

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. The instructions I am about to give you now are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room.

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.

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

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 the 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 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.

When you were instructed that evidence was received for a limited purpose, you must follow that instruction.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

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 of any witness 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

You have heard testimony from persons described as experts. A person who, by knowledge, skill, training, education, or experience, has become expert in some field may state his or her opinion on matters in that field and may also state the reasons for his or her 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' 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. 6

The amended indictment in this case charges the defendant with two different crimes. Count I charges that the defendant committed the crime of Aggravated Sexual Abuse. Count II charges that the defendant committed the crime of Sexual Abuse. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to each of those charges.

The amended indictment is simply the document that formally charges the defendant with the crimes for which he is on trial. The amended indictment is not evidence of anything. At the beginning of the trial, I instructed you that you must presume the defendant to be innocent. Thus, the defendant began the trial with a clean slate, with no evidence against him. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. This presumption can be overcome only if the government proved during the trial, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of the crimes charged.

Keep in mind that each count charges a separate crime. You must consider each count separately, and return a separate verdict for each count.

There is no burden upon a defendant to prove that he is innocent. Instead, the burden of proof remains on the government throughout the trial.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

The crime of Aggravated Sexual Abuse, as charged in Count I of the amended indictment, has four elements, which are:

***One*, that on or about the 7th day of October, 2015, Lloyd Red Horse, Jr., knowingly caused or attempted to cause Misty Bad Warrior to engage in a sexual act;**

***Two*, that Lloyd Red Horse, Jr. committed such act by using force against Misty Bad Warrior and without the consent of Misty Bad Warrior;**

***Three*, that Lloyd Red Horse, Jr. is an Indian; and**

***Four*, that the offense took place in Indian country.**

If all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to Lloyd Red Horse, Jr., then you must find him guilty of the crime charged; otherwise you must find him not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8

The term “sexual act” as provided in these instructions, means contact between the penis and the vulva, and for purposes of these instructions contact involving the penis occurs upon penetration, however slight.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

As used in these instructions, the words “by using force” may be satisfied by showing that the defendant:

- (1) used or threatened to use a weapon; or
- (2) used such physical force that was sufficient to overcome, restrain, or injure the victim; or
- (3) used a threat of harm sufficient to coerce or compel submission by the victim.

Force sufficient to prevent the victim from escaping the sexual act satisfies the force element.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

The crime of Sexual Abuse, as charged in Count II of the amended indictment, has five elements, which are:

One, that on or about the 7th day of October, 2015, Lloyd Red Horse, Jr., knowingly caused or attempted to cause Misty Bad Warrior to engage in a sexual act, namely penetration, however slight, between Lloyd Red Horse, Jr.'s penis and Misty Bad Warrior's vulva;

Two, that at the time of the sexual act, Misty Bad Warrior was incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct or was physically incapable of declining participation in, or communicating her unwillingness to engage in, that sexual conduct;

Three, that Lloyd Red Horse, Jr. knew that Misty Bad Warrior was incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct or was physically incapable of declining participation in, or communicating her unwillingness to engage in, that sexual act;

Four, that Lloyd Red Horse, Jr. is an Indian; and

Five, that the offense took place in Indian country.

If all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to Lloyd Red Horse, Jr., then you must find him guilty of the crime charged; otherwise you must find him not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

In the crimes of Aggravated Sexual Abuse and Sexual Abuse, as charged in Counts I and II of the amended indictment, there must exist in the mind of the defendant the specific intent to attempt the sexual act described in those counts.

If the defendant acted without such specific intent, the attempt to commit such crimes has not been committed.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

Intent may be proved like anything else. You may consider any statements made and acts done by 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

An act is done knowingly if the defendant is aware of the act and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. The government is not required to prove that the defendant knew that his actions were unlawful. 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. 14

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense, and not based on speculation. A reasonable doubt may arise from careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, or from a lack of evidence. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person, after careful consideration, would not hesitate to rely and act upon that proof in life's most important decisions. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

You will note that the amended indictment charges that the offense was committed “on or about” a certain date. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged offense. It is sufficient if the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date or dates reasonably near the dates alleged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

The amended indictment in this case alleges that the defendant Lloyd Red Horse, Jr. is an Indian and that the alleged offenses occurred in Indian country. The existence of those two factors is necessary in order for this Court to have jurisdiction over the crimes charged in the amended indictment.

Counsel for the government, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that the defendant is an Indian and that the place where the alleged incidents are claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

The defendant has not, by entering this agreement or stipulation, admitted his guilt of the offenses charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to establish the facts that the defendant is an Indian and that the place where the alleged incidents are claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

INSTRUCTION NO. 17

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 or bailiff, 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, during your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone other than by note to me 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, Snapchat, LinkedIn, Instagram, YouTube, My Space, or Twitter, to communicate to anyone information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I accept your verdict.

Sixth, 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 on the verdict, your foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the marshal or bailiff that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

CENTRAL DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	3:16-CR-30054-RAL
Plaintiff,	
vs.	VERDICT FORM
LLOYD RED HORSE, JR.,	
Defendant.	

We, the jury, duly empaneled and sworn to try the issues in this case, find as follows:

1. We find the defendant, Lloyd Red Horse, Jr., _____ (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) of Aggravated Sexual Abuse as charged in Count I of the amended indictment.
2. We find the defendant, Lloyd Red Horse, Jr., _____ (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) of Sexual Abuse as charged in Count II of the amended indictment.

DATED this ____ day of August, 2016.

FOREPERSON