#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

# **FILED**

#### **WESTERN DIVISION**

FEB 27 2008

CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) CR 07-50016
Plaintiff,	) )
vs.	) ) JURY INSTRUCTIONS
CLYDE WHITE	)
Defendant.	)
Attorney for plaintiff:	Mark A. Vargo Assistant United States Attorney 515 Ninth Street, Room 201 Rapid City, SD 57701
Attorney for defendant:	Dennis C. Whetzal P.O. Box 8285 Rapid City, SD 57709

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, of course, 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 <u>all</u> are important. This is true even though some of those I gave you at the beginning of trial are not repeated here.

The instructions I am about to give you now as well as those I gave you earlier 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, <u>all</u> instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, must be followed.

The indictment in this case charges that:

On or about August 12, 2006, at Badlands National Park, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Clyde White, then being an unlawful user of a controlled substance as defined in 21 U.S.C. § 802, did knowingly and intentionally possess a firearm, to-wit: a Beretta, model 1951E, 9 mm pistol, bearing serial number E00740, which had been previously shipped and transported in interstate and foreign commerce, all in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(3) and 924(a)(2).

The defendant has pleaded not guilty to these charges.

An indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. To the contrary, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. 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 essential element of the crime charged.

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.

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, the facts that have been stipulated — that is, formally agreed to by the parties, the facts that have been judicially noticed—this is, facts which I say you may, but are not required to, accept as true, even without evidence.

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.

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.

You should judge the testimony of the defendant in the same manner as you judge the testimony of any other witness.

Title 18, of the United States Code, section 922(g)(3) provides in pertinent part as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person . . . who is an unlawful user of . . . any controlled substance . . . to possess . . . any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

# INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The crime of Unlawful User of a Controlled Substance in Possession of a Firearm, has the following essential elements:

- 1. That on or about August 12, 2006, the defendant was an unlawful user of a controlled substance, that is marijuana or cocaine;
- 2. That the defendant knowingly possessed a firearm while he was an unlawful user of a controlled substance; and
- 3. That the firearm was transported across a state line at some time during or before the defendant's possession of it.

The government and the defendant have stipulated that the firearm in question was transported across the state line of South Dakota and if you find that defendant possessed the firearm it was transported across the state line as set forth in paragraph 3 above.

The phrase "unlawful user of a controlled substance" means a person who uses a controlled substance in a manner other than as prescribed by a licensed physician. The defendant must have been actively engaged in the use of a controlled substance during the time he possessed the firearm, but the law does not require that he used the controlled substance at the precise time he possessed the firearm. Such use is not limited to the use of drugs on a particular day, or within a matter of days or weeks before, but rather that the unlawful use has occurred recently enough to indicate that

the individual is actively engaged in such conduct.

You are instructed that marijuana and cocaine are controlled substances.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, the government must prove all of these essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt; otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty.

The government is not required to prove that the defendant knew that his acts or omissions were unlawful. An act is done knowingly if the defendant is aware of the act and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. You may consider evidence of the defendant's words, acts, or omissions, along with all other evidence, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly.

### INSTRUCTION NO. $\underline{q}$

The law recognizes several kinds of possession. A person may have actual possession or constructive possession. A person may have sole or joint possession.

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is then in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, has both the power and the intention at a given time to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in constructive possession of it.

If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

Whenever the word "possession" has been used in these instructions it includes actual as well as constructive possession and also sole as well as joint possession.

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.

You have heard testimony from individuals described as experts. A person who, by knowledge, skill, training, education or experience, has become expert in some field may state their opinion 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.

The testimony of a witness may be discredited or impeached by showing that he or she previously made statements which are inconsistent with his or her present testimony. The earlier contradictory statements are admissible only to impeach the credibility of the witness, and not to establish the truth of these statements. It is the province of the jury to determine the credibility, if any, to be given the testimony of a witness who has been impeached.

If a witness is shown knowingly to have testified falsely concerning any material matter, you have a right to distrust such witness's testimony in other particulars; and you may reject all the testimony of that witness or give it such credibility as you may think it deserved.

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 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, 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 that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

Dated this 27 day of February, 2008.

RICHARD H. BATTEY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE