

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>MOSES CROWE and RANSON LONG PUMPKIN,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CR. 18-50010-JLV</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PRIMARY JURY INSTRUCTIONS</p>
--	--

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

NO. 1 - ROLE OF INSTRUCTIONS .....	2
NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS .....	3
NO. 3 - DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFENSES .....	5
NO. 4 - COUNT I: CARJACKING RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY .....	6
NO. 5 - COUNT II: DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM DURING A CRIME OF VIOLENCE .....	9
NO. 6 - COUNT III: POSSESSION OF A FIREARM BY A PROHIBITED PERSON .....	11
NO. 7 - AIDING AND ABETTING .....	15
NO. 8 - PROOF OF INTENT AND KNOWLEDGE .....	17
NO. 9 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF .....	18
NO. 10 - REASONABLE DOUBT .....	20
NO. 11 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE .....	21
NO. 12 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES .....	23
NO. 13 - IMPEACHMENT .....	24
NO. 14 - STATEMENT BY A DEFENDANT .....	25
NO. 15 - BENCH CONFERENCES AND RECESSES .....	26
NO. 16 - OBJECTIONS .....	27
NO. 17 - EXPERT WITNESSES .....	28
NO. 18 - NOTE TAKING .....	29
NO. 19 - MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY .....	30
NO. 20 - CONDUCT OF THE JURY DURING TRIAL .....	33
NO. 21 - OUTLINE OF THE TRIAL .....	35

**INSTRUCTION NO. 1 - ROLE OF INSTRUCTIONS**

Members of the jury, I will take a few minutes to give you the instructions about this case and about your duties as jurors. At the end of the trial, I will give you further instructions. I may also give you instructions during the trial. These instructions explain the law that applies to this case. Unless I specifically tell you otherwise, all instructions, both those I give you now and those I will give you later, are equally binding on you and must be followed. Consider these instructions with all written and oral instructions given to you during and at the end of the trial and apply them to the facts of the case. You must consider my instructions as a whole and not single out some instructions and ignore others.

## **INSTRUCTION NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS**

This is a criminal case brought by the United States government against the defendants, Moses Crowe and Ranson Long Pumpkin. Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are charged with carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury in Count I of the indictment and discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence in Count II. Mr. Crowe is separately charged with possession of a firearm by a prohibited person in Count III of the indictment. Your duty is to decide from the evidence whether Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are not guilty or guilty of the offenses charged against them. Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence about each individual defendant.

You will find the facts from the evidence presented in court. "Evidence" is defined in Instruction No. 11. You are entitled to consider that 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 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. You will then apply the law to the facts to reach your verdict.

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 may say or do 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 may make that I have any opinion on how you should decide the case.

Please remember only Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin, not anyone else, are on trial here. Also, remember Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are on trial only for the offenses charged against them, not for anything else.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 3 - DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFENSES**

An offense consists of "elements" which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt in order to convict a defendant of that offense. To help you follow the evidence, I will give you the elements of the offenses charged in the indictment. However, I must first explain some preliminary matters.

The charges against Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are set out in an indictment. An indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin pled not guilty to the charges brought against them. Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of the offenses charged against them.

The indictment charges the offenses were committed "on or about" certain dates. The government does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of the charged offenses. It is sufficient if the evidence establishes that an offense occurred within a reasonable time of the dates alleged in the indictment. I will now give you the elements for the offenses 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. Also, keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual defendant.**

**INSTRUCTION NO. 4 -**

**COUNT I: CARJACKING RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY**

Count I of the indictment charges that on or about October 13, 2017, in Rapid City, in the District of South Dakota, the defendants, Moses Crowe and Ranson Long Pumpkin, with the intent to cause death and serious bodily harm, did take and attempt to take a motor vehicle, described as a white 2001 Dodge Grand Caravan bearing VIN 2B8GP44311R222555, that had been transported, shipped, and received in interstate commerce, from and in the presence of Phillip Moore by force, violence, and intimidation, resulting in serious bodily injury, and did aid and abet each other in the commission of the offense.

**Elements**

For you to find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin guilty of the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, on or about October 13, 2017, at Rapid City in the District of South Dakota, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin took, attempted to take, or aided and abetted each other or another person in taking a white 2001 Dodge Grand Caravan bearing VIN 2B8GP44311R222555 from Phillip Moore;**

The offense charged in Count I of the indictment includes an attempt to commit that offense. Mr. Crowe

or Mr. Long Pumpkin may be found guilty of an attempt to engage in carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury if they both intended to engage in the offense and voluntarily and intentionally carried out some act which was a substantial step toward engaging in the offense.

A "substantial step" must be something more than mere preparation, yet may be less than the last act necessary before the actual commission of the substantive offense. In order for behavior to be punishable as an attempt it need not be incompatible with innocence, but the conduct must be necessary to the consummation of the offense and be of such a nature that a reasonable observer viewing the conduct in context could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that it was undertaken with a design to commit the offense charged.

**Two, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin did so by means of force, intimidation or violence;**

**Three, prior to October 13, 2017, the white 2001 Dodge Caravan had been transported, shipped or received in interstate commerce;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for Mr. Crowe, counsel for Mr. Long Pumpkin, Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin have agreed or stipulated that the white 2001 Dodge Caravan had been transported, shipped or received in interstate commerce prior to October 12, 2017.

By entering this agreement or stipulation, Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin have not admitted their guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to establish the fact that the white 2001 Dodge Caravan had been transported, shipped or received in interstate commerce prior to October 12, 2017.

**Four, at the time Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin took, attempted to take, or aided and abetted each other or another person in taking the white 2001 Dodge Caravan, they intended to cause death or serious bodily injury;**

“Serious bodily injury” means bodily injury which involves:

1. A substantial risk of death; or
2. Extreme physical pain; or
3. Protracted and obvious disfigurement; or
4. Protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or mental faculty.

**and**

**Five, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin caused, attempted to cause or aided and abetted each other or another person in causing serious bodily injury to Phillip Moore during the offense.**

To find a defendant guilty of the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I of the indictment, the government must prove all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to that defendant. If the government proves all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant guilty. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant not guilty.

**Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual defendant.**



**INSTRUCTION NO. 5 –**

**COUNT II: DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM DURING A CRIME OF VIOLENCE**

Count II of the indictment charges that on or about October 13, 2017, in Rapid City, in the District of South Dakota, the defendants, Moses Crowe and Ranson Long Pumpkin did knowingly use and did discharge a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence for which they could be prosecuted by the United States, that is, Carjacking and Carjacking Resulting in Serious Bodily Injury and did aid and abet the commission of the offense.

**Elements**

For you to find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin guilty of the offense of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin committed the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I;**

**Two, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin knowingly used or aided and abetted each other or another person in using a firearm during and in relation to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I; and**

The term “firearm” means any weapon which will or is designed to or may be readily converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

The phrase "used a firearm" means that the firearm was actively employed in the course of the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I.

**Three, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin discharged or aided and abetted each other or another person in discharging a firearm during and in relation to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I.**

To find a defendant guilty of the offense of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment, the government must prove all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to that defendant. If the government proves all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant guilty. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant not guilty.

**Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual defendant.**

**INSTRUCTION NO. 6 –**

**POSSESSION OF A FIREARM BY A PROHIBITED PERSON**

Count III of the indictment charges that on or about October 24, 2017, in Rapid City, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Moses Crowe, having been previously convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, and then knowing that he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, did knowingly possess a firearm, namely, a Smith & Wesson, model 1911, .45 caliber pistol, bearing serial number UCY1137, which had been previously shipped and transported in interstate and foreign commerce.

**Elements**

For you to find Mr. Crowe guilty of the offense of possession of a firearm by a prohibited person as charged in Count III of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, prior to October 24, 2017, Mr. Crowe had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for Mr. Crowe and Mr. Crowe have agreed or stipulated that prior to October 24, 2017, Mr. Crowe had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

By entering this agreement or stipulation, Mr. Crowe has not admitted his guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to

establish the fact that prior to October 24, 2017, Mr. Crowe had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

**Two, on or about October 24, 2017, Mr. Crowe knew he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for Mr. Crowe and Mr. Crowe have agreed or stipulated that on or about October 24, 2017, Mr. Crowe knew he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

By entering this agreement or stipulation, Mr. Crowe has not admitted his guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to establish the fact that on or about October 24, 2017, Mr. Crowe knew he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

**Three, on or about October 24, 2017, at Rapid City, in the District of South Dakota, Mr. Crowe knowingly and intentionally possessed a firearm, that is, a Smith & Wesson, model 1911, .45 caliber pistol, bearing serial number UCY1137;**

"Firearm" means any weapon which will or is designed to or may be readily converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

The law recognizes several kinds of possession. A person may have actual possession or constructive possession. A person may have sole or joint possession.

A person who knowingly has direct physical control over a thing, at a given time, is in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, has both the power and the intention at a given time to exercise dominion or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is in constructive possession of it. A person's mere presence at the location where a thing is found is not enough, without more, to establish constructive possession of it.

If one person alone has actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual or constructive possession of a thing, possession is joint.

Whenever the word "possession" is used in these instructions it includes actual as well as constructive possession and sole as well as joint possession.

**and**

***Four, prior to October 24, 2017, the firearm had been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.***

Counsel for the United States, counsel for Mr. Crowe and Mr. Crowe have agreed or stipulated that the firearm had been shipped or transported in interstate commerce prior to October 24, 2017.

By entering this agreement or stipulation, Mr. Crowe has not admitted his guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to establish the fact that the firearm had been shipped or transported in interstate commerce prior to October 24, 2017.

To find Mr. Crowe guilty of the offense of possession of a firearm by a prohibited person as charged in Count III of the indictment, the government must prove all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. If the government proves all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you

must find Mr. Crowe guilty of this offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. Crowe not guilty of this offense.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 7 – AIDING AND ABETTING**

Counts I and II of the indictment charge Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin with aiding and abetting each other or another person in the commission of those offenses. Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin may be found guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury or discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence even if they personally did not do every act constituting those offenses. For you to find a defendant aided and abetted the offenses charged in Counts I and II of the indictment, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, before or at the time either offense was committed, that the defendant:

1. Knew that either offense was being committed or going to be committed;
2. Had enough advance knowledge of the extent and character of either offense that they were able to walk away from the offense before all elements of the offense was complete;
3. Knowingly acted in some way for the purpose of causing, encouraging or aiding the commission of either offense;
4. For the offense charged in Count I, carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, acted with the intent to cause serious bodily injury, as referenced in Instruction No. 4; and
5. For the offense charged in Count II, discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence, acted with the intent to knowingly use a firearm, as referenced in Instruction No. 5.

**Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual offense and each individual defendant.**

Merely being present at the scene of an event or associating with others does not prove that a person has become an aider and abettor. A person who has no knowledge that a crime is being committed or is about to be committed, but who happens to act in a way which advances the offense, does not thereby become an aider and abettor.

For you to find a defendant guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury or discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence by reason of aiding and abetting, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that another person committed all of the essential elements of either offense and that the defendant aided and abetted the commission of that offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant not guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury or discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence by aiding and abetting.

This instruction applies to Count I, carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, and Count II, discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence.



**INSTRUCTION NO. 8 - PROOF OF INTENT AND KNOWLEDGE**

“Intent” and “knowledge” are elements of the offenses charged in this case and must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. The government is not required to prove a defendant knew that his acts or omissions were unlawful. An act is done “knowingly” if a person realizes what he is doing and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. You may consider the evidence of a defendant’s words, acts, or omissions, along with all other evidence, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly.

Intent may be proven like anything else. You may consider any statements made or acts done by a defendant and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in determining that 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. 9 -**

**PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF**

Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are 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 Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin or the fact they are here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin throughout the trial. This presumption alone is sufficient to find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of the offenses charged. The burden is always on the government to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin to prove their 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. Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin are not even obligated to cross examine the witnesses called to testify by the government.

If Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin does not testify, this fact must not be considered by you in any way or even discussed in arriving at your verdict. If Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin testifies, you should judge his testimony in the same manner in which you judge the testimony of any other witness.

If the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt all the essential elements of an offense charged, you must find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin

guilty of that offense. If the government fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any essential element of an offense charged, you must find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin not guilty of that offense.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 10 - 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 doubt based on speculation. 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. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of Mr. Crowe's or Mr. Long Pumpkin's guilt. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

### **INSTRUCTION NO. 11 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE**

I mentioned the word "evidence." "Evidence" includes the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things received as exhibits and stipulated facts. Stipulated facts are facts formally agreed to by the parties. Certain things are not evidence. I shall list those things for you now:

- 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.
- 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 sustain an objection to a question, you must ignore the question and must not try to guess what the answer might have been.
- Testimony I strike from the record or tell you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered.
- Anything you see or hear about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

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

Furthermore, a particular piece of evidence is sometimes received for a limited purpose only. That is, you may use it only for one particular purpose and not for any other purpose. I will tell you when that occurs and instruct you on the purposes for which the piece of evidence can and cannot be used.

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 nonexistence 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.

## **INSTRUCTION NO. 12 - 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' intelligence;
- The opportunity the witness had to see or hear the things testified about;
- The witness' 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' 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.

### **INSTRUCTION NO. 13 - 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;
- A showing that the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter; or
- 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' trial testimony.

You may consider a witness discredited or impeached for other reasons as well. If you believe a witness has been discredited or impeached, it is your exclusive right to give that witness' testimony whatever weight you think it deserves.

If earlier statements of a witness are admitted into evidence, they are not admitted to prove that the contents of those statements are 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.



**INSTRUCTION NO. 14 - STATEMENT BY A DEFENDANT**

You may hear testimony Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin made a statement to others. It is for you to decide:

*First*, whether the statement was made; and

*Second*, if so, how much weight you should give the statement.

In making these two decisions, you should consider all of the evidence including the circumstances under which the statement may have been made.

You may consider the statement of one defendant only in the case against him and not against the other defendant. You may not consider or even discuss one defendant's statement in any way when you are deciding if the government proved its case against the other defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 15 - BENCH CONFERENCES AND RECESSES**

During the trial it may be necessary for me to talk with the lawyers out of the hearing of the jury, either by having a bench conference while the jury is present in the courtroom or by calling a recess. The purpose of these conferences is to decide how certain evidence is to be treated under the rules of evidence, to avoid confusion and error, and to save your valuable time. We will do what we can to keep the number and length of these conferences to a minimum.

Please be patient because while you are waiting, we are working.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 16 – OBJECTIONS**

The lawyers may make objections and motions during the trial that I must rule upon. If I sustain an objection to a question before it is 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 has made an objection.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 17 - EXPERT WITNESSES**

You may hear testimony from individuals described as experts. An individual who, by knowledge, skill, training, education or experience, has 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' 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. 18 - NOTE TAKING**

At the end of the trial, you must make your decision based on the evidence. We have an official court reporter making a record of the trial. However, you will not have a typewritten transcript of the trial testimony of any witness for your use in reaching a verdict. You must pay close attention to the evidence as it is presented.

If you want to take notes during the trial, you may, but be sure your note taking does not interfere with listening to and considering all the evidence. If you choose not to take notes, remember it is your responsibility to listen carefully to the evidence.

Notes you take 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.

If you take notes, do not discuss them with anyone before you begin your deliberations. At the end of each day, please leave your notes in the jury room. 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, either during or after the trial.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 19 - MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY**

You are required to decide this case based solely on the evidence and exhibits that you see and hear in the courtroom. If one or more of you were to get additional information from an outside source, that information might be inaccurate or incomplete or for some other reason not applicable to this case, and the parties would not have a chance to explain or contradict that information because they would not know about it. This is why it is so important that you base your verdict only on information you receive in this courtroom.

In order for your verdict to be fair, you must not be exposed to any other information about the case, the law or any of the issues involved in this trial during the course of your jury duty. This is very important, so I am taking the time to give you a detailed explanation about what you should do and not do during your time as jurors.

*First*, you must not try to get information from any source other than what you see and hear in this courtroom. That means you may not speak to anyone, including your family and friends about this case. You may not use any printed or electronic sources to get information about this case or the issues involved. This includes the internet, reference books or dictionaries, newspapers, magazines, television, radio, computers, smartphones, or any other electronic device. You may not do any personal investigating, such as visiting any of the places involved in this case, using internet maps or Google

Earth or any other such technology, talking to any possible witnesses, or creating your own demonstrations or reenactments of the events which are the subject of this case.

*Second*, you must not communicate with anyone about this case or your jury service, and you must not allow anyone to communicate with you. In particular, you may not communicate about the case through emails, text messages, tweets, blogs, comments or other postings on social networking sites, including but not limited to Facebook, Instagram, Twitter or any other website or application. This applies to communicating with your fellow jurors, your family members, your employer and the people involved in the trial, although you may notify your family and employer that you have been seated as a juror in the case. If you are asked or approached in any way about your jury service or anything about this case, you must respond that you have been ordered not to discuss the matter and immediately report the contact to the court.

I recognize these rules and restrictions may affect activities you may consider to be normal and harmless. I assure you that I am very much aware I am asking you to refrain from activities which may be very common and very important in your daily lives. However, the law requires these restrictions to ensure the parties have a fair trial based on the evidence each party has an opportunity to address.

Any juror who violates the restrictions I have explained to you jeopardizes the fairness of these proceedings, and a mistrial could result which would require the entire trial process to start over. As you can imagine, a mistrial is a tremendous expense and inconvenience to the parties, the court and the taxpayers. If any juror is exposed to any outside information or has any difficulty whatsoever in following these instructions, please notify the court immediately. If any juror becomes aware that one of your fellow jurors has done something that violates these instructions, you are obligated to report that violation to the court as well.

These restrictions remain in effect throughout this trial. Once the trial is over, you may resume your normal activities. At that point, you will be free to read or research anything you wish. You will be able to speak—or choose not to speak—about the trial to anyone you wish. You may write, post or tweet about the case if you choose to do so. The only limitation is that you must wait until after the verdict, when you have been discharged from your jury service.



**INSTRUCTION NO. 20 - CONDUCT OF THE JURY DURING TRIAL**

To ensure fairness, you as jurors must obey the following rules:

*First*, do not talk among yourselves about this case, or about anyone involved with it, until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide your verdict.

*Second*, do not talk with anyone else about this case, or about anyone involved with it, until the trial has ended, and I discharge you as jurors. This means you must not talk to your spouse, other family members or friends about this case until I discharge you as jurors.

*Third*, when you are outside the courtroom, do not let anyone tell you anything about the case or about anyone involved with it, until the trial has ended, and I accept your verdict. If someone should try to talk to you about the case, please report it to me.

*Fourth*, during the trial, you should not talk with or speak to any of the parties, lawyers or witnesses involved in this case—you should not even pass the time of day with any of them. It is important you not only do justice in this case, but that you also give the appearance of doing justice. If a person from one side of the case sees you talking to a person from the other side, even if it is simply to pass the time of day, an unwarranted and unnecessary suspicion about your fairness might be created. If any lawyer, party or witness does not speak to you when you pass in the hall, ride the elevator or the like, it is because they are not supposed to talk or visit with you.

*Fifth*, during the trial, do not make up your mind about what the verdict should be. Keep an open mind until you have gone to the jury room to decide the case and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence.

*Sixth*, if at any time during the trial you have a problem you would like to bring to my attention or if you feel ill or need to go to the restroom, please send a note to the court security officer, who will deliver it to me. Or just raise your hand and get my attention. I want you to be comfortable, so please do not hesitate to inform me of any problem.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 21 - OUTLINE OF THE TRIAL**

The trial will proceed as follows:


After these instructions, the lawyer for the government may make an opening statement. Next, the lawyers for Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin may, but do not have to, make an opening statement. An opening statement is not evidence. It is simply a summary of what the lawyer expects the evidence to be.

The government will then present its evidence and call witnesses. The lawyers for Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin may, but have no obligation to, cross examine them. Following the government's case, Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin may, but do not have to, present evidence or call witnesses. If Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin call witnesses, the government may cross examine them.

After presentation of the evidence is complete, the lawyers will make their closing arguments to summarize and interpret the evidence for you. As with opening statements, closing arguments are not evidence. I will then give you additional instructions, and you will retire to deliberate on your verdict.

Dated November 18, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY L. VIKEN  
CHIEF JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  Plaintiff,  vs.  MOSES CROWE and RANSON LONG PUMPKIN,  Defendants.	CR. 18-50010-JLV  SUPPLEMENTAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS
--	---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

NO. 22 - EQUALLY IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS .....	2
NO. 23 - LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE: CARJACKING .....	3
NO. 24 - COUNT II: DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM DURING A CRIME OF VIOLENCE .....	6
NO. 25 - AIDING AND ABETTING .....	8
NO. 26 - TAKING .....	10
NO. 27 - FLIGHT .....	11
NO. 28 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE .....	12
NO. 29 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS .....	14

VERDICTS

**INSTRUCTION NO. 22 - EQUALLY IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS**

Members of the jury, I will now take a few minutes to give you additional instructions explaining the law which applies to this case. All instructions, both those I gave you earlier and these instructions, are equally binding on you and must be followed. You must consider my instructions as a whole and not single out some instructions and ignore others.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 23 -**

**LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE: CARJACKING**

If you should unanimously find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin not guilty of the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I of the indictment, or, if after reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict as to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, then you must proceed to determine whether Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin is not guilty or guilty of the offense of carjacking under this instruction.

Carjacking is a lesser included offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury. For you to find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin guilty of carjacking, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**Elements**

**One, on or about October 13, 2017, at Rapid City in the District of South Dakota, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin took, attempted to take, or aided and abetted each other or another person in taking a white 2001 Dodge Grand Caravan bearing VIN 2B8GP44311R222555 from Phillip Moore;**

This lesser included offense contains an attempt to commit that offense. Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin may be found guilty of an attempt to engage in carjacking if they both intended to engage in the offense and voluntarily and intentionally carried out some act which was a substantial step toward engaging in the offense.

A "substantial step" must be something more than mere preparation, yet may be less than the last act necessary before the actual commission of the substantive offense. In order for behavior to be punishable as an attempt it need not be incompatible with innocence, but the conduct must be necessary to the consummation of the offense and be of such a nature that a reasonable observer viewing the conduct in context could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that it was undertaken with a design to commit the offense.

**Two, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin did so by means of force, intimidation or violence;**

**Three, prior to October 13, 2017, the white 2001 Dodge Caravan had been transported, shipped or received in interstate commerce;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for Mr. Crowe, counsel for Mr. Long Pumpkin, Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin have agreed or stipulated that the white 2001 Dodge Caravan had been transported, shipped or received in interstate commerce prior to October 12, 2017.

By entering this agreement or stipulation, Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin have not admitted their guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of this stipulation is to establish the fact that the white 2001 Dodge Caravan had been transported, shipped or received in interstate commerce prior to October 12, 2017.

**and**

**Four, at the time Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin took, attempted to take, or aided and abetted each other or another person in taking the white 2001 Dodge Caravan, they intended to cause death or serious bodily injury;**

“Serious bodily injury” means bodily injury which involves:

1. A substantial risk of death; or
2. Extreme physical pain; or
3. Protracted and obvious disfigurement; or
4. Protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or mental faculty.

To find a defendant guilty of the lesser included offense of carjacking, the government must prove all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to that defendant. If the government proves all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant guilty. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant not guilty.

Instruction No. 25, Aiding and Abetting, applies to the lesser included offense of carjacking described in this instruction.

**Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual defendant.**



**INSTRUCTION NO. 24 –**

**COUNT II: DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM DURING A CRIME OF VIOLENCE**

This Instruction replaces Instruction No. 5 in its entirety.

Count II of the indictment charges that on or about October 13, 2017, in Rapid City, in the District of South Dakota, the defendants, Moses Crowe and Ranson Long Pumpkin did knowingly use and did discharge a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence for which they could be prosecuted by the United States, that is, Carjacking and Carjacking Resulting in Serious Bodily Injury and did aid and abet the commission of the offense.

**Elements**

For you to find Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin guilty of the offense of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin committed the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I or the lesser included offense of carjacking as described in Instruction No. 23;**

**Two, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin knowingly used or aided and abetted each other or another person in using a firearm during and in relation to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I or the lesser included offense of carjacking as described in Instruction No. 23;**

The term "firearm" means any weapon which will or is designed to or may be readily converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

The phrase "used a firearm" means that the firearm was actively employed in the course of the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I or the lesser included offense of carjacking as described in Instruction No. 23.

**and**

**Three, Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin discharged or aided and abetted each other or another person in discharging a firearm during and in relation to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I or the lesser included offense of carjacking as described in Instruction No. 23.**

To find a defendant guilty of the offense of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment, the government must prove all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to that defendant. If the government proves all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant guilty. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant not guilty.

Instruction No. 25, Aiding and Abetting, applies to the offense of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment.

**Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual defendant.**

**INSTRUCTION NO. 25 – AIDING AND ABETTING**

This Instruction replaces Instruction No. 7 in its entirety.

Counts I and II of the indictment and the lesser included offense described in Instruction No. 23 charge Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin with aiding and abetting each other or another person in the commission of those offenses. Mr. Crowe and Mr. Long Pumpkin may be found guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, carjacking or discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence even if they personally did not do every act constituting those offenses. For you to find a defendant aided and abetted the offenses charged in Counts I and II of the indictment and the lesser included offense described in Instruction No. 23, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, before or at the time the offense was committed, that the defendant:

1. Knew that the offense was being committed or going to be committed;
2. Had enough advance knowledge of the extent and character of the offense that they were able to walk away from the offense before all elements of the offense was complete;
3. Knowingly acted in some way for the purpose of causing, encouraging or aiding the commission of the offense;
4. For the offense charged in Count I, carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, acted with the intent to cause serious bodily injury, as referenced in Instruction No. 4;
5. For the offense charged in Count II, discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence, acted with the intent to knowingly use a firearm, as referenced in Instruction No. 24; and
6. For the lesser included offense of carjacking described in Instruction No. 23, acted with the intent to cause serious bodily injury, as referenced in Instruction No. 23.

**Keep in mind you must give separate consideration to the evidence regarding each individual offense and each individual defendant.**

Merely being present at the scene of an event or associating with others does not prove that a person has become an aider and abettor. A person who has no knowledge that a crime is being committed or is about to be committed, but who happens to act in a way which advances the offense, does not thereby become an aider and abettor.

For you to find a defendant guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, carjacking or discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence by reason of aiding and abetting, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that another person committed all of the essential elements of the offense and that the defendant aided and abetted the commission of that offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt as to a defendant, you must find that defendant not guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, carjacking or discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence by aiding and abetting.

This instruction applies to Count I, carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, Count II, discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence, and the lesser included offense of carjacking, as described in Instruction No. 23.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 26 – TAKING**

Taking occurs when an individual acquires possession, dominion or control of property for some period of time.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 27 – FLIGHT**

You may consider whether any evidence of flight by Mr. Crowe shows consciousness of guilt of an offense charged. In considering any evidence of flight, remember there may be reasons for this conduct which are consistent with innocence.

This instruction applies only to Count III, possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, described in Instruction No. 6.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 28 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE**

A verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. Your verdict must be unanimous. It is your duty to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view of 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 become convinced it is wrong. To bring the jury 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 Mr. Crowe's or Mr. Long Pumpkin's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on an offense charged against them, then your vote should be for a not guilty verdict on that offense. If all of you reach the same conclusion, the verdict of the jury must be not guilty on the offense. Of course, the opposite also applies. If, in your individual judgment, the evidence establishes Mr. Crowe's or Mr. Long Pumpkin's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on an offense, then your vote should be for a verdict of guilty on that offense. If all of you reach that conclusion, the verdict of the jury must be guilty on the offense.

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. 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, then this case is left open and must be resolved at some later time.



### INSTRUCTION NO. 29 - 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, who will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

*Second*, if Mr. Crowe or Mr. Long Pumpkin is found guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider punishment in any way in deciding whether the government proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt as to the 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.

*Fifth*, 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, date and

sign it and advise the court security officer you have reached a verdict. You will then return to the courtroom where your verdict will be received and announced.

Dated November 21, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY L. VIKEN  
CHIEF JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  Plaintiff,  vs.  MOSES CROWE and RANSON LONG PUMPKIN,  Defendants.	CR. 18-50010-JLV  VERDICT AS TO MOSES CROWE
--	---

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

1. A. We unanimously find the defendant MOSES CROWE (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") \_\_\_\_\_ of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I of the indictment.

**Only proceed to Part 1.B if you found Mr. Crowe not guilty or are unable to reach a unanimous verdict as to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury in Part 1.A of this form. If you found Mr. Crowe guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, leave Part 1.B blank.**

- B. We unanimously find the defendant MOSES CROWE (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") \_\_\_\_\_ of carjacking.

2. We unanimously find the defendant MOSES CROWE (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) \_\_\_\_\_ of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment.
3. We unanimously find the defendant MOSES CROWE (fill in either “not guilty” or “guilty”) \_\_\_\_\_ of possession of a firearm by a prohibited person as charged in Count III of the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Foreperson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  Plaintiff,  vs.  MOSES CROWE and RANSON LONG PUMPKIN,  Defendants.	CR. 18-50010-JLV  VERDICT AS TO RANSON LONG PUMPKIN
--	--

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

1. A. We unanimously find the defendant RANSON LONG PUMPKIN (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") \_\_\_\_\_ of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count I of the indictment.

**Only proceed to Part 1.B if you found Mr. Long Pumpkin not guilty or are unable to reach a unanimous verdict as to the offense of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury in Part 1.A of this form. If you found Mr. Long Pumpkin guilty of carjacking resulting in serious bodily injury, leave Part 1.B blank.**

- B. We unanimously find the defendant RANSON LONG PUMPKIN (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") \_\_\_\_\_ of carjacking.

2. We unanimously find the defendant RANSON LONG PUMPKIN (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") \_\_\_\_\_ of discharge of a firearm during a crime of violence as charged in Count II of the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Foreperson