

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

10-cr-16-bbc

JUAN L. LOREDO,

Defendant.

Attached for the parties' consideration are draft voir dire questions, jury instructions and a verdict form.

Entered this 31st day of August, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge

ORDER GOVERNING FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE

Generally

A defendant may waive his or her presence at the final pretrial conference. A waiver must be in writing, signed by the defendant and submitted to the court not later than the beginning of the conference.

It is not necessary that the attorney actually trying the case attend the final pretrial conference, but trial counsel are bound by representations and decisions made at the conference in their absence.

An attorney located more than 30 miles from the federal courthouse may seek permission to appear telephonically for the final pretrial conference. Such permission must be sought and obtained at least one work day before the conference.

Same day service is required for all final pretrial conference submissions.

Failure timely to file and serve documents or raise issues addressed in this order may constitute waiver at the court's discretion.

All trial counsel and all defendants must appear personally at any final hearing held by a district judge.

Voir Dire Questions and Jury Instructions

At the final pretrial conference the court shall finalize the voir dire questions and create a set of legally accurate jury instructions that contains every instruction the court might need at trial (with the possible exception of a theory of defense instruction). Toward this end, the court will circulate voir dire questions and a packet of jury instructions prior to the parties' submission

deadline for the final pretrial conference. These are the drafts from which we will work at the final pretrial conference.

Pursuant to F.R. Crim. Pro. 30 and not later than the submission deadline, the parties must submit any proposed additions, deletions, or edits to the court's drafts. Each proposed edit to or deletion of a court draft voir dire question must be set forth in a separate paragraph and must cite by number to the question at issue. Each proposed new question must be set forth in a separate paragraph and numbered for ease of reference.

Each proposed edit or deletion of a court draft jury instruction must be set forth in a separate paragraph and must cite by page number to the court's draft. Each proposed new jury instruction must be set forth in a separately numbered paragraph. When applicable, a party must provide adequate citation to any legal authority for any proposed edit, deletion or addition of a jury instruction.

Although a defendant is not required to reveal a theory of defense instruction prior to the close of the government's case in chief, it is helpful and efficient to discuss such instructions at the final pretrial conference whenever possible. Therefore, the court encourages defendants to provide draft theory of defense instructions for consideration on the record at the final pretrial conference. If a defendant is not willing to do this, then the court asks that the defendant submit his or her theory of defense instruction to the court *ex parte* and *in camera* for review prior to trial.

Motions *in Limine* and Notice of Intent To Offer Evidence

Although the trial judges make the final decisions on motions *in limine* and other evidentiary issues, all such issues must be raised at the final pretrial conference for preliminary review and discussion.

The parties must file and serve any and all motions *in limine* not later than the submission deadline for the final pretrial conference. A party may submit all of its motions *in limine* in one document, but each issue must be raised in a separately numbered paragraph. When necessary, a party must provide adequate citation to any legal authority supporting a motion *in limine*.

Not later than the submission deadline for the final pretrial conference the government must file any notice of intent to offer the following types of evidence at trial: 1) Prior felony convictions offered for any purpose; 2) Any F.R. Ev. 404(b) evidence; 3) Any statement by a defendant offered under F.R. Ev. 801(d)(2)(C)-(E); and 4) Any other evidence of which the government is aware and which it intends to offer pursuant to F.R. Ev. 804 - 807. Notice must be provided in a captioned document to be docketed in the court file.

Although a defendant is not required to reveal defense evidence of this sort, it is helpful and efficient to discuss such evidence at the final pretrial conference whenever possible. Therefore, the court encourages defendants to provide such notice for consideration at the final pretrial conference. If a defendant is not willing to do this, then the court asks that the defendant submit such notice to the court *ex parte* and *in camera* for review prior to trial.

Audiovisual Evidence

Not later than fourteen days before the final pretrial conference the government shall serve on all defendants written notice of its intent to introduce at trial audio or visual recordings. This notice shall identify with particularity those portions of the recordings that the government

intends to introduce. The government simultaneously shall provide transcripts of the recordings in final or almost-final form.

Not later than seven days prior to the final pretrial conference a defendant must notify the government whether he or she objects to the admissibility of the recording(s) or any portion thereof, whether he or she disputes any part of the government's transcription, and provide sufficiently particular bases for any such objections or disputes. If the parties cannot promptly resolve their differences, then not later than the submission deadline for the final pretrial conference the defendant must file and serve a motion *in limine* objecting to recordings and transcripts.

Submission of Witness and Evidence Lists

Not later than the Thursday before trial each party shall submit *ex parte* and under seal its list of expected trial witnesses. Not later than the morning of trial, prior to jury selection, each party shall submit a final list of exhibits and a copy of each exhibit marked with sequentially numbered stickers. Exhibit list forms and stickers are available from the clerk of court.

If more than one defendant will be offering exhibits, then the exhibit stickers must identify the offering defendant by name or initials. In preparing exhibit lists, counsel must provide the exhibit number, the witness through whom the exhibit will be offered, and a brief description of the exhibit.

Each party shall maintain custody of its own exhibits throughout the trial and after the trial. Any exhibit referred to during trial becomes part of the record even if not offered or accepted into evidence. Following trial, counsel for each party promptly shall contact the clerk of this court to arrange for the exhibits to be included in the appellate record.

Witness Subpoenas and Writs for Indigent Defendants

If an indigent defendant intends to subpoena trial witnesses at government expense, then not later than 18 days before trial he or she must file a motion under F.R.Crim. Pro. 17(b) naming each witness, providing a street address for service, and proffering why each requested witness is necessary for an adequate defense. The defendant must attach to the motion a completed subpoena form for each witness. Blank subpoena forms are available on the court's web site or from the clerk of court.

If the requested witness is incarcerated, then defendant's Rule 17(b) request and subpoena form must be filed not later than 25 days before trial along with a motion for a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum and a completed draft writ for the magistrate judge to sign.

If a defendant misses the deadline for filing a Rule 17(b) request or petition for a writ, then the court still will consider the request and issue subpoenas and writs if appropriate, but service of the subpoenas by the marshals service cannot be assured. Indigent defendants who have received authorization to use an investigator may have that investigator serve trial subpoenas instead of the marshals service.

Witness payment forms are available through the marshals service. Incarcerated witnesses are not eligible for witness fees.

Last Minute Settlements and Emergencies

The attorneys in this case immediately shall notify the clerk of court if this case settles or if some other event occurs that jeopardizes the trial date. On the weekend before trial, the

parties may reach Clerk of Court Peter A. Oppeneer at 608-287-4875. Failure promptly to notify the clerk without good cause may result in jury costs being assessed against counsel.

Unsealing Confidential Documents

In most cases it is substantively unnecessary and administratively burdensome for the court to maintain the confidentiality of sealed documents following the conclusion of a criminal case. Therefore, the clerk of court shall unseal all sealed documents in this case, including transcripts of *ex parte* hearings, following entry of judgment by the district court.

A document may remain under seal after judgment only if a party makes an adequately supported written request that it remain sealed. Such requests must be filed prior to the entry of judgment. The burden is on the party seeking continued confidentiality to make a timely request that persuades the court.

Voir Dire: United States v. Lored, 10-cr-16-bbc

Statement of the case: This is a criminal case in which the defendant, Juan Lored, is charged with being a member of a methamphetamine distribution conspiracy, with distributing methamphetamine and with possessing methamphetamine with intent to distribute it. 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 by Wednesday. 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:

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.

The government has the burden of proving the defendant's guilt 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.

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

4. Ask counsel to introduce themselves, the defendant 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/partner status and number of children, if any.

Current occupation (former if retired).

Current (or former) occupation of your spouse/partner 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.

Whether you regularly listen to talk radio, and if so, to which programs.

Whether you regularly use the internet to visit sites other than e-mail or personal business, and if so, what types of sites you visit most often.

Whether you have bumper stickers on your vehicles and what they say.

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

7. The defendant is from Mexico. Would any of you find it difficult to serve as an impartial juror in a case in which a Mexican man is charged with crimes involving methamphetamine distribution?

8. Do any of you believe that a Mexican man charged with distributing methamphetamine probably is a dangerous person simply because he is from Mexico and is charged with drug crimes?

9. The defendant does not speak English well and will be using a telephonic interpreter to assist him throughout this trial. Is there anything about the fact that this defendant does not speak English well, or about his use of an interpreter that would affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

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

11. 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?

12. 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?

13. 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?

14. 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?

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

16. 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?

17. 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?

18. 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?

19. 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?

20. 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?

21. Would any of you judge the testimony of a witness who was Latino/Latina differently from other witnesses solely because of the witness's ethnic background?

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

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 witness in a 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 had any negative experience with any lawyer, any court, or any legal proceeding that would affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

26. 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.

27. 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?

28. 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?

29. 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?

30. 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/partner status and number of children, if any.

Current occupation (former if retired).

Current (or former) occupation of your spouse/partner 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.

Whether you regularly listen to talk radio, and if so, to which programs.

Whether you regularly use the internet to visit sites other than e-mail or personal business, and if so, what types of sites you visit most often.

Whether you have bumper stickers on your vehicles and what they say.

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUAN L. LOREDO,

Defendant.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

10-cr-16-bbc

I. INTRODUCTORY INSTRUCTIONS

Members of the jury, we are about to begin the trial of the case. Before it begins, I want to tell you how the trial will proceed and how you should conduct yourselves during the trial.

Your Duties as Jurors

As jurors, you have two duties. Your first duty is to decide the facts from the evidence that you will see and hear in this court. This is your job, not my job or anyone else's.

Your second duty will be to take the law that I will give you at the end of the case and apply it to the facts to decide if the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

You must perform these duties fairly and impartially. Do not let sympathy, prejudice, fear or public opinion influence you. Do not let any person's race, color, religion, national ancestry or gender influence you.

Nothing that I say or do during the trial is meant to indicate any opinion by me about what the facts are or about what your verdict should be.

The Criminal Charges

The charges against the defendant are in a document called an indictment. You will have a copy of the indictment during your deliberations.

The indictment in this case charges that the defendant committed the crimes of distribution of cocaine and conspiracy to distribute cocaine. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charges.

The indictment is simply the formal way of stating what crimes the defendant is accused of committing. It is not evidence that the defendant is guilty and it should not raise even a suspicion of guilt.

The Defendant is Presumed Innocent

The defendant is presumed innocent of each of the charges. This presumption stays with the defendant throughout the case. 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 guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden stays with the government throughout the case. The defendant is never required to prove his innocence. He is not required to produce any evidence at all.

How the Trial Will Proceed

First, the Assistant United States Attorney will make an opening statement outlining the government's case. Immediately after, the defendant's lawyer will make an opening statement outlining defendant's case. Keep in mind that what is said in opening statements is not evidence; it is simply a guide to help you understand what each party expects the evidence to show.

Second, after the opening statements, the government will introduce evidence in support of the charges. At the conclusion of the government's case, the defendant

may introduce evidence. The defendant is not required to introduce any evidence or to call any witnesses. If the defendant introduces evidence, then the government may introduce rebuttal evidence.

Third, after the evidence is presented, the lawyers will make closing arguments explaining what they believe the evidence has shown and what inferences you should draw from the evidence. What is said in closing argument is not evidence. Because the government has the burden of proof, the Assistant United States Attorney has the right to give the first closing argument and to make a short rebuttal argument after the defendant's closing argument.

Fourth, I will instruct you on the law that you are to apply in reaching your verdict.

Fifth, you will retire to the jury room and begin your deliberations.

The trial day will run from 9:00 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. You will have at least an hour for lunch and two additional short breaks, one in the morning and one in the afternoon.

Notetaking

The clerk will give each of you a notepad and pencil for taking notes. This does not mean you have to take notes; take them only if you want to and if you think that they will help you remember the evidence when you are deliberating. Do not let notetaking interfere with your important duties of listening carefully to all of the evidence and of evaluating the credibility of the witnesses. Just because someone has written something down, this does not mean that the written note is more accurate than another juror's mental recollection of the same thing. No one of you is the "secretary" for the jury, responsible for recording evidence. Each of you is responsible for recalling the testimony and the other evidence.

Although you can see that this trial is being recorded by a court reporter, you should not expect to be able to use trial transcripts in your deliberations. You will have to rely on your own memories.

No Communication During the Trial

During recesses you should keep in mind the following instructions:

First, do not discuss the case either among yourselves or with anyone else during the course of the trial. The parties have a right to expect that you will keep an open mind throughout the trial. You should not reach any conclusions about this case until you have heard all of the evidence, you have heard the lawyers' closing arguments, you have received my instructions on the law, and you have retired to deliberate with the other members of the jury about your verdict.

I must warn you, in particular, against commenting about the trial in an e-mail or a blog or Twitter. There have been news accounts recently about cases that have had to be re-tried because a member of the jury communicated electronically about the case during the trial. You can imagine what this would mean in the cost of a re-trial, the inconvenience to your fellow jurors whose work would have gone for nothing and the stress experienced by the defendant.

Second, do not permit any third person to discuss the case in your presence. If anyone tries to talk to you despite your telling him not to, report that fact to the court as soon as you are able. Do not discuss the event with your fellow jurors or discuss with them any other fact that you believe you should bring to the attention of the court.

Third, although it is a normal human tendency to talk with people with whom one is thrown in contact, please do not talk to any of the parties or their attorneys or the witnesses. By this I mean not only do not talk about the case, but do not talk at

all, even to pass the time of day. This is the only way the parties can be sure of the absolute fairness and impartiality they are entitled to expect from you as jurors.

Fourth, do not read about the case on the internet, in newspapers, or listen to radio or television broadcasts about the trial. If a headline catches your eye, do not examine the article further. Media accounts may be inaccurate and may contain matters that are not proper for your consideration. You must base your verdict solely on the evidence produced in court.

Fifth, no matter how interested you may become in the facts of the case, you must not do any independent research, investigation or experimentation. Don't look up materials on the internet or in other sources.

How To Consider the Evidence

You must make your decision in this case based only on the evidence that you see and hear in this court. Do not consider anything you may see or hear outside of court.

The evidence consists 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.

Sometimes during a trial I take 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.

Nothing else is evidence. The lawyers' statements and arguments are not evidence. If what a lawyer says is different from the evidence, the evidence is what counts. The lawyers' questions and objections likewise are not evidence. A lawyer has a duty to object if he thinks a question is improper. If I sustain an objection to a question asked by a lawyer, then you must not speculate on what the answer might have been.

If during the trial I strike a witness's answer to a question or strike an exhibit from the record, or If I tell you to disregard something, then these things are not evidence and you may not consider them.

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

Part of your job as jurors is to decide how believable each witness is, and how much weight to give each witness's testimony. Some factors you may consider are: the witness's age, intelligence, and memory; the witness's ability and opportunity to see, hear or know the things that the witness testified about; the witness's demeanor while testifying; whether the witness had any bias, prejudice or other reason to lie or to slant his or her testimony; inconsistent statements or conduct by the witness; and the believability of the witness's testimony in light of the other evidence presented. You may also consider any other factors that shed light on the believability of each witness's testimony.

The defendant has an absolute right not to testify during this trial. You must not consider in any way the fact that the defendant may choose not to testify. You should not even discuss it in your deliberations.

Give the evidence whatever weight you believe it deserves. Use your common sense in weighing the evidence, and consider the evidence in light of your own every day experience. 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.

You may have heard the terms “direct evidence” and “circumstantial evidence.” Direct evidence is evidence that, if you believe it, directly proves a fact. Circumstantial evidence is evidence that indirectly proves a fact.

For example, direct evidence that it rained last Friday would be testimony from a witness who tells you that she walked through the rainstorm. Circumstantial evidence that it rained last Friday would be testimony from a witness who saw other people’s wet umbrellas drying in the foyer that day.

You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence. The law does not say that one is better than the other. It is up to you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence, whether direct or circumstantial.

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUAN L. LOREDO,

Defendant.

POST TRIAL
JURY INSTRUCTIONS

10-cr-16-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.

CONSIDERATION OF THE EVIDENCE

All of the introductory instructions that I gave you at the beginning of this trial still are in effect. I will give you copies of those instructions to take back to the jury room with you.

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.

In deciding the believability of witnesses, you should judge defendant's testimony in the same way as you judge the testimony of any other witness.

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 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 evidence that the defendant has been convicted of crimes. You may consider this evidence only in deciding whether the defendant's testimony is truthful in whole, in part, or not at all. You may not consider it for any other purpose. A conviction of another crime is not evidence of the defendant's guilt of the crime for which the defendant now is charged.

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 the 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 _____ have received benefits from the government in connection with this case. Specifically, _____ 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 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[s] 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.

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.

THE INDICTMENT

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

The defendant is charged in the indictment as follows:

COUNT 1

From on or about June 1 2009, to on or about November 11, 2009, in the Western District of Wisconsin and elsewhere, the defendant, Juan L. Loreda, and Federico S. Perez knowingly and intentionally conspired with each other and with others, known and unknown to the grand jury, to possess methamphetamine with intent to distribute, and to distribute methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance, with this conspiracy involving 100 grams or more of methamphetamine.

COUNT 2

On or about October 28, 2009, in the Western District of Wisconsin, the defendant, Juan L. Loreda, and Federico S. Perez knowingly and intentionally distributed 100 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance.

COUNT 3

On or about November 11, 2009, in the Western District of Wisconsin and elsewhere, the defendant, Juan L. Loreda, and Federico S. Perez knowingly and possessed with the intent to distribute 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance.

The defendant has entered a plea of not guilty to the charges against him.

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 against him. 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

Count 1 charges the defendant with conspiracy. A conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to accomplish an unlawful purpose. To sustain this charge, the government must prove these elements:

- 1) The conspiracy charged in Count 1 existed, and
- 2) The defendant knowingly became a member of this conspiracy with an intention to further the conspiracy.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that both of these propositions have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of Count 1.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all of the evidence that either of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty of Count 1.

CONSPIRACY INSTRUCTIONS

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 1, 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 1, 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 the defendant's 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.

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

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.

The government must prove that the defendant knowingly and intentionally joined the charged conspiracy, knowing the conspiracy's aim and intending to achieve it.

OBJECTS OF THE CONSPIRACY

Count 1 charges that this was a conspiracy with two objectives, to distribute methamphetamine and to possess methamphetamine with intent to distribute it. To meet its burden of persuasion on the first element of Count 1, the government does not need to prove both of these objectives, but it must prove at least one of them. To

find that the government has proved an objective of the charged conspiracy, you must unanimously agree on at least one objective. It is not sufficient for some of you to find that government has proved a conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine and the rest of you to find that it has proved a conspiracy to possess methamphetamine with intent to distribute it.

BUYER-SELLER RELATIONSHIP

Just because the defendant may have bought methamphetamine from a member of the conspiracy charged in Count 1 does not automatically make the defendant a member of the conspiracy. This is true even if this defendant then re-sold the methamphetamine to other people, and even if the defendant did this more than once. This is because a conspiracy may have customers, even regular customers, who are not actually members of the conspiracy. It is the government's burden to prove that the defendant knowingly joined the agreement to achieve the objectives charged in Count 1.

SINGLE OR MULTIPLE CONSPIRACIES

Although Count 1 charges a single, separate conspiracy, it might be possible to find additional, separate conspiracies regarding distinct parts of this case.

Whether there was one conspiracy, two conspiracies, multiple conspiracies or no conspiracy at all is a fact for you to determine in accordance with these instructions.

If you do not find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant you are considering was a member of any conspiracy, you must find that defendant not guilty of Count 1.

If you find beyond a reasonable doubt that there was one overall conspiracy as alleged in Count 1 and that the defendant was a member of that conspiracy, you should find the defendant guilty of Count 1.

If you find that there was more than one conspiracy and also find that the defendant was a member of one or more of these additional conspiracies, then you may find that defendant guilty of Count 1 only if you further find beyond a reasonable doubt that the proven conspiracy of which the defendant was a member is included within the conspiracy charged in Count 1.

On the other hand, if you find that the proven conspiracy of which the defendant was a member is not included within the conspiracy alleged in Count 1, then you must find the defendant not guilty of this count.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE: COUNT 2

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

1. The defendant knowingly or intentionally distributed methamphetamine as charged in Count 2;
2. The defendant knew that he was distributing a controlled substance.

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

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

With regard to the second element of Count 2 it does not matter whether the defendant knew the substance he distributed was methamphetamine. It is sufficient that the defendant knew that he was distributing some kind of prohibited drug.

ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE: COUNT 3

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

1. The defendant knowingly or intentionally possessed methamphetamine as charged in Count 3;
2. The defendant possessed this methamphetamine with the intent to distribute it to another person.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that both of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of Count 3.

On the other hand, if you find from your consideration of all the evidence that either of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you must find the defendant not guilty of Count 3.

DRUG AMOUNTS

If you find the defendant guilty of Count 1, then you must determine whether the government also has proved the amount of methamphetamine involved in the conspiracy.

The first special verdict question for Count 1 asks whether the conspiracy involved 100 grams or more of methamphetamine. If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the conspiracy involved 100 grams more of methamphetamine, then you should answer the first special verdict question “Yes.” If you answer the first special verdict question “Yes,” then you do not need to answer the second special verdict question because it asks about a lesser quantity.

If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the conspiracy involved 100 grams or more of methamphetamine, then you must answer the first

special verdict question “No.” If you answer the first special verdict question “No,” then you must answer the second special verdict question.

The second special verdict question asks whether the conspiracy involved 5 grams or more of methamphetamine. If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the conspiracy involved 5 grams or more of methamphetamine, then you should answer the second special verdict question “Yes.” If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the conspiracy involved 5 grams or more of methamphetamine, then you must answer the second special verdict question “No.”

When answering the special verdict questions for Count 1, keep in mind that you are to determine the amount of methamphetamine involved in the entire conspiracy, not the amount of methamphetamine associated with the defendant.

Count 2 charges that the defendant distributed 100 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine. If you find the defendant guilty of Count 2, then you must determine whether the government also has proved the amount of methamphetamine that the defendant distributed.

The first special verdict question for Count 2 asks whether the defendant distributed 100 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine. If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant distributed 100 grams more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, then you should answer the first special verdict question “Yes.” If you answer the first special verdict question “Yes,” then you do not need to answer the second special verdict question because it asks about a lesser quantity.

If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant distributed 100 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, then you must answer the first special verdict question “No.” If you answer the first special verdict question “No,” then you must answer the second special verdict question for Count 2.

The second special verdict question for Count 2 asks whether the defendant distributed 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine. If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant distributed 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, then you should answer the second special verdict question “Yes.” If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant distributed 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, then you must answer the second special verdict question “No.”

Finally, Count 3 charges that the defendant possessed 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine. If you find the defendant guilty of Count 5, then you must determine whether the government also has proved the amount of methamphetamine that the defendant possessed with intent to distribute.

The special verdict question for Count 3 asks whether the defendant possessed with intent to distribute 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine. If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant possessed with intent to distribute 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, then you should answer the special verdict question “Yes.” If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant possessed with intent to distribute 5

grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine, then you must answer the special verdict question “No.”

DEFINITIONS

You are instructed that methamphetamine is Schedule II controlled substances.

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

The term “knowingly” means that the 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 the defendant's conduct and by all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

RESPONSIBILITY

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 or she 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 with the criminal venture, participate in it and try to make it succeed.

DELIBERATIONS

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 forms.]

Take these forms to the jury room, and when you have reached unanimous agreement on the verdicts, your foreperson will fill in, date and sign the forms.

Although you have seen that the trial is being recorded by a court reporter, you should not expect to be able to use trial transcripts in your deliberations. You will have to rely on your own memories.

You must give separate consideration to each count. In doing this, you must analyze what the evidence shows as to each count, leaving out of consideration any evidence that was admitted solely as to another 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 count.

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

VERDICT

v. Plaintiff,

10-cr-16-bbc

JUAN L. LOREDO,

Defendant.

COUNT 1

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Juan L. Loredó,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 1 of the indictment.

First Special Verdict Question for Count 1

Answer this first special verdict question only if you found the defendant guilty of Count 1:

(1) Did the conspiracy involve 100 grams or more of methamphetamine?

("Yes" or "No")

Second Special Verdict Question for Count 1

Answer this second special verdict question only if you answered “No” to the first special verdict question for Count 1:

(2) Did the conspiracy involve 5 grams or more of methamphetamine?

("Yes" or "No")

COUNT 2

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Juan L. Loreda,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 2 of the indictment.

First Special Verdict Question for Count 2

Answer this first special verdict question only if you found the defendant guilty of Count 2:

(1) Did the defendant distribute 100 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine?

("Yes" or "No")

Second Special Verdict Question for Count 2

Answer this second special verdict question only if you answered “No” to the first special verdict question for Count 1:

- (2) Did the defendant distribute 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine?

("Yes" or "No")

COUNT 3

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Juan L. Loreda,

("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 3 of the indictment.

Special Verdict Question for Count 3

Answer this first special verdict question only if you found the defendant guilty of Count 1:

- (1) Did the defendant possess with intent to distribute 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine?

("Yes" or "No")

Presiding Juror

Madison, Wisconsin

Date: _____