

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

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

07-CR-033-S

JEROME G. HUGHES,

Defendant.

---

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

Entered this 10<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER

Magistrate Judge

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

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEROME HUGHES,

Defendant.

---

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
AND VOIR DIRE

07-CR-33-S

Statement of the case: This is a criminal case, in which the defendant, Jerome Hughes is charged with distributing crack cocaine and with conspiring to distribute crack cocaine. The defendant also is charged with threatening to injure a government witness. 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: the trial in this case will begin today and will finish tomorrow. Are any of you actually unable to sit as jurors because of this schedule?

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

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

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

Burden of Proof. 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 might choose not to 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 defendants and the case agent. Ask whether jurors know them.

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

Name, age, and city or town of residence.

Marital status and number of children, if any.

Current occupation (former if retired).

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

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

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

Memberships in any groups or organizations.

Hobbies and leisure-time activities.

Favorite types of reading material.

Favorite types of television shows.

Whether you regularly watch any legal or forensic television shows.

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

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

7. The defendant is African American. Would any of you find it difficult to serve as an impartial juror in a case in which an African American man is charged with crimes relating to crack cocaine and witness retaliation?

8. Have any of you or your relatives, ever had any unpleasant experiences with African Americans? [Sidebar if necessary]. Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

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

10. 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?

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? What is the name of that group, and what is your involvement in it? Would this affect your ability to be impartial in this case?

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 believe that a person charged with drug crimes probably is a dangerous person simply because he is charged with a drug crime?

14. 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?

15. 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?

16. 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?

17. 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?

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

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 testimony of a witness who was African American differently from other witnesses solely because of the witness's race?

21. 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?

22. 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?

23. 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?

24. 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?

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

26. 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?

27. 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?

28. 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?

29. 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?

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

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

v.

07-CR-33-S

JEROME G. HUGHES,

Defendant.

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You have heard evidence of acts of 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 any other crime for which that defendant is now 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 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 affected 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 defendants. 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 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 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) That the conspiracy charged in Count 1 existed, and
- 2) That 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.

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.

In connection with the first element of the offense charged in Count 1, the government must prove the existence of at least one of the charged objectives of the conspiracy. Before you may find that the government has met its burden on this point, you must unanimously agree on at least one of the charged objectives of the conspiracy. It is not enough for some of you to find that the government has proved a conspiracy to distribute cocaine base and the rest of you to find that the government has proved a conspiracy to possess cocaine base with the intent to distribute it. All twelve of you must agree on at least one objective of the conspiracy in order to find that the government has proved the first element of Count 1.

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.

The defendant's association with conspirators is not by itself sufficient to prove his or her 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.

The existence of a simple buyer-seller relationship between the defendant and another person is not sufficient to establish a conspiracy, without more, even where the buyer intends to resell controlled substances. By itself, the fact that the defendant may have bought controlled substances from another person or sold controlled substances to another person is not sufficient to establish that the defendant was a member of the charged conspiracy. In considering whether a conspiracy or a simple buyer-seller relationship existed, you should consider all of the evidence, including the following factors:

- (1) Whether the transaction involved large quantities of controlled substances;



- (2) Whether the parties had a standardized way of doing business over time;
- (3) Whether the sales were on credit or on consignment;
- (4) Whether the parties had a continuing relationship;
- (5) Whether the seller had a financial stake in a resale by the buyer;
- (6) Whether the parties had an understanding that the controlled substances would be resold.

No single factor necessarily indicates by itself that a defendant was or was not engaged in a simple buyer-seller relationship.

### 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 was a member of any conspiracy, you must find the 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 the 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 the count that you are considering.

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: COUNTS 2-4

Counts 2, 3 and 4 charge the defendant with distributing cocaine base (crack cocaine). To sustain any of these charges, the government must prove these elements:

1. The defendant distributed cocaine base (crack cocaine) as charged in the count that you are considering;
2. The defendant did so knowingly or intentionally; and,
3. The defendant knew the substance was a controlled substance.

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

On the other hand, if you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt in the count that you are considering, then you must find the defendant not guilty of that count.

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

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

If you find the defendant guilty of any of the counts charged against him, then you must determine the amount of cocaine base (crack cocaine) involved in each such count. There are special verdict questions on these issues for each count. You are to answer these questions for a count only if you find the defendant guilty of that count.

Count 1 has two special verdict questions. The first special verdict question for Count 1 asks whether that count involved 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine). If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that Count 1 involved 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you should

answer the first special verdict question “Yes.” If you answer a first special verdict question “Yes,” then you do not need to answer the second verdict question because it asks about a lesser quantity.

If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that Count 1 involved 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you must answer the first special verdict question for Count 1 “No.” If you answer this first special verdict question “No,” then you must answer the second special verdict question for Count 1.

The second special verdict question for Count 1 asks whether this count involved five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine). If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that Count 1 involved five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you should answer the second special verdict question for that count “Yes.” If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt Count 1 involved five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you must answer the second special verdict question “No.”

Count 2 does not have a special verdict question because the government does not allege that it involved any specific amount of cocaine base (crack cocaine).

There is one special verdict question for Count 3 and Count 4 and it asks whether each of those counts involved five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine). If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the count you are considering involved five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you should answer the special verdict question for that count “Yes.” If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the count you are considering involved five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you must answer the special verdict question for that count “No.”

You must give separate consideration to each special verdict question and you must base your answer solely on the evidence admitted as to the count that you are considering.

#### ELEMENTS OF THE CHARGE: COUNT 5

Count 5 charges the defendant with threatening to harm a government witness. To sustain this charge, the government must prove these elements:

- 1) That on or about the date charged, the defendant knowingly made a threat to injure another person;
- 2) The defendant made this threat with intent to retaliate against this person;
- 3) The defendant's intent to retaliate against this person arose from that person having provided information to a law enforcement officer relating to the commission of the federal offenses charged in Counts 1 through 4 of the indictment in this case.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each of these propositions have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of Count 5.

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 5.

As used in Count 5, the term "threat" means acts or statements that would reasonably induce fear of bodily harm in an ordinary person. However, the government need not prove that the recipient of a threat actually feared its consequences, and the government does not have to prove that the defendant actually intended to carry out his threat. [*United States v. Velasquez*, 772 F.2d 1348, 1357 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985)]. It is enough if the defendant made the threat of bodily injury with the intent to retaliate against the person threatened because of that person's cooperation with law enforcement officers in the investigation of the crimes charged in Counts 1-4.

*[question for counsel: does the government need to prove that the person at whom the threat was directed actually heard it or became aware of it, or must the government simply prove that the defendant intended him to become aware of the threat, or is the government required only to prove that the threat was made to someone, and IF the person against whom it was directed had become aware of it, it was reasonably capable of inducing fear in him?]*

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.

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 a defendant's conduct and by all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

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, then he is responsible for such acts as though he personally committed them.

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

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

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

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Plaintiff,

VERDICT

JEROME G. HUGHES,

07-CR-33-S

Defendant.

---

**COUNT 1**

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Jerome G. Hughes,

\_\_\_\_\_  
("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 this count involve 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine)?

\_\_\_\_\_  
("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 this count involve 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine)?

\_\_\_\_\_  
("Yes" or "No")

**COUNT 2**

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Jerome G. Hughes,

\_\_\_\_\_  
("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, Jerome G. Hughes,

\_\_\_\_\_  
("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 3:

(1) Did this count involve five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine)?

\_\_\_\_\_  
("Yes" or "No")

**COUNT 4**

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Jerome G. Hughes,

\_\_\_\_\_  
("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 4 of the indictment.

**Special Verdict Question for Count 4**

Answer this first special verdict question only if you found the defendant guilty of Count 4:

- (2) Did this count involve five grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine)?

\_\_\_\_\_  
("Yes" or "No")

**COUNT 5**

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Jerome G. Hughes,

\_\_\_\_\_  
("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")

of the offense charged in Count 5 of the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Juror

Madison, Wisconsin

Date: \_\_\_\_\_