

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

**SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. CR. 17-40082-01-KES
Plaintiff,	
vs.	<b>FINAL INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY</b>
JAY LESLIE HAGGARD,	
Defendant.	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FINAL INSTRUCTIONS

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1 – INTRODUCTION..... 1

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 2 – SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR..... 2

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 3 – CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A CHILD..... 5

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 4 – CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A CHILD..... 7

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 5 – FURNISHING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO A CHILD..... 9

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 6 – FURNISHING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO A CHILD..... 10

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 7 – PROOF OF INTENT ..... 11

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 8 – DEFENSE TO SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR... 12

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 9 – IMPEACHMENT ..... 13

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 10 – DEFENDANT’S TESTIMONY – IMPEACHMENT BY PRIOR CONVICTION..... 14

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 11 – STATEMENT BY DEFENDANT..... 15

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 12 – PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF..... 16

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 13 – REASONABLE DOUBT ..... 17

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 14 – DUTY TO DELIBERATE..... 18

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 15 – DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS..... 19

VERDICT FORM

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 1 – INTRODUCTION

Members of the jury, the written instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial and the oral instructions I gave you during the trial remain in effect. I now give you some additional instructions.

The instructions I am about to give you, as well as the preliminary instructions given to you at the beginning of the trial, are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room. *All* instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, must be followed. This is true even though some of the instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial are not repeated here.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 2 – SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR

For you to find Jay Leslie Haggard guilty of the offense of Sexual Abuse of a Minor as charged in Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove the following seven essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, that between on or about August 22-23, 2017, Haggard did engage or attempt to engage in a sexual act with Y.L.F.;**

The term “sexual act” is defined as

- A) Contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, and contact involving the penis occurs upon penetration, however slight;
- B) Contact between the mouth and the penis, the mouth and the vulva, or the mouth and the anus;
- C) The penetration, however slight, of the anal or genital opening of another by a hand or finger or by any object, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person; or
- D) The intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of another person who has not attained the age of 16 years with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person.

A person may be found guilty of an attempt if he intended to engage in a sexual act and voluntarily and intentionally carried out some act that was a substantial step toward engaging in a sexual act.

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 crime. In order for behavior to be punishable as an attempt, it need not be incompatible with innocence, yet it must be necessary to the consummation of the crime and be of such a nature that a reasonable observer, viewing it in context, could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that it was undertaken in accordance with a design to violate that statute.

**Two, that Haggard did such acts knowingly;**

An act is done “knowingly” if the defendant is aware of the act and does not act, or fail to act, through ignorance, mistake, or accident. You may consider evidence of the defendant’s words, acts, or omissions, along with all the other evidence, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly.

The government is not required to prove that the defendant knew his acts or omissions were unlawful.

**Three, that at the time of the offense Y.L.F. had attained the age of twelve years but had not attained the age of sixteen years;**

**Four, that at the time of the offense Y.L.F. was at least four years younger than Haggard;**

**Five, that Y.L.F. is an Indian;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that Y.L.F. is an Indian.

The defendant has not, by entering into this agreement or stipulation, 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 present to the jury the fact that Y.L.F. is an Indian.

**Six, that Haggard is non-Indian;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that Haggard is non-Indian.

The defendant has not, by entering into this agreement or stipulation, 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 present to the jury the fact that Haggard is non-Indian.

**And seven, that the offense took place in Indian Country in the District of South Dakota.**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that the alleged offense took place in Indian Country.

The defendant has not, by entering into this agreement or stipulation, 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 present to the jury the fact that the alleged offense took place in Indian Country.

For you to find Haggard guilty of the offense charged in Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove all seven of the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find Haggard not guilty of the offense charged in Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 3 – CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A CHILD

For you to find Jay Leslie Haggard guilty of the offense of Contributing to the Delinquency of a Child as charged in Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove the following five essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, that between on or about August 22-23, 2017, Haggard did cause, encourage, or contribute to the abuse, neglect or delinquency of a child, Y.L.F., or caused the child, Y.L.F., to become a child in need of supervision;**

The term “delinquent child” means any child ten years of age or older who, regardless of whether the violation occurred, has violated any federal, state, or local law or regulation for which there is a penalty of a criminal nature for an adult, except state or municipal hunting, fishing, boating, park, or traffic laws that are classified as misdemeanors, or petty offenses, or any violation of SDCL § 35-9-2 (purchase, attempt to purchase, possession, or consumption of alcoholic beverages by any person under the age of twenty-one years) or SDCL § 32-23-21 (driver under the age of twenty-one years operating a vehicle after alcohol or drug consumption).

The term “child in need of supervision” means:

- A) Any child of compulsory school age who is habitually absent from school without legal excuse;
- B) Any child who has run away from home or is otherwise beyond the control of the child’s parent, guardian, or custodian;
- C) Any child whose behavior or condition endangers the child’s own welfare or the welfare of others;
- D) Any child who has violated any federal, state, or local law or regulation for which there is not a penalty of a criminal nature for an adult, except SDCL § 34-46-2(2) (purchase, attempt to purchase, possession, or consumption of a tobacco product) or petty offenses; or
- E) Any child who has violated SDCL § 35-9-2 (purchase, attempt to purchase, possession, or consumption of alcoholic beverages by any person under the age of twenty-one years) or SDCL § 32-23-21 (driver under the age of twenty-one years operating a vehicle after alcohol or drug consumption).

**Two, that at the time of the offense Y.L.F. had not attained the age of eighteen years;**

**Three, that Y.L.F. is an Indian;**

The parties stipulated that Y.L.F. is an Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

**Four, that Haggard is non-Indian;**

The parties stipulated that the defendant is non-Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

**And five, that the offense took place in Indian Country in the District of South Dakota.**

The parties stipulated that the alleged offense took place in Indian Country. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

For you to find Haggard guilty of the offense charged in Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove all five of the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find Haggard not guilty of the offense charged in Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 4 – CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A CHILD

For you to find Jay Leslie Haggard guilty of the offense of Contributing to the Delinquency of a Child as charged in Count 3 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove the following five essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, that between on or about August 22-23, 2017, Haggard did cause, encourage, or contribute to the abuse, neglect or delinquency of a child, M.C., or caused the child, M.C., to become a child in need of supervision;**

The term “delinquent child” was defined for you in Final Instruction No. 3.

The term “child in need of supervision” was defined for you in Final Instruction No. 3.

**Two, that at the time of the offense M.C. had not attained the age of eighteen years;**

**Three, that M.C. is an Indian;**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that M.C. is an Indian.

The defendant has not, by entering into this agreement or stipulation, 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 present to the jury the fact that M.C. is an Indian.

**Four, that Haggard is non-Indian;**

The parties stipulated that the defendant is non-Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

**And five, that the offense took place in Indian Country in the District of South Dakota.**

The parties stipulated that the alleged offense took place in Indian Country. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.



For you to find Haggard guilty of the offense charged in Count 3 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove all five of the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find Haggard not guilty of the offense charged in Count 3 of the Superseding Indictment.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 5 – FURNISHING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO A CHILD

For you to find Jay Leslie Haggard guilty of the offense of Furnishing Alcoholic Beverages to a Child as charged in Count 4 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove the following five essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, that between on or about August 22-23, 2017, Haggard sold or gave for use as a beverage any alcoholic beverage to Y.L.F.;**

**Two, that at the time of the offense Y.L.F. had not attained the age of eighteen years;**

**Three, that Y.L.F. is an Indian;**

The parties stipulated that the Y.L.F. is an Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

**Four, that Haggard is non-Indian;**

The parties stipulated that the defendant is non-Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

**And five, that the offense took place in Indian Country in the District of South Dakota.**

The parties stipulated that the alleged offense took place in Indian Country. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

For you to find Haggard guilty of the offense charged in Count 4 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove all five of the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find Haggard not guilty of the offense charged in Count 4 of the Superseding Indictment.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 6 – FURNISHING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES TO A CHILD

For you to find Jay Leslie Haggard guilty of the offense of Furnishing Alcoholic Beverages to a Child as charged in Count 5 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove the following five essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, that between on or about August 22-23, 2017, Haggard did sell or give for use as a beverage any alcoholic beverage to M.C.;**

**Two, that at the time of the offense M.C. had not attained the age of eighteen years;**

**Three, that M.C. is an Indian;**

The parties stipulated that M.C. is an Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 4.

**Four, that Haggard is non-Indian;**

The parties stipulated that the defendant is non-Indian. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

**And five, that the offense took place in Indian Country in the District of South Dakota.**

The parties stipulated that the alleged offense took place in Indian Country. The effect of this stipulation has previously been explained in Final Instruction No. 2.

For you to find Haggard guilty of the offense charged in Count 5 of the Superseding Indictment, the government must prove all five of the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. Otherwise, you must find Haggard not guilty of the offense charged in Count 5 of the Superseding Indictment.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 7 – PROOF OF INTENT

Intent may be proven like anything else. You may consider any statements made or 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.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 8 – DEFENSE TO SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR

In a prosecution for sexual abuse of a minor, it is a defense that the defendant reasonably believed that the other person had attained the age of sixteen years. With regard to this defense, the burden is on Haggard to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he reasonably believed Y.L.F. had attained the age of sixteen years at the time they engaged in the alleged sexual act. There is no burden on the United States to prove either that Haggard knew the age of Y.L.F. or that Haggard knew that a four-year age difference existed between him and Y.L.F. when they engaged in the alleged sexual act.

To prove something by a preponderance of the evidence is to prove that it is more likely true than not true. It is determined by considering all of the evidence and deciding what evidence is more believable. If, on this issue, the evidence is equally balanced, you cannot find that issue has been proved by a preponderance of the evidence.

If you find that Haggard has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he reasonably believed Y.L.F. had attained the age of sixteen years at the time they engaged in the sexual act, you must find Haggard not guilty of sexual abuse of a minor as charged in the Superseding Indictment.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 9 – IMPEACHMENT

In Preliminary Instruction No. 6, I instructed you generally on the credibility of witnesses. I now give you this further instruction on how the credibility of a witness can be “impeached” and how you may treat certain evidence.

A witness may be discredited or impeached by contradictory evidence; by a showing that the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter; or by evidence that at some other time the witness has said or done something, or has failed to say or do something, that is inconsistent with the witness’s present testimony. If earlier statements of a witness were admitted into evidence, they were not admitted to prove that the contents of those statements were true. Instead, you may consider those earlier statements only to determine whether you think they are consistent or inconsistent with the trial testimony of the witness, and therefore whether they affect the credibility of that witness.

If you believe that a witness has been discredited or impeached, it is your exclusive right to give that witness’s testimony whatever weight, if any, you think it deserves.

Your decision on the facts of this case should not be determined by the number of witnesses testifying for or against a party. You should consider all the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses you choose to believe or not believe. 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.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 10 – DEFENDANT’S TESTIMONY – IMPEACHMENT  
BY PRIOR CONVICTION

You have heard evidence that defendant, Jay Leslie Haggard, was previously convicted of a felony. You may use that evidence only to help you decide whether to believe his testimony and how much weight to give it. The fact that he was previously convicted of a crime does not mean that he committed the crimes charged here, and you must not use that evidence as any proof of the crimes charged in this case.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 11 – STATEMENT BY DEFENDANT

You have heard testimony that the defendant, Jay Leslie Haggard, made a statement to law enforcement. It is for you to decide:

*First*, whether the defendant, Jay Leslie Haggard, made the statement;  
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.



FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 12 – PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF

The presumption of innocence means that the defendant is presumed to be absolutely not guilty.

- This presumption means that you must put aside all suspicion that might arise from the defendant's arrest, the charges, or the fact that he is here in court.
- This presumption remains with the defendant throughout the trial.
- This presumption is enough, alone, for you to find the defendant not guilty, unless the prosecution proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, all of the elements of an offense charged against him.

The burden is always on the prosecution to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

- This burden never, ever shifts to the defendant to prove his innocence.
- This burden means that the defendant does not have to call any witnesses, produce any evidence, cross-examine the prosecution's witnesses, or testify.

This burden means that you must find the defendant not guilty of the offenses charged against him, unless the prosecution proves beyond a reasonable doubt that he has committed each and every element of the offenses.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 13 – REASONABLE DOUBT

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense.

- A reasonable doubt may arise from evidence produced by the prosecution or the defendant, keeping in mind that the defendant never, ever has the burden or duty to call any witnesses or to produce any evidence.
- A reasonable doubt may arise from the prosecution's lack of evidence.

The prosecution must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

- Proof beyond a reasonable doubt requires careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case before making a decision.
- Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof so convincing that you would be willing to rely and act on it in the most important of your own affairs.

The prosecution's burden is heavy, but it does not require proof beyond all possible doubt.

FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 14 – DUTY TO DELIBERATE

A verdict must represent the careful and impartial judgment of each of you. Before you make that judgment, you must consult with one another and try to reach agreement if you can do so consistent with your individual judgment.

- If you are convinced that the prosecution has not proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, say so.
- If you are convinced that the prosecution has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, say so.
- Do not give up your honest beliefs just because others think differently or because you simply want to be finished with the case.
- On the other hand, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and to change your opinion if you are convinced that it is wrong.
- You can only reach a unanimous verdict if you discuss your views openly and frankly, with proper regard for the opinions of others, and with a willingness to re-examine your own views.
- Remember that you are not advocates, but judges of the facts, so your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence.
- The question is never who wins or loses the case, because society always wins, whatever your verdict, when you return a just verdict based solely on the evidence, reason, your common sense, and these Instructions.
- You must consider all of the evidence bearing on each element before you.
- Take all the time that you feel is necessary.
- Remember that this case is important to the parties and to the fair administration of justice, so do not be in a hurry to reach a verdict just to be finished with the case.

## FINAL INSTRUCTION NO. 15 – DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS

You must follow certain rules while conducting your deliberations and returning your verdict:

- Select a foreperson to preside over your discussions and to speak for you here in court.
- Do not consider punishment in any way in deciding whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. If the defendant is guilty, I will decide what the sentence should be.
- Communicate with me by sending me a note through a Court Security Officer (CSO). The note must be signed by one or more of you. Remember that you should not tell anyone, including me, how your votes stand. I will respond as soon as possible, either in writing or orally in open court.
- Base your verdict solely on the evidence, reason, your common sense, and these Instructions. Again, nothing I have said or done was intended to suggest what your verdict should be—that is entirely for you to decide.
- Reach your verdict without discrimination. In reaching your verdict, you must not consider the defendant's race, color, religious beliefs, national origin, or sex. You are not to return a verdict for or against the defendant unless you would return the same verdict without regard to his race, color, religious beliefs, national origin, or sex.
- Complete the Verdict Form. The foreperson must bring the signed verdict form to the courtroom when it is time to announce your verdict.
- When you have reached a verdict, the foreperson will advise the CSO that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

Good luck with your deliberations.

Dated March 7, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

Handwritten signature of Karen E. Schreier in blue ink, written over a horizontal line.

KAREN E. SCHREIER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE