

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALVIN BRUCE,

Defendant.

FINAL PRETRIAL
CONFERENCE ORDER

07-CR-057-S

On August 6, 2007, this court held the final pretrial conference. Defendant Calvin Bruce was present with his attorney, Anthony Delyea. The government was represented by Assistant United States Attorney Rita Rumbelow.

We started as usual with the court's voir dire package, to which neither party had any proposed changes or additions.

We moved to jury instructions. The government had no proposed changes or objections to the court's packet. Bruce filed an *in limine* theory of defense instruction that the court will consider at the close of the evidence at trial. See *dk. 63*, under seal. The court will apply this circuit's four-part test at that time. See *United States v. Prude*, 489 F.3d 873, 882 (7th Cir. 2007).

Bruce offered two other proposed instructions to which the government objected. First, Bruce asked for a more detailed instruction on the voluntariness of his post-arrest statement. See *dk. 59*. Bruce acknowledges that the Seventh Circuit Pattern Instruction #3.02 is designed to cover this situation as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3501. See *Advisory Committee Notes to the Instruction*; see also *United States v. Broeske*, 178 F.3d 887, 889 (7th Cir. 1999). The actual

decision on legal voluntariness belongs to the court, not the jury, since an involuntary statement cannot be used for any purpose. Even so, the jury may determine circumstances affecting voluntariness to determine how much weight to give a post-arrest statement. Bruce contends that the circumstances of his post-arrest statement are exceptional, and therefore a more tailored instruction on this point is necessary. The government disagrees, asserting that the circuit's pattern instruction suffices. The issue is framed for the district court.

Second, Bruce requests a jury instruction on the detective's alleged failure to comply with a state law requiring state officers to record post-arrest confessions. See *dk. 60*, citing Wis. Stat. § 968.073.¹ The government opposes any such instruction, claiming it is irrelevant to the jury's determination. The government may be submitting a written brief on this point. It appears the government's position is that the Seventh Circuit Pattern Instruction #3.02, cited above, is adequate under the circumstances. The issue is framed for consideration by the district court.

While reserving their right to tailor and cull the instructions at the close of all the evidence, the parties had no other issues regarding the jury instructions to raise at the final pretrial conference.

Next we considered the parties' *in limine* issues. The government filed a notice of intent to offer evidence. See *dk. 52*. Bruce does not contest and does not need to be heard on Point **A** (his Rule 609 criminal record), Point **B** (extraneous information regarding Bruce's March 28, 2007 arrest) or Point **F** (the government's expert witnesses). Bruce wishes to be heard on Point

¹At this juncture, the violation may only be characterized as "alleged" because there is a "good cause" exception the recording requirement that the police might invoke. This did not come up with addressing the suppression motion because state law does not govern the federal analysis. See *e.g. United States v. Brack*, 188 F.3d 748, 759 (7th Cir. 1999)(dealing with Fourth Amendment issues).

E regarding the recorded portion of his post-arrest statement and the government's partial transcript. At trial the government intends to play more of the recorded interrogation than it has transcribed but less than the entire 52-minute conversation. The government has proffered that it prepared a transcript only for those portions of the interrogation that are hard to discern; the other relevant portions of the interrogation are clear enough for the jury to hear without the assistance of a transcript. Bruce does not quibble with this specific point; his contention is that the jury needs to hear more of the recording than the government intends to play; it may be that the court ends up playing virtually the entire 52-minute recording. The parties will address this issue in greater detail at the final hearing.

Government motion *in limine* No. 1 (dkt. 53) seeks to exclude any defense evidence or argument regarding the lack of fingerprints on the baggie of crack cocaine Bruce is charged with possessing. Bruce vociferously disagrees, claiming that in *this* case, the fact that there are no prints is highly relevant. See dkt. 61. The parties have cited to the relevant case law in their motions, so the dispute is framed for the court's determination.

Government *motion in limine* No. 2 (dkt. 54) seeks to exclude evidence or arguments of the penalties Bruce faces if convicted in this case. Bruce strongly opposes with this motion. See dkt. 62. Bruce contends that Detective Rietzler's threats to send him to federal prison for twenty years directly affect the weight the jury should give his confession. The government replies that it does not intend to play these portions of the recorded interrogation at trial: it deems all of this irrelevant, because Bruce's confession was not involuntary. (The motion to suppress still is pending, with objections to be filed Tuesday morning, August 7). Bruce seeks

to introduce these portions of the recorded interrogation for the jury's consideration, contending that his fear of a long sentence caused him to admit to things that were not true. This dispute is framed for decision by the district court.

The government filed three additional motions in limine (dks. 55, 56 and 57) that Bruce does not oppose. Bruce had no other in limine issues to bring to the court's attention. That concluded both sides' substantive agenda for the final pretrial conference.

The parties are aware that they will pick their jury on August 13, 2007, then will return on August 15, 2007 to try this case. The parties agree that one alternate juror will suffice. Attorney Delyea will obtain street clothes for Bruce to wear at trial. The parties had no other matters to bring to the court's attention.

Entered this 7th 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.

CALVIN BRUCE,

Defendant.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
AND VOIR DIRE

07-CR-57-S

Statement of the case: This is a criminal case, in which the defendant, Calvin Bruce, is charged with possessing crack cocaine with intent to distribute it. The defendant has entered a plea of not guilty to this charge.

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 charge 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 charge. 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 a crime involving crack cocaine?

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-15-S

CALVIN BRUCE,

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:

COUNT 1

On or about March 28, 2007, in the Western District of Wisconsin, the defendant, Calvin Bruce, knowingly and intentionally possessed with intent to distribute 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), a Schedule II controlled substance.

The indictment in this case is the formal method of accusing the defendant of a crime and placing the defendant on trial. It is not evidence against the defendants 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

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

1. The defendant knowingly or intentionally possessed cocaine base (crack cocaine) as charged in Count 1;
2. The defendant possessed this cocaine base (crack cocaine) with the intent to distribute it to another person; 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, then you should find the defendant guilty.

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,, then you must find the defendant not guilty.

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

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.

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

It does not matter whether the defendant knew the substance he possessed was cocaine base (crack cocaine). It is sufficient that the defendant knew that he possessed some kind of prohibited drug.

If you find the defendant guilty of Count 1, then you must determine the amount of cocaine base (crack cocaine) involved. There are two special verdict questions on this issue. You are to answer these questions only if you find the defendant guilty.

The first special verdict question asks whether Count 1 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 “No.” Then you must answer the second special verdict question.

The second special verdict question asks whether Count 1 involved 5 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 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you should answer the second special verdict question “Yes.” If you do not find by proof beyond a reasonable doubt that Count 1 involved 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine), then you must answer the second special verdict question “No.”

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, 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.

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,

CALVIN BRUCE,

Defendant.

VERDICT

07-CR-57-S

COUNT 1

We, the Jury in the above-entitled cause, find the defendant, Calvin Bruce,

("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 Count 1 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 Count 1 involve 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base (crack cocaine)?

("Yes" or "No")

Presiding Juror

Madison, Wisconsin

Date:-----