

**FILED**

**JAN 30 2008**

  
CLERK

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JUBAL RIDER RATTLER,

Defendant.

No. CR 07-50090-01-KES

**FINAL  
INSTRUCTIONS  
TO THE JURY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FINAL INSTRUCTION . . . . .	1
NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
NO. 2 - LARCENY . . . . .	2
NO. 3 - ALIBI . . . . .	4
NO. 4 - IMPEACHMENT . . . . .	5
NO. 5 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF . .	6
NO. 6 - REASONABLE DOUBT . . . . .	7
NO. 7 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE . . . . .	8
NO. 8 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS . . . . .	10

**VERDICT FORM**

## FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION

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

The instructions I am about to give you, as well as the preliminary instructions given to you at the beginning of the trial, are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room. *All* instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, must be followed. This is true even though some of the instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial are not repeated here.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 2 - LARCENY

The indictment charges that, on or about October 31, 2006, in Indian Country, in the District of South Dakota, Jubal Rider Rattler, an Indian, did unlawfully take and carry away, with the intent to steal and purloin, the personal property of another, namely a 2004 Mitsubishi Gallant belonging to Lynelle Eagle Bull, of value in excess of \$1,000.00.

***Elements***

For you to find Jubal Rider Rattler guilty of Larceny, as charged in the indictment, the prosecution must prove each of the following five essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

***One, that on or about October 31, 2006, Mr. Rattler did unlawfully take a 2004 Mitsubishi Gallant automobile belonging to Lynelle Eagle Bull;***

***Two, that Mr. Rattler did so with the intent to steal or purloin the automobile;***

***Three, that the automobile has a value in excess of \$1,000; and***

***Four and Five, that the defendant is an Indian person and that the offense took place in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota.***

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

The defendant has not, by entering into 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 present to the jury the facts that the defendant is an Indian and that if the

jury finds that the alleged incident occurred, it occurred in Indian country.

For you to find the defendant guilty of Larceny, the government must prove all of these essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 3 - ALIBI

One of the issues in this case is whether the defendant was present at the time and place of the alleged crime. If, after considering all the evidence, you have a reasonable doubt that the defendant was present, then you must find him not guilty.

#### FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 4 - IMPEACHMENT

In Preliminary Instruction No. 7, I instructed you generally on the credibility of witnesses. I now give you this further instruction on how the credibility of a witness can 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 that 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. 5 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN  
OF PROOF

Jubal Rider Rattler 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 that he is here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with Mr. Rider Rattler throughout the trial. That presumption alone is sufficient to find him not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome as to Mr. Rider Rattler only if the prosecution proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of the crime charged against him.

The burden is always upon the prosecution to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to the defendant, for the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence. Therefore, the fact that the defendant did not testify must not be discussed or considered by you in any way when deliberating and arriving at your verdict. A defendant is not even obligated to produce any evidence by cross-examining the witnesses who are called to testify by the prosecution.

Unless the prosecution proves beyond a reasonable doubt that Jubal Rider Rattler committed each and every element of the offense charged in the indictment against him, you must find him not guilty of that offense.

## FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 6 - REASONABLE DOUBT

A reasonable doubt may arise from the evidence or lack of evidence produced by the prosecution. 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 in the more serious and important transactions of life. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

## FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 7 - 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 consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors.

In the course of your deliberations you should not hesitate to re-examine your own views, and to change your opinion if you are convinced it is wrong. To bring twelve minds to an 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 on that offense. If all of you reach the same conclusion, then the verdict of the jury must be not guilty for the defendant on that offense. 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, then your vote should be for a verdict of guilty against the defendant on that charge, and if all of you reach that conclusion, then the verdict of the jury must be guilty for the defendant on that charge. As I instructed you earlier, the burden is upon the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt every essential element of a crime 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, regardless of whether your verdict is not guilty or guilty, when justice is done.

Finally, remember that you are not partisans; you are judges—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 that you carefully consider all of the evidence bearing upon the questions before you. You may take all the time that you feel is necessary.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 8 - 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. That person will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

*Second*, if the defendant is guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider the punishment of Jubal Rider Rattler in any way in deciding whether the prosecution has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

*Third*, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, you may send a note to me through the marshal or court security officer, 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.**

*Fourth*, your verdict must be based solely on the evidence and on the law 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 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 court security officer that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

Dated January 30, 2008.



Karen E. Schreier  
Chief Judge