

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

KENT HAZELRIGG,

Defendant.

No. CR 08-50062-04-KES

**FINAL
INSTRUCTIONS
TO THE JURY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINAL INSTRUCTION

NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
NO. 2 - "INTENT" AND "KNOWLEDGE"	2
NO. 3 - CONSPIRACY TO DISTRIBUTE METHAMPHETAMINE	3
NO. 4 - ACTS AND STATEMENTS OF CO-CONSPIRATORS	10
NO. 5 - DRUG USE	11
NO. 6 - IMPEACHMENT	12
NO. 7 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF ..	14
NO. 8 - REASONABLE DOUBT	15
NO. 9 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE	16
NO. 10 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS	18

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 – “INTENT” AND “KNOWLEDGE”

“Intent” and “knowledge” are elements of the offenses charged in this case and must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. The prosecution 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 the other evidence, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 3 – CONSPIRACY TO DISTRIBUTE
METHAMPHETAMINE

The superseding indictment charges that, no later than August 2007, and continuing through April 2008, in the District of South Dakota and elsewhere, the defendant, Kent Hazelrigg, did knowingly and intentionally combine, conspire, confederate, and agree with others known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to knowingly and intentionally distribute and possess with the intent to distribute 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of methamphetamine, its salts, isomers and salts of its isomers.

Elements

For you to find Kent Hazelrigg guilty of the “conspiracy” offense charged in the superseding indictment, the prosecution must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

One, that at a time no later than August 2007, and continuing through April 2008, two or more persons reached an agreement or came to an understanding to possess with the intent to distribute, or to distribute, a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine;

The prosecution must prove that the defendant reached an agreement or understanding with at least one other person. It makes no difference whether that person is a defendant or named in the superseding indictment.

The “agreement or understanding” need not be an express or formal agreement or be in writing or cover all the details of how it is to be carried out. Nor is it necessary that the members have directly stated between themselves the details or purpose of the scheme.

The superseding indictment charges a conspiracy to commit two separate crimes or offenses, namely

possession with intent to distribute methamphetamine and distribution of methamphetamine. It is not necessary for the prosecution to prove a conspiracy to commit both of those offenses. It would be sufficient if the prosecution proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, a conspiracy to commit *one* of those offenses; but, in that event, in order to return a verdict of guilty, you must unanimously agree upon *which* of the two offenses was the subject of the conspiracy. If you cannot agree in that manner, you must find the defendant not guilty.

To assist you in determining whether there was an agreement or understanding to possess with the intent to distribute methamphetamine, which was one of the alleged objectives of the conspiracy, you should consider the elements of a "possession with intent to distribute" offense. The elements of possession with intent to distribute methamphetamine are the following: (1) a person was in possession of methamphetamine; (2) the person knew that he was, or intended to be, in possession of a controlled substance; and (3) the person intended to distribute some or all of the methamphetamine to another person.

To assist you in determining whether there was an agreement or understanding to distribute methamphetamine, which was the other alleged objective of the conspiracy, you should consider the elements of a "distribution" offense. The elements of distribution of methamphetamine are the following: (1) a person intentionally distributed methamphetamine to another; and (2) at the time of the distribution, the person knew that what he was distributing was a controlled substance.

To find the defendant guilty of the "conspiracy" charged in the superseding indictment, you do not have to find that the offense of possession with the intent to distribute methamphetamine or distribution of methamphetamine was actually committed by the

defendant or anyone else. It is the agreement to distribute or to possess with the intent to distribute methamphetamine that is illegal, so that is the conduct that has been charged in the superseding indictment, and what must be proved to establish the defendant's guilt on that charge.

Two, that Kent Hazelrigg voluntarily and intentionally joined in the agreement or understanding, either at the time it was first reached or at some later time while it was still in effect;

You should understand that merely being present at the scene of an event, or merely acting in the same way as others or merely associating with others, does not prove that a person has joined in an agreement or understanding. A person who has no knowledge of a conspiracy but who happens to act in a way which advances some purpose of one, does not thereby become a member. Similarly, the mere knowledge of an illegal act or association by a defendant with an individual engaged in the illegal conduct of a conspiracy is not enough to prove a person has joined the conspiracy.

On the other hand, a person may join in an agreement or understanding, as required by this element, without knowing all the details of the agreement or understanding, and without knowing who all the other members are. Further, it is not necessary that a person agree to play any particular part in carrying out the agreement or understanding. A person may become a member of a conspiracy even if that person agrees to play only a minor part in the conspiracy, as long as that person has an understanding of the unlawful nature of the plan and voluntarily and intentionally joins in it.

In deciding whether the defendant voluntarily and intentionally joined in the agreement, you must consider only evidence of his own actions and statements. You may not consider actions and pretrial

statements of others, except to the extent that pretrial statements of others describe something that has been said or done by the defendant.

And three, that at the time Kent Hazelrigg joined in the agreement or understanding, he knew the purpose of the agreement or understanding.

For you to find the defendant guilty of “conspiracy,” as charged in the superseding indictment, the prosecution must prove all of the essential elements of this offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find him not guilty of the “conspiracy” charge.

Quantity of methamphetamine

If you find the defendant guilty of the “conspiracy” offense alleged in the superseding indictment, you must also determine beyond a reasonable doubt the quantity of methamphetamine involved in the conspiracy for which the defendant can be held responsible. The prosecution does not have to prove that the offense involved the amount or quantity of methamphetamine charged in the superseding indictment, although the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the quantity of methamphetamine actually involved in the offense for which the defendant can be held responsible. Therefore, you must ascertain whether or not the controlled substance in question was in fact methamphetamine, as charged in the superseding indictment, and you must determine beyond a reasonable doubt the amount of the methamphetamine involved in the offense for which the defendant can be held responsible. In so doing, you may consider all of the evidence in the case that may aid in the determination of these issues.

A defendant guilty of conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine, as charged in the superseding indictment, is responsible for quantities of methamphetamine that he actually distributed or agreed to distribute. Such a

defendant is also responsible for those quantities of methamphetamine that fellow conspirators distributed or agreed to distribute, if you find that the defendant could have reasonably foreseen, at the time he joined the conspiracy or while the conspiracy lasted, that those prohibited acts were a necessary or natural consequence of the conspiracy.

You must determine the *total quantity* of the controlled substance involved in the conspiracy for which the defendant can be held responsible. You must indicate the *range* within which that *total quantity* falls. You must determine that *total quantity* in terms of grams of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of methamphetamine. In making your determination of quantity as required, it may be helpful to remember that one pound is equal to 453.6 grams, that one ounce is equal to 28.35 grams, and that one kilogram is equal to 1000 grams.

Again, you must determine *beyond a reasonable doubt* the quantity of methamphetamine involved in the conspiracy for which the defendant can be held responsible.

Lesser Included Offense – Conspiracy to Possess Methamphetamine

If your verdict under this instruction is not guilty of conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine, or if after all reasonable efforts you are unable to reach a verdict on this charge, you should record that decision on the verdict form and go on to consider whether the defendant is guilty of the crime of conspiracy to possess methamphetamine. The crime of conspiracy to possess methamphetamine, a lesser included offense of the crime charged in the superseding indictment, has the following three essential elements:

One, that at a time no later than August 2007, and continuing through April 2008, two or more persons reached an agreement or came to an understanding to possess a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine;

The prosecution must prove that the defendant reached an agreement or understanding with at least one other person. It makes no difference whether that person is a defendant or named in the superseding indictment.

The “agreement or understanding” need not be an express or formal agreement or be in writing or cover all the details of how it is to be carried out. Nor is it necessary that the members have directly stated between themselves the details or purpose of the scheme.

To assist you in determining whether there was an agreement or understanding to possess methamphetamine, you should consider the elements of a “possession” offense. The elements of possession of methamphetamine are the following: (1) that a person was in possession of methamphetamine; and (2) the person knew that he was, or intended to be, in possession of a controlled substance.

To find the defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of “conspiracy to possess methamphetamine,” you do not have to find that the offense of possession of methamphetamine was actually committed by the defendant or anyone else. It is the agreement to possess methamphetamine that is illegal, so that is the conduct that has been charged in the lesser included offense, and what must be proved to establish the defendant’s guilt on that charge.

Two, that Kent Hazelrigg voluntarily and intentionally joined in the agreement or understanding, either at the time it was first reached or at some later time while it was still in effect;

The term “agreement or understanding” was previously explained for you in this instruction.

And three, that at the time Kent Hazelrigg joined in the agreement or understanding, he knew the purpose of the agreement or understanding.

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

~~***Quantity of methamphetamine***~~

~~If you find the defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of “conspiracy to possess methamphetamine,” you must also determine beyond a reasonable doubt the quantity of methamphetamine involved in the conspiracy for which the defendant can be held responsible as previously explained in this instruction.~~

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 4 –
ACTS AND STATEMENTS OF CO-CONSPIRATORS

You may consider acts knowingly done and statements knowingly made by a defendant's co-conspirators during the existence of the conspiracy and in furtherance of it as evidence pertaining to the defendant even though they were done or made in the absence of and without the knowledge of the defendant. This includes acts done or statements made before the defendant had joined the conspiracy, for a person who knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally joins an existing conspiracy is responsible for all of the conduct of the co-conspirators from the beginning of the conspiracy.

Acts and statements which are made before the conspiracy began or after it ended are admissible only against the person making them and should not be considered by you against any other defendant.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 5 – DRUG USE

One of the issues in this case is whether the defendant was taking drugs at the time the acts charged in the superseding indictment were committed. Being under the influence of a drug provides a legal excuse for the commission of a crime only if the effect of the drug makes it impossible for the defendant to have voluntarily and intentionally joined in the agreement or understanding, or to have known the purpose of the agreement or understanding. Evidence that the defendant acted while under the influence of drugs may be considered by you, together with all the other evidence, in determining whether or not he did in fact voluntarily and intentionally join in the agreement or understanding and knew the purpose of the agreement or understanding.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 6 – 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.

You have heard evidence that Alysia Herrick, Barbara Church, Sue Vlcek, Perry Arpan, Roberta Thiesing, and Chris Kujawa have been convicted of a crime. You may use that evidence only to help you decide whether or not to believe these witnesses and how much weight to give their testimony.

Similarly, you have heard evidence that Alysia Herrick and Chris Kujawa have pleaded guilty to charges that are alleged to have arisen out of the same events for which the defendant is now on trial. You cannot consider such a witness’s guilty plea as any evidence of the guilt of the defendant. Rather, you can consider such a witness’s guilty plea only for the purpose of determining how much, if at all, to rely upon his or her testimony.

You should treat the testimony of certain witnesses with greater caution and care than that of other witnesses:

1. You have heard testimony from Alysia Herrick and Chris Kujawa stating that they participated in the crime charged against the defendant. Their testimony was received in evidence and may be

considered by you. You may give their testimony such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not their testimony may be influenced by their desire to please the Government or to strike a good bargain with the Government about their own situations is for you to determine.

2. You have also heard evidence that Alysia Herrick testified that she believed that she was under a grant of immunity and may be testifying in the hope that the government will not file further charges against her. Her testimony was received in evidence and you may consider it. You may give her testimony such weight as you think it deserves. Whether or not her testimony may have been influenced by her hope that the Government will not file charges against her is for you to determine.

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. 7 – PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND
BURDEN OF PROOF

Kent Hazelrigg 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 the defendant throughout the trial. That presumption alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the prosecution proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of a 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. 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 Kent Hazelrigg has committed each and every element of the offense charged in the superseding indictment against him, you must find him not guilty of that offense.

