

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
WESTERN DIVISION

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p>GABRIEL WHITE PLUME, SR.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CR. 23-50025-JLV</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PRIMARY JURY INSTRUCTIONS</p>
--	--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NO. 1 - ROLE OF INSTRUCTIONS	3
NO. 2 - DUTY OF JURORS	4
NO. 3 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF.....	6
NO. 4 - REASONABLE DOUBT	7
NO. 5 - DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFENSES	8
NO. 6 - COUNT I: AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE BY USE OF FORCE.....	9
NO. 7 - COUNT II: AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE BY USE OF FORCE.....	11
NO. 8 - COUNT III: ASSAULT RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY.....	13
NO. 9 - COUNT IV: ASSAULT BY STRANGULATION OR SUFFOCATION.....	15
NO. 10 - COUNT V: DISTRIBUTION OF METHAMPHETAMINE TO A PERSON UNDER AGE 21	17
NO. 11 - COUNT VI: TAMPERING WITH A WITNESS.....	19
NO. 12 - COUNT VII: ASSAULT RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY INJURY	21
NO. 13 - COUNT VIII: ASSAULT RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY.....	23
NO. 14 - COUNT IX: SEXUAL ABUSE	25
NO. 15 - ATTEMPT	27
NO. 16 - AIDING AND ABETTING	28
NO. 17 - DEFINITIONS	30
NO. 18 - STIPULATION REGARDING JURISDICTION.....	31
NO. 19 - PROOF OF INTENT AND KNOWLEDGE	32
NO. 20 - DEFINITION OF EVIDENCE	33
NO. 21 - CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES.....	35

NO. 22 - IMPEACHMENT..... 36

NO. 23 - EXPERT WITNESSES 37

NO. 24 - STATEMENT BY THE DEFENDANT 38

NO. 25 - BENCH CONFERENCES AND RECESSES 39

NO. 26 - OBJECTIONS 40

NO. 27 - NOTE TAKING..... 41

NO. 28 - MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY..... 42

NO. 29 - CONDUCT OF THE JURY DURING TRIAL..... 45

NO. 30 - OUTLINE OF THE TRIAL 47

**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, Gabriel White Plume, Sr. Mr. White Plume is charged with assault by strangulation or suffocation, distribution of methamphetamine to a person under age 21, tampering with a witness, assault resulting in substantial bodily injury, sexual abuse, two counts of assault resulting in serious bodily injury and two counts of aggravated sexual abuse. Your duty is to decide from the evidence whether Mr. White Plume is not guilty or guilty of the offenses charged against him.

You will find the facts from the evidence presented in court. “Evidence” is defined in Instruction No. 20. 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 Mr. White Plume, not anyone else, is on trial here. Also, remember Mr. White Plume is on trial only for the offenses charged against him, not for anything else.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3 –

PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN OF PROOF

Mr. White Plume 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 Mr. White Plume or the fact he is here in court. The presumption of innocence remains with Mr. White Plume throughout the trial. This presumption alone is sufficient to find Mr. White Plume not guilty. The presumption of innocence may be overcome only if the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt each essential element of the offenses charged. The burden is always on the government to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to Mr. White Plume to prove his 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. Mr. White Plume is not even obligated to cross-examine the witnesses called to testify by the government.

If Mr. White Plume does not testify, this fact must not be considered by you in any way or even discussed in arriving at your verdict. If Mr. White Plume testifies, you should judge his 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 the offenses charged, you must find Mr. White Plume guilty. If the government fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any essential element of the offenses charged, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 4 –
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 Mr. White Plume's guilt. However, proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 5 –
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 Mr. White Plume are set out in an indictment. An indictment is simply an accusation. It is not evidence of anything. Mr. White Plume pled not guilty to the charges brought against him. Mr. White Plume is presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the offenses charged.

The indictment charges the offenses were committed “on or about” certain dates. The government does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of the offenses charged. It is sufficient if the evidence establishes that the offenses 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. 6 -

COUNT I: AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE BY USE OF FORCE

Count I of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, did knowingly cause and attempt to cause another person to engage in a sexual act, that is contact between Cante Long Soldier's mouth and the defendant's penis by the use of force, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of aggravated sexual abuse by use of force as charged in Count I of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume knowingly caused Cante Long Soldier to engage in a sexual act or attempted to do so;

The term "sexual act," as used in this instruction, means contact between Mr. White Plume's penis and Ms. Long Soldier's mouth. Contact involving the penis occurs upon penetration, however slight.

"Attempt" is defined in Instruction No. 15.

Two, Mr. White Plume did so by using force against Ms. Long Soldier;

"Force" is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Three and Four, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the offense took place in Indian country, at Manderson, South Dakota.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of aggravated sexual abuse by use of force 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7 -

COUNT II: AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE BY USE OF FORCE

Count II of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, aiding and abetting did knowingly cause and attempt to cause another person to engage in a sexual act, that is digital penetration, however slight, of Cante Long Soldier's vagina with the defendant's fingers and hand, with the intent to abuse, humiliate, degrade and arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person by the use of force, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find the defendant guilty of the offense of aggravated sexual abuse by use of force as charged in Count II of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume, individually or aiding and abetting another person, knowingly caused Cante Long Soldier to engage in a sexual act or attempted to do so;

"Sexual act," as used in this instruction, means penetration, however slight, between Mr. White Plume's fingers or hand and Ms. Long Soldier's vagina with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person.

"Aiding and abetting" is defined in Instruction No. 16.

"Attempt" is defined in Instruction No. 15.

Two, Mr. White Plume did so by using force against Ms. Long Soldier;

“Force” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Three and Four, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the offense took place in Indian country, at Manderson, South Dakota.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of aggravated sexual abuse by use of force 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8 -

COUNT III: ASSAULT RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY

Count III of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, aiding and abetting did unlawfully assault Cante Long Soldier, said assault resulting in serious bodily injury, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count III of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume, individually or aiding and abetting another person, knowingly assaulted Cante Long Soldier;

“Aiding and abetting” is defined in Instruction No. 16.

“Assault” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Two, the assault resulted in serious bodily injury to Ms. Long Soldier;

“Serious bodily injury” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Three and Four, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the alleged offense occurred in Indian country at Manderson, South Dakota.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault resulting in serious bodily injury 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9 -

COUNT IV: ASSAULT BY STRANGULATION OR SUFFOCATION

Count IV of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, did unlawfully assault his dating partner, Cante Long Soldier, by strangulation, suffocation and attempting to do so, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault by strangulation or suffocation as charged in Count IV of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume unlawfully assaulted Cante Long Soldier or attempted to do so by strangulation or suffocation;

“Assault” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

“Attempt” is defined in Instruction No. 15.

“Strangulation” means intentionally, knowingly or recklessly impeding a person’s normal breathing or circulation of a person’s blood by applying pressure to the throat or neck, regardless of whether the conduct results in any visible injury or whether there is any intent to kill or cause protracted injury to the person.

“Suffocation” means intentionally, knowingly or recklessly impeding a person’s normal breathing by covering the person’s mouth or nose, or both, regardless of whether the conduct results in any visible injury or whether there is any intent to kill or cause protracted injury to the person.

Two, Ms. Long Soldier was a dating partner of Mr. White Plume;

“Dating partner” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Three and Four, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the offense occurred at Manderson, South Dakota, in Indian country.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault by suffocation or strangulation as charged in Count IV 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10 -

COUNT V: DISTRIBUTION OF METHAMPHETAMINE

TO A PERSON UNDER AGE 21

Count V of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., a person at least eighteen years of age, did knowingly and intentionally distribute a substance containing methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance, to Cante Long Soldier, a person under twenty-one years of age, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of distribution of methamphetamine to a person under age 21, as charged in Count V of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in the District of South Dakota, Mr. White Plume knowingly and intentionally distributed methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance, to Cante Long Soldier;

Methamphetamine is a Schedule II controlled substance.

Two, at the time of the distribution Mr. White Plume knew that methamphetamine was a controlled substance;

Three, at the time of the distribution Mr. White Plume was least 18 years old; and

Four, at the time of the distribution Ms. Long Soldier had not attained the age of 21.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of distribution of methamphetamine to a person under age 21 as charged in Count V 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11 -

COUNT VI: TAMPERING WITH A WITNESS

Count VI of the indictment charges that on or about between February 1, 2023, and February 28, 2023, in the District of South Dakota and elsewhere, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., did corruptly attempt to obstruct, influence and impede an official proceeding by contacting the victim, Cante Long Soldier, over Facebook and by phone attempting to get her to drop the charges against him, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of tampering with a witness as charged in Count VI of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about between February 1, 2023, and February 28, 2023, in the District of South Dakota and elsewhere, Mr. White Plume knowingly used or attempted to use corrupt persuasion against Cante Long Soldier;

To corruptly persuade someone means to persuade with consciousness of wrongdoing.

“Attempt” is defined in Instruction No. 15.

Two, Mr. White Plume acted with the intent to influence the testimony of Ms. Long Soldier by contacting her over Facebook or by telephone;

To act with “intent to influence” means to act for the purpose of getting Ms. Long Soldier to change, color or shade her testimony in some way. It is not necessary for the government to prove that Ms. Long Soldier’s testimony was, in fact, changed in any way.

and

Three, Mr. White Plume acted with the intent to get Ms. Long Soldier to not testify in connection with a trial of a criminal case against the defendant.

A defendant need not know the “trial of a criminal case” was a federal proceeding or that a criminal trial actually was pending or about to be instituted. A defendant need only contemplate that a criminal trial proceeding may occur in the future in which Ms. Long Soldier’s testimony may be material.

To find the defendant guilty of the offense of tampering with a witness as charged in Count VI 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12 -

COUNT VII: ASSAULT RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY INJURY

Count VII of the indictment charges that on or about between January 1, 2023, and January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, did unlawfully assault Cante Long Soldier, a dating partner, said assault resulting in substantial bodily injury to Cante Long Soldier, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault resulting in substantial bodily injury as charged in Count VII of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about between January 1, 2023, and January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume, knowingly assaulted Cante Long Soldier;

“Assault” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Two, Ms. Long Soldier was a dating partner of Mr. White Plume;

“Dating partner” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Three, the assault resulted in substantial bodily injury to Ms. Long Soldier;

“Substantial bodily injury” means bodily injury which involves:

- (1) a temporary but substantial disfigurement; or
- (2) a temporary but substantial loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.

Four and Five, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the offense occurred at Manderson, South Dakota, in Indian country.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault resulting in substantial bodily injury as charged in Count VII 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13 -

COUNT VIII: ASSAULT RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY

Count VIII of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, did unlawfully assault Cante Long Soldier with a cigarette, said assault resulting in serious bodily injury, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count VIII of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume knowingly assaulted Cante Long Soldier with a cigarette;

“Assault” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Two, the assault resulted in serious bodily injury to Ms. Long Soldier;

“Serious bodily injury” is defined in Instruction No. 17.

Three and Four, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the alleged offense occurred in Indian country at Manderson, South Dakota.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of assault resulting in serious bodily injury as charged in Count VIII 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr.

White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14 -

COUNT IX: SEXUAL ABUSE

Count IX of the indictment charges that on or about January 10, 2023, at Manderson, in Indian country, in the District of South Dakota, the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., an Indian person, aiding and abetting did knowingly engage in and attempt to engage in a sexual act, to wit: digital penetration, however slight of Cante Long Soldier's vagina with defendant's fingers and hand, at that time when Cante Long Soldier was incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct and was physically incapable of declining participation in and communicating unwillingness to engage in the sexual act, and the defendant, Gabriel White Plume, Sr., knew Cante Long Soldier was so incapacitated, all in violation of federal law.

Elements

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of sexual abuse as charged in Count IX of the indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, on or about January 10, 2023, Mr. White Plume, individually or aiding and abetting another person, knowingly caused Cante Long Soldier to engage in a sexual act or attempted to do so;

"Sexual act," as used in this instruction, means penetration, however slight, between Mr. White Plume's fingers or hand and Ms. Long Soldier's vagina.

“Attempt” is defined in Instruction No. 15.

“Aiding and abetting” is defined in Instruction No. 16.

Two, Ms. Long Soldier was incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct or was physically incapable of declining participation in or communicating unwillingness to engage in the sexual act;

Three, Mr. White Plume knew Ms. Long Soldier was incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct or was physically incapable of declining participation in or communicating unwillingness to engage in the sexual act;

Four and Five, Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and the offense took place in Indian country, at Manderson, South Dakota.

To find Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense of sexual abuse as charged in Count IX 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 Mr. White Plume guilty of the offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15 –

ATTEMPT

A person may be found guilty of an attempt to commit an offense if he intended to engage in an offense and voluntarily and intentionally carried out some act which was a substantial step towards engaging in the offense.

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 offense. 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 offense and be of such a nature that a reasonable observer, viewing it in context, would conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that it was undertaken in accordance with a design to commit the substantive offense.

This instruction applies to Counts I, II, IV, VI and IX of these instructions.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16 –

AIDING AND ABETTING

A defendant may be found guilty of an offense by aiding and abetting even if he personally did not do every act constituting the offense. In order to have aided and abetted the offense, the defendant, before or at the time the offense was committed, must have:

1. Known the offense was being committed or going to be committed;
2. Knowingly acted in some way for the purpose of causing, encourage or assisting in the commission of the offense; and
3. Acted with the knowledge and intent required for the commission of the offense.

Merely being present at the scene of an event, or merely acting in the same way as others, or merely associating with others, does not prove that a person has become an aider and abettor. A person who has no knowledge that an offense is being committed or is about to be committed, but who happens to act in a way which advances the offense, does not thereby become an aider and abettor.

For you to find Mr. White Plume guilty of an offense by reason of aiding and abetting, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that all of the essential elements of the offense were committed by some person or persons and that Mr. White Plume aided and abetted the commission of that

offense. If the government fails to prove any essential element beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. White Plume not guilty of the offense by aiding and abetting.

This instruction applies to Counts II, III and IX of these instructions.

INSTRUCTION NO. 17 –

DEFINITIONS

“Assault” means any 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.

“Dating partner” means a person who was then or previously had been in a romantic or intimate relationship with Mr. White Plume. The existence of a dating relationship can be determined by considering the length and type of the relationship and the frequency of interaction between the individuals involved in the relationship.

“Force” means the use or threatened use of a weapon; the use of physical force sufficient to overcome, restrain or injure the alleged victim; the use of a threat of harm sufficient to coerce or compel submission by Ms. Long Soldier; or the use of force sufficient to prevent Ms. Long Soldier from escaping the sexual act.

“Serious bodily injury” means bodily injury which involves:

- (1) a substantial risk of death; or
- (2) extreme physical pain; or
- (3) protracted and obvious disfigurement; or
- (4) protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or mental faculty.

INSTRUCTION NO. 18 -

STIPULATION REGARDING JURISDICTION

Counsel for the United States, counsel for Mr. White Plume, and Mr. White Plume have agreed or stipulated that Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and that the place where the alleged incident occurred is at Manderson, South Dakota, and is in Indian country.

By entering into this agreement or stipulation, Mr. White Plume has not 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 Mr. White Plume is an Indian person and that, if the jury finds the alleged incidents occurred, they occurred in Indian country.

This stipulation applies to Counts I, II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII and IX of these instructions.

INSTRUCTION NO. 19 –

PROOF OF INTENT AND KNOWLEDGE

“Intent” and “knowledge” are elements of the offense charged in this case and must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. The government is not required to prove Mr. White Plume knew that his acts or omissions were unlawful. An act is done “knowingly” if a person realizes what he is doing and does not act through ignorance, mistake or accident. You may consider the evidence of Mr. White Plume’s words, acts or omissions, along with all other evidence, in deciding whether he acted knowingly.

Intent may be proven like anything else. You may consider any statements made or acts done by Mr. White Plume and all the facts and circumstances in evidence which may aid in determining his 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. 20 –
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. 21 –
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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 22 –

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;
- A showing that the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter; or
- 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.

You may consider a witness discredited or impeached for other reasons as well. 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.

If earlier statements of a witness are admitted into evidence, they are not admitted to prove that the contents of those statements are 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.

**INSTRUCTION NO. 23 –
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 opinion.

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. 24 –

STATEMENT BY THE DEFENDANT

You may hear testimony Mr. White Plume made a statement to others.

It is for you to decide:

First, whether the statement was made; 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.

INSTRUCTION NO. 25 -

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. 26 –

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. 27 -

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, you will not have a typewritten transcript of the trial testimony of any witness 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. 28 –

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 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, comments or other postings on social networking sites, including but not limited to Facebook, Instagram, Twitter or any other website or application. 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. 29 –

CONDUCT OF THE JURY DURING TRIAL

To ensure 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. 30 - OUTLINE OF THE TRIAL

The trial will proceed as follows:

After these instructions, the lawyer for the government may make an opening statement. Next, the lawyer for Mr. White Plume may, but does 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 lawyer for Mr. White Plume may, but has no obligation to, cross-examine them. Following the government's case, Mr. White Plume may, but does not have to, present evidence or call witnesses. If Mr. White Plume 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 July 24, 2023.

BY THE COURT:



JEFFREY L. VIKEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GABRIEL WHITE PLUME, SR.,

Defendant.

CR. 23-50025-JLV

SUPPLEMENTAL
JURY INSTRUCTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NO. 31 - EQUALLY IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS.....	2
NO. 32 - DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY-IMPEACHMENT BY PRIOR CONVICTION	3
NO. 33 - FLIGHT	4
NO. 34 - DUTY TO DELIBERATE.....	5
NO. 35 - DUTY DURING DELIBERATIONS.....	7

VERDICT

INSTRUCTION NO. 31 -

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. 32 -

DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY -

IMPEACHMENT BY PRIOR CONVICTION

You have heard evidence that Mr. White Plume was previously convicted of a crime. You may use this evidence only to help you decide whether to believe his testimony and how much weight to give his testimony. That evidence does not mean he committed the offenses charged and you must not use that evidence as proof of the offenses charged in this case.

You may give such evidence no weight or such weight as you think it is entitled to receive.

INSTRUCTION NO. 33 -

FLIGHT

You may consider whether any evidence of flight by the defendant shows consciousness of guilt of an offense charged. In considering any evidence of flight, remember there may be reasons for this conduct which are consistent with innocence.

INSTRUCTION NO. 34 -

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 become 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 Mr. White Plume's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, then your vote should be for a not guilty verdict as to that offense. If all of you reach the same conclusion, the verdict of the jury must be not guilty as to that offense. Of course, the opposite also applies. If, in your individual judgment, the evidence establishes Mr. White Plume's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, then your vote should be for a guilty verdict as to that offense. If all of you reach that conclusion, the verdict of the jury must be guilty as to 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. 35 -

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 Mr. White Plume 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 vote stands 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 forms are simply the written notice of the decision you reach in this case. You will take these forms to the jury room. When you

have unanimously agreed on the verdict, the foreperson will fill in the forms, date and sign them 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 July 27, 2022.

BY THE COURT:



JEFFREY L. VIKEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE