

**FILED**

MAY 10 2012

  
CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR. 11-50128-JLV
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	FINAL INSTRUCTIONS
	)	TO THE JURY
vs.	)	
	)	
JAMES LADEAUX,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FINAL INSTRUCTION:

NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION ..... 2

NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS ..... 3

NO. 3 - PRELIMINARY MATTERS ..... 5

NO. 4 - ASSAULT ON A FEDERAL OFFICER WITH A DANGEROUS WEAPON ..... 6

NO. 5 - PROOF OF INTENT OR KNOWLEDGE ..... 9

NO. 6 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF. 10

NO. 7 - REASONABLE DOUBT ..... 11

NO. 8 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE ..... 12

NO. 9 - STATEMENTS BY DEFENDANT ..... 14

NO. 10 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES ..... 15

NO. 11 - IMPEACHMENT ..... 16

NO. 12 - EXPERT WITNESSES ..... 17

NO. 13 - OBJECTIONS ..... 18

NO. 14 - USE OF NOTES ..... 19

NO. 15 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE ..... 20

NO. 16 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS ..... 22

VERDICT FORM .....

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION**

Members of the jury, the written instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial and any oral instructions I gave you during the trial remain in effect. All instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, are equally binding on you and must be followed.

The final instructions I am about to give you will be available in the jury room. These instructions explain the law that applies to this case. You must consider my instructions as a whole and not single out some instructions and ignore others.

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS**

This is a criminal case brought by the United States government against the defendant, James LaDeaux. The defendant is charged with the offense of assault on a federal officer with a dangerous weapon. Your duty is to decide from the evidence whether the defendant is not guilty or guilty of the offense charged against him. You will find the facts from the evidence presented in court. "Evidence" is defined in Final Instruction No. 8. You are entitled to consider that evidence in light of your own observations and experiences. You may use reason and common sense to draw conclusions from facts established by the evidence. You will then apply the law to the facts to reach your verdict. You are the sole judges of the facts, but you must follow the law as stated in my instructions, whether you agree with the law or not.

It is vital to the administration of justice that each of you faithfully perform your duties as jurors. Do not allow sympathy or prejudice to influence you. The law demands of you a just verdict based solely on the evidence, your common sense, and the law as I give it to you. Do not take anything I said or did during the trial as an indication of what I think about the evidence or what I think your verdict should be. Do not conclude from any ruling or comment I made that I have any opinion on how you should decide the case.

Please remember only Mr. LaDeaux, not anyone else, is on trial here.  
Also, remember Mr. LaDeaux is on trial only for the offense charged against  
him, not for anything else.

### **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 3 - PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

An offense consists of “elements” which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt in order to convict the defendant of that offense. To help you evaluate the evidence, I will give you the elements that make up the offense charged in the indictment. However, I must first explain some preliminary matters.

The charge against the defendant is set out in an indictment. An indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. The defendant pled not guilty to the charge brought against him. Therefore, the defendant is presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of the offense charged.

The indictment charges the offense was committed “on or about” a certain date. The government does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of the offense charged. It is sufficient if the evidence establishes that the offense occurred within a reasonable time of the date alleged in the indictment.

**FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 4 -**

**ASSAULT ON A FEDERAL OFFICER WITH A DANGEROUS WEAPON**

The indictment charges that on or about September 5, 2011, at Pine Ridge, in the District of South Dakota, James LaDeaux, did forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with Clayton Ten Fingers, while Officer Ten Fingers was employed pursuant to federal law as a law enforcement officer with the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Department of Public Safety, and while Officer Ten Fingers was engaged in the performance of his official duties, and in doing so, James LaDeaux utilized a dangerous weapon, that is, a knife.

***Elements***

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of assault on a federal officer with a dangerous weapon as charged in the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, that on or about September 5, 2011, James LaDeaux forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with Oglala Sioux Tribe, Department of Public Safety Officer Clayton Ten Fingers;**

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

An “assault” is any intentional and voluntary attempt or threat to do injury to the person of another, when coupled with the apparent present ability to do so sufficient to put the person against whom the attempt is made in fear of immediate bodily harm.

**Two, that Mr. LaDeaux used a dangerous weapon in the commission of the act;**

A “dangerous weapon” is any object used in a manner likely to endanger life or inflict serious bodily harm.

**Three, that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally; and**

**Four, that at the time of the act, Clayton Ten Fingers was an officer with the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Department of Public Safety and was doing what he was employed by the Tribe to do.**

You are instructed Clayton Ten Fingers was a federal officer at the time alleged in the indictment. The defendant need not know Clayton Ten Fingers was a federal officer. You must still determine whether Clayton Ten Fingers, at the time of the act, was an officer with the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Department of Public Safety, and whether he was doing what he was employed by the Tribe to do.

“Doing what he was employed by the Tribe to do” means simply acting within the scope of what that person is employed to do. The test is whether the officer’s actions fall within the agency’s overall mission, in contrast to engaging in a personal frolic of his own.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of assault on a federal officer with a dangerous weapon as charged in the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government

proves all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense.

**FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 5 - PROOF OF INTENT**

Intent may be proven 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 defendant's intent.

**FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 6 -**

**PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF**

The defendant is presumed innocent and, therefore, not guilty. This presumption of innocence requires you to put aside all suspicion that might arise from the arrest or charge of the defendant or the fact he is here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial. This presumption alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of the offense charged.

The burden is always on the government to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to the defendant to prove his innocence, for the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence. The defendant is not even obligated to cross-examine the witnesses called to testify by the government. The fact the defendant did not testify must not be considered by you in any way or even discussed in arriving at your verdict.

If the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt all the essential elements of the offense charged in the indictment, you must find the defendant guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any essential element of the offense charged in the indictment, you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense.

**FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 7 - REASONABLE DOUBT**

A reasonable doubt may arise from the evidence or lack of evidence produced during trial. 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 must be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it in the more serious and important affairs of life. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 8 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE**

I mentioned the word “evidence.” “Evidence” includes the testimony of witnesses and documents and other things received as exhibits. Certain things are *not* evidence. I shall list those things for you now:

1. Statements, arguments, questions, and comments by lawyers representing the parties in the case are not evidence. Opening statements and closing arguments by lawyers are not evidence.
2. Objections and rulings on 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. Anything you see or hear about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

The fact an exhibit was shown to you does not mean you must rely on it more than you rely on other evidence.

Furthermore, transcripts of recordings were received for a limited purpose only. That is, they can be used by you only for one particular purpose and not for any other purpose. I told you when that occurred and instructed you on the purposes for which the transcripts can and cannot be used.

Some of you may have heard the terms “direct evidence” and “circumstantial evidence.” You should not be concerned with those terms. The law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence. You should give all evidence the weight and value you believe it is entitled to receive.

The weight of the evidence is not determined by the number of witnesses testifying as to the existence or non-existence of any fact. Also, the weight of the evidence should not be determined merely by the number or volume of documents or exhibits. The weight of evidence depends on its quality, not quantity. The quality and weight of the evidence are for you to decide.

**FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 9 - STATEMENTS BY DEFENDANT**

You have heard testimony the defendant made statements to others.

It is for you to decide:

*First*, whether the defendant made the statements and

*Second*, if so, how much weight you should give the statements.

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

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 10 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES**

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 says, 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 see or hear the things testified about; the witness's memory; any motives the witness may have for testifying a certain way; the behavior of the witness while testifying; whether the witness said something different at an earlier time; the witness's drug or alcohol use or addiction, if any; 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 people sometimes see or hear things differently and sometimes forget things. You need to consider whether a contradiction results from an innocent misrecollection or sincere lapse of memory or instead from an intentional falsehood or pretended lapse of memory.

Finally, just because a witness works in law enforcement or is employed by the government does not mean you should give more weight or credibility to the witness's testimony than you give to any other witness's testimony.

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 11 - IMPEACHMENT**

In the last instruction, I instructed you generally on the credibility of witnesses. I now instruct you further on how the credibility of a witness may be “impeached” and how you may treat certain evidence.

A witness may be discredited or impeached by contradictory evidence; by a showing that the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter; or by evidence that at some other time the witness said or did something, or failed to say or do something, that is inconsistent with the witness’s present testimony. If earlier statements of a witness were admitted into evidence, they were not admitted to prove that the contents of those statements were true. Instead, you may consider those earlier statements only to determine whether you think they are consistent or inconsistent with the trial testimony of the witness and therefore whether they affect the credibility of that witness.

If you believe a witness has been discredited or impeached, it is your exclusive right to give that witness’s testimony whatever weight you think it deserves.

**FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 12 - EXPERT WITNESSES**

You may have heard testimony from a person described as an expert. Persons who, by knowledge, skill, training, education or experience, have become an expert in some field may state their opinions on matters in that field and may also state the reasons for their opinion.

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.

### **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 13 - OBJECTIONS**

The lawyers made objections during the trial that I ruled upon. If I sustained an objection to a question before it was answered, do not draw any inferences or conclusions from the question itself. The lawyers have a duty to object to testimony or other evidence they believe is not properly admissible. Do not hold it against a lawyer or the party the lawyer represents because the lawyer made objections.

### **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 14 - USE OF NOTES**

You must make your decision based on the evidence. We have an official court reporter making a record of the trial. However, we will not have a typewritten transcript of the trial available for your use in reaching a verdict.

Notes you took during the trial are not necessarily more reliable than your memory or another juror's memory. Therefore, you should not be overly influenced by the notes.

At the end of the trial, you may take your notes out of the notebook and keep them or leave them, and we will destroy them. No one will read the notes.

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 15 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE**

A verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. Your verdict as to the defendant must be unanimous. It is your duty to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view to reaching agreement if you can do so without violence to your individual judgment. Of course, you must not surrender your honest convictions as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinions of other jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but you should do so only after considering the evidence with your fellow jurors.

In the course of your deliberations you should not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if you are convinced it is wrong. To bring twelve minds to a unanimous result, you must examine the questions submitted to you openly and frankly with proper regard for the opinions of others and with a willingness to re-examine your own views.

Remember that if, in your individual judgment, the evidence fails to establish the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on the offense charged against him, then the defendant should have your vote for a not guilty verdict. If all of you reach the same conclusion, then the verdict of the jury must be not guilty for the defendant. Of course, the opposite also applies. If, in your individual judgment, the evidence establishes the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on the offense charged against him, then your vote

should be for a verdict of guilty against the defendant. If all of you reach that conclusion, then the verdict of the jury must be guilty for the defendant. As I instructed you earlier, the burden is upon the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt every essential element of the offense charged.

Remember also that the question before you can never be whether the government wins or loses the case. The government, as well as society, always wins when justice is done, regardless of whether your verdict is not guilty or guilty.

Finally, remember that you are not partisans. You are judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence. You are the judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight of the evidence.

You may conduct your deliberations as you choose. However, I suggest you carefully consider all of the evidence bearing upon the questions before you. You may take all the time you feel is necessary.

There is no reason to think that another trial would be tried in a better way or that a more conscientious, impartial, or competent jury would be selected to hear it. Any future jury must be selected in the same manner and from the same source as you. If you should fail to agree on a verdict, the defendant's case is left open and must be resolved at some later time.

## **FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 16 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS**

There are certain rules you must follow while conducting your deliberations and returning your verdict:

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

*Second*, if the defendant is found guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider punishment of the defendant in any way in deciding whether the government has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt as to the offense charged in the indictment.

*Third*, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, you may send a note to me through the court security officer, signed by one or more jurors. After conferring with the lawyers, I will respond as soon as possible, either in writing or orally in open court. Remember you should not tell anyone—including me—how your votes stand numerically.

*Fourth*, your verdict must be based solely on the evidence and on the law contained in these instructions. **The verdict, whether not guilty or 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 you reach in this case. You will take this form to the jury room. When you have

unanimously agreed on a verdict, the foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the court security officer that you have reached a verdict. You will then return to the courtroom where your verdict will be received and announced.

Dated May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY D. VIKEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

)

CR. 11-50128-JLV

Plaintiff,

)

)

VERDICT

vs.

)

)

JAMES LADEAUX,

)

)

Defendant.

)

We, the jury, duly empaneled and sworn to try the issues in this case, unanimously find the defendant James LaDeaux \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") of Assault on a Federal Officer with a Dangerous Weapon as charged in the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Foreperson