

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 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 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 audio 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 January 1 2008, to on or about November 11, 2009, in the Western District of Wisconsin and elsewhere, the defendant, Juan L. Loreda, knowingly and intentionally conspired with and Federico S. Perez a/k/a/ "Freddy" 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 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing methamphetamine.

COUNT 2

On or about October 28, 2009, in the Western District of Wisconsin, the defendant, Juan L. Loreda, knowingly and intentionally distributed 50 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, knowingly and intentionally possessed with the intent to distribute 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 500 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 conspiracy involved 500 grams or 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 conspiracy involved 500 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.

The second special verdict question asks whether the conspiracy involved 50 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 conspiracy involved 50 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 conspiracy involved 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing 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 50 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 special verdict question for Count 2 asks whether the defendant distributed 50 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 50 grams 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 distributed 50 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.