## "CORRECTED PAGE"

1	come in. All right.
2	So for the defense, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 15, 36, 38,
3	39, 41. The government's objections to anything other
4	than Exhibit 2 is made for the record. Those will come
5	in. Very well.
6	Ms. Sassower, if you would compile the
. 7	originals of 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 15, 36, 38, 39 41, we can
8	bring the jury in.
9	Yes, we are. It's gonna take her 10 or 15
10	minutes to do that so just give, be a little bit more
11	patient and we'll break.
12	MR. GOLDSTONE: Your Honor, we're ready with
13	the originals.
14	THE COURT: And they've been handed up. So
15	we're gonna take 10 minutes so the court reporter who's
16	been transcribing this proceeding can take a
17	break.
18	When we resume in 10 minutes, we'll call
19	the jury in, the defense will rest its case and we will
20	then begin with my
21	MS. SASSOWER: Excuse me.
22	THE COURT: charging the jury.
23	MS. SASSOWER: I have a motion, as is my right.
24	THE COURT: Very well.
25	MS. SASSOWER: And may the record reflect that

1	the Court is resting for me. I do not rest, as I was
2	precluded, prevented from giving direct testimony from
3	the stand as to the critical facts pertaining to this
4	THE COURT: What is your motion?
5	MS. SASSOWER: bogus, malicious
6	THE COURT: What is your motion?
7	MS. SASSOWER: I
8	THE COURT: Excuse me, before you make your
9	motion. With regard to the exhibits, the numbers are
10	confusing on this particular document. I need you to
11	review it.
12	MS. SASSOWER: Again, I make a motion for
13	judgment of acquittal for this case which fails as a
14	matter of law. The evidence now resoundingly shows that
15	the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing was adjourned.
16	That at issue is a public congressional hearing
17	at which a respectful request was made to testify. That
18	is consistent with what a hearing is supposed to be
19	about.
20	THE COURT: The question
21	MS. SASSOWER: The taking -
22	THE COURT: The question
23	MS. SASSOWER: and receiving of testimony.
24	THE COURT: The question for purposes of your
25	motion is whether or not a reasonable fact finder could

find proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That is your argument. That is the scope of it and make the argument now.

MS. SASSOWER: Well, there is no precedent and none has been shown of another case where a citizen's respectful request at a public congressional hearing has resulted in an arrest. This, the, you not only have no act of disruption.

The whole idea that a respectful request at a public hearing to testify is disruption is an anathema, cannot be. And you have no appearance here by the complainant, Senator Chambliss, in support of this prosecution.

Apparently no one at the Senate Judiciary

Committee is willing to put their name to such a

proposition that a respectful request to testify at a

congressional hearing is disruption of Congress.

Now, there is no evidence in the record that I intended anything but to respectfully and appropriately request to testify, which is what I did.

And that intent is clear as a bell stated over and again and most particularly in the 39-page May 21st fax to, to Capitol police, copies of which went to the Senate Judiciary Committee, to Senator Schumer, Senator Clinton.

1	THE COURT: What's your next point, Ms.
2	Sassower?
3	MS. SASSOWER: Okay. Again
4	THE COURT: No.
5	MS. SASSOWER: There is no sign up at the
6	Senate Judiciary Committee - don't even think about
7	requesting to testify. There is no presentation of any
8	rules or regulations as relates to requests to testify
9	at a public hearing.
10	And there is no, there is evidence that I
11	inquired as to the rules and procedures and none were
12	forthcoming.
13	Finally, again critical to this charge is that
14	when someone claims the right to speak in a public
15	place, the crucial question is whether the manner of
16	expression is basically incompatible with the normal
17	activity of a particular place at a particular time.
18	Again, we are talking about a public
19	congressional hearing, hearing.
20	THE COURT: Very well.
21	MS. SASSOWER: And
22	THE COURT: Very well. I've heard
23	Enough.
24	MS. SASSOWER: consistent with the
25	THE COURT: Please be seated

1	MS. SASSOWER: purpose of a hearing.
2	THE COURT: No, excuse me. We're done. Mr.
3	Mendelsohn.
4	MR MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, viewing the
5	evidence in the light most favorable to the government,
6	as the Court must do at this time, we believe the
7	evidence more than sufficiently shows that a reasonable
8	mind could find beyond a reasonable doubt that the
9	defendant committed the offense of disruption of
10	Congress on May 22nd 2003.
11	THE COURT: Very well. The standard for ruling
12	on a motion for judgment of acquittal, as I previously
13	stated for the record, is set forth in Curley vs. United
14	States, 81 U.S. App. D.C. 389, page 392, 160 F 2d. 229,
<b>1</b> 5	page 232. It's a 1947 case.
16	Simply put, the standard is as follows: If
17	there is no evidence upon which a reasonable mind might
18	fairly conclude guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, the
19	motion must be granted.
20	In reviewing the facts of this case in the light
21	most favorable to the government, as the Court must do
22	in such a motion, certainly there has been the
23	presentation of evidence from which a reasonable fact
24	finder could find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.
<b>2</b> 5	On that basis, the motion for judgment of

1	acquittal is denied. We will be in recess for 15
2	minutes. So 10 after three we will resume with the
3	instructions to the jury and closing arguments.
4	Before we adjourn for 15 minutes, Ms. Liu, you
5	informed me that the initial closing and the rebuttal
6	total 15 to 20 minutes, is that correct?
7	MS. LIU: That's correct, Your Honor. I expect
8	the initial closing to take about 15 minutes and the
9	rebuttal, although it depends in some part upon what Ms.
10	Sassower says, to take about 5 to 8 minutes.
11	THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Sassower, your
12	estimate of time for your closing statement.
13	MS. SASSOWER: I don't know. I haven't been
14	able to even present the direct case from the stand.
15	THE COURT: Very well.
16	MS. SASSOWER: I don't know.
17	THE COURT: Then I will give you 20
18	minutes.
19	THE CLERK: The Court will stand in recess
20	until return of court in 15 minutes.
21	(Thereupon, the Court recessed at 3:00 p.m.)
22	(Thereupon, the Court reconvened at 3:10 p.m.)
23	THE CLERK: United States versus Elena
24	Sassower, case number M4113-03.
25	MS. LIU: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Jessie Liu

1	for the United States.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Mendelsohn.
3	MR. MENDELSOHN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Aaron
4	Mendelsohn for the United States.
5	MS. SASSOWER: Criminal defendant Elena
6	Sassower.
7	MR. GOLDSTONE: Mark Goldstone, attorney
8	adviser.
9	THE COURT: Good afternoon, please be seated.
10	(Pause)
11	THE CLERK: United States versus Elena
12	Sassower, Case No. M4113-03.
13	MR, MENDELSOHN: Aaron Mendelsohn for the
14	United States
15	THE COURT: Yes. Jessie Liu for the
16	government.
17	MS. LIU: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jessie
18	Liu for the United States.
19	THE COURT: Very well.
20	MS. SASSOWER: Elena Sassower, criminal
21	defendant, pro se.
22	MR. GOLDSTONE: Mark Goldstone,
23	Attorney adviser.
24	THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be
25	seated. All right. As soon as my law clerk walks in

with a copy of the jury instructions for each of you, I 1 will bring the jury in and deliver the charge. 2 For those who are seated in the audience, the 3 first order of business once the jury is brought in will 4 be my announcement that the defense has rested its case 5 and that I will charge them on the law that is to be 6 7 applied in the case. During my charge to the jury, the outer doors 8 will be locked because I don't want ingress and egress 9 to interfere with their concentration. 10 So if you don't want to be in here for, it's 11 probably gonna take me 20 minutes to deliver this, then 12 you need to exit the room. We will then unlock the door 13 at the, before the start of the closing statements by 14 15 counsel. 16 MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, the elements of 17 the offense, the language that we proffer to the Court is not the exact language that's in the elements of the 18 19 offense. Jury instruction number 16. 20 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Mendelsohn. 21 MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, the law clerk has 22 the --23 THE COURT: Just tell me. 24 MR. MENDELSOHN: -- proposed elements of the

offense. I don't have it but it is jury number, jury

1	instruction number 16.
2	THE COURT: Yes, I, I have it in front of me.
3	MR. MENDELSOHN: If I could have the
4	THE COURT: I've read it. What's the, what,
5	tell, direct me to the -
6	MR. MENDELSOHN: Right.
7	THE COURT: specific problem.
8	MR. MENDELSOHN: In number one.
9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	MR. MENDELSOHN: The defendant uttered loud,
11	threatening or abusive language or engaged in disorderly
12	or disruptive conduct.
13	THE COURT: Give me the copy of the statute
14	from your material. Is that it?
15	MR. MENDELSOHN: That's all, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Very well. That's the way it will
17	be read.
18	MR. MENDELSOHN: Which way, Your Honor?
19	THE COURT: Or. Very well, bring them in.
20	(Thereupon, the jury returned to the
21	courtroom at 3:25 p.m.)
22	THE COURT: Please be seated. Ladies and
23	gentlemen, the defense has rested its case and we're
24	entering the phase now where I will give you your final
25	instructions. I'd ask that you pay particularly close

attention to these instructions.

And to the extent that you need to be reminded of the particulars of these instructions, since there are several, a copy of the instructions will be provided for you during your deliberations.

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the jury, you are about to enter your final duty in this case which is to decide the issues of fact and to return a verdict as to the defendant's innocent, innocence or guilt of the charge.

I told you at the very start of the trial that your principal function during the taking of testimony would be to listen carefully and to observe each witness who testified.

It has been obvious to me, to counsel and to the defendant that you have conscientiously discharged this duty. I ask you now to give me that same careful attention as I instruct you on the law applicable to this case.

My function is to conduct this trial in an orderly, fair and efficient manner, to rule on questions of law and to instruct you on the law that applies in this case.

It is your duty to accept the law as I state it to you. You should consider all the instructions as a

whole. You may not disregard any instruction, give 1 special attention to any one instruction, or question 2 the wisdom of any rule of law. 3 As I stated previously, I will provide you with 4 a written copy of my instructions. During your 5 deliberations, you may, if you want, refer to these 6 instructions. While you may refer to any particular portion 8 of the instructions, you are to consider the 9 instructions as a whole and you may not follow some and 10 11 ignore others. The fact that you have been provided with a 12 copy of my instructions should not discourages, 13 discourage you from making an inquiry regarding the 14 meaning of these instructions, if necessary. 15 Please return the instructions to me when your 16 verdict is rendered. When you return to the juryroom, 17 you should select a foreperson to preside over your 18 deliberations and to be your spokesperson here in court. There are no specific rules regarding how you 20 should select a foreperson. That is up to you. 21 However, as you go about the task, be mindful of your 22 mission to reach a fair and just verdict based on the 23

Consider whether you wish to select a

24

25

evidence.

foreperson who will be able to facilitate your discussions, who can help you organize the evidence, who will encourage civility and mutual respect among all of you, who will invite each juror to speak up regarding his or her views about the evidence and who will promote a full and fair consideration of that evidence.

The verdict must represent the considered

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree to the verdict. Your verdict must be unanimous. Each juror must agree on it.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement, if you can do so without compromising your own individual judgment.

Each of you must decide the case for himself or herself. But you must do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors.

In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced that your opinion is erroneous.

On the other hand, do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or

merely re, or merely to return a verdict. Remember at all times that you are not partisans, you are judges of the facts.

I am sending into the juryroom with you the exhibits that have been received in evidence except for the videotape. You may examine any or all of them as you consider your verdict.

If you wish to view the portion of the videotape that has been admitted into evidence, please notify Ms. Franklin by a written note and we will assemble in the courtroom with the appropriate equipment.

The exhibits that have been entered into evidence are labeled with letters and numbers. The system of labeling and numbering exhibits is simply to help the parties organize the presentation of the case.

You are to attach no particular significance to the system employed to label certain exhibits with letters and numbers or the fact that some exhibits are not in sequence. Excuse me.

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with me, you may send a note by the clerk or marshal signed by your foreperson or by one or more members of the jury.

No member of the jury should try to communicate

with me by any means other than a signed note. And I 1 will never communicate with any member of the jury on a 2 matter touching the merits of this case except in 3 writing or orally here in open court. 4 If I get a note from you, I am going to respond 5 here in the courtroom with counsel and the parties 7 present. Everyone is entitled, once you begin your 8 deliberations, to know about any communications that we 9 have between us. 10 Bear in mind that you are never under any 11 12 circumstances, to reveal to any person, not the clerk, the marshal or me, how the jury stands on the question 13 of the defendant's guilt or innocence until after you 14

have reached a unanimous verdict.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This means, for example, that you should never state to the court that the jury is divided six to six, 7 to five, 11 to one, or in any other fashion whether for conviction or acquittal.

I instructed you earlier during this trial that you are to ignore any reports in the newspaper or on radio or television concerning this case.

While you deliberate, there may be reports in the newspaper or on radio or television relating to this case.

Again, as I instructed you earlier, please make sure you do not read, listen to or watch any of the reports. You must decide this case solely on the evidence presented in the courtroom and consider only evidence that meets certain standards in reaching your verdict.

For example, a witness may testify about events

For example, a witness may testify about events he himself has seen or heard. But, except as I have held to be admissible as an exception to the hearsay rule, he generally may not testify about matters that others have told him about.

Also, witnesses must be sworn to tell the truth and are subject to cross-examination. News reports about this case are not subject to these standards.

And if you read, listen to or watch these reports, you may be exposed to misleading or inaccurate information that unduly favors one side of the case and to which the other side is unable to respond.

Therefore, you must completely disregard any press, television, or radio reports that you may read, see, or hear. Such reports are not evidence and you should not be influenced in any manner whatsoever by such publicity.

A form of verdict has been prepared for your convenience. You will take this form to the juryroom.

And when you have reached a unanimous agreement as to your verdict, you will have your foreperson fill in, date and sign the form to state the verdict upon which you unanimously agree and then return with your verdict to the courtroom.

At this point I'd like to talk with you a bit about how court will convene while you deliberate. First, during the period of deliberations, we will convene court in each day the way, the same way that we have.

You will deliberate at your own pace. You will decide how much times, how much time it takes to fairly and impartially consider the charge that you will be presented on the verdict form.

During the course of that time, we will convene each day at 9:45 a.m. and close at 4:45 p.m. I will not reconvene in the courtroom with everyone present unless I have a note from you that I need to respond to.

Most of the time, you will be able to begin your deliberations here and then stop at 4:45. You cannot, however, have any deliberations whatsoever unless all 12 of you are present.

Once all 12 are present, then your foreperson can say that you may begin the discussions. At the end of the day when your fore, foreperson says you are going

to stop for the day, again, you cannot have any discussion unless all 12 of you are present.

As I said, if I receive a note from you during deliberations, I will respond. But I will give counsel and the defendant an opportunity to comment on what my response will be before I respond.

So sometimes there may be some delay in responding to your note until I get counsel and the defendant here and have a hearing on what I should say to you. This is because all of the parties are entitled to know what I'm going to say.

When you return to the courtroom with your verdict, the foreperson will bring the verdict form into the courtroom with you. The marshal, when I ask for it, will take the verdict form from the foreperson and hand it to the courtroom clerk.

The courtroom clerk will then do what we call publish the verdict. The courtroom clerk will read aloud the verdict that you have entered.

At that point, just so you know how it works, the clerk will say to the fore, foreperson, is that the verdict you just announced? Hopefully you will all say yes.

Any party can ask that the jury be polled on the verdict as just announced. If there is a request for a

poll, then I will direct the clerk to poll the jury.

The clerk then says, do each of you agree with the verdict as just announced and we'll say juror number one. Hopefully juror number one, will say yes. And then the clerk will say jury number two, and we just go down the line until all jurors have been polled.

If anyone says no, that means that we do not have a unanimous verdict and I will ask you to retire to the juryroom and come back when you have reached a unanimous verdict.

That is all the poll, that polling the jury is, just so you know how the process works when you come back.

While the alternate juror will not begin deliberations with the 12 regular jurors, it is possible that you could be called to deliberate at some future time. Because that possibility exists, you are instructed that you should continue to follow my instructions not to discuss this case with anyone at any time.

The Court will notify you when the jury has completed its deliberations. When that occurs, your jury service will be discharged and you will be free to discuss the case.

Your function as the jury is to determine what

the facts are in this case. You are the sole judges of the facts. You alone decide what weight to give to the evidence presented during the trial.

You decide the value of the evidence and the believability of the witnesses. You should determine the facts without prejudice, fear, sympathy or favoritism.

You should not be improperly influenced by anyone's race, ethnic origin, or gender. Decide the case solely from a fair consideration of the evidence.

You may not take anything I may have said or done as indicating how I think you should decide this case. If you believe that I have expressed or indicated an opinion as to the facts, you should ignore it. It is your sole and exclusive duty and responsibility to decide the verdict in this case.

In determining the facts, you are reminded that before each member was accepted and sworn to act as a juror, he or she was asked questions concerning competency, qualifications, fairness and freedom from prejudice and bias.

On the faith of those answers, the juror was accepted by the parties. Therefore, those answers are as binding on each of you now as they were then and should remain so until the jury is discharged from

consideration of this case.

If any reference by the Court or the attorneys to evidence does not coincide with your own recollection of the evidence, it is your recollection which should control during your deliberations.

During the trial, I have permitted those jurors who wanted to do so to take notes. You may take your notes with you to the juryroom and use them during your deliberations if you wish.

As I told you at the beginning of the trial, your notes are only to be an aid to your memory. They are not evidence in the case and they should not replace your memory of the evidence.

Those jurors who have not taken notes should rely on their memory of the evidence. The notes are intended to be for the notetaker's own personal use.

At the end of your deliberations, please tear out from your notebooks any notes you have made and give them to your foreperson. The clerk will collect your notebooks and pencils when you return to the courtroom.

And I will ask the foreperson to give the clerk your notes when your verdict is announced. The clerk will give the notes to me and I will destroy your notes immediately after the trial. No one, including myself, will look at them.

The essential elements of this offense, each of which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, are as follows: that defendant uttered loud, threatening or abusive language or engaged in disorderly or disruptive conduct within any of the United States Capitol buildings.

That defendant did so willfully and knowingly and that at the time she did so, she had the intent to impede or disrupt or disturb the orderly conduct of any session of Congress or either house thereof, or the orderly conduct within any such building of any hearing before or any deliberations of any committee or subcommittee of the Congress, or either house thereof.

An act is done willingly and knowingly if it is done voluntarily, purposefully and deliberately and with intent to violate the law and not because of mistake or accident or inadvertently.

Disorderly and disruptive conduct means conduct that hinders or interferes with the peaceful conduct of governmental business.

When someone claims the right to speak in a public place, the crucial question is whether the manner of expression is basically incompatible with the normal activity of a particular place at a particular time.

In a criminal case, the government has the

burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. In civil cases, it is only necessary 2 to prove that a fact is more likely true than not, or in 3 some cases that its truth is highly probable. In criminal cases such as this one, the 5 government's proof must be more powerful than that. Ιt must be beyond a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt, as the name implies, is a 8 doubt based on a, on reason, a doubt for which you have a reason based upon the evidence or lack of evidence in 10 11 the case. If after careful, honest and impartial 12 consideration of all the evidence you cannot say that 13 you are firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt, then 14 15 you have a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would 16 cause a reasonable person, after careful and thoughtful 17 reflection, to hesitate to act in the graver or more 18 important matters in life. 19 However, it is not an imaginary doubt, nor a 20 doubt based on speculation or guesswork. It is a doubt 21 based on reason. 23

The government is not required to prove guilt beyond all doubt or to a mathematical or scientific certainty. Its burden is to prove guilt beyond a

24

reasonable doubt.

Every defendant in a criminal case is presumed to be innocent. This presumption of innocence remains with the defendant throughout the trial, unless and until she is proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

The burden is on the government to prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden of proof never shifts throughout the trial. The law does not require a defendant to prove her innocence or to produce any evidence.

The defendant began the trial here with a clean slate. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit the defendant unless you, as jurors, are unanimously convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of her guilt after a careful and impa, impartial consideration of all of the evidence in this case.

If the government fails to sustain its burden, you must find the defendant not guilty. If you find that the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the offense with which the defendant is charged, it is your duty to find her guilty.

One of the elements of the offense, upon which
I have already instructed you, requires proof by the
government of a certain state of mind signified by using
terms like willfully and knowingly.

1 Someone's intent or knowledge ordinarily cannot be proved directly because there is no way of looking 2 directly into the workings of the human mind. 3 However, you may infer a defendant's intent or knowledge from the surrounding circumstances. You may 5 consider any statements made or acts done or not done by the defendant and all other facts and circumstances 7 received in evidence that may indicate the defendant's intent or knowledge. You may infer, but are not required to infer, that a person intends the natural and probable consequences of acts knowingly done by him. It is entirely up to you, however, to decide what facts to find from the evidence received during trial, during this trial. You should consider all the circumstances and evidence that you think are relevant in determining whether the government has proved beyond doubt, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant acted with the necessary state of mind. The defendant's theory of the case is that the defendant did not willfully and knowingly engage in disorderly and disruptive conduct within a United States Capitol Building.

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defendant had no intent to impede or disrupt or

disturb the orderly conduct of a session of Congress.

Ms. Sassower's conduct did not hinder or interfere with the peaceful conduct of governmental business and her manner of expression was not incompatible with the normal activity of that particular place at a particular time.

You will note that the information charges that the offense was committed on or about on a particular date. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged offense.

It is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

You are specifically cautioned against permitting the character of the charge itself to affect your minds in arriving at your verdict. You must permit only the evidence in this case to enter into your deliberations and findings in a, in rendering a fair and impartial verdict.

You will be provided with copies of the information against the defendant. An information is merely the formal way of accusing a person of a crime to bring her to trial.

You must not use the information for any

purpose other than informing yourselves of the charge you are to consider. You must not consider the information as evidence of any kind.

You may not consider it as any evidence of the defendant's guilt or draw any inference of guilt from it.

You have heard testimony of criminal acts purportedly committed by the defendant with which she is not formally charged in the information.

That evidence was introduced by the defendant for the purpose of showing defendant's intent or any bias against her.

You are instructed that if you find that the defendant did engage in criminal activity not charged to her here, you are not to draw an inference from such a finding that the defendant is a person of bad character and that she must therefore be guilty of the crime with which she is charged.

In other words, the fact that the defendant may have broken the law on another occasion not charged in the information, is not by itself evidence that she committed any offense for which she is now on trial.

The questions put to the witnesses by counsel and the defendant are not part of the evidence in this case.

If a lawyer or the defendant asked a witness a question that contained an assertion of fact, you may not consider the assertion as evidence of the fact, unless the fact is elsewhere established by the evidence or the witness adopts the fact in answering the question.

The opening statements and closing arguments are likewise not evidence. They are intended only to assist you in understanding the evidence and the contentious, contentions of the parties.

Finally, anything you may have heard or seen outside this courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded.

The lawyers in this case sometimes objected when the other side asked a question, made an argument, or offered evidence which the objecting lawyer believed was not proper.

You must not be prejudiced against the lawyer who made the objections. It is the lawyer's responsibility to object to evidence which they believe is not admissible.

If during the course of the trial, I sustained an objection to a lawyer's question, you should disregard the question and you must not speculate as to what the answer would have been.

If the objection was overruled, treat the answer like you would any other. If after a witness answered a lawyer's question, I ruled that the answer should be stricken, you should both disregard, you should disregard both the question and the answer in your deliberations.

Likewise, exhibits as to which I have sustained an objection or which I ordered stricken are not evidence and you must not consider them in your deliberations.

The defendant has the right to choose not to have counsel and to represent herself. In this case, the defendant chose to represent herself with the assistance of an attorney adviser.

You are to draw no inference whatsoever from defendant's decision to represent herself.

You will recall that I told you that you were permitted to draw reasonable inferences from the testimony of the witnesses. This is because there are two types of evidence from which you may find the facts of a case: direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.

When a witness, such as an eyewitness, asserts actual knowledge of a fact, that witness' testimony is direct evidence.

Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of

facts and circumstances that enable you to draw inferences that may indicate the guilt or innocence of a defendant.

Let me give you an example. If you look out a

Let me give you an example. If you look out a window and saw that snow was folding, falling, you would be an eyewitness to the fact that snow was falling.

If you thereafter testified in court that you had seen snow falling, your testimony would be direct evidence of the fact that snow was falling at the time you saw it happen.

However, if you looked out a window and saw no snow on the ground and then went to sleep and saw snow on the ground after you woke up, your testimony about those observations would be circumstantial evidence that snow fell while you were asleep.

The law makes no distinction between the weight you should give to either kind of evidence. Nor does circumstantial evidence require a greater degree of certainty than direct evidence.

In reaching a verdict in this case, you should weigh all of the evidence presented both direct and circumstantial.

In determining whether the government has established the charge against the defendant beyond a

reasonable doubt, you must consider and weigh the testimony of all the witnesses who have appeared before you. You are the sole judge of the credibility of the witnesses.

In other words, you alone are to determine whether to believe any witness and the extent to which any witness should be believed.

In reaching a conclusion as to the credibility of any witness, you may consider any matter that may have a bearing on the subject.

You may consider the demeanor and the behavior of the witness on the witness stand, the witness' manner of testifying, whether the witness impresses you as a truthful person, whether the witness impresses you as having an accurate memory and recollection, whether the witness has any motive for not telling the truth, whether the witness had a full opportunity to observe the matters about which he or she has testified, whether the witness has any interest in the outcome of this case, or friendship or hostility toward other people concerned with this case.

Inconsistencies or discrepancies in the testimony of a witness or between the testimony of different witnesses, may or may not cause you to discredit such testimony.

Two or more persons witnessing an incident or transaction may see or hear it differently. An innocent misrecollection like a failure of recollection is not an uncommon experience.

In weighing the effect of the inconsistency or discrepancy, always consider whether it pertains to a

discrepancy, always consider whether it pertains to a matter of importance or unimportant detail and whether the inconsistency or discrepancy results from innocent error or intentional falsehood.

You may consider the reasonableness or unreasonableness, the probability or improbability of the testimony of a witness in determining whether to accept it as true and accurate.

You may consider whether the witness has been contradicted or supported by other credible evidence. If you believe that any witness has shown him or herself to be biased or prejudiced for or against either side in this trial, you may consider and determine whether such bias or prejudice has colored the testimony of the witness so as to affect the desire and capability of the witness to tell the truth.

You should give the testimony of each witness such weight as in your judgment it is fairly entitled to receive.

The weight of the evidence is not necessarily

determined by the number of witnesses testifying for each side. Rather, you should consider all of the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses you believe.

You may find the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side is more believable than the testimony of a greater number of witnesses on the other side, or you may find the contrary.

The defendant has a right to become a witness in her own behalf. Her testimony should not be believed merely because she is the defendant.

Let me restate that. The defendant has a right to become a witness in her own behalf. Her testimony should not be disbelieved merely because she is the defendant.

In weighing her testimony, however, you may consider the fact that the defendant has a vital interest in the outcome of this trial.

As with the testimony of any other witness, you should give the defendant's testimony such weight as in your judgment it is fairly entitled to receive.

A police officer's testimony should be evaluated by you just as any other evidence in the case. In evaluating the officers' credibility, you should use the same guidelines that you apply to the testimony of

- 19