

**FILED**

JUN 13 2008

*[Signature]*  
CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
CENTRAL DIVISION

\*\*\*\*\*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

MATTHEW DAVID STYMIEST,

Defendant.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

CR 08-30006

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

\*\*\*\*\*

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it is my duty now to explain the rules of law you must apply to this case.

You as jurors are the sole judges of the facts. But it is your duty to follow the law stated in these instructions, and to apply that law to the facts as you find them from the evidence before you. It would be a violation of your sworn duty to base your verdict upon any rules of law other than the ones given you in these instructions, regardless of your personal feelings as to what the law ought to be.

You are not to single out one instruction alone as stating the law, but must consider the instructions as a whole.

INSTRUCTION NO. 2

You have been chosen and sworn as jurors to try the issues of fact presented by the allegations of the indictment and the denial made by the defendant in his plea of "not guilty." You are to perform this duty without bias or prejudice, because the law does not permit jurors to be governed by sympathy or public opinion. The accused and the public expect that you will carefully and impartially consider all of the evidence and will follow the law as stated by the Court, in order to reach a just verdict, regardless of the consequences to any party.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

The indictment in this case charges that the defendant committed the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to this charge.

As I told you at the beginning of the trial, an indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. To the contrary, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. Therefore, the defendant, even though charged, begins the trial with no evidence against him. This presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty and can be overcome only if the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of the crime charged.

There is no burden upon the defendant to prove that he is innocent. Accordingly, the fact that the defendant did not testify must not be considered by you in any way, or even discussed, in arriving at your verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense, and not the mere possibility of innocence. A reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, must be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

I have mentioned the word “evidence.” The evidence in this case consists of the testimony of witnesses, the documents and other things received as exhibits, and the facts that have been stipulated to-- that is, formally agreed to by the parties.

You may use reason and common sense to draw deductions or conclusions from facts which have been established by the evidence in the case.

Certain things are not evidence. I shall list those things again for you now:

1. Statements, arguments, questions and comments by lawyers representing the parties in the case are not evidence.

2. Objections are not evidence. Lawyers have a right to object when they believe something is improper. You should not be influenced by the objection. If I sustained an objection to a question, you must ignore the question and must not try to guess what the answer might have been.

3. Testimony and questions that I struck from the record, or told you to disregard, are not evidence and must not be considered.

4. Anything you saw or heard about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

Finally, you were instructed that some evidence was received for a limited purpose only and you must follow such instructions.

INSTRUCTION NO. 6

There are two types of evidence from which you may find the truth as to the facts of a case--direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness; circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances indicating the guilt or innocence of the defendant. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to either direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. Nor is a greater degree of certainty required of circumstantial evidence than of direct evidence. You should weigh all the evidence in the case. After weighing all the evidence, if you are not convinced of the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

In deciding what the facts are, you may have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You may believe all of what a witness said, or only part of it, or none of it.

In deciding what testimony to believe, consider the witness's intelligence, the opportunity the witness had to have seen or heard the things testified about, the witness's memory, any motives that witness may have for testifying a certain way, the manner of the witness while testifying, whether that witness said something different at an earlier time, the general reasonableness of the testimony, and the extent to which the testimony is consistent with any evidence that you believe.

In deciding whether or not to believe a witness, keep in mind that people sometimes hear or see things differently and sometimes forget things. You need to consider therefore whether a contradiction is an innocent misrecollection or lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood, and that may depend on whether it has to do with an important fact or only a small detail.



INSTRUCTION NO. 8

The weight of the evidence is not necessarily determined by the number of witnesses testifying. You should consider all the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses are worthy of a greater credence. You may find that the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side is more credible than the testimony of a greater number of witnesses on the other side.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

You have heard testimony from persons described as experts. A person who, by knowledge, skill, training, education or experience, has become an expert in some field may state opinions on matters in that field and may also state the reasons for those opinions.

Expert testimony should be considered just like any other testimony. You may accept or reject it, and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness's education and experience, the soundness of the reasons given for the opinion, the acceptability of the methods used, and all the other evidence in the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

The crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury, as charged in the indictment, has five essential elements, which are:

1. On or about November 18, 2007, the defendant voluntarily and intentionally assaulted Juan Hernandez;
2. The assault resulted in serious bodily injury to Juan Hernandez;
3. The defendant was not acting in self defense as defined in Instruction No 14.
4. The defendant is an Indian; and
5. The alleged offense took place in Indian Country.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime as charged in the indictment, the government must prove all of these essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

“Serious bodily injury” as used in the indictment and Instruction No. 10 means bodily injury which involves:

1. a substantial risk of death;
2. extreme physical pain;
3. protracted and obvious disfigurement; or
4. protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

If you should unanimously find the defendant “Not Guilty” of the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in the indictment, or if, after all reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict as to the crime charged in the indictment, then you must proceed to determine the guilt or innocence of the defendant as to the crime of assault by striking, beating, or wounding under this instruction.

The crime of assault by striking, beating, or wounding, a lesser included offense of the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in the indictment, has four essential elements, which are:

1. On or about November 18, 2007, defendant did assault Juan Hernandez by striking, beating, or wounding him;
2. The defendant was not acting in self defense as defined in Instruction No. 14;
3. The defendant is an Indian; and
4. The alleged offense occurred in Indian country.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, a lesser included offense of the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in the indictment, the government must prove all of the essential elements of this lesser included offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant Matthew David Stymiest is an Indian. There are two elements for you to determine in deciding whether the defendant is an Indian under federal criminal jurisdiction.

The first element is whether the defendant has some Indian blood. If and only if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that Matthew Stymiest has Indian blood in him, may you then go on to consider the second element.

The second element is whether Matthew Stymiest is recognized as an Indian by the tribe or by the federal government or both. Among the factors that you may consider are:

1. enrollment in a tribe;
2. government recognition formally or informally through providing the defendant assistance reserved only to Indians;
3. tribal recognition formally or informally through subjecting the defendant to tribal court jurisdiction;
4. enjoying benefits of tribal affiliation; and
5. social recognition as an Indian through living on a reservation and participating in Indian social life, including whether the defendant holds himself out as an Indian.

It is not necessary that all of these factors be present. Rather, the jury is to consider all of the evidence in determining whether the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is an Indian.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

If a person reasonably believes that force is necessary to protect himself or another person from what he reasonably believes to be unlawful physical harm about to be inflicted by another and uses such force, then he acted in self defense or defense of others.

However, self defense which involves using force likely to cause death or great bodily harm is justified only if the person reasonably believes that such force is necessary to protect himself or the third person from what he reasonably believes to be a substantial risk of death or great bodily harm.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

Intent may be proved like anything else. You may consider any statements made and acts done by the defendant, and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in a determination of the intent of the defendant.

You may, but are not required to, infer that a person intends the natural and probable consequences of acts knowingly done or knowingly omitted.



INSTRUCTION NO. 16

You have heard testimony that the defendant made statements to Special Agent Oscar Ramirez of the Federal Bureau of Investigation . It is for you to decide:

First, whether the defendant made the statements, and

Second, if so, how much weight you should give to them.

In making these two decisions you should consider all of the evidence, including the circumstances under which the statements may have been made.

INSTRUCTION NO. 17

The indictment in this case alleges that the defendant is an Indian and that the alleged offense occurred in Indian country. The existence of those two factors is necessary in order for this Court to have jurisdiction over the case.

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that the place where the alleged incident is claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

The defendant has not, by entering this agreement or stipulation, admitted his guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to establish the fact that the place where the alleged offense is claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

Upon retiring to the jury room, you will select one of your number to act as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations, and will be your spokesperson here in Court.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.

You will take this form to the jury room and, when you have reached unanimous agreement as to your verdict, you will have your foreperson fill in, date and sign the form to state the verdict upon which you unanimously agree, and then return with your verdict to the courtroom.

INSTRUCTION NO. 19

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return any verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. Your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty, as jurors, to consult with one another, and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for himself or herself, but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with the other jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views, and change your opinion, if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence, solely because of the opinion of the other jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times, you are not partisans. You are judges—judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 20

If you have questions, you may send a note by a marshal, signed by your foreperson, or by one or more members of the jury.

You will note from the oath about to be taken by the marshal that the marshal and all other persons are forbidden to communicate in any way or manner with any member of the jury on any subject touching the merits of the case.

Bear in mind also that you are never to reveal to any person--not even to the Court--how the jury stands, numerically or otherwise, on the question of the guilt or innocence of the accused, until after you have reached a unanimous verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 21

It is proper to add a final caution.

Nothing that I have said in these instructions—and nothing that I have said or done during the trial—has been said or done to suggest to you what I think your verdict should be.

What the verdict shall be is your exclusive duty and responsibility.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
CENTRAL DIVISION

\*\*\*\*\*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

CR 08-30006

-vs-

MATTHEW DAVID STYMIEST,  
  
Defendant.

VERDICT

\*\*\*\*\*

Please return a verdict by placing an "X" in the space provided.

We, the jury in the above entitled action, as to the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury, find David Matthew Stymiest:

\_\_\_\_\_ NOT GUILTY      \_\_\_\_\_ GUILTY

If, and only if, you found David Matthew Stymiest NOT GUILTY of assault resulting in serious bodily injury, or if, after all reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict as to that crime, then you must deliberate on the lesser included offense of assault by striking, beating, or wounding, and complete the following:

We, the jury in the above entitled action, as to the crime of assault by striking, beating, or wounding, a lesser included offense of assault resulting in serious bodily injury, find David Matthew Stymiest:

\_\_\_\_\_ NOT GUILTY      \_\_\_\_\_ GUILTY

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Foreperson