


UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

**FILED**  
DEC 04 2015  
  
CLERK

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,<br/><br/>Plaintiff,<br/><br/>vs.<br/><br/>REBECCA M. SOTHERLAND,<br/><br/>Defendant.</p> | <p>CR. 14-50080-JLV<br/><br/>SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS TO<br/>THE JURY</p> |
|---|--|

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

NO. 21 - EQUALLY IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS ..... 2  
NO. 22 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE ..... 3  
NO. 23 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS ..... 5

VERDICT

**INSTRUCTION NO. 21 - 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. 22 - 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 are 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 Ms. Sotherland's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on an offense charged against her, then Ms. Sotherland should have your vote 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 that offense. Of course, the opposite also applies. If, in your individual judgment, the evidence establishes Ms. Sotherland's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on an offense charged, your vote should be for a

verdict of guilty against Ms. Sotherland on that offense. If all of you reach that conclusion, the verdict of the jury must be guilty on that 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. 23 - 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 Ms. Sotherland 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 offenses 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 December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JEFFREY L. VIKEN', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

JEFFREY L. VIKEN  
CHIEF JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,<br/><br/>Plaintiff,<br/><br/>vs.<br/><br/>REBECCA M. SOTHERLAND,<br/><br/>Defendant.</p> | <p>CR. 14-50080-JLV<br/><br/>VERDICT</p> |
|---|--|

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

1. We unanimously find the defendant REBECCA SOTHERLAND \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") of Deprivation of Civil Rights as charged in count I of the indictment.
2. We unanimously find the defendant REBECCA SOTHERLAND \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") of Assault with a Dangerous Weapon as charged in count II of the indictment.
3. We unanimously find the defendant REBECCA SOTHERLAND \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in either "not guilty" or "guilty") of Obstruction of a Federal Investigation as charged in count III of the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Foreperson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
WESTERN DIVISION

**FILED**  
DEC 01 2015  
*[Signature]*  
CLERK

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,<br/><br/>Plaintiff,<br/><br/>vs.<br/><br/>REBECCA M. SOTHERLAND,<br/><br/>Defendant.</p> | <p>CR. 14-50080-JLV<br/><br/>INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY</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 - DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS ..... 6  
NO. 5 - ASSAULT WITH A DANGEROUS WEAPON ..... 9  
NO. 6 - OBSTRUCTION OF A FEDERAL INVESTIGATION ..... 12  
NO. 7 - PROOF OF INTENT ..... 14  
NO. 8 - TRIBAL ORDINANCE ..... 15  
NO. 9 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND  
BURDEN OF PROOF ..... 16  
NO. 10 - REASONABLE DOUBT ..... 18  
NO. 11 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE ..... 19  
NO. 12 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES ..... 21  
NO. 13 - IMPEACHMENT ..... 23  
NO. 14 - EXPERT WITNESSES ..... 24  
NO. 15 - BENCH CONFERENCES AND RECESSES ..... 25  
NO. 16 - OBJECTIONS ..... 26  
NO. 17 - NOTE TAKING ..... 27  
NO. 18 - MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY ..... 28  
NO. 19 - CONDUCT OF THE JURY DURING TRIAL ..... 31  
NO. 20 - OUTLINE OF THE TRIAL ..... 33



**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 defendant, Rebecca Sotherland. Ms. Sotherland is charged with deprivation of civil rights, assault with a dangerous weapon and obstruction of a federal investigation. Your duty is to decide from the evidence whether Ms. Sotherland is not guilty or guilty of the offenses charged against her.

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 Ms. Sotherland, not anyone else, is on trial here. Also, remember Ms. Sotherland is on trial only for the offenses charged against her, 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 Ms. Sotherland are set out in an indictment. An indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. Ms. Sotherland pled not guilty to the charges brought against her. Ms. Sotherland is presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of a charged offense.

The indictment charges the offenses were committed “on or about” a certain date. The government does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of an offense charged. It is sufficient if the evidence establishes that an offense occurred within a reasonable time of the date 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.**

**INSTRUCTION NO. 4 –  
DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS**

Count I of the indictment charges that on or about August 15, 2014, at Manderson, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Rebecca Sotherland, while acting under color of law, deployed Oleoresin Capsicum spray and repeatedly deployed a taser on Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull, willfully depriving him of the right, secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, to be free from the use of unreasonable force by a law enforcement officer. The offense involved the use of dangerous weapons and resulted in bodily injury to Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull.

**Elements**

For you to find Ms. Sotherland guilty of the offense of deprivation of civil rights as charged in count I of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, on or about August 15, 2014, at Manderson, in the District of South Dakota, Ms. Sotherland was acting under color of law;**

A person acts under “color of law” when she acts in her official capacity or purports or claims to act in her official capacity. Action under color of law includes the abuse or misuse of the power possessed by the defendant by virtue of her official position.

**Two, Ms. Sotherland deprived Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull of his right to be free from the use of unreasonable force by a law enforcement officer, which is protected by the Constitution of the United States;**

You are instructed that every person has the constitutional right to be free from a law enforcement officer's use of unreasonable force during an arrest, detention or other stop.

In determining whether the force was "unreasonable," you must consider the purpose and need for the application of force, the relationship between the need for force and the amount of force that was used, and whether a reasonable officer on the scene, without the benefit of hindsight, would have used that much force under similar circumstances. You should keep in mind that the decision about how much force to use often must be made in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly changing. You must determine whether the defendant's actions were reasonable in light of the facts and circumstances confronting her, without regard to her own state of mind, intention or motivation.

**Three, Ms. Sotherland acted willfully, that is, she intended to deprive Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull of this constitutional right;**

To act "willfully" means the defendant voluntarily and intentionally acted with the intent to do something the law forbids.

It is not necessary for you to find that the defendant was thinking in legal terms at the time of the conduct in question. You may find the defendant acted with the required intent even if you find she had no real familiarity with the Constitution or with the constitutional right to be free from the use of unreasonable force, provided you find the defendant intended to accomplish that which the law forbids.

**and**

**Four, the conduct involved the use of a dangerous weapon or resulted in bodily injury to Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull.**

A "dangerous weapon" is an object used in a manner likely to endanger life or inflict serious bodily harm.

The term “bodily injury” means a cut, abrasion, bruise, burn, disfigurement, physical pain, illness, impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or mental faculty, or any other injury to the body, no matter how temporary.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of deprivation of civil rights as charged in count I 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 the defendant guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 5 - ASSAULT WITH A DANGEROUS WEAPON**

Count II of the indictment charges that on or about August 15, 2014, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Rebecca Sotherland, did knowingly assault Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull, an Indian person, with dangerous weapons, namely, a taser and Oleoresin Capsicum spray, with the intent to do bodily harm.

**Elements**

For you to find Ms. Sotherland guilty of the offense of assault with a dangerous weapon as charged in count II of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, on or about August 15, 2014, Ms. Sotherland unlawfully assaulted Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull;**

An “assault” is any intentional and voluntary attempt or threat to do injury to the person of another, which when coupled with the apparent present ability to do so, is sufficient to put the person against whom the attempt is made in fear of immediate bodily harm.

An assault by an on-duty law enforcement officer is “unlawful” when she uses unreasonable force during the assault.

In determining whether the force was “unreasonable,” you must consider the purpose and need for the application of force, the relationship between the need for force and the amount of force that was used, and whether a reasonable officer on the scene, without the benefit of hindsight, would have used that much force under similar circumstances. You should keep in mind that the decision about how much force to use often must be made in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly changing. You must determine



whether the defendant's actions were reasonable in light of the facts and circumstances confronting her, without regard to her own state of mind, intention or motivation.

**Two, Ms. Sotherland used a dangerous weapon, namely a taser or Oleoresin Capsicum spray, to commit the assault;**

A "dangerous weapon" is an object used in a manner likely to endanger life or inflict serious bodily harm.

**Three, Ms. Sotherland intended to inflict bodily harm to Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull;**

"Intent to inflict bodily harm" means knowingly and intentionally doing an act for the purpose of causing another person to suffer bodily injury. An act is done "knowingly" if done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake, accident or other innocent reasons.

**Four and five, Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull is an Indian person and the offense took place at Manderson, South Dakota, in Indian country.**

Counsel for the United States, counsel for the defendant and the defendant have agreed or stipulated that Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull is an Indian person and that the place where the alleged incident occurred is in Manderson, South Dakota, in Indian country.

By entering into this agreement or stipulation, the defendant has not admitted her guilt of the offense charged, and you may not draw any inference of guilt from the stipulation. The only effect of the stipulation is to establish the facts that Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull is an Indian person and if the alleged incident occurred, it occurred in Indian country.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of assault with a dangerous weapon as charged in count II 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 the defendant guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 6 - OBSTRUCTION OF A FEDERAL INVESTIGATION**

Count III of the indictment charges that on or about August 15, 2014, at Manderson, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Rebecca Sotherland, in relation to and in contemplation of a matter within the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, an agency of the United States, knowingly made a false entry in a record or document with intent to impede, obstruct or influence the investigation or proper administration of the matter within federal jurisdiction. That is, the defendant, Rebecca Sotherland, authored an Oglala Sioux Tribe Department of Public Safety offense/incident report that falsely described the circumstances surrounding her deployment of Oleoresin Capsicum spray and repeated tasing of Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull by stating that Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull resisted arrest, fought against her and continuously pulled away from her. She also falsely reported the number of times she drive stunned and tasered Jefferson Stewart Eagle Bull.

**Elements**

For you to find Ms. Sotherland guilty of the offense of obstruction of a federal investigation as charged in count III of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

**One, on or about August 15, 2014, Ms. Sotherland knowingly falsified a document;**

An act is done “knowingly” if done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake, accident or other innocent reasons.

**Two, Ms. Sotherland did so with the intent to impede, obstruct or influence an investigation or the proper administration of a matter; and**

There is no requirement that the investigation or matter was pending at the time of the obstruction, but only that the defendant's acts were taken in relation to the investigation or matter.

There is no requirement that the falsifying of the document actually obstructed the investigation or matter.

**Three, the investigation or matter was within the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is an agency of the United States.**

The government does not have to prove that the defendant specifically knew that the matter was within the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of obstruction of a federal investigation 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 the defendant guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty of the offense.

**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.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 8 - TRIBAL ORDINANCE**

It is unlawful to be intoxicated within the confines of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. A police officer may use reasonable force to restrain an intoxicated person and if necessary to protect herself, the intoxicated person and others.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 9 -**

**PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF**

The defendant is 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 the defendant or the fact she is here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial. This presumption alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the government proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, each essential element of an offense charged. The burden is always on the government to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to the defendant to prove her 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. The defendant is not even obligated to cross-examine the witnesses called to testify by the government. If the defendant does not testify, this fact must not be considered by you in any way or even discussed in arriving at your verdict. If the defendant testifies, you should judge her 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 the defendant guilty of that offense. If the government fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any

essential element of an offense charged, you must find the defendant 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 the defendant'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, it can be used by you 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.

Finally, just because a witness works in law enforcement or is employed by the government does not mean you should give more weight or credibility to the witness' testimony than you give to any other witness' testimony.

**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; by a showing that the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter; or by 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. 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 a witness has been discredited or impeached, it is your exclusive right to give that witness’ testimony whatever weight you think it deserves.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 14 - 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 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' 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. 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 - 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, we will not have a typewritten transcript of the trial available 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. 18 - 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, PDAs, 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, chat rooms, comments or other postings, social networking sites, including but not limited to Facebook, Instagram, Twitter or any other website. 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. 19 - CONDUCT OF THE JURY DURING TRIAL**

To insure 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. 20 - OUTLINE OF THE TRIAL**

The trial will proceed as follows:

After these instructions, the lawyers for the government may make an opening statement. Next, the lawyers for the defendant 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 the defendant may, but have no obligation to, cross examine them. Following the government's case, the defendant may, but does not have to, present evidence or call witnesses. If the defendant calls 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 December 1, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

  
JEFFREY L. VIKEN  
CHIEF JUDGE