



INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Members of the Jury:

Now that you have heard all of the evidence, it becomes my duty to instruct you on the law applicable to this case. In the interest of clarity, I will read the instructions to you, and each of you will have a copy of the instructions in the jury room.

In any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges; the other is the jury. It is my duty to preside over the trial and to determine what testimony and evidence is relevant under the law for your consideration. It is your duty, as judges of the facts, to follow and apply that law to the facts as you find them from the evidence in the case. You are not to single out one instruction alone as stating the law, but you must consider the instructions as a whole. Neither are you to be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated by me. That is, you must not substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I give it to you, regardless of the consequences.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The indictment in this case charges substantially as follows:

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

An indictment is but a formal method of accusing a defendant of a crime. It is not evidence of any kind against a defendant, and does not create any presumption or permit any inference of guilt. It is a mere charge or accusation--nothing more and nothing less.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The indictment charges that the crime was committed "on or about" a certain date. It is not necessary that the proof establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged crime. It is sufficient if the evidence shows beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A separate crime is charged in each count of the indictment. Each count and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The fact that you may find the defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the crimes charged should not control your verdict as to any other crimes charged. Your verdict with respect to each count of the indictment must be unanimous.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

To the charges contained in the indictment, the defendant has entered pleas of "not guilty." These pleas put in issue every element of the crimes charged and make it incumbent upon the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crimes charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The law presumes a defendant to be innocent of crime. This presumption remains with him throughout the trial. Thus, a defendant, although accused, begins the trial with a "clean slate," with no evidence against him and the law permits nothing but legal evidence presented before the jury to be considered in support of any charge against a defendant. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit the defendant now on trial, unless the jurors are satisfied of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, from all the evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The government has the burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of the crime charged. Some of you may have served as jurors in civil cases, where you were told that it is only necessary to prove that a fact is more likely true than not true. In criminal cases, the government's proof must be more powerful than that. It must be beyond a reasonable doubt.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt. There are very few things in this world that we know with absolute certainty, and in criminal cases the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt. If, based on your consideration of the evidence, you are firmly convinced that the defendant is guilty of the crime charged, you must find him guilty. If on the other hand, you think there is a real possibility that he is not guilty, you must give him the benefit of the doubt, and find him not guilty.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Burden of proof means burden of persuasion. The burden is always upon the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt every essential element of the crimes charged. In determining whether or not it has met this burden, you must consider all the evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The question of intent is a matter for you to determine.

Intent is a state of mind. Since it is not possible to look into a person's mind to see what went on, the only way you have of arriving at the intent of the defendant is for you to take into consideration all of the facts and circumstances shown by the evidence, including the exhibits, and determine from all such facts and circumstances what the intent of the defendant was at the time in question.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

In every crime there must exist a union or joint operation of act and intent.

The burden is always upon the government to prove both act and intent beyond a reasonable doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

There are two types of evidence from which a jury may properly find a defendant guilty of crime. One is direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness. The other is circumstantial evidence, the proof of a chain of circumstances pointing to the commission of the offense.

The law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence but requires that, before convicting a defendant, the jury be satisfied of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt from all the evidence in the case.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

While you should consider only the evidence in the case, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions which reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which have been established by the testimony and evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The weight to be given the evidence is determined not by the number of witnesses or the amount of testimony produced by either side, but by the credibility of the witnesses and the nature and quality of their testimony. The evidence of one witness who is entitled to full credit is sufficient for the proof of any fact in this case, and you would be justified in returning a verdict in accordance with such testimony even though a number of witnesses gave conflicting testimony, if from the consideration of the whole case and the reliability and credibility of the various witnesses you believe the one witness as opposed to the greater number of witnesses.

Always keep in mind that the law never imposes on a defendant in a criminal case the burden of duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Although you must consider all of the evidence, you are not required to accept all of the evidence as true or accurate.

You are the sole judges of the credibility or "believability" of each witness and the weight to be given to his or her testimony. In weighing the testimony of a witness you should consider the witness's relationship to the government or to the defendant; any interest the witness may have in the outcome of the case; the witness's manner while testifying; the opportunity and ability to observe or acquire knowledge concerning the facts about which the witness testified; the witness's candor, fairness and intelligence; and the extent to which the witness has been supported or contradicted by other credible evidence. You may, in short, accept or reject the testimony of any witness in whole or in part.

When weighing conflicting testimony you should consider whether the discrepancy has to do with a material fact or with an unimportant detail, and should keep in mind that innocent misrecollection -- like failure of recollection -- is not uncommon.

In addition, while you must consider only the evidence in the case, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and

reach conclusions which reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which have been established by the testimony and evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

In considering the evidence in this case, you are expected to use your good sense; consider the evidence for only those purposes for which it has been admitted, and give it a reasonable and fair construction in the light of your common knowledge of the natural tendencies and inclinations of human beings.

You are to perform your duty without bias as to any party or person. The law does not permit jurors to be governed by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors and they have the right to expect nothing less.

Keep constantly in mind that it would be a violation of your sworn duty to base a verdict upon anything but the evidence in, and the law applicable to, this case.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Statements, questions and arguments of counsel are not evidence. The evidence consists of the sworn testimony of the witnesses and all exhibits received in evidence. When, however, the attorneys on both sides stipulate or agree as to the existence of a fact, the jury must accept the stipulation and regard that fact as proved.

Any evidence as to which an objection was sustained by the court, and any evidence ordered stricken by the court, must be entirely disregarded. Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence, and must be entirely disregarded.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

During the trial I questioned witnesses and passed upon objections to the admission of certain testimony or exhibits into evidence. Questions relating to the admissibility of evidence are solely questions of law for the court, and you must not concern yourselves with the reasons for my rulings. In your consideration of the case, you must draw no inference from these rulings and you must consider only the evidence which I admitted.

Neither in any question I have asked, nor in these instructions, nor in any ruling, action or remark that I have made during the course of this trial, have I intended to interpose any opinion or suggestion as to how I would resolve any of the issues of this case. If I have made any remark that you believe indicates how I would decide this case, I instruct you to disregard such remark.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The punishment provided by law for the [crime] [crimes] charged is a matter exclusively within the province of the court and may not be considered by the jury in any way in deciding whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the [crime] [crimes] charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

During your deliberations, you may refer, if you wish, to any notes you took during the trial. Remember, however, that your notes are not evidence and remember, also, that it is your memories regarding the evidence, and not your notes, which control.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A final suggestion by the court--not technically an instruction upon the law--may assist your deliberations. The attitude of jurors at the outset of and during their deliberations is important. It is seldom productive for a juror, immediately upon entering the jury room, to make an emphatic expression of his or her opinion upon the case or to announce a determination to stand for a certain verdict. The reason is obvious: we are all human and it is difficult to recede from a position once definitely stated, even though later convinced it is unsound.

Jurors are selected for the purpose of doing justice. This presupposes and requires deliberation--counseling together in an effort to agree. Have in mind at all times, therefore, that you are a deliberative body, selected to function as judges of the facts in a controversy involving the substantial rights of the parties. You will make a definite contribution to efficient administration of justice when and if you arrive at a just and proper verdict under the evidence which has been adduced. No one can ask more and you will not be satisfied to do less.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

During your deliberations, that is when all of you are together in the jury room, you are released from the admonition regarding discussion of the case.

The admonition regarding discussion remains in effect at any time when all of you are not in the jury room, or when you are away from the courthouse. The admonition regarding reading, listening to or watching news reports about the case, doing any sort of independent investigation or discussing the case with any third party, remains in effect at all times until such time as I release you from the admonition. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this admonition.

[The alternate jurors will not be allowed to participate in deliberations but they remain bound by all aspects of the admonition. The clerk's office will notify the alternate jurors of the verdict and, if appropriate, when they will need to return.]

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Any verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. In other words, your verdict must be unanimous, and it must be unanimous as to each count.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times you are not partisans. You are judges--judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Upon retiring to the jury room, you should first select one of your number to act as your foreperson, who will preside over your deliberations and will be your spokesperson here in court. A form of verdict has been prepared for your convenience.

You will take the verdict form to the jury room, and when you have reached unanimous agreement as to your verdict, you will have your foreperson fill it in, date and sign it, and then return to the courtroom.

If, during your deliberations, you should desire to communicate with the court, please reduce your message or question to writing, signed by the foreperson and pass the note to my law clerk, who will bring it to my attention. I will then respond as promptly as possible, either in writing or by having you return to the courtroom so that I can address you orally. I caution you, however, with regard to any message or question you might send, that you should never state or specify your numerical division at the time.

---

MONTI L. BELOT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

MISCELLANEOUS INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The defendant has offered himself as a witness and has testified from the witness stand. Having done so, you are to determine the credibility of said defendant in the same way as you would consider the testimony of any other witness who took the stand.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The law does not compel a defendant to testify. The fact that the defendant did not take the witness stand and testify in his own behalf does not create any presumption against him. You must not permit that fact to weigh in the slightest degree against the defendant, nor should it enter into your discussions or deliberations in any manner.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Evidence relating to any alleged statement, confession, admission, or act or omission alleged to have been made or done by a defendant outside of court and after a crime has been committed should always be considered by the jury with caution and weighed with great care. Any such alleged statement, confession, or admission should be disregarded entirely unless the other evidence in the case convinces the jury beyond a reasonable doubt that the statement, confession, admission, or act or omission was made or done knowingly and voluntarily.

In determining whether any statement, confession, admission, or act or omission alleged to have been made by a defendant outside of court and after a crime has been committed was knowingly and voluntarily made or done, the jury should consider the age, training, education, occupation, and physical and mental condition of the defendant and his treatment while in custody or under interrogation as shown by the evidence in the case. Also consider all other circumstances in evidence surrounding the making of the statement, confession, or admission.

If after considering the evidence you determine that a statement, confession, admission, or act or omission was made or done knowingly and voluntarily, you may give it such weight as you feel it deserves under the circumstances.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The defendant is on trial only for the acts alleged in the indictment. He is not on trial for any other acts or conduct. In determining whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty, you are therefore to consider only whether the defendant has or has not committed the acts charged in this indictment. Even if you are of the opinion that he is guilty of some offense not charged in the indictment, you must find the defendant not guilty if the evidence does not show beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the specific acts charged in the indictment.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

There has been evidence presented which relates to possible unlawful acts and conduct of the defendant, other than the specific offenses with which he is charged and is on trial. You are instructed that this evidence has been admitted only for the limited purpose of showing [                    ], if any, of said defendant with respect to the offenses with which he is charged. Such evidence of other unlawful acts of a like or similar nature may not be considered by you as proof the defendant is guilty of the specific offenses charged, but is relevant and may be considered by you only for the limited purposes I have just stated.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The testimony of a witness who provides evidence against a defendant for immunity from punishment, or for personal advantage or vindication, must be examined and weighed by the jury with greater care than the testimony of an ordinary witness. The jury must determine whether the witness's testimony has been affected by interest, or by prejudice against a defendant.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

An accomplice is one who unites with another person in the commission of a crime, voluntarily and with common intent. An accomplice does not become incompetent as a witness because of participation in the crime charged. On the contrary, the testimony that he or she is an accomplice may be received in evidence and considered by the jury, even though not corroborated by other evidence, and given such weight as the jury feels it should have.

The jury, however, should keep in mind that such testimony should be received with caution and considered with great care. You should not convict a defendant upon the unsupported testimony of an alleged accomplice unless you believe that unsupported testimony beyond a reasonable doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

You may consider the testimony of [NAME] who is a codefendant who has pled guilty to charges related to the charges against the defendant in this case.

You may consider the guilty plea only to the extent that you find that it bears upon the credibility of codefendant [NAME]. The guilty plea itself is not evidence of the guilt of the defendant before you. You are not to consider the guilty plea for any purpose other than in assessing the credibility of [NAME] as a witness.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A witness may be discredited or "impeached" by contradictory evidence, by a showing that he or she testified falsely concerning a material matter, or by evidence that at some other time the witness has said or done something, or has failed to say or do something, which is inconsistent with the witness's present testimony.

If you believe that any witness has been so impeached, then it is your exclusive province to give the testimony of that witness such credibility or weight, if any, as you may think it deserves.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

When it has been shown that a witness has been convicted of a felony, you are to determine the witness's credibility and the weight to be given the witness's testimony the same as you would the testimony of any other witness. The fact that a witness has been convicted of crime may be considered by you in determining what credit and weight you will give to that witness's testimony.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The testimony of a drug abuser must be examined and weighed by the jury with greater care than the testimony of a witness who does not abuse drugs.

The jury must determine whether the testimony of the drug abuser has been affected by drug use or the need for drugs.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

You have heard tape recordings of conversations made by witnesses for the government. These tape recordings were legally recorded and are a proper form of evidence. You may consider the tape recordings just like any other form of evidence. It is for you as the trier of fact to determine what was said in the taped conversations, by whom, and the weight and credit, if any, to be given such recorded evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Typewritten transcripts of the tape recorded conversations have been furnished to you solely for your convenience in assisting you in following the conversation or in identifying the speakers.

The tapes themselves, however, are evidence in the case and the typewritten transcripts are not evidence. What you hear on the tapes is evidence. What you read on the transcript is not. If you perceive any variation between the two, you will be guided solely by the tapes and not by the transcripts.

If you cannot, for example determine from the tape recording that particular words were spoken or if you cannot determine from the tape recording who said a particular word or words, you must disregard the transcripts insofar as those words or that speaker are concerned.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

The rules of evidence provide that if scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify and state his or her opinion concerning such matters.

You should consider each expert opinion received in evidence in this case and give it such weight as you may think it deserves. If you should decide that the opinion of an expert witness is not based upon sufficient education and experience, or if you should conclude that the reasons given in support of the opinion are not sound, or that the opinion is outweighed by other evidence, then you may disregard the opinion entirely.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

As a defense to the crimes charged in the indictment, the defendant has asserted that he was a victim of entrapment.

You are instructed that entrapment occurs when the criminal design or conduct originates in or is the product of the minds of the law enforcement officers or their agents, and is implanted by them in the mind of an otherwise innocent person. Thus, where a person has no previous intent or purpose to violate the law, but is induced or persuaded by the officers or agents to commit a crime, he is a victim of entrapment and the law, as a matter of policy, forbids his conviction in such a case. On the other hand, where a person already has the readiness and willingness to violate the law, the fact that the officers or agents merely provide him with an opportunity to commit the crime, and do so even by disguise or ruse, there is no entrapment.

Once the defense of entrapment is raised the burden is on the United States to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not entrapped.

If then the jury should find beyond a reasonable doubt from the evidence in the case that before anything at all occurred with respect to the offenses charged in the Indictment, the defendant was ready and willing to commit the crimes charged whenever opportunity was afforded, and that the law enforcement

officers or their agents did no more than provide the opportunity, then the jury should find that the defendant was not a victim of entrapment.

On the other hand, if the evidence in the case should leave you with a reasonable doubt whether the defendant had the previous intent or purpose to commit the offenses charged in the Indictment and he did so only because he was induced or persuaded by the law enforcement officers or their agents, then it is your duty to acquit him as to the offenses.

For purposes of this case, \_\_\_\_\_, the informant, was an agent of the law enforcement officers.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Defendant, in response to the charges against him in the indictment, has offered evidence that he was acting under coercion and duress [describe].

A coercion or duress defense requires the establishment of three elements: (1) an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury, (2) a well-grounded fear that the threat will be carried out, and (3) no reasonable opportunity to escape the threatened harm. If there was a reasonable, legal alternative available, a chance to refuse to do the criminal act and also avoid the threatened harm, the defense fails.

The United States bears the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that \_\_\_\_\_ was not acting under coercion, as defined in the three elements above, when he performed the act or acts charged.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Good faith is an absolute defense to the charges in this case. While the term "good faith" has no precise definition, it means, among other things, a belief or opinion honestly held, an absence of malice or ill will, and an intention to avoid taking unfair advantage of another. If the defendant believed in good faith that he was acting properly, even if he was mistaken in that belief, and even if others were injured by his conduct, there would be no crime. An honest mistake in judgment or an error in management does not rise to the level of intent to defraud.

On the other hand, if the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant participated in the scheme to defraud alleged in the indictment, then a belief by the defendant, that ultimately everything would work out so that no one would lose any money, does not require a finding by you that the defendant acted in good faith. If the defendant participated in the scheme for the purpose of obtaining money to which he was not entitled or of causing some financial loss to another, then no amount of honest belief on the part of the defendant that the scheme would ultimately make a profit for the investors will excuse fraudulent actions or false representations by him.

The burden of establishing lack of good faith and criminal intent rests upon the government. A defendant is under no

burden to prove his good faith; rather, the government must prove bad faith or knowledge of falsity beyond a reasonable doubt.

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

Defendant has offered evidence he was a person of good character prior to the alleged commission of the offenses charged in the indictment. Such evidence is competent and is to be considered in connection with other evidence in the case. Such evidence is admitted upon the theory that a man having good character is not as likely to commit a crime as one who does not possess good character. While good character is not a defense to the offenses alleged in this case, it may be sufficient to generate a reasonable doubt and it is a circumstance to be weighed by the jury in connection with all of the other evidence in the case.