

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ELLERY ZEPHIER SR.,

Defendant.

4:24-CR-40096-RAL

FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS

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.

Some of you may have heard the terms “direct evidence” and “circumstantial evidence.” You are instructed that 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.

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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

The Superseding Indictment in this case charges the defendant with two counts of assault with a dangerous weapon, one count of assault resulting in serious bodily injury, and one count of kidnapping. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to these charges.

The Superseding Indictment is simply the document that formally charges the defendant with the crimes for which he is on trial. The Superseding 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 United States proved during the trial, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of a crime charged.

Please remember that only the defendant, not anyone else, is on trial here, and that the defendant is on trial only for the crimes charged, not for anything else.

There is no burden upon the defendant to prove that he is innocent. Instead, the burden of proof remains on the United States throughout the trial. 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. 6

The crime of Assault with a Dangerous Weapon, as charged in Count I of the Superseding Indictment, has four essential elements, which are:

One, that on or about between July 20, 2024 and July 25, 2024 Ellery Zephier, Sr., assaulted Kristy Selwyn with the specific intent to cause bodily harm;

“Assault” as it applies to this case means any intentional and voluntary harmful and offensive touching of another person without justification or excuse.

Two, that Ellery Zephier, Sr., used a dangerous weapon, specifically shod feet;

“Dangerous weapon” means an object with the capacity to endanger life or inflict bodily harm and used in a manner likely to do so.

Three, the assault happened in Charles Mix County, South Dakota, in Indian Country; and

Four, Ellery Zephier, Sr., is an Indian.

If all four of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant Ellery Zephier, Sr., then you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., guilty of the crime charged in Count I; otherwise, you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

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. 8

The crime of Assault Resulting in Serious Bodily Injury, as charged in Count II of the Superseding Indictment, has four essential elements, which are:

One, on or about July 20, 2024 and July 25, 2024 Ellery Zephier, Sr., assaulted Kristy Selwyn;

“Assault” as it applies to this case means any intentional and voluntary harmful and offensive touching of another person without justification or excuse.

Two, the assault resulted in serious bodily injury;

“Serious bodily injury” as used in these instructions means bodily injury which involves one or more of the following: (1) substantial risk of death; or (2) extreme physical pain; or (3) protracted and obvious disfigurement; or (4) protracted loss or impairment of the functions of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.

Three, the assault took place in Charles Mix County, South Dakota, in Indian country; and

Four, Ellery Zephier, Sr., is an Indian.

If all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to Ellery Zephier, Sr., then you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., guilty of the crime charged in Count II; otherwise, you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

The crime of Kidnapping, as charged in Count III of the Superseding Indictment, has four essential elements, which are:

***One*, between on or about July 20, 2024 and July 25, 2024, Ellery Zephier, Sr., unlawfully seized, confined, kidnapped, abducted, or carried away Kristy Selwyn without her consent;**

***Two*, that Ellery Zephier, Sr., held Kristy Selwyn for the purpose of assaulting her or otherwise;**

The “or otherwise” is satisfied if the person kidnapped was taken for some reason that the defendant considered sufficient benefit to him, or for some purpose of the defendant’s own.

***Three*, Ellery Zephier, Sr., is an Indian; and**

***Four*, the kidnapping took place in Charles Mix County, South Dakota, in Indian country.**

If all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to Ellery Zephier, Sr., then you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., guilty of the crime charged in Count III; otherwise, you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

The term “kidnap” as used in Instruction No. 9 means to take and carry away a person by force and against his or her will. “Seize,” “confine,” and “carry away” all mean the taking and carrying away of a person, or holding of someone by force or without that person’s consent.

Nonphysical restraint, such as by fear or deception, may be sufficient to constitute a kidnapping if all the elements of the crime are proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

The crime of Assault with a Dangerous Weapon, as charged in Count IV of the Superseding Indictment, has four essential elements, which are:

One, that on or about between July 20, 2024 and July 25, 2024 Ellery Zephier, Sr., assaulted Kristy Selwyn with the specific intent to cause bodily harm;

“Assault” as it applies to this case means any intentional and voluntary harmful and offensive touching of another person without justification or excuse.

Two, that Ellery Zephier, Sr., used a dangerous weapon, specifically serving tray/ large ashtray;

“Dangerous weapon” means an object with the capacity to endanger life or inflict bodily harm and used in a manner likely to do so.

Three, the assault happened in Charles Mix County, South Dakota, in Indian Country; and

Four, Ellery Zephier, Sr., is an Indian.

If all four of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant Ellery Zephier, Sr., then you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., guilty of the crime charged in Count IV; otherwise, you must find Ellery Zephier, Sr., not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

The Superseding Indictment in this case alleges that the defendant 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 Superseding Indictment.

Counsel for the United States, 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, by entering this agreement or stipulation, has not 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 places where the alleged offenses are claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

The Superseding Indictment charges that the offenses were committed between “on or about” certain dates. Although it is necessary for the United States to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the dates alleged in the Superseding Indictment, it is not necessary for the United States to prove that the offenses were committed precisely on the dates charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

You have heard testimony that the defendant previously assaulted Kristy Selwyn and Angelique Drapeau. This testimony was received for a limited purpose only. The testimony about prior assaults may be used by you only to determine issues of defendant's intent, absence of mistake or lack of accident regarding alleged behavior toward Kristy Selwyn on or about and between July 20 and July 25, 2024.

If you conclude that the defendant did not commit the prior assault, then you must disregard the evidence. The defendant is on trial only for the crimes charged in the Superseding Indictment and only for those crimes. You may not convict a person simply because you believe he may have committed some acts, even bad acts, in the past.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

You have heard testimony from persons described as experts. 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

Reasonable doubt is doubt based upon reason and common sense, and not doubt 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. 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 United States 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 court security officer, 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 smart phone, 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, TikTok, X (formerly known as Twitter), or Truth Social, 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 court security officer that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. ELLERY ZEPHIER SR., Defendant.</p>	<p>4:24-CR-40096-RAL VERDICT FORM</p>
--	--

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

1. We find the defendant, Ellery Zephier, Sr., _____ (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) of Assault with a Dangerous Weapon as charged in Count I of the Superseding Indictment.
2. We find the defendant, Ellery Zephier, Sr., _____ (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) of Assault Resulting in Serious Bodily Injury as charged in Count II of the Superseding Indictment.
3. We find the defendant, Ellery Zephier, Sr., _____ (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) of the crime of Kidnapping as charged in Count III of the Superseding Indictment.
4. We find the defendant, Ellery Zephier, Sr., _____ (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) of Assault with a Dangerous Weapon as charged in Count IV of the Superseding Indictment.

Dated January _____, 2025.

Foreperson