

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

FILED

FEB 24 2010

[Signature]
CLERK

CENTRAL DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

HAROLD DRAPEAU, JR.,

Defendant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

CR. 09-30086-RAL

FINAL INSTRUCTIONS
TO JURY

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Members of the jury, the instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial and during the trial remain in effect. I now give you some additional instructions.

You must continue to follow the instructions I gave you earlier, as well as those I give you now. You must not single out some instructions and ignore others, because all are important.

These instructions are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room. I emphasize, however, that this does not mean they are more important than my earlier instructions. Again, all instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, must be followed.

INSTRUCTION NO. 2

It is your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You will then apply the law, as I give it to you, to those facts. You must follow my instructions on the law, even if you thought the law was different or should be different.

Do not allow sympathy or prejudice to influence you. The law demands of you a just verdict, unaffected by anything except the evidence, your common sense, and the law as I give it to you.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

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 -- this 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 that I struck from the record, or told you to disregard, is not evidence and must not be considered.
4. Anything you saw or heard about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

Finally, if you were instructed that some evidence was received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

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. 5

The indictment in this case charges that the defendant committed the crime of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer by causing bodily injury. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to that 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. Thus the defendant, even though charged, begins the trial with no evidence against him. The 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 element of the crime charged.

There is no burden upon a 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. 6

The crime of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer by causing bodily injury, as charged in the indictment, has four elements, which are:

***One*, on or about the 23rd day of August, 2009, Harold Drapeau, Jr. forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with Marlin Mousseau, a federal officer employed as a police officer by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;**

“Forcibly” means by use of force. Physical force is sufficient but actual physical contact is not required. You may also find that a person who, in fact, has the present ability to inflict bodily harm upon another and who threatens or attempts to inflict bodily harm upon such person acts forcibly. In such a case, the threat must be a present one.

***Two*, the alleged offense was done voluntarily and intentionally;**

***Three*, the alleged offense resulted in bodily injury to Marlin Mousseau; and**

***Four*, at the time of the alleged offense, Marlin Mousseau was doing what he was employed by the federal government to do and not deviating from the employer’s business for personal reasons;**

The Government also must prove by the greater weight of the evidence the following essential element: that the alleged offense took place in South Dakota.

If all of the elements of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant and it has further been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not acting in self defense as defined in Instruction No. 8, and it has further been proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged offense took place in South Dakota, then you must find the defendant guilty of the crime charged; otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7A

If, and only if, your verdict as to the charge of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer by causing bodily injury is not guilty, or if after all reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict on that charge, you should record that decision on the verdict form and go on to consider whether the defendant is guilty of the crime of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer through physical contact not causing bodily injury.

The crime of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer through physical contact not causing bodily injury has four elements, which are:

***One*, on or about the 23rd day of August, 2009, Harold Drapeau, Jr. forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with Marlin Mousseau, a federal officer employed as a police officer by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;**

“Forcibly” means by use of force. Physical force is sufficient but actual physical contact is not required. You may also find that a person who, in fact, has the present ability to inflict bodily harm upon another and who threatens or attempts to inflict bodily harm upon such person acts forcibly. In such a case, the threat must be a present one.

***Two*, the alleged offense was done voluntarily and intentionally;**

***Three*, the alleged offense resulted in physical contact but not bodily injury to Marlin Mousseau; and**

***Four*, at the time of the alleged offense, Marlin Mousseau was doing what he was employed by the federal government to do and not deviating from the employer’s business for personal reasons;**

The Government also must prove by the greater weight of the evidence the following essential element: that the alleged offense took place in South Dakota.

If all of the elements of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant and it has further been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not acting in self defense as defined in Instruction No. 8, and it has further been proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the alleged offense took place in South Dakota, then you must find the defendant guilty of the crime charged; otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7B

If, and only if, your verdict as to the charges of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer by causing bodily injury and the charge of Assaulting, Resisting, or Impeding a Federal Officer through physical contact not causing bodily injury, both are not guilty, or if after all reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict on those charges, you should record that decision on the verdict form and go on to consider whether the defendant is guilty of the crime of simple assault of a federal officer. The crime of simple assault of a federal officer, a lesser included offense of the crime charged in the indictment, has the following three essential elements:

***One*, on or about the 23rd day of August, 2009, Harold Drapeau, Jr. assaulted Marlin Mousseau, a federal officer employed as a police officer by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;**

A "simple assault" of a federal officer is conduct that forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates or interferes with a federal officer where such conduct does not involve actual physical contact, or serious bodily injury.

***Two*, the assault was done voluntarily and intentionally;**

***Three*, at the time of the assault, Marlin Mousseau was doing what he was employed by the federal government to do and not deviating from the employer's business for personal reasons;**

***Four*, that the offense took place in South Dakota.**

If all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant and it has further been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not acting in self defense as defined in Instruction No. 8, then you must find the defendant guilty of the crime of simple assault; otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8

If a person reasonably believes that force is necessary to protect himself 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.

A person is not justified in using force for the purpose of resisting arrest or other performance of duty by a law enforcement officer within the scope of his official duties. However, a person is justified in using force to resist excessive force used by a law enforcement officer.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

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. 10

The Government must prove by the greater weight of the evidence that the offense charged was begun, continued or completed in the District of South Dakota.

To prove something by the greater weight of the evidence is to prove that it is more likely true than not true. This is a lesser standard than proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The requirement of proof beyond a reasonable doubt applies to all other issues in the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

In conducting your deliberations and returning your verdict, there are certain rules you must follow. I shall list those rules for you now.

First, when you go to the jury room, you must select one of your members as your foreperson. That person will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

Second, it is your duty, as jurors, to discuss this case with one another in the jury room. You should try to reach agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment, because a verdict - whether guilty or not guilty - must be unanimous.

Each of you must make your own conscientious decision, but only after you have considered all the evidence, discussed it fully with your fellow jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors.

Do not be afraid to change your opinions if the discussion persuades you that you should. But do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right, or simply to reach a verdict.

Third, if the defendant is found guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider punishment in any way in deciding whether the Government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Fourth, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, you may send a note to me through the marshal or bailiff, signed by one or more jurors. I will respond as soon as possible either in writing or orally in open court. Remember that you should not tell anyone - including me - how your votes stand numerically.

Fifth, during your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone other than by note to me by any means about this case. You may not use any electronic device or media, such as a telephone, cell phone, smart phone, iPhone, Blackberry or computer; the internet, any internet service, or any text or instant messaging service; or any internet chat room, blog, or website such as Facebook, My Space, LinkedIn, YouTube or Twitter, to communicate to anyone information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I accept your verdict.

Sixth, your verdict must be based solely on the evidence and on the law which I have given to you in my instructions. The verdict whether guilty or not guilty must be unanimous. Nothing I have said or done is intended to suggest what your verdict should be - that is entirely for you to decide.

Finally, the verdict form is simply the written notice of the decision that you reach in this case. You will take this form to the jury room, and when each of you has agreed on the verdict, your foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the marshal or bailiff that you are ready to return to the courtroom.