


 [Appointment and services of interpreter](#)

It is not error for court to appoint different interpreters during trial on behalf of different parties to case. Rules Civ.Proc., K.S.A. 60-243(e).

[Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[6]

Criminal Law

 [Appointment and services of interpreter](#)

Trial court did not abuse discretion by appointing two interpreters to elicit testimony of **deaf** victim of aggravated incest, where, after consulting with authorities from school for **deaf**, court concluded that **deaf** interpreter would best be able to understand and make himself understood to victim, and hearing interpreter would then report **deaf** interpreter's understanding of victim's responses. Rules Civ.Proc., K.S.A. 60-243(e).

[Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[7]

Criminal Law

 [Remarks and Conduct of Judge](#)

Defendant in aggravated incest prosecution was not prejudiced by court's consultation with doctor who subsequently testified for prosecution, where doctor's testimony was elicited to establish competency of victim to testify and was largely concerned with explaining extent of victim's handicaps.

[Cases that cite this headnote](#)

prejudicial to defendant; (4) no abuse of discretion was committed by the district court in finding the **deaf juvenile** victim of the crime competent to testify; and (5) the statute prohibiting lewd and lascivious conduct, [K.S.A. 21-3508\(1\)\(b\)](#), is not unconstitutionally overbroad as applied to the facts of this case.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Robe

responses. We find this decision to be eminently

