

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL TEPOEL,

Defendant.

FINAL PRETRIAL
CONFERENCE ORDER

07-cr-66-bbc

On March 18, 2008, this court held the final pretrial conference. Defendant Daniel Tepoel appeared representing himself, and assisted by new CJA standby counsel, Sarah Schmeiser. The government was represented by Assistant United States Attorney John Vaudreuil.

First we discussed the universe of voir dire questions. I added most of the information and questions requested by the government, but denied one requested question. Tepoel proposed a series of questions, some of which I agreed to add, some of which I did not, all for reasons stated on the record. The final version of the voir dire is attached to this order.

Next we discussed the universe of jury instructions. I agreed to correct the typographical errors noted by the government and add the pattern *Pinkerton* instruction to the packet. Tepoel, at this point, had no proposed changes or additions. I advised Tepoel about his right to present a theory of defense instruction at the close of the government's case in chief.

Next we discussed the government's notice of intent to offer evidence (dkt. 99) and series of motions in limine (dks. 100-108). As for the government's notice of intent to offer evidence,

Tepoel only wishes to be heard regarding the admissibility of alleged co-conspirator statements. As always, the court will require a *Santiago* hearing. Tepoel does not dispute the government's motions docketed as 102-105 or 106-107. Tepoel wishes to be heard on the government's intent to offer evidence under the present sense impression exception to the hearsay rule (dkt. 100), the government's motion to exclude specified foreign documents for not complying with 18 U.S.C. § 3505 (dkt. 101), and the government's motion to exclude any evidence or argument regarding the specified lawsuit in Grenada filed in 2001 (dkt. 108). I flagged 105 *sua sponte* so that the court could provide direction to both sides on the limits of evidence regarding Tepoel's good faith. On all disputed issues, I advised Tepoel that he should be prepared to offer his best arguments and any case law he can find in support of his position. Tepoel had no additional *in limine* issues to raise on his behalf.

We closed with a discussion of "housekeeping" for trial. The parties are aware of and will attend the final hearing with Judge Crabb on March 20, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in Courtroom 250. The parties are aware this case is going to trial as scheduled on March 24, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. The government's rough prediction is that it will conclude its case in chief around Wednesday noon, so that Tepoel should have any first witnesses available for Wednesday afternoon. In light of this, Tepoel suggests that the court set aside five full days for trial. In light of this, the court will call two alternate jurors. I explained to Tepoel how this court conducts jury selection. I also advised Tepoel that it was his obligation to familiarize himself with the court's ELMO so that

he can present his evidence on this system at trial. The parties had no other matters to bring to the court's attention.

Entered this 19th day of March, 2008.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge

Voir Dire: United States v. Tepoel, 07-cr-66-bbc

Statement of the case: This is a criminal case, in which the defendant, Daniel Tepoel, is charged with engaging in an investment fraud scheme involving fraudulent prime bank instruments and a fraudulent high yield program. The defendant also is charged with making false statements to the FBI during its investigation of this case. The defendant has entered a plea of not guilty to these charges.

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

2. Scheduling: this case will begin today and will conclude by this Friday. Are any of you actually unable to sit as jurors because of this schedule?

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

4. The court reads Federal Criminal 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.

Indictment Not Evidence. 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 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.

Would any of you be unable or unwilling to follow these instructions?

5. Ask the Assistant U.S. Attorneys to introduce themselves and their case agent. Ask defendant to introduce himself and his standby attorney. Ask whether jurors know them.

6. The defendant is representing himself with assistance from what we call a standby attorney. The reasons why the defendant is representing himself are not relevant to the trial or to the jury's consideration of the evidence or its deliberations and verdict. Is there anything about the fact that the defendant does not have an attorney and is representing himself that would affect your ability to be fair to the defendant or to the government in this case?

7. 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.

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.

Whether you read business or financial magazines or newspapers and if so, which ones.

Whether you regularly watch or listen to business or financial programs on television or radio, and if so, which programs.

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

9. Have any of you or members of your family ever worked for, held accounts with or had any other dealings with these businesses:

(1) Rainbow Management Trust, Duluth, MN

(2) Interstate Mortgage Company Duluth MN

(3) Republic Bank, Duluth, MN

(4) Interstar Management, LTD

(5) Grenada Cooperative Bank, Ltd., Grenada

(6) Cinnamon Hill condominiums, Grenada

10. Apart from what you have already told us, how many of you ever have had any employment, training or experience in the fields of accounting, financial investments, banking, lending, financing, or multi-tiered marketing? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

11. Including retirement plans and college savings plans, how many of you have invested money in stocks, bonds, futures, derivative, hedge funds, off-shore institutions or some other investment plan or program? Please tell us the nature of your portfolio, being sure to mention any investments that might be characterized as non-mainstream / untraditional.

12. Do any of you, your spouses, or significant others actively manage your own financial investments by doing your own research, buying or selling?

13. Have any of you or any members of your family ever owned a time share or a condominium that was not your principle residence?

14. Have any of you, your family or close friends ever been the victim or believe that you have been the victim of any actual or attempted fraud or swindle, whether related to investments or otherwise? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

15. Have any of you or any members of your family ever had owned your own business or been on the board of directors of any company? Please tell us the nature of the business and approximately when you owned it or were on its board. Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

16. Have any of you or any members of your family ever had a business relationship with any other bank, credit union, check-cashing business, collection business or other financial business? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

17. 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?

18. 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?

19. 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, any prosecutor's office, or any prison? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

20. 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?

21. If the defendant were to choose to testify, would any of you judge the defendant's credibility differently from other witnesses solely because it was the defendant who was testifying?

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

23. 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?

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

25. 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?

26. 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?

27. 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.

28. 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?

29. 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?

30. 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?

31. 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.

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.

Whether you read business or financial magazines or newspapers and if so, which ones.

Whether you regularly watch or listen to business or financial programs on television or radio, and if so, which programs.

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL TEPOEL,

Defendant.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

07-cr-66-bbc

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 that 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 may find the testimony of one witness or a few witnesses more persuasive than the testimony of a larger number. You need not accept the testimony of the larger number of witnesses.

You have received evidence of statements said to be made by the defendant to _____ . You must decide whether the defendant made any of the statements attributed to him. If you find that a 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.

You have heard evidence of acts of defendant other than those charged in the indictment. Specifically, you've heard evidence that the defendant _____ . You may consider

this evidence only on the question _____. You should consider this evidence only for these limited purposes.

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 evidence about the character trait of _____ for untruthfulness. You should consider this evidence in deciding the weight that you will give to their testimony.

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.

You have heard evidence about a number of the witnesses that may affect your evaluation of their testimony:

_____ have admitted lying under oath.

You have heard testimony that _____ have received benefits from the government in connection with this case. Specifically, they received reduced charges or were not charged with all the crimes they could have been charged with or both and they have the possibility of reduced sentences.

You have heard testimony from _____, who each stated that he or she was involved in the commission of the alleged crimes charged against the defendant.

The witnesses _____ have pleaded guilty to crimes arising out of the same allegations for which the defendants are now on trial.

The witness _____, has received immunity; that is, a promise from the government that any testimony or other information she provided would not be used against her 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. Moreover, the guilty pleas of witnesses _____ cannot be considered as evidence against the defendants on trial now.

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 government] [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.

You have heard recorded conversations. These recorded conversations are proper evidence and you may consider them, just as any other evidence. When the recordings were played during the trial, you were furnished transcripts of the recorded conversations prepared by government agents. The recordings are the evidence, and the transcripts were provided to you only as a guide to help you follow as you listen to the recordings. The transcripts are not evidence of what was actually said or who said it. It is up to you to decide whether the transcripts correctly reflect what was said and who said it. If you noticed any difference between what you heard on the recordings and what you read in the transcripts, you must rely on what you heard, not what you read. And if after careful listening, you could not hear or understand certain parts of the recordings, you must ignore the transcripts as far as those parts are concerned.

I am providing you with the recordings and a player. You are not required to play the tapes, in part or in whole. You may rely, instead, on your recollections of these recordings as you heard them at trial. If you do decide to listen to a tape recording and wish to have the transcript corresponding to that recording, ask the Marshal in writing and the transcript will be given to you. You may choose to listen to the cassette without the transcript.

THE INDICTMENT

The defendant is charged in the indictment as follows:

[court reads the indictment].

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 guilt of the defendant 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.

THE ELEMENTS OF MAIL FRAUD: COUNTS 1, 3, 4 AND 5

The defendant is charged in Counts 1, 3, 4 and 5 with mail fraud. To sustain any of these charges, the government must prove these elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, the defendant knowingly devised or participated in the scheme to defraud or obtain money by means of false pretenses, representations or promises, as described in Paragraphs 1 through 11 of Count 1;

Second, the false pretenses, representations or promises made by the defendant as part of the scheme were material;

Third, the defendant acted knowingly and with the intent to defraud; and,

Fourth, that for the purpose of carrying out the scheme or attempting to do so, the defendant used or caused the use of the United States Mails in the manner charged in the particular count that you are considering.

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

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 as to a particular count, then you must find the defendant not guilty of that count.

THE ELEMENTS OF WIRE FRAUD: COUNTS 6 AND 7

The defendant is charged in Counts 6 and 7 with wire fraud. To sustain either of these charges against the defendant, the government must prove these elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, the defendant knowingly devised or participated in the scheme to defraud or to obtain money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises, as described in Paragraphs 1 through 11 of Count 1;

Second, the false pretenses, representations or promises made by the defendant as part of the scheme were material;

Third, the defendant acted knowingly and with the intent to defraud; and

Fourth, that for the purpose of carrying out the scheme or attempting to do so, the defendant caused interstate wire communications to take place in the manner charged in the particular count that you are considering.

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

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 as to a particular count, then you must find the defendant not guilty of that count.

A scheme is a plan or course of action formed with the intent to accomplish some purpose. A scheme to defraud is a scheme that is intended to deceive or cheat another and to obtain property.

In proving the first element of Counts 1 and 3 through 7, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt either that there was a scheme to defraud, or that there was a scheme to obtain money. The government does not have to prove both that there was a scheme to defraud and a scheme to obtain money. However, before you may find that the government has met its burden of proof as to the first element, you must unanimously agree on one of the two purposes of the charged scheme. It is not enough for some of you to find that there was a scheme to defraud and the rest of you to find that there was a scheme to obtain money. In order to find that the government has met its burden of proof as to the first element, you must all agree that there was a scheme to defraud, or you must all agree that there was a scheme to obtain money.

Similarly, before you may find that the charged scheme existed, you must find that one or more of the specified material false pretenses, representations, promises and acts charged has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt. Although it is not necessary that the government prove all of the material false pretenses, representations, and promises charged in paragraphs 1 - 11 of Count 1, it must prove at least one of them beyond a reasonable

doubt to establish the existence of the scheme to defraud. Before you may find that the government has met this burden, you must unanimously agree on at least one of the specified material false pretenses, representations or promises. It is not enough for some of you to agree that the defendant made one particular material false representation and the rest of you agree that the defendant made another.

A representation or promise can be false in several ways. First, a representation or promise is false if the defendant knew that it was untrue at the time he made it. Second, a representation or promise is false if the defendant made it with reckless indifference as to whether it was true or false, provided that the defendant made it with intent to defraud. Third, a representation or promise is false when it constitutes a half-truth or effectively omits or conceals a material fact, provided that the defendant made or used the half-truth, omission, or concealment with intent to defraud.

A false representation or promise is “material” if it has the natural tendency to influence, or is capable of influencing, the decision of the person to whom it is addressed.

The phrase "intent to defraud" means that the acts charged were done knowingly with the intent to deceive or cheat the victim in order to cause a gain of money or property to the defendant.

Good faith, or the absence of an intent to defraud, constitutes a complete defense to the charge of wire fraud. The good faith defense requires a genuine belief by the defendant that the representations or promises alleged to be fraudulent were true at the time he made them. A defendant's honest and genuine belief that he will be able to perform in the future what he promised in the past is not a defense to mail or wire fraud if the defendant also knowingly made false and fraudulent representations. The burden of proving good faith does not rest with the defendant because the defendant does not have any

obligation to prove anything in this case. It is the government's burden to prove to you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant acted with the specific intent to defraud as alleged in Counts 1 and 3 through 7 of the indictment.

The government is not required to produce direct evidence to establish the defendant's intent. The government may prove the defendant's intent by means of circumstantial evidence alone. In determining the defendant's intent, you may consider all of his statements, acts and omissions, as well as all other facts and circumstances in evidence that indicate the defendant's state of mind.

The statutes against mail fraud and wire fraud can be violated whether or not there is any loss or damage to the victim of the crime or gain to the defendant.

"Interstate commerce" means trade, transactions, transportation or communication between any point in a state and any place outside that state or between two points within a state through a place outside the state. "Foreign commerce" means trade, transactions, transportation or communication between any point in a country and any place outside that country. The government must prove that the foreseeable consequences of the defendant's acts would be to affect interstate or foreign commerce. It is not necessary for you to find that the defendant knew or intended that his actions would affect interstate or foreign commerce.

Although an item communicated interstate need not itself contain a fraudulent representation or promise or a request for money, it must further or attempt to further the scheme.

Each separate use of an interstate communication facility in furtherance of the scheme to defraud constitutes a separate offense.

THE ELEMENTS OF CONSPIRACY: COUNT 2

The defendant is charged in Count 2 with conspiring with other people to commit mail fraud and wire fraud. A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to accomplish an unlawful purpose. To sustain the charge in Count 2, the government must prove these elements:

First, the conspiracy charged in Count 2 existed;

Second, the defendant knowingly became a member of this conspiracy with an intention to further the conspiracy; and

Third, an overt act was committed by at least one conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy.

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

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

A conspiracy may be established even if its purpose was not accomplished.

To be a member of the conspiracy, the defendant need not join at the beginning or know all the other members or the means by which its purpose was to be accomplished. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was aware of the common purpose and was a willing participant.

As to the first element of Count 2, in deciding whether the charged conspiracy existed, you may consider the actions and statements of every one of the alleged participants. An agreement may be proved from all the circumstances and the words and conduct of all of the alleged participants which are shown by the evidence.

As to the second element of Count 2, in deciding whether the defendant joined the charged conspiracy, you must base your decision solely on what the defendant personally did or said. In determining what the defendant personally did or said, you may consider his own words and acts. You also may consider the words and acts of other people to help you determine what the defendant personally did or said, and you may use the words and acts of other people to help you understand and interpret the defendant's own words and acts. Keep in mind, however, that the defendant's membership in the charged conspiracy can only be proved by his own words or acts.

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.

The defendant's association with conspirators is not by itself sufficient to prove his participation or membership in a conspiracy.

If a 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.

To meet its burden of proof as to Count 2, the government must prove that the defendant knowingly and intentionally joined the charged conspiracy, knowing the conspiracy's aim and intending to achieve it.

A conspirator is responsible for offenses committed by his fellow conspirators if he was a member of the conspiracy when the offenses were committed and if those offenses were committed in furtherance of and as a foreseeable consequence of the conspiracy.

Therefore, if you find the defendant guilty of the conspiracy charged in Count 2 and if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that while he was a member of this conspiracy, his fellow conspirator, Gary Milosevich, committed either or both of the offenses charged in Counts 6 and 7 in furtherance of and as a foreseeable consequence of this conspiracy, then you should find the defendant guilty of that count or those counts.

In meeting its burden of proof for the third element of Count 2, the government does not need to prove all of the overt acts charged in the conspiracy. It only needs to prove one. However, you must unanimously agree on at least one overt act. It is not sufficient for some of you to find that the government has proved one overt act and the rest of you to find that the government has proved a different overt act. All twelve of you must agree on a particular act or acts.

The overt act proved may itself be a lawful act.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE: COUNT 8

The defendant is charged in Count 8 with wilfully making false statements. To sustain this charge the government must prove these elements:

First, the defendant made a false statement or representation as specified in count 8;

Second, the defendant knew that the statement or representation was false;

Third, the false statement or representation was material;

Fourth, the defendant made this false statement or representation knowingly and willfully; and

Fifth, the statement or representation was made in a matter within the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the government of the United States.

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 of Count 8.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any of these elements has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty of Count 8.

As for the first element of Count 8, the government must prove that the defendant made at least one of the statements specifically charged in Count 8, but it does not have to prove that he made all of them. However, before you may find that the government has met its burden of proof on this point, you must unanimously agree that on at least one of them. It is not enough for some of you to find that the defendant made the statement charged in Paragraph (a) and the rest of you to find he made the statement charged in paragraph (b) or (c). All twelve of you must agree on at least one charged statement before you may find that the government has proved this point.

A statement is “false” if untrue when made and then known to be untrue by the person making it.

The word “willfully” means the voluntary and intentionally, and with the intent to do something the law forbids.

A defendant does not act willfully if he believes in good faith that he is acting within the law. However, you may consider the reasonableness of that defendant's belief together with all the other evidence in the case in determining whether the defendant held the belief in good faith. The burden of proving good faith does not rest with the defendant because the defendant has no obligation to prove anything to you. The government has the burden of proving to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted willfully.

A statement is “material” if it had the effect of influencing the action of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or if it was capable of or had the potential to do so. It is not necessary that the statement actually have that influence or be relied on by the FBI, so long as it had the potential or capability to do so.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a part of the Executive Branch of the government of the United States, and the FBI has jurisdiction to investigate mail and wire fraud.

As used throughout these instructions, all forms of the verb “to know” and the adverb “knowingly” mean that a defendant realized what he was doing and was aware of the nature of his conduct and did not act through ignorance, mistake or accident. Knowledge may be proved by a defendant's conduct and by all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

An offense may be committed by more than one person. A 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.

Any person who knowingly aids, counsels, commands, induces or procures the commission of an offense may be found guilty of that offense. However, that person must knowingly associate himself with the criminal activity, participate in the activity, 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 the 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 consider each count and the evidence relating to it separate and apart from every other count. Your verdict of guilty or not guilty of an offense charged in one count should not control your decision as to any 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,

VERDICT

v.

07-cr-66-bbc

DANIEL TEPOEL,

Defendant.

COUNT 1

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("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, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 2 of the indictment.

COUNT 3

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 3 of the indictment.

COUNT 4

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 4 of the indictment.

COUNT 5

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 5 of the indictment.

COUNT 6

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 6 of the indictment.

COUNT 7

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 7 of the indictment.

COUNT 8

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Daniel Tepoel,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 8 of the indictment.

Presiding Juror

Madison, Wisconsin

Date: _____