three or four months[,] . . . and I wasn't allowed to go out on dates with guys." Child's theory was that B.G. was motivated to fabricate the claim of rape because she feared the punishment and disapproval of her parents, devout Christians who "don't believe in sex before marriage." The State of New Mexico opposed Child's motion to permit the cross-examination of the complaining witness in regard to her prior sexual conduct with her boyfriend on the grounds that this was intended to portray the complaining witness as an individual who is likely to engage in sexual activity outside of marriage. According to the appellate court, there are five areas to consider in making a decision on this issue: (1) whether there is a clear showing that complainant committed the prior acts; (2) whether the circumstances of the prior acts closely resemble those of the present case; (3) whether the prior acts are clearly relevant to a material issue, such as identity, intent, or bias; (4) whether the evidence is necessary to the defendant's case; [and] (5) whether the probative value of the evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect.

As a judge, would you permit Child to cross-examine the complaining witness in regard to her sexual conduct with her boyfriend? See *State v. Stephen F.,* 152 P.3d 842 (N.M. Ct. App. 2007).

You can find the answer at study.sagepub.com/lippmaness2e