

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

FINAL PRETRIAL
CONFERENCE ORDER

v.

06-CR-016-C

LAMOUNT D. WILLIAMS,

Defendant.

On June 9, 2006 this court held the final pretrial conference. Defendant Lamount Williams was present with his attorney, Reed Cornia. The government was represented by Assistant United States Attorney Meredith Duchemin.

First we discussed the voir dire. Both sides made suggestions, most of which I accepted as discussed on the record. A copy of the final set of voir dire questions is attached to this order.

Next we discussed the universe of jury instructions. As counsel are aware, they will have the opportunity at the close of the evidence to tailor the instructions to the proof actually admitted at trial. With that understanding, neither side had any substantive objections to its opponent's instructions with one exception: the government has offered a second paragraph defining the term "in furtherance" that is an element of count 3, the § 924(c) gun charge against Williams. Williams objects to using paragraph 2 at all, claiming that it is unnecessary and unfairly prejudicial. As a corollary to this, Williams urges the

court to use the narrower definition of “in furtherance” adopted by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *United States v. Rios*, __ F.3d __, 2006 WL 1511837 (9th Cir. June 2, 2006). Over Williams’s objection I included the government’s proposed second paragraph in the packet after modifying it to parallel more closely the language of *United States v. Duran*, 407 F.3d 828, 840-41 (7th Cir. 2005). On the facts of this case, the more detailed definition of “in furtherance” should help frame the jury’s deliberations and lead to a more accurate verdict. Notwithstanding Williams’s objections, the court’s view is that the additional language benefits Williams by specifying what actually qualifies as “in furtherance” under these circumstances. I have modified the other jury instructions to account for the parties’ suggestions. A copy of the universe of jury instructions is attached to this order.

We then discussed in limine issues. Williams does not dispute any of the government’s motions in limine 1-4. Williams does wish to be heard on some portions of the government’s notice of intent to offer evidence (dkt. 22) and its supplement (dkt. 21). Although Williams does not object to the crimes listed in paragraph A under Rule 609(a), it is possible the parties will not agree on how to characterize these crimes, so the issue remains potentially viable. Williams disputes the admissibility under Rule 404(b) of any prior drug convictions in the government’s case in chief (paragraph C of the government’s motion). Williams also disputes the government’s claim of “intricately related evidence” in paragraph D of its motion. Williams does not contest the government’s experts, but advised that he might still find and submit experts of his own. Although Attorney Cornia very much

would like to exclude at trial Williams's post-arrest statements (paragraph H), he is aware of no legal basis to do so and is not asking to be heard at the final hearing.

In response to Williams's 16-part motion in limine (dkt. 29), the government only wishes to be heard on portions of paragraphs 11, 12 and 14. With regard to paragraph 11, the government contends that it may argue, within reason, that "the jury has a civic duty to convict the defendant" in the event the government has met its burden of proof. In paragraph 12, the government does not wish to be constrained from making "any criticism . . . by the prosecutor to defense counsel." Assistant United States Attorney Duchemin does not have any thing in mind today, but contends that the motion is too broadly worded. In paragraph 14, the government wishes to admit as part of Williams's post-arrest statements, his description of his own street name "Shorty" as a piece of Williams's narrative of his life as a drug dealer. All three issues are framed for resolution at the final hearing.

The final hearing shall be held June 15, 2006 at 3:00 p.m.

The parties anticipate that this case will go to trial as scheduled on June 19, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. The parties are predicting a one day trial. One alternate juror will suffice. Williams has access to street clothes for trial. The parties are aware they must use the

court's electronic presentation system for their evidence. The parties had no other matters to bring to the court's attention.

Entered this 9th day of June, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER

Magistrate Judge

Voir Dire: United States v. Lamont Williams, 06-CR-16-C

Statement of the case: This is a criminal case, in which the defendant, Lamont Williams, is charged with three counts: 1) possessing cocaine base with intent to distribute it; 2) possessing a handgun in furtherance of drug trafficking; and 3) unlawful possession of a firearm after having been convicted of a crime punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding one year. The defendant has entered a plea of not guilty to the charges against him.

Have any of you heard of this case before today? Would this affect your ability to serve impartially as a juror in this case?

1. Scheduling: this case will begin today and will conclude late this afternoon. Are any of you actually unable to sit as jurors because of this schedule?

2. Is there anything about the nature of the charges in this case that might affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

3. The court reads Pattern Jury Instructions of the Seventh Circuit:

Presumption of Innocence. The defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charges. This presumption remains with the defendant throughout every stage of the trial and during your deliberations on the verdict, and is not overcome unless from all the evidence in the case you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty.

Burden of Proof. The government has the burden of proving the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, and this burden remains on the government throughout the case. The defendant is not required to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence.

The defendant has an absolute right not to testify. The fact that the defendant does not testify cannot be considered by you in any way in arriving at your verdict.

Do any of you think that you do not understand these instructions? Would any of you be unable or unwilling to follow these instructions?

4. Ask counsel to introduce themselves, the defendants and the case agent. Ask whether jurors know them.

5. Invite each juror, in turn, to rise, and provide the following information:

Name, age, and city or town of residence.

Marital status and number of children, if any.

Current occupation (former if retired).

Current (or former) occupation of your spouse and any adult children.

Any military service, including branch, rank and approximate date of discharge.

Level of education, and major areas of study, if any.

Memberships in any groups or organizations.

Hobbies and leisure-time activities.

Favorite types of reading material.

Favorite types of television shows.

6. Do any of you in the jury box know each other from before today?

7. The defendant is African American. Would any of you find it difficult to serve as an impartial juror in a case in which a young African American man is charged with crimes involving cocaine base and a handgun?

8. Have any of you, your relatives or any close friends ever belonged to any group that is concerned in any way with marijuana, alcohol, or other drugs, either for or against them? What is the name of that group, and what is your involvement in it? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

9. Do any of you think that the drug laws in this country or the enforcement of the drug laws are either too harsh or too lenient?

10. Do any of you believe that a person charged with drug crimes is probably a dangerous person simply because he or she is charged with a drug crime?

11. Do any of you, your family or close friends work in a health related field which treats or counsels people who have problems related to alcohol or other drugs? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

12. Have any of you, your relatives or close friends ever needed, sought, or obtained any sort of counseling or treatment for a problem related to alcohol or any other drug? [Sidebar if necessary]. Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

13. Have any of you, your relatives, or close friends ever been accused of, or convicted of any criminal offense, or any offense involving cocaine or marijuana? [Sidebar if necessary]. Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

14. How many of you own firearms or live with someone who possesses firearms? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

15. Other than what you have already told us, do any of you belong to any groups or organizations that concern themselves with firearms or the possession of firearms, either for or against? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

16. Do any of you have any strong opinions or feelings about firearms or the possession of firearms? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

17. Have any of you, your family or close friends ever been injured by a firearm? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

18. Do any of you, by virtue of past dealings with the United States government, or for any reason, have any bias for or against the government in a criminal case?

19. Have any of you, your relatives, or close friends ever worked for the local, county, state, or federal government? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

20. Have any of you, your relatives, or close friends ever worked for, or had other professional contact with any law enforcement, investigative or security company or agency, or any prison? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

21. Have any of you ever belonged to any organization or group that excluded people because of their race, gender, or religion?

22. Would any of you judge the credibility of a witness who was a law enforcement officer or government employee differently from other witnesses solely because of his or her official position?

23. Would any of you judge the credibility of a witness who had been convicted of a crime in the past differently from other witnesses solely because of this prior conviction?

24. Would any of you judge the testimony of a witness who was African American differently from other witnesses solely because of the witness's race?

25. If a defendant were to choose to testify, would any of you judge his or her credibility differently from other witnesses solely because it was the defendant who was testifying?

26. Have any of you, your relatives, or close friends ever been the victim of any crime? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

27. Have any of you, your relatives, or close friends ever been a witness in a trial? Is there anything about this experience that might affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

28. Have any of you, your relatives, or close friends ever had any negative experience with any lawyer, any court, or any legal proceeding that would affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

29. How many of you have served previously as a juror in another case? Please tell us in which court you served, approximately when, the type of cases you heard, whether you were foreperson, and the verdicts.

30. If at the conclusion of the trial you were to be convinced of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, is there any one of you who would not, or could not, return a verdict of guilty?

31. If at the conclusion of the trial you were not to be convinced of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, is there any one of you who would not, or could not, return a verdict of not guilty?

32. The court will instruct you on the law to be applied in this case. You are required to accept and follow the court's instructions in that regard, even though you may disagree with the law. Is there any one of you who cannot accept this requirement?

33. Do you know of any reason whatever, either suggested by these questions or otherwise, why you could not sit as a trial juror with absolute impartiality to all the parties in this case?

JUROR BACKGROUND INFORMATION

When asked to do so by the court, please stand and provide the following information about yourself:

Name, age, and city or town of residence.

Marital status and number of children, if any.

Current occupation (former if retired).

Current (or former) occupation of your spouse and any adult children.

Any military service, including branch, rank and approximate date of discharge.

Level of education, and major areas of study, if any.

Memberships in any groups or organizations.

Hobbies and leisure-time activities.

Favorite types of reading material.

Favorite types of television shows.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAMOUNT WILLIAMS,

Defendant.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

06-CR-16-C

Members of the jury, you have seen and heard all the evidence and the arguments of the attorneys. Now I will instruct you on the law.

You have two duties as a jury. Your first duty is to decide the facts from the evidence in the case. This is your job, and yours alone.

Your second duty is to apply the law that I give you to the facts. You must follow my instructions on the law, even if you disagree with them. Each of the instructions is important. You must follow all of them.

Perform these duties fairly and impartially. Do not allow sympathy, prejudice, fear or public opinion to influence you. Do not allow any person's race, color, religion, national ancestry or sex to influence you.

Nothing I say now and nothing I said or did during the trial is meant to indicate any opinion on my part about what the facts are or about what your verdict should be.

The evidence consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits admitted in evidence and stipulations.

A stipulation is an agreement between both sides that certain facts are true.

I have taken judicial notice of certain facts that may be regarded as matters of common knowledge. You may accept those facts as proved, but you are not required to do so.

You are to decide whether the testimony of each of the witnesses is truthful and accurate, in part, in whole, or not at all, as well as what weight, if any, you give to the testimony of each witness. In evaluating the testimony of any witness, you may consider among other things: the witness's age; the witness's intelligence; the ability and opportunity the witness had to see, hear, or know the things the witness testified about; the witness's memory; any interest, bias, or prejudice the witness may have; the manner of the witness while testifying; and the reasonableness of the witness's testimony in light of all the evidence in the case.

You should judge the defendant's testimony in the same way as you judge the testimony of any other witness.

You should use common sense in weighing the evidence. Consider the evidence in light of your own observations in life. You are allowed to draw reasonable inferences from facts. In other words, you may look at one fact and conclude from it that another fact exists. Any inferences you make must be reasonable and must be based on the evidence in the case.

Some of you have heard the phrases “circumstantial evidence” and “direct evidence.” Direct evidence is the testimony of someone who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a series of facts that tend to show whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. You should decide how much weight to give to any evidence. You

should consider all the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, in reaching your verdict.

Certain things are not evidence. I will list them for you:

First, testimony and exhibits that I struck from the record or that I told you to disregard are not evidence and must not be considered.

Second, anything that you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be entirely disregarded. This includes any press, radio, or television reports you may have seen or heard. Such reports are not evidence and must not influence your verdict.

Third, questions and objections by the lawyers are not evidence. Lawyers have a duty to object when they believe a question is improper. You should not be influenced by any objection or by my ruling on it.

Fourth, the lawyers' statements to you are not evidence. The purpose of these statements is to discuss the issues and the evidence. If the evidence as you remember it differs from what the lawyers said, your collective memory is what counts.

It is proper for a lawyer to interview any witness in preparation for trial.

You have received evidence of a statement said to be made by the defendant to _____. You must decide whether the defendant did make the statement. If you find that the defendant did make the statement, then you must decide what weight, if any, you believe the statement deserves. In making this decision, you should consider all matters in evidence having to do with the statement, including those concerning the defendant himself, and the circumstances under which the statement was made.

The defendant has an absolute right not to testify. In arriving at your verdict, you must not consider the fact that the defendant did not testify.

A statement made by the defendant before trial that is inconsistent with the defendant's testimony here in court may be used by you as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in it, and also in deciding the truthfulness and accuracy of the defendant's testimony in this trial.

You have heard evidence that the defendant has been convicted of a crime. You may consider this evidence only to determine whether the government has proved all the elements of the offense charged in Count 1 as set forth below. You may not consider it for any other purpose.

You have heard evidence that the defendant has been convicted of a crime. You may consider this evidence only for two purposes. First, you may use it to determine whether the government has proved all the elements of the offense charged in Count 1 as set forth below. Second, you may use the fact of the defendant's conviction in deciding whether the defendant's testimony is truthful as a whole, in part, or not at all. You may not consider it for any other purpose.

You have heard evidence of acts of the defendant other than those charged in the indictment. Specifically, _____. You may consider this evidence only on the questions of _____. You should consider this evidence only for this limited purpose.

You have heard evidence that _____ have been convicted of crimes. You may consider this evidence only in deciding whether the testimony of any of these

witnesses is truthful in whole, in part, or not at all. You may not consider this evidence for any other purpose.

You have heard [reputation/opinion] evidence about the character trait of _____ for truthfulness [or untruthfulness]. You should consider this evidence in deciding the weight that you will give to _____'s testimony.

You have heard [reputation and/or opinion] evidence about the defendant's character trait for [truthfulness, peacefulness, etc]. You should consider character evidence together with all the other evidence in the case and in the same way.

You have heard evidence that before the trial, witnesses made statements that may be inconsistent with their testimony here in court. If you find that it is inconsistent, you may consider the earlier statement only in deciding the truthfulness and accuracy of that witness's testimony in this trial. You may not use it as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in that prior statement. If that statement was made under oath, you may also consider it as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in that prior statement.

A statement made by the defendant before trial that is inconsistent with the defendant's testimony here in court may be used by you as evidence of the truth of the matters contained in it, and also in deciding the truthfulness and accuracy of that defendant's testimony in this trial.

_____ has admitted lying under oath. You may give his testimony such weight as you believe it deserves, keeping in mind that it must be considered with caution and great care.

You have heard testimony that _____ has received benefits from the government in connection with this case. Specifically, _____ You may give the testimony of this witness such weight as you believe it deserves, keeping in mind that it must be considered with caution and great care.

You have heard testimony from _____ who each stated that he or she was involved in the commission of the alleged crime charged against the defendant. You may give the testimony of these witnesses such weight as you believe it deserves, keeping in mind that it must be considered with caution and great care.

The witnesses _____ have pleaded guilty to a crime arising out of the same allegations for which the defendant is now on trial. You may give the testimony of these witnesses such weight as you believe it deserves, keeping in mind that it must be considered with caution and great care. Moreover, the guilty pleas of these defendants cannot to be considered as evidence against the defendant on trial now.

The witnesses _____ have received immunity; that is, a promise from the government that any testimony or other information he or she provided would not be used against him in a criminal case. You may give the testimony of these witnesses such weight as you believe it deserves, keeping in mind that it must be considered with caution and great care.

You must consider with caution and great care the testimony of any witness who is currently addicted to drugs. It is up to you to determine whether the testimony of a drug addict has been affect by drug use or the need for drugs.

The witnesses _____ gave opinions about matters requiring special knowledge or skill. You should judge this testimony in the same way that you judge the testimony of any other witness. The fact that such a person has given an opinion does not mean that you are required to accept it. Give the testimony whatever weight you think it deserves, considering the reasons given for the opinion, the witness' qualifications and all of the other evidence in the case.

Certain summaries are in evidence. They truly and accurately summarize the contents of voluminous books, records or documents, and should be considered together with and in the same way as all other evidence in the case.

Certain summaries are in evidence. Their accuracy has been challenged by the defendant. Thus, the original materials upon which the exhibits are based have also been admitted into evidence so that you may determine whether the summaries are accurate.

THE INDICTMENT

The defendant is charged in the indictment as follows:

COUNT 1

On or about January 3, 2006, in the Western District of Wisconsin, the defendant, Lamont D. Williams, after having previously been convicted of a crime punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding one year, knowingly and unlawfully possessed in and affecting commerce a Jennings, .22 caliber pistol, serial number 1082394, said firearm having previously traveled and affected interstate commerce.

COUNT 2

On or about January 3, 2006, in the Western District of Wisconsin, the defendant, Lamont D. Williams, knowingly and unlawfully possessed with intent to distribute a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (“crack cocaine”), a Schedule II controlled substance.

COUNT 3

On or about January 3, 2006, in the Western District of Wisconsin, the defendant, Lamont D. Williams,, knowingly and unlawfully possessed a firearm, specifically, a Jennings, .22 caliber pistol, serial number 1082394, in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime for which he might be prosecuted in a court of the United States, that is, possession cocaine base with intent to distribute, as charged in Count 2 of this indictment, which is incorporated by reference herein.

The indictment in this case is the formal method of accusing the defendant of crimes and placing the defendant on trial. It is not evidence against the defendant and does not create any implication of guilt.

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

The defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charges. This presumption continues during every stage of the trial and your deliberations on the verdict. It is not overcome unless from all the evidence in the case you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty as charged.

The government has the burden of proving the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden of proof stays with the government throughout the case. The defendant is never required to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence at all.

The indictment charges that the offenses were committed "on or about" certain dates. The government must prove that the offenses happened reasonably close to those dates but it is not required to prove that the alleged offenses happened on those exact dates.

ELEMENTS OF THE CHARGE: COUNT 1

To sustain the charge against the defendant in Count 1, the government must prove these elements:

- 1) Prior to January 3, 2006, the defendant had been convicted of a crime that was punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than one year;
- 2) On or about January 3, 2006, the defendant knowingly possessed the firearm charged in Count 1; and
- 3) This firearm was possessed in or affecting interstate commerce.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each of these elements has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these elements has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

As to the first element of Count 1, the parties have stipulated that prior to January 3, 2006, the defendant had been convicted of a crime that was punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than one year. Therefore, you may conclude the government has met its burden of proof on the first element of Count 1.

Possession of an object is the ability to control it. Possession may exist even when a person is not in physical contact with the object, but knowingly has the power and intention to exercise direction and control over it, either directly or through others.

The term “knowingly” means that the defendant realized what he was doing and was aware of the nature of his or her conduct and did not act through ignorance, mistake or accident. Knowledge may be proved by the defendant's conduct and by all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

As to the third element of Count 1, a firearm has traveled in interstate commerce if it has traveled between one state and any other state or country, or across a state or national boundary line. The government does not need to show how the firearm traveled in interstate commerce or that the firearm’s travel was related to the defendant’s possession of it, or that the defendant knew that the firearm had traveled in interstate commerce.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE: COUNT 2

To sustain the charge against the defendant in Count 2, the government must prove these elements:

1. The defendant knowingly or intentionally possessed cocaine base;
2. The defendant possessed this cocaine base with the intent to deliver it to another person; and,
3. The defendant knew that this was a controlled substance.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of Count 2.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty of Count 2.

You are instructed that cocaine base is a Schedule II controlled substance.

Distribution is the transfer of possession from one person to another.

As to the third element of Count 3, it is sufficient that the defendant knew that the substance was some kind of prohibited drug. It does not matter whether the defendant knew that the substance was cocaine base (crack cocaine).

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE FOR COUNT 2

The crime of possession of cocaine base with intent to distribute it as charged against defendant in Count 2 of the indictment includes the lesser offense of possession of cocaine base.

If you find the defendant not guilty of the crime of possession of cocaine base with intent to distribute it, or if you cannot unanimously agree that the defendant is guilty of that crime, then you must proceed to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the lesser offense of possession of cocaine base.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE OF POSSESSION OF COCAINE BASE

To sustain the charge of possession of possessing cocaine base, the government must prove two elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

1. That the defendant knowingly or intentionally possessed cocaine base;
2. The defendant knew that the substance was a controlled substance; and

3. The defendant did not obtain this cocaine base pursuant to a valid prescription or order from a practitioner acting in the course of his professional practice.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each of these propositions has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE: COUNT 3

To sustain the charge in Count 3, the government must prove these elements:

- 1) The defendant committed the drug trafficking crime charged in Count 2;
- 2) The defendant knowingly possessed the firearm specified in Count 3; and
- 3) The defendant possessed this firearm in furtherance of the drug trafficking crime.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty.

Proof of ownership of the firearm is not required to prove possession.

As to the third element of Count 3, the phrase “in furtherance” means that the defendant’s possession of the firearm furthered, promoted, advanced, or helped forward the drug trafficking crime charged in Count 2. It is not sufficient for you to find that the defendant possessed the firearm but that his possession of it was not in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime.

Possession of a firearm for protection can be in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime so long as the evidence specifically ties the firearm to the drug trafficking activity. In making this determination, you should consider all of the circumstances, including the type of drug activity that is being conducted, accessibility of the firearm, the type of the weapon, whether the weapon is stolen, the status of the possession (legitimate or illegal), whether the gun is loaded, proximity to drugs or drug profits, and the time and circumstances under which the gun is found.

You cannot find the defendant guilty of Count 3 if you find that he was guilty of Count 2's lesser included offense because simple possession of crack cocaine without an intent to distribute it is not a drug trafficking crime.

By themselves, the defendant's presence at the scene of a crime and knowledge that a crime is being committed are not sufficient to establish the defendant's guilt.

If the defendant performed acts that advanced a criminal activity but had no knowledge that a crime was being committed or was about to be committed, those acts alone are not sufficient to establish the defendant's guilt.

An offense may be committed by more than one person. The defendant's guilt may be established without proof that the defendant personally performed every act constituting the crime charged.

If the defendant knowingly caused the acts of another, the defendant is responsible for those acts as though he personally committed them.

The defendant need not personally perform every act constituting the crime charged. Every person who willfully participates in the commission of a crime may be found guilty.

Whatever a person is legally capable of doing he can do through another person by causing that person to perform the act. If the defendant willfully ordered, directed or authorized the acts of another, he is responsible for such acts as though he personally committed them.

Any person who knowingly aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures the commission of a crime is guilty of that crime. However, that person must knowingly associate himself or herself with the criminal venture, participate in it and try to make it succeed.

Upon retiring to the jury room, select one of your number as your presiding juror. This person will preside over your deliberations and will be your representative here in court. A verdict form has been prepared for you.
[Court reads verdict form.]

Take this form to the jury room, and when you have reached unanimous agreement on the verdict, your foreperson will fill in, date and sign the form.

Each count of the indictment charges the defendant with having committed a separate offense. You must give separate consideration to each count. You must consider each count and the evidence relating to it separate and apart from the other count. You should return a separate verdict as to each count. Your verdict of guilty or not guilty of an offense charged in one count should not control your decision as to the defendant under the other count.

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. Whether your verdict is guilty or not guilty, it must be unanimous. You should make every reasonable effort to reach a verdict. In doing so, you should consult with one another, express your own views and listen to the opinions of your fellow jurors. Discuss your differences with an open mind. Do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if you come to believe it is wrong. But do not surrender your honest beliefs about the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinions of your fellow jurors or for the purpose of returning a unanimous verdict.

The twelve of you should give fair and equal consideration to all the evidence and deliberate with the goal of reaching an agreement consistent with the individual judgment of each juror. You are impartial judges of the facts. Your only interest is to determine whether the government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with the court, you may send a note by a bailiff, signed by your foreperson or by one or more members of the jury. No member of the jury should ever attempt to communicate with the court by any means other than a signed writing, and the court will never communicate with any member of the jury on any subject touching the merits of the case otherwise than in writing, or orally here in open court. You will note from the oath about to be taken by the bailiffs that they too, as well as all other persons, are forbidden to communicate in any way or manner with any member of the jury on any subject touching the merits of the case. You must not reveal to any person, including the court, your numerical split on any verdict question until you have reached a unanimous verdict on every defendant and every count.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

VERDICT

06-CR-16-C

LAMOUNT D. WILLIAMS,

Defendant.

COUNT 1

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Lamount D. Williams,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 1 of the indictment.

COUNT 2

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Lamount D. Williams,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 2 of the indictment.

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE FOR COUNT 2

If you find the defendant Not Guilty of Count 2, or if you cannot unanimously agree that the defendant is guilty of Count II, then you must answer this question:

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Lamount D. Williams,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the lesser included offense of simple possession of cocaine base.

COUNT 3

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Lamount D. Williams,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 3 of the indictment.

Presiding Juror

Madison, Wisconsin

Date: _____