clean, effective impeachment.

Impeachment follows a specific and disciplined structure: commit, credit, and confront. And don’t forget to lead as you impeach.

First, commit the witness to their current testimony. Establish clearly what they are saying now. “You testified on direct that the light was green?” “But that hasn’t always been your testimony, has it?” If they admit to the inconsistency, the impeachment is complete.

Second, credit the prior statement. You can spend as much or as little time as your style permits reinforcing the credibility of that prior statement. “You took a deposition in this case? And at that deposition you swore to tell the truth? And you did tell the truth, didn’t you?”

Third, confront the witness with the inconsistency. You show them the prior statement, and you read the statement out loud, because you control how the statement is said. “I’m going to read aloud your statement and you let me know if get even one word incorrect. ‘The light was red.’ Did I get that right?”

Recognizing When Impeachment Is Complete

It is important to recognize when impeachment has already occurred. If the witness admits the inconsistency at the first step, the impeachment is complete. There is no need to press further.

Additionally, once you have completed the impeachment, stop. It is not effective to accuse the witness of lying. That argument belongs in closing. A witness is unlikely to agree that they are lying, and pressing the point risks diminishing the effectiveness of the impeachment you have

already achieved. Rather, doing so invites the witness to explain their answer during your cross examination, an opportunity you should not afford.

Practical Considerations in Impeachment

Impeachment is not always straightforward. Questions often arise about how to present prior statements to the jury. For example, displaying deposition testimony on a screen may be effective, but it is often dependent on the judge and subject to objection.

Opposing counsel may insist on identifying the precise page and line before allowing the statement to be shown, and may object on the grounds that there is no true inconsistency. Many impeachment issues are not clear-cut, and the line between consistency and inconsistency can be difficult to draw.

Additional complications arise with forms of evidence such as video recordings that have not been transcribed. In such cases, impeachment may require alternative approaches, including refreshing recollection or introducing the material under another evidentiary theory.

Understanding the Limits of Impeachment

Impeachment is a powerful tool, but it has limits. It is offered to show inconsistency, not necessarily to establish the truth of the prior statement. If the underlying fact is critical to your case, you may need to introduce the prior statement into evidence independently rather than relying solely on impeachment.

This distinction is particularly important for preserving the record and meeting your burden of proof.

Common Evidentiary Mistakes

Effective cross-examination also requires a clear understanding of evidentiary rules. Lawyers often confuse hearsay and authentication. These are distinct objections. Hearsay concerns an out-of-court statement offered for its truth. Authentication concerns whether the evidence is what it purports to be.

Similarly, statements by an opposing party are generally admissible as admissions of a party opponent, which are categorized as non-hearsay. Lawyers sometimes mistakenly analyze these statements as “statements against interest,” which imposes additional requirements for admissibility under the state and federal rules.

The best evidence rule is not the better evidence rule. If there is a video, writing, or recording of something, a witness should not testify about their contents unless they have personal knowledge of the underlying information. For example, if someone witnessed a car accident, and the car

accident was also on video, the best evidence rule would not prevent the witness from testifying about the car accident. However, if someone derived their knowledge solely from a video, then that would be subject to a best evidence objection.

The rule of optional completeness is not an objection. It is a rule of inclusion, not exclusion. This occurs when somebody is using a portion of a statement, usually a part of a deposition, and by not showing the full context of the statement, it leaves a mischaracterization with the jury.

Understanding these distinctions allows you to make more precise objections and to respond effectively when opposing counsel raises them.

Conclusion

Effective cross-examination is not about confrontation for its own sake. It is about control, precision, and restraint. The lawyer who leads every question, structures impeachment carefully, and knows when to stop is the lawyer who maintains credibility with the jury and advances the client's case.

The discipline required is substantial. But when done well, cross-examination becomes exactly what it should be: a focused, persuasive method of telling your client's story through the opposing witness.
