

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

CR 10-40088

Plaintiff,

-vs-

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

JAVIER MUNOZ-RUIZ,

Defendant.

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

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 all are important. This is true even though some of those I gave you at the beginning of the trial are not repeated here.

The instructions I am about to give you now 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, 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 a defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find that defendant 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

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. 10

You have heard testimony from a person described as an expert. Persons who, by knowledge, skill, training, education or experience, have become 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

The Indictment in this case charges that on or about July 22, 2010, in the District of South Dakota, defendant Javier Munoz-Ruiz, an alien, after having been previously deported from the United States on or about August 18, 2004, at Nogales, Arizona, was found in the United States in the District of South Dakota, without having obtained the consent of the Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland Security or the Attorney General of the United States to apply for lawful admission into the United States, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a).

The defendant, Javier Munoz-Ruiz, has pleaded not guilty to the charge made against him, and is presumed to be innocent unless and until the Government proves him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

As I told you at the beginning of the trial, an Indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. To the contrary, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. Thus the defendant, even though charged, begins the trial with no evidence against him. 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..

There is no burden upon a defendant to prove that he 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. 12

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. 13

Section 1326(a) of Title 8 of the United States Code provides, in pertinent part:

. . . [A]ny alien who —

(1) has been . . . deported, or removed or has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding, and thereafter

(2) enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, unless . . . prior to his reembarkation at a place outside the United States . . . the Attorney General or the Secretary of the United States Department of Homeland Security has expressly consented to such alien's reapplying for admission . . .

shall be guilty of an offense against the United States.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

The crime of illegal reentry after deportation, as charged in the Indictment, has four essential elements, which are:

First, the defendant, Javier Munoz-Ruiz, is an alien;

Second, the defendant was deported from the United States prior to the time of the offense alleged in the Indictment;

Third, after he was deported, the defendant was found in the United States;

Fourth, at the time he was found in the United States, the defendant had not obtained the consent of the United States Department of Homeland Security or the Attorney General of the United States to apply for readmission into the United States.

If all four of these essential elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant, Javier Munoz-Ruiz, then you must find the defendant guilty of the crime charged in the Indictment. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

An alien is a person who is not a natural-born or naturalized citizen of the United States.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

The Indictment charges that the offense was committed “on or about” a certain date.

Although it is necessary for the Government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on dates reasonably near the dates alleged in the Indictment, it is not necessary for the Government to prove that the offense was committed precisely on the dates charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 17

In conducting your deliberations and returning your verdicts, 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 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, 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. 17, continued

Fifth, your verdict 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 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 upon 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

During your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone by any means about this case. You may not use any electronic device or media, such as a telephone, cell phone, smart phone, iPhone, Blackberry or computer; the internet, any internet service, or any text or instant messaging service; or any internet chat room, blog, or website such as Facebook, My Space, LinkedIn, YouTube or Twitter, to communicate to anyone any information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I accept your verdict.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CR 10-40088

Plaintiff,

-vs-

VERDICT FORM

JAVIER MUNOZ-RUIZ,

Defendant.

Please return your verdict by placing an "X" or "√" in the appropriate space below.

We, the jury in the above entitled and numbered case, as to the crime of illegal reentry after deportation, as charged in the Indictment, find the defendant, Javier Munoz-Ruiz:

_____ NOT GUILTY

_____ GUILTY

Dated this _____ day of October, 2010.

Foreperson