

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
NORTHERN DIVISION

FILED

NOV - 3 2015


CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LINDA JOAN McLAUGHLIN,

Defendant.

CR 15-10028-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. It would be a violation of your sworn duty to base your verdict 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 denial made by the defendant in her plea 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 a just verdict, regardless of the consequences to any party.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

The charge pending in this case is incest. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to this charge.

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 her. 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 crime charged.

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 that the defendant made a statement to law enforcement officers. It is for you to decide:

First, whether the defendant made the statement.

Second, if so, how much weight you should give to it.

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

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

The crime of incest, as charged in the indictment, has six essential elements, which are:

1. That on or about the 17th day of June, 2015, the Defendant engaged in a mutually consensual act of sexual penetration with Joseph Follows the Road, Sr.;
2. That both parties were 18 years of age or older;
3. That the Defendant and Joseph Follows the Road, Sr. were not legally married;
4. That the Defendant was then related to Joseph Follows the Road, Sr. as daughter and father;
5. That the Defendant is an Indian; and
6. That the alleged offense took place in Indian country.

For you to find the Defendant guilty of this crime as charged in 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, the term “sexual penetration” means an act however slight, of sexual intercourse, cunnilingus, fellatio, anal intercourse, or any intrusion, however slight, of any part of the body or of any object into the genital or anal opening of another person’s body.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

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. 13

The indictment in this case alleges that the defendant is an Indian and that the alleged offense occurred in Indian country. The existence of those two factors is necessary in order for this Court to have jurisdiction over the crime 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 incident is claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

The defendant has not, by entering this agreement or stipulation, admitted her 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 defendant is an Indian and that the place where the alleged offense is claimed to have occurred is in Indian country.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that defendant is the biological daughter of Joseph Milo Follows the Road, Sr.

The defendant has not, by entering this agreement or stipulation, admitted her 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 defendant is the daughter of Joseph Milo Follows the Road, Sr.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

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 verdict, you will have your foreperson fill in, date and sign the form to state the verdict upon which you unanimously agree, and then notify the marshal that you have a verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return any verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. Your verdict 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. 17

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 a unanimous verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18

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 verdict should be.

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LINDA JOAN McLAUGHLIN,

Defendant.

1:15-CR-10028-CBK

VERDICT

Please return a verdict by placing an "X" in the space provided.

We, the jury in the above entitled action, as to the crime of incest, find Linda Joan McLaughlin:

_____ NOT GUILTY _____ GUILTY

Dated this _____ day of November, 2015.

FOREPERSON