

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CR No. 14-115 ML

ALAN BRADLEY

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. INTRODUCTION
.1

2. FUNCTION OF A JURY2

3. JURY’S RECOLLECTION CONTROLS 2

4. CONSIDER ONLY THE OFFENSE CHARGED2

5. PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE 2

6. BURDEN OF PROOF 3

PART II THE OFFENSES CHARGED

7. INDICTMENT – DEFINED 5

8. “ON OR ABOUT” – DEFINED5

9. THE OFFENSE CHARGED 5

10. ASSIMILATIVE CRIMES ACT 18 U.S.C. § 13 6

11. “SPECIAL MARITIME AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES” – DEFINED 6

12. DRIVING AS TO ENDANGER, RESULTING IN DEATH, R.I. GEN. LAWS § 31-27-1
..... 7

13. “RECKLESS DISREGARD FOR THE SAFETY OF OTHERS” – DEFINED 8

14. PROXIMATE CAUSATION8

PART III: CONSIDERATION OF THE EVIDENCE

15. EVIDENCE RECEIVED IN THIS CASE9

16. INFERENCES – DEFINED9

17. EVIDENCE – DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL
.10

18. OBJECTIONS AND WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE
.10

19. EXHIBITS
10

20. STIPULATIONS
.11

21. REMARKS OF COUNSEL 11

22. CONDUCT OF COURT AND COUNSEL 11

23. TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES12

PART IV: DELIBERATIONS AND VERDICT

24. UNANIMOUS VERDICT – JURY CONDUCT 14

25. COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN COURT AND JURY DURING
DELIBERATIONS15

PART I: GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

Members of the jury, we have now come to the end of this trial. This case, like all criminal cases, is a serious one. I say this because the defendant and the United States have a deep concern for your mature consideration of the evidence as presented and the law which I am about to give you.

Although you as the jury are the sole judges of the facts, you are duty bound to follow the law as I instruct you, and to apply that law to the facts as you find them to be from the evidence which has been presented during this trial. You are not to single out any one instruction as stating the law. Rather, you must consider these instructions in their entirety. You are not to be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law, regardless of any opinion which you might have as to what the law ought to be. It would be a violation of your sworn duty to base your verdict upon any version of the law other than that which I am about to give to you.

You have been chosen and sworn as jurors in this case to try the issues of fact presented by the allegations of the indictment and the denial made by the “not guilty” plea of the defendant. You are to perform this duty without bias or prejudice as to any party. The law does not permit jurors to be governed by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion. The accused and the government are entitled to an impartial consideration of all the evidence. Moreover, the parties and the public expect that you will carefully and impartially consider all the evidence in the case, follow the law as stated by the Court, and reach a just verdict, regardless of the consequences.

The fact that the prosecution is brought in the name of the United States of America

entitles the government to no greater consideration than that accorded to any other party to a litigation. By the same token, it is entitled to no less consideration. All parties, whether government or individuals, stand as equals at the bar of justice.

2. FUNCTION OF A JURY

Ladies and gentlemen, you are the trier of facts; you alone must determine what the facts are in this particular case. My function and duty is to instruct you on the law that applies to this case. It is your duty to accept the law as I give it to you—whether or not you agree with it—and to apply that law to the facts as you find them.

3. JURY'S RECOLLECTION CONTROLS

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.

4. CONSIDER ONLY THE OFFENSE CHARGED

The defendant is not on trial for any act or any conduct other than that specifically charged in the indictment.

5. PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

In all criminal cases, there is a presumption of innocence. Every defendant under our system of law is presumed to be innocent of the accusation which is filed against him or her, and this presumption of innocence must remain with the defendant from the moment the charge is

brought, throughout the trial, through the arguments of counsel, throughout the instructions of the Court, and throughout your deliberations when you retire to consider your verdict in the secrecy of the jury room.

The presumption of innocence remains unless and until you find that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of a charge as stated in the indictment. If you find, however, that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of each and every element of the crime with which he is charged, the presumption of innocence disappears and is of no further avail to him.

6. BURDEN OF PROOF

In criminal cases, the law places the burden of proof upon the government. The government has the burden of proving each and every element of the offense as charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

What is meant by the term “beyond a reasonable doubt?” Obviously, the obligation resting upon the government to prove a defendant’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean that it must do so beyond all conceivable doubts. Nor does it require the government to prove a defendant’s guilt to a mathematical or scientific certainty. Reasonable doubt means that the government must adduce evidence which, on examination, is found to be so convincing and compelling as to leave in your minds no reasonable doubt about the defendant’s guilt. We know from experience what a doubt is, just as we know when something is reasonable or unreasonable. Reasonable doubt by definition means a doubt founded upon reason and not speculation, that is, a doubt for which you can give some reason.

If, therefore, after reviewing all the evidence, there remains in your mind a doubt about the defendant's guilt, and this doubt appears in the light of the evidence to be reasonable, your duty is to find the defendant not guilty. If, however, at the end of your deliberations, you are convinced by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, your duty would be to return a verdict against him.

PART II: THE OFFENSE CHARGED

7. INDICTMENT – DEFINED

This case, like most criminal cases, began with the filing of an indictment. You will have the indictment before you in the course of your deliberations in the jury room. An indictment is not evidence. An indictment is nothing more than an accusation. It is a piece of paper filed with the Court to bring a criminal charge against a defendant. The indictment simply brings this matter before you for determination. Beyond that, it has no significance whatsoever. Here, the defendant has pleaded not guilty and has put in issue the charge alleged in the indictment. The government therefore has the burden of proving the allegations made against the defendant.

8. “ON OR ABOUT” – DEFINED

You will note that 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 that the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged in the indictment.

9. THE OFFENSE CHARGED

The indictment charges that on or about September 26, 2013, in the District of Rhode Island, the defendant “while within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, did operate a motor vehicle in reckless disregard of the safety of others resulting in the death of another person, in violation of R.I Gen. Laws § 31-27-1” all in violation of 18 U.S.C.

§§ 7 and 13.

10. ASSIMILATIVE CRIMES ACT, § 18 U.S.C. § 13

Title 18, United States Code, Section 13 makes it a crime to commit certain offenses within the special territorial jurisdiction of the United States. For you to find the defendant guilty of this charge, you must be satisfied that the government has proven each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant committed the offense of driving to endanger, death resulting, in violation of R.I. Gen. Laws § 31-27-1; and,

Second, that the defendant committed that offense within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

11. “SPECIAL MARITIME AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES” – DEFINED

The “special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States” includes lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction of the United States, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States by consent of the legislature of the State in which the land is situated, for the building of a fort, arsenal, dock, or other needed building.

The parties stipulate and agree that the September 26, 2013 incident occurred on the grounds of Naval Station Newport, which is in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

12. DRIVING SO AS TO ENDANGER, RESULTING IN DEATH, R.I. GEN. LAWS § 31-27-1

For you to find that defendant committed the offense of driving so as to endanger, death resulting, in violation of R.I. Gen. Laws § 31-27-1, you must be satisfied that the government has proven each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant was operating a motor vehicle;

Second, that the defendant operated that motor vehicle in reckless disregard of the safety of others; and,

Third, that the death of another person ensued as a proximate result of an injury received by the defendant's reckless operation of the motor vehicle.

13. "RECKLESS DISREGARD OF THE SAFETY OF OTHERS" – DEFINED

Reckless disregard for the safety of others is defined as embarking upon a course of conduct demonstrating a heedless indifference to the consequences of the actions. Mere error in judgment by a driver is not sufficient, nor is the negligence that could support a civil action for damages. Recklessness must be related to time, place, persons and surrounding circumstances and be measured by them.

In other words, the defendant must have known or should have known that his manner of driving created an unreasonable risk of harm to others, but he need not have intended to cause such harm. Intentional conduct, not intentional harm is what is prohibited by R.I. Gen. Laws § 31-27-1.

Thus, in order to convict the defendant for a violation of R.I. Gen. Laws § 31-27-1, you

must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant knew or should have known that his manner of driving created an unreasonable risk of harm to others, but you need not find that the defendant intended to cause such harm.

14. PROXIMATE CAUSATION

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted in reckless disregard for the safety of others, then you must also determine if the defendant's manner of operating his motor vehicle was the proximate cause of the victim's death. The term "proximate cause" is defined as "a cause that directly produces an event and without which the event would not have occurred." Therefore, in the context of this case, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the victim's death occurred as a result of the collision with the defendant's vehicle. In other words, the victim must have died from injuries sustained after having been struck by defendant's vehicle.

The parties stipulate and agree that the death of Frank Lema was the proximate result of being struck by the Chevrolet Colorado pickup truck.

PART III: CONSIDERATION OF THE EVIDENCE

15. EVIDENCE RECEIVED IN THIS CASE

For the purpose of determining whether or not the government has sustained its burden of proof, you must evaluate all of the evidence. The evidence in this case consists of the sworn testimony of the witnesses and all exhibits received in evidence, and any facts to which the parties have stipulated.

Any proposed testimony or proposed exhibit to which an objection was sustained by the Court, as well as any testimony ordered stricken by the Court, must be entirely disregarded.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not proper evidence and must be entirely disregarded.

16. INFERENCES—DEFINED

In determining whether the government has sustained its burden of proof, you are to consider only the evidence. But in your consideration of the evidence, you are not limited to the statements of witnesses, or solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You are permitted to draw, from the facts which you find have been proven, such reasonable inferences as seem justified in light of your experiences.

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.

17. EVIDENCE—DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL

There are, generally speaking, two types of evidence. One is direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness. The other is indirect or circumstantial evidence, which is a chain of circumstances pointing to certain facts.

The law makes no distinction at all between the weight to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence. Nor is a greater degree of certainty required of circumstantial evidence than of direct evidence. In determining whether the government has sustained its burden of proof you can and should weigh all the evidence, both direct and circumstantial.

18. OBJECTIONS AND WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE

The fact that the Court may have admitted evidence over objection should not influence you in determining the weight that you will give such evidence. Nor should statements made by counsel, either for or against the admission of offered evidence, influence your determination of the weight that you will give the evidence if admitted. In other words, you should determine the weight that you will give such evidence on the basis of your own consideration of it and without regard to the statements of counsel concerning the admissibility of such evidence.

19. EXHIBITS

Exhibits admitted into evidence by the Court are properly before you, and will be available to you during your deliberations. An exhibit marked by the Court for identification is not evidence in the case unless or until it was admitted by the Court as a full exhibit. If it has not been admitted as a full exhibit, you may not consider it. If it was admitted, however, it is just as

much a part of the evidence in the case as the testimony which you have heard from the witness stand.

20. STIPULATIONS

The evidence in this case includes facts to which the parties have agreed or stipulated. A stipulation means simply that the government and the defendant accept the truth of a particular proposition or fact. Since there is no disagreement, there is no need for evidence apart from the stipulation. You may accept the stipulation as fact and give it whatever weight you choose.

21. REMARKS OF COUNSEL

Remarks, statements, or questions by counsel are not evidence and are not to be considered by you as evidence during your deliberations. Neither should you permit objections by counsel to the admission of evidence, or the rulings of the Court, create any bias or prejudice toward counsel or the party whom he represents. It is the duty of counsel for both sides to represent their clients vigorously and to defend their client's rights and interests. In the performance of that duty, counsel freely may make objection to the admission of offered evidence, or to any other ruling of the Court, and should not be penalized for doing so.

22. CONDUCT OF COURT AND COUNSEL

If during trial, or in instructing you, I have said or done anything that has caused you to believe that I was indicating an opinion as to what the facts are in this case, you should put that belief out of your mind. I did not intend to indicate any such opinion. In fact, I try not to have an

opinion about the case because you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts.

In determining the facts, you are to consider only that evidence which has properly been placed before you. It is the Court's duty to pass upon the admissibility of the offered evidence, that is, to decide whether or not offered evidence should be considered by you. Evidence admitted by the Court is properly before you for your consideration; evidence which the Court has refused to admit, or may have stricken from the record after you heard it, is not proper subject for your deliberations and is not to be considered by you.

23. TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES

The law does not require you to accept or credit the evidence I have admitted. In determining what evidence you will accept, you must make your own evaluation of the testimony given by each of the witnesses, and the weight you choose to give to his or her testimony.

In evaluating the testimony of witnesses you may consider several facts-the opportunity of the witnesses to have acquired knowledge of that to which they testified; their conduct and demeanor while testifying; their interest or lack of interest, if any, in the outcome of the case; their intelligence or lack thereof; and the probability or improbability of the truth of their testimony.

Inconsistencies or discrepancies in the testimony of a witness or between the testimony of different witnesses may or may not cause you to disbelieve or discredit such testimony. Two or more persons witnessing an incident or a transaction may simply see or hear it differently. Innocent misrecollection, like failure of recollection, is not an uncommon experience. In

weighing the effect of a discrepancy, however, always consider whether it pertains to a matter of importance or an insignificant detail and consider whether the discrepancy results from innocent error or from intentional falsehood.

The testimony of a witness may be discredited or impeached by showing that he or she previously made statements which are different than or inconsistent with his or her testimony here in court. These statements may be used to impeach the credibility of that witness. It is within your province to assess the credibility, if any, to be given the testimony of a witness who has made prior inconsistent or contradictory statements.

PART IV: DELIBERATIONS AND VERDICT

24. UNANIMOUS VERDICT -- JURY CONDUCT

To render a verdict, all twelve of you must agree, that is, your verdict must be unanimous. Therefore, during your deliberations and in your consideration of the evidence, you should exercise reasonable and intelligent judgment. It is not required that you yield your view simply because a majority holds to the contrary view, but in pursuing your deliberations, you should keep your minds reasonably open with respect to any point in dispute so that you will not be prevented from achieving a unanimous verdict due to mere stubbornness. It is your right, however, to maintain your view. The vote of each juror is as important as the vote of any other juror, and you need not give up your view, sincerely held, simply because a majority holds to the contrary view.

Do not approach your consideration of the case in an intellectual vacuum. You are not required to disregard your experiences and observations in the ordinary everyday affairs of life. Indeed, your experiences and observations are essential to your exercise of sound judgment and discretion, and it is your right and duty to consider the evidence in light of such experiences and observations. It is hoped and anticipated that you will sift all of the evidence in this case through maturity and common sense.

Of course, prejudice, sympathy or compassion should not be permitted to influence you. All that any party is entitled to, or expects, is a verdict based upon your fair, scrupulous and conscientious examination of the evidence and an application of the law to that evidence as I have instructed you.

25. COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN COURT AND JURY DURING DELIBERATIONS

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with the Court, you may send a note signed by your foreperson, or by one or more members of the jury. The foreperson may then hand such written request or question to the marshal in whose charge you will be placed. The marshal will bring any written questions or requests to me. I will attempt to fulfill your request or answer your question. Other than the method outlined, please do not attempt to communicate privately or in any other way with the Court.

Bear in mind also that you are never to reveal to any person-not even to the Court-how the jury stands, numerically or otherwise, on the question of whether the accused is guilty or not guilty, until after you have reached a unanimous verdict.