

Evidence

Crawford Issues

[State v. Whittington](#), __ N.C. __, __ S.E.2d __ (Jan. 24, 2014). (1) *Melendez-Diaz* did not impact the “continuing vitality” of the notice and demand statute in G.S. 90-95(g); when the State satisfies the requirements of the statute and the defendant fails to file a timely written objection, a valid waiver of the defendant’s constitutional right to confront the analyst occurs. (2) The State’s notice under the statute in this case was deficient in that it failed to provide the defendant a copy of the report and stated only that “[a] copy of report(s) will be delivered upon request.” However, the defendant did not preserve this issue for appeal. At trial he asserted only that the statute was unconstitutional under *Melendez-Diaz*; he did not challenge the State’s notice under the statute. Justice Hudson dissented, joined by Justice Beasley, arguing that the majority improperly shifts the burden of proving compliance with the notice and demand statute from the State to defendant.