

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
CENTRAL DIVISION

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. TIFFANY SPOTTED WAR BONNET, Defendant.</p>	<p>3:19-CR-30062-RAL FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS</p>
--	---

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Members of the jury, the instructions I gave you at the beginning of the trial and during the trial remain in effect. I now give you some additional instructions. The instructions I am about to give you now are in writing and will be available to you in the jury room.

You must, of course, continue to follow the instructions I gave you earlier, as well as those I give you now. You must not single out some instructions and ignore others, because all are important.

All instructions, whenever given and whether in writing or not, must be followed.

INSTRUCTION NO. 2

It is your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You will then apply the law, as I give it to you, to those facts. You must follow my instructions on the law, even if you thought the law was different or should be different.

Do not allow sympathy or prejudice to influence you. The law demands of you a just verdict, unaffected by anything except the evidence, your common sense, and the law as I give it to you.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

I have mentioned the word “evidence.” The “evidence” in this case consists of the testimony of witnesses, the documents and other things received as exhibits, and the facts that have been stipulated—that is, formally agreed to by the parties.

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

If you were instructed that evidence was received for a limited purpose, you must follow that instruction.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

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 of any witness 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

The indictment in this case charges the defendant with two different crimes. The defendant is charged with one count of assault with a dangerous weapon and one count of assault resulting in serious bodily injury. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to these charges.

The indictment is simply the document that formally charges the defendant with the crimes for which she is on trial. The indictment is not evidence of anything. At the beginning of the trial, I instructed you that you must presume the defendant to be innocent. Thus, the defendant began the trial with a clean slate, with no evidence against her. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to find the defendant not guilty. This presumption can be overcome only if the United States proved during the trial, beyond a reasonable doubt, each element of the crimes charged.

Please remember that only the defendant, not anyone else, is on trial here, and that the defendant is on trial only for the crimes charged, not for anything else.

There is no burden upon a defendant to prove that she is innocent. Instead, the burden of proof remains on the United States throughout the trial. Accordingly, the fact that the defendant did not testify must not be considered by you in any way, or even discussed, in arriving at your verdict.

INSTRUCTION NO. 6

The crime of assault with a dangerous weapon, as charged in Count I of the indictment has five elements, which are:

***One*, that on or about the 4th day of March, 2019, the defendant, Tiffany Spotted War Bonnet, voluntarily and intentionally assaulted Patrick Chekpa;**

***Two*, that the defendant used a dangerous weapon, that is a sharp metal object, in the assault;**

***Three*, that the assault was committed on Patrick Chekpa with the specific intent to do bodily harm;**

***Four*, that the defendant is an Indian; and**

***Five*, that the alleged offense took place in Indian country.**

If you find unanimously that the government has proved these five elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant, and if it has further been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not acting in self-defense, then you must find the defendant guilty of this crime. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

The phrase “dangerous weapon” as used in these instructions means an object with the capacity to endanger life or inflict bodily harm and used in a manner likely to do so.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8

The crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury, as charged in Count II of the indictment, has four elements, which are:

***One*, that on or about the 4th day of March, 2019, the defendant, Tiffany Spotted War Bonnet, voluntarily and intentionally assaulted Patrick Chekpa;**

***Two*, that the assault resulted in serious bodily injury;**

***Three*, that the defendant is an Indian; and**

***Four*, that the alleged offense took place in Indian country.**

If you find unanimously that the government has proved these four elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to the defendant, and if it has further been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not acting in self-defense, then you must find the defendant guilty of this crime. Otherwise, you must find the defendant not guilty of this offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

“Serious bodily injury” as used in these instructions means bodily injury which involves a substantial risk of death; extreme physical pain; protracted and obvious disfigurement; or protracted loss or impairment of the functions of a bodily member, organ or mental faculty.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

Intent or knowledge may be proved like anything else. You may consider any statements made and acts done by the defendant, and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in the 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. 11

In the crime of assault with a dangerous weapon, as charged in Count I of the indictment, there must exist in the mind of the perpetrator the specific intent to do bodily harm to the alleged victim. If the defendant acted without such specific intent, the crime of assault with a dangerous weapon has not been committed. There is no such requirement for the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count II of the indictment.

Being under the influence of alcohol provides a legal excuse for the commission of the offense of assault with a dangerous weapon, but only if the effect of alcohol makes it impossible for the defendant to have the specific intent to cause bodily harm. Evidence that the defendant acted while under the influence of alcohol may be considered by you, together with all the other evidence, in determining whether or not she did, in fact, have the specific intent to do bodily harm through an assault with a dangerous weapon.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

If a person reasonably believes force is necessary to protect herself from what she reasonably believes to be unlawful physical harm about to be inflicted by another and uses such force, then she acted in self-defense. If a person acts in self-defense, she is not guilty of the charged offenses.

However, self-defense which involves the use of force likely to cause death or great bodily harm is justified only if the person reasonably believes the force is necessary to protect herself from what she reasonably believes to be a substantial risk of death or great bodily harm.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

You have heard testimony that the defendant made a statement to others. It is for you to decide:

First, whether the defendant made the statement; and

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

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

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

You have heard testimony from a person described as an expert. A person who, by knowledge, skill, training, education, or experience, has become an expert in some field may state his or her opinion on matters in that field and may also state the reasons for his or her 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. 15

Reasonable doubt is doubt based upon reason and common sense, and not doubt based on speculation. A reasonable doubt may arise from careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, or from a lack of evidence. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof of such a convincing character that a reasonable person, after careful consideration, would not hesitate to rely and act upon that proof in life's most important decisions. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

In conducting your deliberations and returning your verdict, there are certain rules you must follow. I shall list those rules for you now.

First, when you go to the jury room, you must select one of your members as your foreperson. That person will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

Second, it is your duty, as jurors, to discuss this case with one another in the jury room. You should try to reach agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment, because a verdict—whether guilty or not guilty—must be unanimous. Each of you must make your own conscientious decision, but only after you have considered all the evidence, discussed it fully with your fellow jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors. Do not be afraid to change your opinions if the discussion persuades you that you should. But do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right, or simply to reach a verdict.

Third, if the defendant is found guilty, the sentence to be imposed is my responsibility. You may not consider punishment in any way in deciding whether the United States has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Fourth, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations, you may send a note to me through the marshal or court security officer, signed by one or more jurors. I will respond as soon as possible either in writing or orally in open court. Remember that you should not tell anyone—including me—how your votes stand numerically.

Fifth, during your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone other than by note to me by any means about this case. You may not use any electronic device or media, such as a telephone, smart phone, or computer; the internet, any internet service, or any text or instant messaging service; or any internet chat room, blog, or website such as Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram, YouTube, or Twitter, to communicate to anyone information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I accept your verdict.

Sixth, your verdict must be based solely on the evidence and on the law which I have given to you in my instructions. Nothing I have said or done is intended to suggest what your verdict should be—that is entirely for you to decide.

Finally, the verdict form is simply the written notice of the decision that you reach in this case. You will take this form to the jury room, and when each of you has agreed on the verdict, your foreperson will fill in the form, sign and date it, and advise the marshal or court security officer that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
CENTRAL DIVISION

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. TIFFANY SPOTTED WAR BONNET, Defendant.</p>	<p>3:18-CR-30062-RAL VERDICT FORM</p>
--	--

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

1. We find Defendant Tiffany Spotted War Bonnet _____ (fill in either “guilty” or “not guilty”) of the crime of assault with a dangerous weapon as charged in Count I of the indictment.
2. We find Defendant Tiffany Spotted War Bonnet _____ (fill in either “guilty” or “not guilty”) of the crime of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count II of the indictment.

Dated December ____, 2019

Foreperson