

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
WESTERN DIVISION

FILED

AUG 26 2011


CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR. 11-50029-JLV
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) FINAL INSTRUCTIONS
) TO THE JURY
)
)
JEFFREY J. GRIMES,)
)
)
Defendant.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINAL INSTRUCTION:

NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION 1
NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS 2
NO. 3 - PRELIMINARY MATTERS 4
NO. 4 - COUNT 1: MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS . . 5
NO. 5 - COUNT 2: MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS . . 7
NO. 6 - COUNT 3: MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS . . 9
NO. 7 - THREAT TO INJURE REPUTATION 11
NO. 8 - INTENT TO EXTORT 12
NO. 9 - KNOWINGLY 13
NO. 10- COUNT 4: REPEATED TELEPHONE CALLS 14
NO. 11- COUNT 5: REPEATED TELEPHONE CALLS 15
NO. 12 - REPEATED OR REPEATEDLY 16
NO. 13 - WITH INTENT TO HARASS 17
NO. 14 - COUNT 6: ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT . . 18
NO. 15 - COUNT 7: ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT . . 20
NO. 16 - COUNT 8: ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT . . 22
NO. 17 - COUNT 9: ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT . . 24
NO. 18 - COUNT 10: ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT . 26
NO. 19 - COUNT 11: ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT . 28
NO. 20 - ANONYMOUS CALLER 30

NO. 21 - WITH INTENT TO ANNOY, ABUSE, THREATEN OR HARASS	31
NO. 22 - COUNT 12: REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS	32
NO. 23 - COUNT 13: REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS	34
NO. 24 - COUNT 14: REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS	36
NO. 25 - COUNT 15: REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS	38
NO. 26 - COUNT 16: REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS	40
NO. 27 - COUNT 17: REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS	42
NO. 28 - SOLELY TO HARASS	44
NO. 29 - COUNT 18: STALKING	45
NO. 30 - COUNT 19: STALKING	47
NO. 31 - OFFENSE IN VIOLATION OF A PROTECTION ORDER ..	49
NO. 32 - INTENT	50
NO. 33 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF	51
NO. 34 - REASONABLE DOUBT	52
NO. 35 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE	53
NO. 36 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES	55
NO. 37 - IMPEACHMENT	56
NO. 38 - EXPERTS	57
NO. 39 - OBJECTIONS	58
NO. 40 - USE OF NOTES	59
NO. 41 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE	60
NO. 42 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS	62
 VERDICT FORM	

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1 - INTRODUCTION

Members of the jury, the written instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial and any oral instructions I gave you during the trial remain in effect. All instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, are equally binding on you and must be followed.

The final instructions I am about to give you are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room. These instructions explain the law that applies to this case. You must consider my instructions as a whole and not single out some instructions and ignore others.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS

This is a criminal case brought by the United States government against the defendant, Jeffrey Grimes. The defendant is charged with five different offenses contained in nineteen counts. Those alleged offenses are: mailing threatening communications, repeated telephone calls, anonymous telephone harassment, repeated harassing communication, and stalking. Your duty is to decide from the evidence whether the defendant is not guilty or guilty of each offense charged against him. You will find the facts from the evidence presented in court. "Evidence" is defined in Final Instruction No. 35. You are entitled to consider the evidence in light of your own observations and experiences. You may use reason and common sense to draw conclusions from facts established by the evidence. You will then apply the law, which I give you in these instructions, to the facts to reach your verdict. You are the sole judges of the facts, but you must follow the law as stated in my instructions, whether you agree with the law or not.

It is vital to the administration of justice that each of you faithfully perform your duties as jurors. Do not allow sympathy or prejudice to influence you. The law demands of you a just verdict based solely on the evidence, your common sense, and the law as I give it to you. Do not take anything I said or did during the trial as an indication of what I think about the evidence or what

I think your verdict should be. Do not conclude from any ruling or comment I made that I have any opinion on how you should decide the case.

Please remember only Mr. Grimes, not anyone else, is on trial here. Also, remember he is on trial only for the offenses charged against him, not for anything else.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 3 - PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Each offense consists of “elements” which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt in order to convict the defendant of that offense. To help you evaluate the evidence, I will give you the elements that make up each offense. However, I must first explain some preliminary matters.

The charges against the defendant are set out in a superseding indictment. An indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. The defendant pled not guilty to the charges brought against him. Therefore, the defendant is presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of an offense charged.

The indictment charges the offenses were committed “on or about” a certain date. The government does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of an offense charged. It is sufficient if the evidence establishes that an offense occurred within a reasonable time of the date alleged in the indictment.

In the following instructions, I will give you the elements for each offense charged in the indictment. Keep in mind that each count charges a separate offense. You must consider each count separately and return a separate verdict for each count.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 4

COUNT 1 - MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of mailing threatening communications as charged in count 1 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about between November 2009 and March 2010, in the District of South Dakota and elsewhere, Jeffrey Grimes caused to be delivered by the Postal Service according to the direction, a communication to Mark Kari, Sr., the named addressee;

Two, that the communication contained a threat to injure the reputation of the addressee or another person, that is, a threat to injure the reputation of Mark Kari, Sr., or Linda (Kari) Fall by instigating defamatory public gossip in Bison, South Dakota, about the alleged interracial and adulterous affair of Linda (Kari) Fall, or by placing defamatory engravings on this topic on the tombstone of Mark Kari, Jr., who is deceased;

A “threat to injure reputation” is defined in Final Instruction No. 7.

Three, that Mr. Grimes sent the communication with the intent to extort money or other thing of value, that is, \$10,000; and

“Intent to extort” is defined in Final Instruction No. 8.

Four, that Mr. Grimes acted knowingly.

“Knowingly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 9.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of mailing threatening communications as charged in count 1 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 5

COUNT 2 - MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of mailing threatening communications as charged in count 2 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

***One*, that on or about between November 2009 and March 2010, in the District of South Dakota and elsewhere, Jeffrey Grimes caused to be delivered by the Postal Service according to the direction, a communication to Mark Kari, Sr., the named addressee;**

***Two*, that the communication contained a threat to injure the reputation of the addressee or another person, that is, a threat to injure the reputation of Mark Kari, Sr., or Linda (Kari) Fall by sending defamatory letters to other family and Bison, South Dakota, community members regarding the interracial and adulterous affair of Linda (Kari) Fall;**

“Threat to injure reputation” is defined in Final Instruction No. 7.

***Three*, that Mr. Grimes sent the communication with the intent to extort money or other thing of value from Mark Kari, Sr., that is, a demand for the “debt owed” by Linda (Kari) Fall; and**

“Intent to extort” is defined in Final Instruction No. 8.

***Four*, that Mr. Grimes acted knowingly.**

“Knowingly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 9.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of mailing threatening communications as charged in count 2 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 6

COUNT 3 - MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of mailing threatening communications as charged in count 3 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about between November 2009 and March 2010, in the District of South Dakota and elsewhere, Jeffrey Grimes caused to be delivered by the Postal Service according to the direction, a communication to David Kari, the named addressee;

Two, that the communication contained a threat to injure the reputation of the addressee or another person, that is, a threat to injure the reputation of David Kari, his family, or Linda (Kari) Fall by making defamatory phone calls to Bison, South Dakota, community members regarding the alleged interracial and adulterous affair of Linda (Kari) Fall;

“Threat to injure reputation” is defined in Final Instruction No. 7.

Three, that Mr. Grimes sent the communication with the intent to extort money or other thing of value from David Kari, that is, \$20,000; and

“Intent to extort” is defined in Final Instruction No. 8.

Four, that Mr. Grimes acted knowingly.

“Knowingly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 9.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of mailing threatening communications as charged in count 3 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 7

THREAT TO INJURE REPUTATION

“Threat to injure reputation” is determined based on an objective test, that is, whether an ordinary, reasonable recipient who is familiar with the context of the communication would interpret it as a threat. In determining whether a reasonable person would feel threatened, you may consider the totality of the circumstances in which the communication was made. Evidence of the emotional reaction experienced by the person receiving the allegedly threatening communication may be considered, but it is not the sole determining factor of whether or not the communication did in fact contain a “threat to injure reputation.” The government is not required to prove the defendant actually intended to carry out the threat or that the defendant had the ability to carry out the threat.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 8

INTENT TO EXTORT

“Intent to extort” means to act with the purpose of obtaining money or something of value from someone because of a threat to injure the reputation of the addressee or of another, or the reputation of a deceased person.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 9

KNOWINGLY

An act is done “knowingly” if the defendant realized what he was doing and did not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. You may consider the evidence of a person’s acts and words, if any, along with all the evidence, in deciding whether a person acted knowingly.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 10

COUNT 4 - REPEATED TELEPHONE CALLS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated telephone calls as charged in count 4 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about between January 1 and January 11, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Mark or Bernice Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls with the intent to harass a person at the called number.

“With intent to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 13.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated telephone calls as charged in count 4 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 11

COUNT 5 - REPEATED TELEPHONE CALLS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated telephone calls as charged in count 5 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about between January 1 and January 11, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls with the intent to harass a person at the called number.

“With intent to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 13.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated telephone calls as charged in count 5 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 12

REPEATED OR REPEATEDLY

”Repeated” or “repeatedly” means to recur again and again, or to do over and over again in close proximity to one another so as to be called a single episode and not separated by periods of months or years.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 13

WITH INTENT TO HARASS

“With intent to harass” requires an intent to provoke an adverse emotional reaction in the recipient of the call. In determining whether the call was made “with intent to harass,” you may consider the totality of the circumstances.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 14

COUNT 6 - ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 6 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 4, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made a telephone call from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call without disclosing his identity, regardless of whether a conversation or communication ensued; and

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass a person at the called number or who received the communication.

“Anonymous caller” is defined in Final Instruction No. 20.

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 21.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 6 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt,
you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 15

COUNT 7 - ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 7 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 10, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made a telephone call from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call without disclosing his identity, regardless of whether a conversation or communication ensued; and

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass a person at the called number or who received the communication.

“Anonymous caller” is defined in Final Instruction No. 20.

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 21.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 7 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt,
you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 16

COUNT 8 - ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 8 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 11, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made a telephone call from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call without disclosing his identity, regardless of whether a conversation or communication ensued; and

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass a person at the called number or who received the communication.

“Anonymous caller” is defined in Final Instruction No. 20.

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 21.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 8 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 17

COUNT 9 - ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 9 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 23, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made a telephone call from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call without disclosing his identity, regardless of whether a conversation or communication ensued; and

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass a person at the called number or who received the communication.

“Anonymous caller” is defined in Final Instruction No. 20.

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 21.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 9 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 18

COUNT 10 - ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 10 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 24, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made a telephone call from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call without disclosing his identity, regardless of whether a conversation or communication ensued; and

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass a person at the called number or who received the communication.

“Anonymous caller” is defined in Final Instruction No. 20.

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 21.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 10 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt,
you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 19

COUNT 11 - ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE HARASSMENT

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 11 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 25, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made a telephone call from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call without disclosing his identity, regardless of whether a conversation or communication ensued; and

Three, that Mr. Grimes made the telephone call with the intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass a person at the called number or who received the communication.

“Anonymous caller” is defined in Final Instruction No. 20.

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 21.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of anonymous telephone harassment as charged in count 11 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt,
you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 20

ANONYMOUS CALLER

A caller does not avoid criminal responsibility merely because the recipient may suspect, or have a very good idea of, the caller's identity.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 21

WITH INTENT TO ANNOY, ABUSE, THREATEN OR HARASS

“With intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass” requires an intent to provoke an adverse emotional reaction in the recipient of the call. In determining whether the call was made with the “intent to annoy, abuse, threaten or harass,” you may consider the totality of the circumstances.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 22

COUNT 12 - REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 12 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 4, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that during the telephone calls some conversation or communication occurred, in the form of several harassing voice messages; and

Four, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls solely to harass a person at the called number or any person who received the communication.

“Solely to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 28.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 12 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 23

COUNT 13 - REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 13 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 10, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that during the telephone calls some conversation or communication occurred, in the form of several harassing voice messages; and

Four, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls solely to harass a person at the called number or any person who received the communication.

“Solely to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 28.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 13 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 24

COUNT 14 - REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 14 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 11, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that during the telephone calls some conversation or communication occurred, in the form of several harassing voice messages; and

Four, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls solely to harass a person at the called number or any person who received the communication.

“Solely to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 28.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 14 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 25

COUNT 15 - REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 15 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 23, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that during the telephone calls some conversation or communication occurred, in the form of several harassing voice messages; and

Four, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls solely to harass a person at the called number or any person who received the communication.

“Solely to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 28.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 15 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 26

COUNT 16 - REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 16 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 24, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that during the telephone calls some conversation or communication occurred, in the form of several harassing voice messages; and

Four, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls solely to harass a person at the called number or any person who received the communication.

“Solely to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 28.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 16 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 27

COUNT 17 - REPEATED HARASSING COMMUNICATIONS

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 17 of the indictment, the government must prove the following four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about January 25, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes made telephone calls from a state other than South Dakota to Dan or Marcie Kari in the state of South Dakota;

Two, that the telephone calls were made repeatedly; and

“Repeatedly” is defined in Final Instruction No. 12.

Three, that during the telephone calls some conversation or communication occurred, in the form of several harassing voice messages; and

Four, that Mr. Grimes made the repeated telephone calls solely to harass a person at the called number or any person who received the communication.

“Solely to harass” is defined in Final Instruction No. 28.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of repeated harassing communications as charged in count 17 of the indictment, the government must prove all four essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the

government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt,
you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 28

SOLELY TO HARASS

“Solely to harass” requires an intent to provoke an adverse emotional reaction in the alleged victim. If an interstate telephone call involves the exchange of legitimate information or areas of legitimate communication or conversation, it is not being made “solely to harass.” In determining whether the calls were made “solely to harass,” you may consider the totality of the circumstances.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 29

COUNT 18 - STALKING

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of stalking as charged in count 18 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about between December 1, 2009, and March 31, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes, while located in a state other than South Dakota, used facilities of interstate commerce, that is, the mail or phone;

Two, that Mr. Grimes engaged in a course of conduct of using the facilities of interstate commerce, that is, the mail or phone, with the intent to harass and cause substantial emotional distress to Dan or Marcie Kari, who were located in South Dakota;

To determine whether the call was made “with the intent to harass and cause substantial emotional distress,” you may consider the totality of the circumstances. The government is not required to prove the defendant actually intended to follow through on any statements made or that he took steps to follow through with such statements.

and

Three, that Mr. Grimes’ conduct did cause substantial emotional distress to Dan or Marcie Kari.

“Substantial emotional distress” does not require proof through expert testimony, medical or counseling records. In order to prove “substantial emotional distress,” there must be credible evidence to

support a finding an alleged victim's "substantial emotional distress" was causally related to unlawful conduct.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of stalking as charged in count 18 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 30

COUNT 19 - STALKING

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of stalking as charged in count 19 of the indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that on or about between December 1, 2009, and March 31, 2011, Jeffrey Grimes, while located in a state other than South Dakota, used facilities of interstate commerce, that is, the mail or phone;

Two, that Mr. Grimes engaged in a course of conduct of using the facilities of interstate commerce, that is, the mail or phone, with the intent to harass and cause substantial emotional distress to Mark or Bernice Kari, who were located in South Dakota;

To determine whether the call was made “with the intent to harass and cause substantial emotional distress,” you may consider the totality of the circumstances. The government is not required to prove the defendant actually intended to follow through on any statements made or that he took steps to follow through with such statements.

and

Three, that Mr. Grimes’ conduct did cause substantial emotional distress to Mark or Bernice Kari.

“Substantial emotional distress” does not require proof through expert testimony, medical or counseling records. In order to prove “substantial emotional distress,” there must be credible evidence to

support a finding an alleged victim's "substantial emotional distress" was causally related to unlawful conduct.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of stalking as charged in count 19 of the indictment, the government must prove all three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 31

OFFENSE IN VIOLATION OF A PROTECTION ORDER

If you find Mr. Grimes guilty of the offense of stalking in count 18 then you must determine whether the offense was committed in violation of a protection order issued by the state of South Dakota for the benefit of Dan or Marcie Kari.

If you find Mr. Grimes guilty of the offense of stalking in count 19, then you must determine whether the offense was committed in violation of a protection order issued by the state of South Dakota for the benefit of Mark or Bernice Kari.

A “protection order” includes any injunction, restraining order, or other order issued by a civil court for the purpose of preventing violent or threatening acts or harassment against, or contact or communication with or physical proximity to, another person, so long as the order is issued on behalf of a person seeking protection.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 32 - INTENT

Intent may be proved like anything else. You may consider any statements made and acts done the defendant, and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in the determination of the defendant's intent.

You may, but are not required to, infer that a person intends the natural and probable consequences of acts knowingly done or knowingly omitted.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 33 -

PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF

The defendant 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 he is here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial. This presumption alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of an offense charged.

The burden is always on the government to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to the defendant to prove his innocence, for the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence. The defendant is not even obligated to cross-examine the witnesses called to testify by the government. If the defendant did not testify, this fact must not be considered by you in any way or even discussed in arriving at your verdict.

Unless the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed each and every essential element of an offense charged in the indictment, you must find him not guilty of that offense.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 34 - REASONABLE DOUBT

A reasonable doubt may arise from the evidence or lack of evidence produced during trial. 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 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 affairs of life. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 35 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE

I mentioned the word “evidence.” “Evidence” includes the testimony of witnesses and documents and other things received as exhibits. Certain things are *not* evidence. I shall list those things for you now:

1. Statements, arguments, questions, and comments by lawyers representing the parties in the case are not evidence. Opening statements and closing arguments by lawyers are not evidence.
2. Objections and rulings on 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. Anything you see or hear about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

The fact an exhibit was shown to you does not mean you must rely on it more than you rely on other evidence.

Some of you may have heard the terms “direct evidence” and “circumstantial evidence.” You should not be concerned with those terms. The law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence. You

should give all evidence the weight and value you believe it is entitled to receive.

The weight of the evidence is not determined by the number of witnesses testifying as to the existence or non-existence of any fact. Also, the weight of the evidence should not be determined merely by the number or volume of documents or exhibits. The weight of evidence depends on its quality, not quantity. The quality and weight of the evidence are for you to decide.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 36 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES

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 says, 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 see or hear the things testified about; the witness's memory; any motives the witness may have for testifying a certain way; the behavior of the witness while testifying; whether the witness said something different at an earlier time; the witness's drug or alcohol use or addiction, if any; 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 people sometimes see or hear things differently and sometimes forget things. You need to consider whether a contradiction results from an innocent misrecollection or sincere lapse of memory or instead from an intentional falsehood or pretended lapse of memory.

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

Finally, just because a witness works in law enforcement or is employed by the government does not mean you should give more weight or credibility to the witness's testimony than you give to any other witness's testimony.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 37 - IMPEACHMENT

In the last instruction, I instructed you generally on the credibility of witnesses. I now instruct you further on how the credibility of a witness may 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 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. 38 - EXPERTS

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

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 39 - OBJECTIONS

The lawyers made objections during the trial that I ruled upon. If I sustained an objection to a question before it was answered, do not draw any inferences or conclusions from the question itself. The lawyers have a duty to object to testimony or other evidence they believe is not properly admissible. Do not hold it against a lawyer or the party the lawyer represents because the lawyer made objections.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 40 - USE OF NOTES

You must make your decision based on the evidence. We have an official court reporter making a record of the trial. However, we will not have a typewritten transcript of the trial available for your use in reaching a verdict.

Notes you took during the trial are not necessarily more reliable than your memory or another juror's memory. Therefore, you should not be overly influenced by the notes.

At the end of the trial, you may take your notes out of the notebook and keep them or leave them, and we will destroy them. No one will read the notes.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 41 - 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 change your opinion if you are convinced it is wrong. To bring twelve minds to a 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 an 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 an offense

charged against him, then your vote should be for a verdict of guilty against the defendant on that offense. If all of you reach that conclusion, then the verdict of the jury must be guilty for the defendant on that offense. As I instructed you earlier, the burden is on the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt every essential element of an offense 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 when justice is done, regardless of whether your verdict is not guilty or guilty.

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

There is no reason to think that another trial would be tried in a better way or that a more conscientious, impartial, or competent jury would be selected to hear it. Any future jury must be selected in the same manner and from the same source as you. If you should fail to agree on a verdict, the case is left open and must be resolved at some later time.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 42 - 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. He or she will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

Second, if the defendant is found guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider punishment of the defendant in any way in deciding whether the government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt as to each offense charged in the indictment.

Third, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, you may send a note to me through the court security officer, signed by one or more jurors. After conferring with the lawyers, I will respond as soon as possible, either in writing or orally in open court. Remember 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 you reach in this case. You will take this form to the jury room. When you have

unanimously agreed on the verdict, the foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the court security officer that you have reached a verdict. You will then return to the courtroom where your verdict will be received and announced.

Dated August 26th, 2011.

BY THE COURT:



JEFFREY L. VIKEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE