

Jury Instructions

United States of America v. Roldy Francois
(Cr. 10-38-S)

Introduction

At this time, it is my duty to instruct you on the law applicable to this case. You must accept the rules of law that I give you and apply them to the facts in this case as you find those facts to be.

In applying the law that I am about to explain to you in these instructions, you must consider the instructions as a whole. You should not choose one part and disregard another. You must accept and apply the law as I give it to you in its entirety.

You must accept and apply the rules of law that I give to you whether you agree with them or not. It would be a violation of the oath you took as jurors to base a decision on any version of the law other than that contained in my instructions, just as it would be a violation of that oath to return a decision upon anything but the evidence in this case. It is not up to you to decide what the law is or should be. Your duty is to apply the law as I explain it to you.

Presumption of Innocence

As I told you at the start of this trial, the Defendant is presumed to be innocent of the accusation against him. This presumption of innocence remains with the Defendant unless and until the Government presents evidence satisfying you beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty.

The presumption of innocence is sufficient to require a not guilty verdict unless you find that such evidence has been presented.

If you find that the Government has proven the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the presumption of innocence disappears and is of no further avail to him. However, until that time, the presumption remains with the Defendant.

Defendant's Constitutional Right Not to Testify

A Defendant in a criminal trial has a constitutional right not to testify and no inference of guilt, or of anything else, may be drawn from the fact that the Defendant did not testify. For any of you to draw such an inference would be wrong; indeed, it would be a violation of your oath as a juror.

Selection of Counsel

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the right to counsel in criminal proceedings.

In this case, the Defendant Roldy Francois initially chose prior to the start of trial, to represent himself. It is his right to represent himself if he so chooses.

It was a choice he made and it was a choice he amended shortly after the trial began.

The decision to represent himself should not in any way be used against him nor should any adverse inference be drawn because he initially made a choice to represent himself.

It is a right which he exercised and to which he was entitled and it has no bearing on your impartial consideration of the evidence presented in this case.

Mr. Francois' decision to ultimately change his mind and allow Mr. Dimitri to represent him should also not be used against him, to draw any adverse inferences against him.

Again, his decision to ask for counsel was an option left open and the determination made by Mr. Francois that it would be more prudent to utilize Mr. Dimitri was also a right which he chose to exercise.

Neither choice shall be used or can be used to draw any adverse inferences against Mr. Francois.

Proof of All Elements

I will shortly explain the offense with which the Defendant is charged and the elements the Government must prove in order to establish that the Defendant is guilty of this offense.

In order for the Government to prove the Defendant guilty of an offense, it must convince you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that it has proved each and every element of that offense. Possibilities or even probabilities are not sufficient.

If the Government fails to prove any one or more elements of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the Defendant not guilty of that particular offense.

On the other hand, if you are convinced, beyond a reasonable doubt, that all elements of the offense with which the Defendant has been charged have been proven, then you should find the Defendant guilty of that offense.

Bear in mind that the requirement that the Government prove every element of the offense with which the Defendant is charged does not mean that the Government is required to prove every statement contained in the indictment.

What it means is that the Government must prove facts sufficient to prove all of the elements of the offense with which the Defendant is charged as I have explained them.

Reasonable Doubt

As I have said, the burden is upon the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of the charge made against him. It is a strict and heavy burden, but it does not mean that the Defendant's guilt must be proved beyond all possible doubt. It does require that the evidence exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the Defendant's guilt.

A reasonable doubt may arise not only from the evidence produced but also from a lack of evidence. Reasonable doubt exists when, after weighing and considering all the evidence, using reason and common sense, jurors cannot say that they have a settled conviction of the truth of the charge.

Of course, a Defendant is never to be convicted on suspicion or conjecture. If, for example, you view the evidence in the case as reasonably permitting either of two conclusions—one that the Defendant is guilty as charged, the other that the Defendant is not guilty—you will find the Defendant not guilty.

It is not sufficient for the Government to establish a probability, though a strong one, that a fact charged is more likely to be true than not true. That is not enough to meet the burden of proof beyond reasonable doubt. On the other hand, 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.

Concluding my instructions on the burden, then, I instruct you that what the Government must do to meet its heavy burden is to establish the truth of each part of the offense charged by proof that convinces you and leaves you with no reasonable doubt, and thus satisfies you that you can, consistently with your oath as jurors, base your verdict upon it. If you so find as to the charge against the Defendant, you will return a verdict of guilty on that charge. If, on the other hand, you think there is a reasonable doubt about whether the Defendant is guilty of the offense, you must give the Defendant the benefit of the doubt and find the Defendant not guilty of that offense.

Indictment - Effect

You will have the indictment with you in the jury room to help you remember the precise nature of the charge against the Defendant.

I remind you, once again, that an indictment is nothing more than an accusation. It should not be considered as evidence of guilt. It may not even be the basis of an inference of guilt. All that it does is to bring this matter before you for determination. Beyond that, it has no significance, whatever. It merely sets forth the elements of the offense which the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

Definition of "On or About"

You will note the indictment charges that the offense was committed "on or about" a certain date. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged offense. It is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

Summary of the Charges

The Indictment in this case charges the Defendant, Roldy Francois, with seventeen counts.

Counts One through Four charge the Defendant with being in possession of a firearm after having been previously convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year imprisonment.

Count Five charges the Defendant with being in possession of a firearm with an obliterated or removed serial number.

Counts Six through Nine charge the Defendant with making false and fictitious statements to a federally licensed firearms dealer in acquisition of a firearm.

Counts Ten through Thirteen charge the Defendant with possession of an identification document with intent to defraud the United States.

Counts Fourteen through Seventeen charge the Defendant with aggravated identity theft.

Multiple Counts - One Defendant

Keep in mind, a separate offense is charged in each of the counts of the Indictment. Each offense, and the evidence which applies to it, should be considered separately, and you should return separate verdicts as to each count unless I instruct you to do otherwise.

Counts One through Four -
Felon In Possession of a Firearm

The Defendant is charged with being a felon in possession of a firearm. For you to find the Defendant guilty of this charge, you must be satisfied that the government has proven each of the following things beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant has been convicted in any court of at least one crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year. The Defendant has stipulated that he has been convicted of a felony. You are to take that fact as proven;

Second, that the Defendant knowingly possessed the firearm described in the Indictment; and

Third, that the firearm moved in or affected interstate commerce.

Knowingly

The term "knowingly" means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or by accident.

Possess

The term "possess" means to exercise authority, dominion or control over something. It is not necessarily the same as legal ownership. A person can possess something even though he or she does not own it.

Possession

Possession includes both "actual" and "constructive" possession. A person who has direct physical control of an object on or around his person is then in actual possession of it. A person who is not in actual possession, but who has both the power and intention at a given time to exercise dominion and control over something, either directly or through others, is in constructive possession of it. Whenever I use the term "possession" in these instructions, I mean actual as well as constructive possession.

Firearm

The term "firearm" means any weapon which will or is designed to or may be readily converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

In or Affecting Commerce

The third element that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt is that the firearm moved in or affected interstate commerce. This means that the firearm, at any time after it was manufactured, traveled from one state to another. The travel need not have been connected to the charge in the Indictment and need not have been in furtherance of any unlawful activity and need not have occurred while the defendant possessed the firearm.

It is sufficient that the Defendant possessed the firearm in the State of Rhode Island and that the firearm was manufactured outside the State of Rhode Island.

Count Five -
Possession of a Firearm with an Obliterated Serial Number

The Defendant is charged with possessing a firearm in or affecting commerce with an obliterated or removed serial number. It is against federal law to possess a firearm with an obliterated or removed serial number that has been connected with interstate commerce. For you to find the Defendant guilty of this crime, you must be satisfied that the Government has proven each of the following things beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant knowingly possessed the firearm described in the Indictment;

Second, that the serial number was removed, obliterated or altered at the time the Defendant possessed the firearm;

Third, that the Defendant knew that the serial number had been removed, obliterated, or altered; and

Fourth, that the firearm was connected with interstate commerce.

Counts Six Through Nine -
Making False and Fictitious Written Statements to a Federally
Licensed Firearms Dealer in Acquisition of a Firearm

The Defendant is charged with making a false statement in connection with trying to buy a firearm, specifically that the Defendant indicated on ATF Form 4473 that he had never been convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year imprisonment, when in fact, the Defendant had previously been convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year imprisonment. It is against federal law to knowingly make a false statement in connection with trying to buy a firearm.

For you to find the Defendant guilty of this crime, you must be convinced that the government has proven each of these things beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, that the Defendant knowingly made a false statement as charged in the Indictment;

Second, that at the time he made the statement the Defendant was trying to buy a firearm from a licensed dealer; and

Third, that the statement was intended ^{my} to, or likely to, deceive the licensed dealer about a fact material to the lawfulness of the sale.

The government does not have to prove that the Defendant knew that he was violating the law.

A statement is "false" if it is untrue when made.

A false statement is made "knowingly" if the person making

it knows that it is false, or demonstrates a reckless disregard for the truth and has a conscious purpose to avoid learning the truth, and is not acting merely by ignorance, accident or mistake.

A fact is "material" if it has a natural tendency to influence or to be capable of influencing the decision of the licensed dealer as to whether it is lawful to sell the firearm to the buyer, regardless of whether the licensed dealer actually relies upon the statement.

Intent or knowledge may not ordinarily be proven directly because there is no way of directly scrutinizing the workings of the human mind. In determining what the Defendant knew or intended at a particular time, you may consider any statements made or acts done or omitted by the Defendant and all other facts and circumstances received in evidence that may aid in your determination of the Defendant's knowledge or intent. You may infer, but you certainly are not required to infer, that a person intends the natural and probable consequences of acts knowingly done or knowingly omitted. It is entirely up to you, however, to decide what facts are proven by the evidence received during this trial.

Counts Ten through Thirteen -
Possession of an Identification Document with the Intent to Use
the Document to Defraud the United States

The Defendant is charged in Counts Ten through Thirteen with possessing an identification document for use in defrauding the United States. In order for Defendant to be found guilty of that charge, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant knowingly possessed an identification document; and

Second, that the Defendant intended the identification document to be used to defraud the United States.

An "identification document" is a document that is made or issued by or under the authority of the United States Government and contains information about a particular person. In other words, it is of a type intended or commonly accepted to identify an individual. ✓

The phrase "intended for the document to be used to defraud the United States" means a specific intent to mislead or deceive an officer or employee of the United States in carrying out his or her official duties. The heart of the crime is the intent to mislead or deceive. The government does not have to prove that anyone was actually misled or deceived.

Counts Fourteen through Seventeen-
Aggravated Identity Theft

The Defendant is charged with aggravated identify theft. It is against federal law to possess someone else's identity. For you to find the Defendant guilty of this crime you must be convinced that the government has proven each of these things beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant committed the crime of making false statements in connection with the acquisition of a firearm or the crime of possession of an identification document with the intent to defraud the United States, as described above.

Second, that during and in relation to the crime of making false statements in connection with the acquisition of a firearm or the crime of possession of an identification document with the intent to defraud the United States, the Defendant knowingly used a means of identification, the name and date of birth of Efrain Colon Baez, without lawful authority.

Third, that the means of identification actually belonged to another person.

Fourth, that the Defendant knew that the means of identification belonged to another person.

Someone knows a fact if he has actual knowledge of it. Knowledge may not ordinarily be proven directly because there is no way of directly scrutinizing the workings of the human mind.

In determining what the Defendant knew at a particular time, you may consider any statements made or acts done or omitted by the Defendant and all other facts and circumstances received in evidence that may aid in your determination of the Defendant's knowledge.

The term "means of identification" means any name or number that may be used, alone or in conjunction with any other information, to identify a specific individual, including any name, social security number, date of birth, official state or government issued driver's license or identification number.

Method of Assessing Evidence

Now that you know what it is that the Government must prove and the standard of proof to be applied, the next question is how do you determine whether the Government has proved these things beyond a reasonable doubt?

Obviously, you must make your determination solely from the evidence properly before you and from all reasonable and legitimate inferences to be drawn from that evidence.

The evidence that is properly before you consists of:

1. The testimony of the witnesses;
2. The exhibits that I have admitted into evidence; and
3. Any stipulations among the attorneys in which they agree as to what the facts are.

From that evidence, you may draw whatever conclusions are reasonable under the circumstances.

The evidence that is properly before you does not include:

1. Comments or statements by the attorneys;
2. Answers given by witnesses which I ordered stricken and instructed you to disregard;
3. Documents, photographs or other items which may have been referred to but have not been admitted into evidence. Since they are not proper evidence, you should not speculate or guess as to what they might say or show and you may not consider them except to the

extent that, and for the purpose that, they may have been read or shown to you during the course of the trial; or

4. Anything you may have heard or seen outside of this courtroom regarding the events in question or the participants in this case.

Evidence of the Defendant's Prior Conviction

You have heard evidence that the Defendant was previously convicted of a crime punishable by more than one year imprisonment.

You may consider this evidence for the limited purpose of deciding if the government has proved this element of the offense. The fact that the Defendant was previously convicted of another crime does not mean that he committed the crime for which he is now on trial. You must not use that prior conviction as proof of the crime charged in this case, except as to the element requiring proof of the prior conviction. Put in other words, you must not use that conviction as proof that the Defendant possessed a firearm. Remember, the only purpose for which you may consider the prior conviction is to determine if the government satisfied the element of the offense that requires proof of a prior conviction.

Witnesses - Credibility - General Factors

As to the testimony of witnesses, your principal task is to determine the credibility of the witnesses and the weight you will give to the testimony of each.

In making that determination, there are a number of factors that you may consider:

1. The opportunity or lack of opportunity the witness had to acquire knowledge of the facts about which the witness testified. In other words, was the witness in a position to have accurately perceived the facts that the witness related to you.

2. The reliability or unreliability of the witness's memory. In other words, did the witness have a clear recollection of what happened or was the witness's memory uncertain or unclear.

3. The witness's appearance on the stand. Did the witness appear to be a person who was telling the complete and unadulterated truth, or did it appear that the witness was slanting things one way or another either consciously or unconsciously.

4. The probability or improbability of the witness's testimony. Did what the witness had to say sound reasonable or plausible or did it appear to be highly unlikely or impossible.

5. Whether the witness had anything to gain or lose from the outcome of this case. In other words, was the witness totally impartial or did the witness have some stake in the outcome or some reason to favor one side or the other.

Witnesses - Number - Weight of Testimony

In evaluating the testimonial evidence, remember that you are not required to believe something to be a fact simply because a witness has stated it to be a fact and no one has contradicted what that witness said. If, in the light of all of the evidence, you believe that the witness is mistaken or has testified falsely or that he or she is proposing something that is inherently impossible or unworthy of belief, you may disregard that witness's testimony even in the absence of any contradictory evidence.

You should also bear in mind that it is not the number of witnesses testifying on either side of a particular issue that determines where the weight of the evidence lies. Rather, it is the quality of the witnesses' testimony that counts.

Thus, just because one witness testifies on one side of an issue and one witness testifies on the other side does not necessarily mean that you must consider the evidence evenly balanced. If you feel that one of the witnesses was more credible than the other, for whatever reason, you may find that the weight of the evidence lies on the side of that witness.

Similarly, just because there may be more witnesses testifying on one side of an issue than on the other does not mean that the weight of the evidence lies in favor of the greater number of witnesses. Once again, it is the credibility or

quality of the testimony that determines where the weight of the evidence lies.

Witnesses - Credibility - Government Agents

The fact that a witness may be employed by a law enforcement agency does not, by itself, mean that you should give that witness's testimony any greater or any lesser weight simply because of that fact. You should assess the credibility and testimony of such a witness by applying the same factors as you would with respect to any other witness.

Expert Witnesses

During this trial, you have heard testimony from two witnesses who have specialized knowledge in a technical field. Such persons are sometimes referred to as expert witnesses. Because of their specialized knowledge, they are permitted to express opinions which may be helpful to you in determining the facts.

Since they do have specialized knowledge, the opinions of expert witnesses, whether expressed personally or in documents which have been admitted into evidence, should not be disregarded lightly.

On the other hand, you are not required to accept such opinions just because the witnesses have specialized knowledge.

In determining what weight to give to the testimony of a so-called expert witness, you should apply the same tests of credibility that apply to the testimony of any other witness. That is to say, you should consider such things as the witness's:

- opportunity to have observed the facts about which he testified; and
- apparent candor or lack of candor.

In addition, you should take into account the witness's:

- qualifications; and
- the accuracy of the facts upon which the witness's opinions were based.

In short, you should carefully consider the opinions of expert witnesses, but they are not necessarily conclusive.

The Government as a Party

The mere fact that this case is brought in the name of the United States of America does not entitle the prosecution to any greater consideration than that accorded to the Defendant. By the same token, it does not mean that the prosecution is entitled to any less consideration. All parties, whether Government or individuals, stand as equals at the bar of justice.

Exhibits

In addition to assessing the credibility of the witnesses and the weight to be given to their testimony, you should also evaluate the exhibits which you will have with you in the jury room. Examine them and consider them carefully.

However, bear in mind that merely because an exhibit has been admitted into evidence does not mean that you are required to accept it at face value. Like the testimony of a witness, the significance of an exhibit or the weight you attach to it will depend upon your evaluation of that exhibit in light of all the facts and circumstances of the case.

Circumstantial Evidence

As I mentioned previously, you may consider only the evidence that is properly before you. However, that does not mean that, in determining the facts, you are limited to the statements of the witnesses or the contents of the exhibits.

In reaching your conclusions, you are permitted to draw, from facts which you find have been proved, such reasonable inferences as seem justified in the light of your experience.

Inferences are deductions or conclusions which reason and common sense lead you to draw from facts which have been established by the evidence in the case.

Such evidence is sometimes called circumstantial evidence. To put it another way, a fact may be proved either by direct evidence or by circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence includes such things as the testimony of an eyewitness who personally observed the fact in question or a photograph or document showing the actual thing described.

Circumstantial evidence consists of proof of a series of facts or circumstances from which the existence or nonexistence of another fact may be reasonably inferred.

The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to direct and circumstantial evidence. However, it does require that any fact required to convict the Defendant be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Flight

Intentional flight by the Defendant after he is accused of the crime for which he is now on trial, may be considered by you in light of all the other evidence in the case. The burden is upon the government to prove intentional flight. Intentional flight after the Defendant is accused of a crime is not alone sufficient to conclude that he is guilty. Flight does not create a presumption of guilt. At most, it may provide the basis for an inference of consciousness of guilt. But flight may not always reflect feelings of guilt. Moreover, feelings of guilt, which are present in many innocent people, do not necessarily reflect actual guilt. In your consideration of the evidence of flight, you should consider that there may be reasons for the Defendant's actions that are fully consistent with innocence.

It is up to you as members of the jury to determine whether or not evidence of intentional flight shows a consciousness of guilt and the weight or significance to be attached to any such evidence.

Conduct of Court - General

As I have said before, it is up to you to determine the facts in this case. You should not interpret anything I have said or done during this trial as expressing an opinion on my part as to what the facts in this case are. I have not intended to express any such opinion and you should not be concerned about what my opinions might be regarding the facts. That is a matter for you to decide.

Objections

During this trial there have been occasions when the attorneys or the Defendant have objected to a question that was asked of a witness. You are not to penalize either the Government or the Defendant for making objections to testimony which they believed to be not in conformance with the rules of evidence. It is their right to make such objections.

If I sustained the objection, it is important that you not speculate about what the answer to the objected-to question might have been. By sustaining the objection, the court has determined that the evidence should not be considered by you.

Bias and Prejudice

Neither bias in favor of any person or cause, prejudice against any person or cause, nor sympathy of any kind should be permitted to influence you in the course of your deliberations.

All that any party here is entitled to, or, for that matter expects, is a verdict based upon your fair, scrupulous and conscientious examination of the evidence before you and your application of the law as I have explained it to you.

Verdict - Unanimity Required

In order to return a verdict in this case, all twelve of you must agree as to what that verdict will be. You cannot return a verdict of either guilty or not guilty against the Defendant unless your decision is unanimous.

Therefore there are two things that you should keep in mind during the course of your deliberations.

On the one hand, you should listen carefully as to what your fellow jurors have to say and should be open minded enough to change your opinion if you become convinced that it was incorrect.

On the other hand, you must recognize that each of you has an individual responsibility to vote for the verdict that you believe is the correct one based on the evidence that has been presented and the law as I have explained it. Accordingly, you should have the courage to stick to your opinion even though some or all of the other jurors may disagree as long as you have listened to their views with an open mind.

Selection of Foreperson and Duty to Deliberate

When you begin your deliberations, you should elect one member of the jury as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over the deliberations and speak for you here in court.

You will then discuss the case with your fellow jurors to reach agreement if you can do so. Your verdict must be unanimous. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but you should do so only after you have considered all of the evidence, discussed it fully with the other jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors.

Do not be afraid to change your opinion during the course of the deliberations if the discussion persuades you that you should. Do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right.

Communications with the Court

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with me, you may send a note through the marshal, signed by the foreperson. No member of the jury should ever attempt to contact me except by a signed writing; and I will communicate with any member of the jury on anything concerning the case only in writing, or here in open court.

Jury Recollection Controls - Rehearing Testimony

If any reference by the Court or by counsel to matters of evidence does not coincide with your own recollection, it is your recollection which should control during your deliberations.

Occasionally, juries want to rehear testimony. Understand that in a relatively short trial, generally, your collective recollection should be sufficient for you to be able to deliberate effectively. However, if you feel that you need to rehear testimony, I will consider your request. However keep in mind that this is a time-consuming and difficult process, so if you think you need this, consider your request carefully and be as specific as possible.

Return of Verdict

A verdict form has been prepared for you by the Court. After you have reached unanimous agreement on a verdict, your foreperson will fill in the form that has been given to you, sign and date it, and advise the Court that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

Copy of Instructions

I have instructed you on the law that governs your deliberations. I will send into the jury room a written copy of my instructions. You are reminded, however, that the law is as I have given it to you from the bench; the written copy is merely a guide to assist you.