

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASEY LYNN CROW GHOST

Defendant.

CR 21-10003-CBK

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it is my duty now to explain the rules of law you must apply to this case.

You as jurors are the sole judges of the facts. But it is your duty to follow the law stated in these instructions, and to apply that law to the facts as you find them from the evidence before you. I also gave you instructions during the trial and you must follow those instructions. It would be a violation of your sworn duty to base your verdicts upon any rules of law other than the ones given you in these instructions, regardless of your personal feelings as to what the law ought to be.

You are not to single out one instruction alone as stating the law, but must consider the instructions as a whole.

INSTRUCTION NO. 2

You have been chosen and sworn as jurors to try the issues of fact presented by the allegations of the indictment and the denials made by the defendant in his pleas of “not guilty.” You are to perform this duty without bias or prejudice, because the law does not permit jurors to be governed by sympathy or public opinion. The accused and the public expect that you will carefully and impartially consider all of the evidence and will follow the law as stated by the Court, in order to reach just verdicts, regardless of the consequences to any party.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

The indictment in this case charges the defendant with the crimes of first degree murder and the use of a firearm during a crime of violence that causes death. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to these charges.

As I told you at the beginning of the trial, an indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. To the contrary, the defendant is presumed to be innocent. Therefore, the defendant, even though charged, begins the trial with no evidence against him. This presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty and can be overcome only if the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of the crimes charged.

There is no burden upon the defendant to prove that he is innocent.

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

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense, and not the mere possibility of innocence. A reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, must be proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person would not hesitate to rely and act upon it. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

I have mentioned the word “evidence.” The evidence in this case consists of the testimony of witnesses, and the documents and other things received as exhibits.

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 and questions that I struck from the record, or told you to disregard, are not evidence and must not be considered.
4. Anything you saw or heard about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence.

Finally, you were instructed that some evidence was received for a limited purpose only and you must follow that instruction.

INSTRUCTION NO. 6

There are two types of evidence from which you may find the truth as to the facts of a case -- direct and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness; circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances indicating the guilt or innocence of the defendant. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence. Nor is a greater degree of certainty required of circumstantial evidence than of direct evidence. You should weigh all the evidence in the case. After weighing all the evidence, if you are not convinced of the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

In deciding what the facts are, you may have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You may believe all of what a witness said, or only part of it, or none of it.

In deciding what testimony to believe, consider the witness's intelligence, the opportunity the witness had to have seen or heard the things testified about, the witness's memory, any motives that witness may have for testifying a certain way, the manner of the witness while testifying, whether that witness said something different at an earlier time, the general reasonableness of the testimony, and the extent to which the testimony is consistent with any evidence that you believe.

In deciding whether or not to believe a witness, keep in mind that people sometimes hear or see things differently and sometimes forget things. You need to consider therefore whether a contradiction is an innocent misrecollection or lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood, and that may depend on whether it has to do with an important fact or only a small detail.

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



INSTRUCTION NO. 8

The weight of the evidence is not necessarily determined by the number of witnesses testifying. You should consider all the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses are worthy of a greater credence. You may find that the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side is more credible than the testimony of a greater number of witnesses on the other side.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

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

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. 10

The crime of first-degree murder, as charged in Count I of the indictment, has six essential elements, which are:

1. On or about December 12, 2020, the defendant voluntarily and intentionally killed Allison Archambault.
2. The defendant did so with malice aforethought as defined in Instruction No. 11 and not in the heat of passion as submitted in Instruction No. 16.
3. The killing was premeditated as defined in Instruction No. 12
4. The defendant was not acting in self-defense as defined in Instruction No. 13
5. The defendant is an Indian; and
6. The alleged offense occurred in Indian Country.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime charged in Count I of the indictment, the government must prove all of these essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

As used in these instructions, “malice aforethought” means an intent, at the time of a killing, willfully to take the life of a human being, or an intent willfully to act in callous and wanton disregard of the consequences to human life. But “malice aforethought” does not necessarily imply any ill will, spite, or hatred towards the individual killed.

In determining whether Allison Archambault was unlawfully killed with malice aforethought, you should consider all the evidence concerning the facts and circumstances preceding, surrounding, and following the killing which tend to shed light upon the question of intent.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

A killing is premeditated when it is intentional and the result of planning or deliberation. The amount of time needed for premeditation of a killing depends on the person and the circumstances. It must be long enough for the defendant, after forming the intent to kill, to be fully conscious of his intent, and to have thought about the killing.

For there to be premeditation the defendant must think about the taking of a human life before acting. The amount of time required for premeditation cannot be arbitrarily fixed. The time required varies as the minds and temperaments of people differ and according to the surrounding circumstances in which they may be placed. Any interval of time between forming the intent to kill, and acting on that intent, which is long enough for the defendant to be fully conscious and mindful of what he intended and willfully set about to do, is sufficient to justify the finding of premeditation.

Instruction No. 13

If a person reasonably believes that force is necessary to protect himself or another person from what he reasonably believes to be unlawful physical harm about to be inflicted by another and uses such force, then he acted in self-defense or defense of others.

However, self-defense which involves using force likely to cause death or great bodily harm is justified only if the person reasonably believes that such force is necessary to protect himself or the third person from what he reasonably believes to be a substantial risk of death or great bodily harm.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

If you should unanimously find the defendant “Not Guilty” of the crime of first-degree murder as charged in Count I of the indictment, or if, after all reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict as to the crime charged in Count I of the indictment, then you must proceed to determine the guilt or innocence of the defendant as to second-degree murder under this instruction.

The crime of second-degree murder, a lesser included offense of the crime of first-degree murder as charged in Count I of the indictment, has five essential elements, which are:

1. On or about December 12, 2020, the defendant unlawfully killed Allison Archambault.
2. The defendant did so with malice aforethought as defined in Instruction No. 11 and not in the heat of passion as defined in Instruction No. 16.
3. The defendant was not acting in self-defense as defined in Instruction No. 13.
4. The defendant is an Indian; and
5. The alleged offense occurred in Indian Country.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, a lesser included offense of the crime of first-degree murder as charged in Count I of the indictment, the government must prove all of the essential elements of this lesser included offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

If you should unanimously find the defendant “Not Guilty” of the crime of first-degree murder and “Not Guilty” of the crime of second-degree murder or if, after all reasonable efforts, you are unable to reach a verdict as to the crime of first-degree murder and the crime of second-degree murder, then you must go on to consider whether the defendant committed the offense of voluntary manslaughter under this instruction.

The crime of voluntary manslaughter, a lesser included offense of the crime of first-degree murder as charged in Count I of the indictment, has five essential elements, which are:

1. On or about December 12, 2020, the defendant voluntarily and intentionally killed Allison Archambault.
2. The defendant acted in the heat of passion caused by adequate provocation, as defined in Instruction No. 16.
3. The defendant was not acting in self-defense as defined in Instruction No. 13.
4. The defendant is an Indian; and
5. The alleged offense occurred in Indian Country.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, a lesser included offense of the crime of first-degree murder as charged in Count I of the indictment, the government must prove all of the essential elements of this lesser included offense beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.



INSTRUCTION NO. 16

The defendant acted upon heat of passion caused by adequate provocation, if:

1. The defendant was provoked in a way that would cause a reasonable person to lose his self-control.
2. A reasonable person subject to the same provocation would not have regained self-control in the time between the provocation and the killing; and
3. Three, the defendant did not regain his self-control in the time between the provocation and the killing.

Heat of passion may result from anger, rage, resentment, terror or fear. The question is whether the defendant, while in such an emotional state, lost self-control and acted on impulse and without reflection.

Provocation, in order to be adequate under the law, must be such as would naturally induce a reasonable person in the passion of the moment to temporarily lose self-control and kill on impulse and without reflection. A blow or other personal violence may constitute adequate provocation, but trivial or slight provocation, entirely disproportionate to the violence of the retaliation, is not adequate provocation.

It must be such provocation as would arouse a reasonable person.

If the provocation aroused the defendant because he was voluntarily intoxicated, and would not have aroused a sober person, it does not reduce the offense to manslaughter.

INSTRUCTION NO. 17

The crime of use of a firearm during a crime of violence that causes death, as charged in Count II of the indictment, has three essential elements, which are:

1. The defendant committed the crime of murder as charged in Count I of the indictment, or committed one of the lesser-included offenses to Count I.
2. On or about December 12, 2020, the defendant knowingly discharged a firearm, a Sig Sauer brand handgun with serial number 37B067878, during or in relation to the crime of murder as charged in Count I, or in relation to one of the lesser-included offenses to Count I, and
3. The defendant used the firearm to cause the death of Allison Archambault.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime charged in Count II of the indictment, the government must prove all of these essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

Intent may be proved like anything else. You may consider any statements and acts done by the defendant, and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in a 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. 19

The indictment charges that the offenses were committed “on or about” a certain date. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged offenses. It is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 20

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

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that 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 offenses are claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

INSTRUCTION NO. 21

Upon retiring to the jury room, you will select one of your number to act as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations and will be your spokesperson here in Court.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.

You will take this form to the jury room and, when you have reached unanimous agreement as to your verdicts, you will have your foreperson fill in, date, and sign the form to state the verdicts upon which you unanimously agree, and then notify the marshal that you have a verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 22

The verdicts must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return any verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. Your verdicts must be unanimous.

It is your duty, as jurors, to consult with one another, and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement, if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for himself or herself, but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with the other jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views, and change your opinion, if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of the evidence, solely because of the opinion of the other jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times, you are not partisans. You are judges - judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. 23

If you have questions, you may send a note by a marshal, signed by your foreperson, or by one or more members of the jury.

You will note from the oath about to be taken by the marshal that he, as well as all other persons, are forbidden to communicate in any way or manner with any member of the jury on any subject touching the merits of the case.

Bear in mind also that you are never to reveal to any person--not even to the Court--how the jury stands, numerically or otherwise, on the question of the guilt or innocence of the accused, until after you have reached unanimous verdicts.



INSTRUCTION NO. 24

It is proper to add a final caution.

Nothing that I have said in these instructions, and nothing that I have said or done during the trial, has been said or done to suggest to you what I think your verdicts should be.

What the verdicts shall be is your exclusive duty and responsibility.