

FILED
JUN 06 2007
[Signature]
CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CR 06-40128-02

Plaintiff,

-vs-

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

JESSE LYNN HINTZ,

Defendant.

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Members of the jury, the instructions I am about to give you 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.

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

There is nothing particularly different in the way that you should consider the evidence in a trial from that in which any reasonable and careful person would treat any very important question that must be resolved by examining facts, opinions, and evidence. You are expected to use your good sense in considering and evaluating the evidence in the case for only those purposes for which it has been received and to give such evidence a reasonable and fair construction in the light of your common knowledge of the natural tendencies and inclinations of human beings.

Keep constantly in mind that it would be a violation of your sworn duty to base a verdict upon anything other than the evidence received in the case and the instructions of the Court. Remember as well that the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence because the burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt is always assumed by the government.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

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 any facts that have been stipulated—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 will 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. 5

There are two types of evidence which are generally presented during a trial—direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who asserts or claims to have actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances indicating the existence of a fact. The law makes absolutely no distinction between the weight or value to be given to either direct 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 her not guilty.

INSTRUCTION NO. 6

If any reference by the Court or by counsel to matters of testimony or exhibits does not coincide with your own recollection of that evidence, it is your recollection which should control during your deliberations and not the statements of the Court or of counsel.

You are the sole judges of the evidence received in this case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

If you took notes during the trial, your notes should be used only as memory aids. You should not give your notes precedence over your independent recollection of the evidence. If you did not take notes, you should rely on your own independent recollection of the proceedings and you should not be influenced by the notes of other jurors. I emphasize that notes are not entitled to any greater weight than the recollection or impression of each juror as to what the testimony may have been.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8

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. 9

You have heard evidence that Jennifer Pierce has pleaded guilty to a crime which arose out of the same events for which the Defendant is on trial here. You must not consider that guilty plea as any evidence of this Defendant's guilt. You may consider that witness's guilty plea only for the purpose of determining how much, if at all, to rely upon that witness's testimony and as Pierce's acknowledgment of her participation in the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

You have heard evidence that Jennifer Pierce has made a plea agreement with the Government and her sentencing is scheduled in the future. The Government has indicated that its position at Pierce's sentencing will be impacted by the truthfulness of Pierce's trial testimony and whether her testimony differs substantially from accounts she previously gave to investigators. Her testimony was received in evidence and may be considered by you. You may give her testimony such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not her testimony may have been influenced by the Government's promise is for you to determine.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10 A

You have heard evidence that Joseph Marshall has made an agreement with the Government regarding his willingness to assist the government in this case. The Government's position at Marshall's sentencing was impacted by Marshall's willingness to give assistance. His testimony was received in evidence and may be considered by you. You may give his testimony such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not his testimony may have been influenced by the Government's agreement is for you to determine.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

Your decision on the facts of this case should not be determined by the number of witnesses testifying for or against a party. You should consider all the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses you choose to believe or not believe. 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. 12

You must presume that the Defendant is innocent of the crimes charged against her. The indictment is only a formal method of beginning a criminal case. It does not create any presumption of guilt; it is merely an accusation. The fact that a person has been indicted does not create any inference, nor is it evidence, that she is guilty of a crime. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit the Defendant unless you as jurors are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the Defendant's guilt of the crimes charged from all the evidence that has been introduced in the case against her.

The burden is always upon the prosecution to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to a 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. Unless the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Defendant committed each and every element of the crimes charged against her in the Superseding Indictment, you must find the Defendant not guilty.

There is no burden upon the Defendant to prove that she 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. 13

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. 14

Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment charges that between on or about August 21, 2006 and August 23, 2006, in the District of South Dakota, the Defendant, Jesse Lynn Hintz, wilfully harbored or concealed Jeremy Provancial or Joseph Marshall, two escaped prisoners, after they had escaped from the custody of the Attorney General, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1072.

Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment charges that between on or about August 21, 2006 and August 23, 2006, in the District of South Dakota, the Defendant Jesse Lynn Hintz, rescued, aided or assisted the escapes of Jeremy Provancial or Joseph Marshall, two escaped prisoners who were, at the time of their escape, committed to the custody of the Attorney General by virtue of felony convictions, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 752(a).

The Defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charges against her, and she is presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves her guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

The Superseding Indictment charges that the offenses alleged were committed “between on or about” certain dates. Although it is necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the dates alleged in the Superseding Indictment, it is not necessary for the government to prove that the offenses were committed precisely on the dates charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

Section 752(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code provides, in pertinent part, that:

Whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids or assists the escape, or attempt to escape, of any person ... committed to the custody of the Attorney General or to any institution or facility by his direction, shall [be guilty of an offense against the United States].

Section 1072 of Title 18 of the United States Code provides, in pertinent part, that:

Whoever willfully harbors or conceals any prisoner after his escape from the custody of the Attorney General or from a Federal penal or correctional institution, [shall be guilty of an offense against the United States].

INSTRUCTION NO. 17

The crime of harboring or concealing escaped prisoners, as charged in Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment, has two essential elements, which are:

- One, Jeremy Provancial or Joseph Marshall escaped from the Glory House in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, where they were in the custody of the United States Attorney General; and
- Two, thereafter, between on or about August 21, 2006 and August 23, 2006, the Defendant, Jesse Lynn Hintz, voluntarily and intentionally harbored or concealed Jeremy Provancial or Joseph Marshall.

If you find these two elements unanimously and beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the Defendant guilty of the crime of harboring or concealing escaped prisoners, otherwise you must find the Defendant not guilty of this crime. Record your determination on the Verdict Form that is submitted to you with these instructions.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

The terms "harbor" and "conceal" mean any physical act of providing assistance, including food and shelter, and other assistance to aid the prisoner in avoiding detection and apprehension.

INSTRUCTION NO. 19

The crime of instigating or assisting escape, as charged in Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment, has three essential elements, which are:

One, Jeremy Provancial or Joseph Marshall left the Glory House in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, where they were in the custody of the United States Attorney General, without permission;

Two, between on or about August 21, 2006 and August 23, 2006, the Defendant, Jesse Lynn Hintz, rescued, instigated, aided or assisted in the escape of Jeremy Provincial or Joseph Marshall from the Glory House; and

Three, Defendant Jesse Lynn Hintz knew that Jeremy Provincial or Joseph Marshall did not have permission to leave the Glory House;

If you find these three elements unanimously and beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the Defendant guilty of the crime of aiding and assisting the escaped prisoners, otherwise you must find the Defendant not guilty of this crime. Record your determination on the Verdict Form that is submitted to you with these instructions.

INSTRUCTION NO. 20

The crime of aiding an escapee terminates once the escapee has reached temporary safety. After that point in time, aid to the fugitive is no longer aiding the escape, although it may be evidence of harboring and concealing.

INSTRUCTION NO. 21

In conducting your deliberations and returning your verdict, there are certain rules you must follow. I will 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 your verdicts – 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, you may send a note to me through the marshal, 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 vote stands numerically.

INSTRUCTION NO. 21, continued

Fifth, your verdicts must be based solely on the evidence and on the law which I have given to you in my instructions. Nothing I have said or done is intended to suggest what your verdicts 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 upon the verdicts, your foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the marshal that you are ready to return to the courtroom.