

Judicial Council of California • Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/invitationstocomment/

INVITATION TO COMMENT
CALCRIM

| | |
|--|---|
| Title | Action Requested |
| Criminal Jury Instructions (CALCRIM) Revisions | Review and submit comments by June 26, 2012 |
| Recommended by | Proposed Effective Date |
| Advisory Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions Hon. Sandy R. Kriegler, Chair | August 31, 2012 |
| | Contact |
| | Robin Seeley, Attorney, 415-865-7710 robin.seeley@jud.ca.gov |

Summary

New and revised instructions reflecting user suggestions and recent developments in the law.

CALCRIM Invitation to Comment, May 2012

Table of Contents

| Instruction Number | Instruction Title |
|---------------------------|--|
| 101 | Cautionary Admonitions: Jury Conduct |
| 124 | Separation Admonition |
| 318, 335 | Prior Statements as Evidence, Accomplice Testimony |
| 336 | In-Custody Informant |
| 350 | Character of Defendant |
| 370 | Motive |
| 510, 3404 | Accident Defense |
| 571 | Homicide Series |
| 840 | Inflicting Injury on Spouse, Cohabitant, or Fellow Parent Resulting in Traumatic Condition |
| 1151 | Pandering |
| 1400-1401 | Criminal Street Gang Series |
| 2040 | Unauthorized Use of Personal Identifying Information |
| 2100 | DUI with Injury |
| 2646 | Threatening a Witness After Testimony or Information Given |
| 2843 | Determining Income: Bank Deposits Method |
| New 2998 | Cruelty to Animals |
| 3462 | Voluntary Intoxication |
| 3470 | Right to Self-Defense or Defense of Another (Non-Homicide) |

| Instruction Number | Instruction Title |
|---------------------------|--|
| 3517-3519 | Instructions to Jurors on Lesser Included Offenses and Verdict Forms |
| 3590 | Final Instruction on Discharge of Jury |

101. Cautionary Admonitions: Jury Conduct (Before, During, or After Jury Is Selected)

Our system of justice requires that trials be conducted in open court with the parties presenting evidence and the judge deciding the law that applies to the case. It is unfair to the parties if you receive additional information from any other source, because that information may be unreliable or irrelevant and the parties will not have had the opportunity to examine and respond to it. Your verdict must be based only on the evidence presented during trial in this court and the law as I provide it to you.

During the trial, do not talk about the case or about any of the people or any subject involved in the case with anyone, not even your family, friends, spiritual advisors, or therapists. Do not share information about the case in writing, by email, by telephone, on the Internet, or by any other means of communication. You must not talk about these things with other jurors, either, until you begin deliberating.

As jurors, you may discuss the case together only after all of the evidence has been presented, the attorneys have completed their arguments, and I have instructed you on the law. After I tell you to begin your deliberations, you may discuss the case only in the jury room, and only when all jurors are present.

You must not allow anything that happens outside of the courtroom to affect your decision [unless I tell you otherwise]. During the trial, do not read, listen to, or watch any news report or commentary about the case from any source.

Do not use the Internet (, a dictionary/[, or _____ <insert other relevant source of information or means of communication>]) in any way in connection with this case, either on your own or as a group. Do not investigate the facts or the law or do any research regarding this case. Do not conduct any tests or experiments, or visit the scene of any event involved in this case. If you happen to pass by the scene, do not stop or investigate.

[If you have a cell phone or other electronic device, keep it turned off while you are in the courtroom and during jury deliberations. An electronic device includes any data storage device. If someone needs to contact you in an emergency, the court can receive messages that it will deliver to you without delay.]

During the trial, do not speak to a defendant, witness, lawyer, or anyone associated with them. Do not listen to anyone who tries to talk to you about the case or about any of the people or subjects involved in it. If someone asks you about the case, tell him or her that you cannot discuss it. If that person keeps talking to you about the case, you must end the conversation.

If you receive any information about this case from any source outside of the trial, even unintentionally, do not share that information with any other juror. If you do receive such information, or if anyone tries to influence you or any juror, you must immediately tell the bailiff.

Keep an open mind throughout the trial. Do not make up your mind about the verdict or any issue until after you have discussed the case with the other jurors during deliberations. Do not take anything I say or do during the trial as an indication of what I think about the facts, the witnesses, or what your verdict should be.

Do not let bias, sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion influence your decision.

You must reach your verdict without any consideration of punishment.

I want to emphasize that you may not use any form of research or communication, including electronic or wireless research or communication, to research, share, communicate, or allow someone else to communicate with you regarding any subject of the trial. [If you violate this rule, you may be subject to jail time, a fine, or other punishment.]

When the trial has ended and you have been released as jurors, you may discuss the case with anyone. [But under California law, you must wait at least 90 days before negotiating or agreeing to accept any payment for information about the case.]

New January 2006; Revised June 2007, April 2008, December 2008, April 2010, October 2010, April 2011, February 2012

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct the jurors on how they must conduct themselves during trial. (Pen. Code, § 1122.) See also California Rules of Court, Rule 2.1035.

Do not instruct a jury in the penalty phase of a capital case that they cannot consider sympathy. (*People v. Easley* (1982) 34 Cal.3d 858, 875–880 [196 Cal.Rptr. 309, 671 P.2d 813].) Instead of this instruction, CALCRIM 761 is the proper introductory instruction for the penalty phase of a capital case.

If there will be a jury view, give the bracketed phrase “unless I tell you otherwise” in the fourth paragraph. (Pen. Code, § 1119.)

AUTHORITY

- Statutory Admonitions ▶ Pen. Code, § 1122.
- Avoid Discussing the Case ▶ *People v. Pierce* (1979) 24 Cal.3d 199 [155 Cal.Rptr. 657, 595 P.2d 91]; *In re Hitchings* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 97 [24 Cal.Rptr.2d 74, 860 P.2d 466]; *In re Carpenter* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 634, 646–658 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d 665, 889 P.2d 985].
- Avoid News Reports ▶ *People v. Holloway* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 1098, 1108–1111 [269 Cal.Rptr. 530, 790 P.2d 1327], disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Stansbury* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 824, 830 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d. 394, 889 P.2d 588].
- Judge’s Conduct as Indication of Verdict ▶ *People v. Hunt* (1915) 26 Cal.App. 514, 517 [147 P. 476].
- No Bias, Sympathy, or Prejudice ▶ *People v. Hawthorne* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43, 73 [14 Cal.Rptr.2d 133, 841 P.2d 118].
- No Independent Research ▶ *People v. Karis* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 612, 642 [250 Cal.Rptr. 659, 758 P.2d 1189]; *People v. Castro* (1986) 184 Cal.App.3d 849, 853 [229 Cal.Rptr. 280]; *People v. Sutter* (1982) 134 Cal.App.3d 806, 820 [184 Cal.Rptr. 829].
- This Instruction Upheld ▶ *People v. Ibarra* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1174, 1182–1183 [67 Cal.Rptr.3d 871].
- Court’s Contempt Power for Violations of Admonitions ▶ Pen. Code, § 1122(a)(1); Code Civ. Proc. § 1209(a)(6) (effective 1/1/12).

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, § 643.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 81, *Jury Selection and Opening Statement*, § 81.06[1], Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.05[1], [4] (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Admonition Not to Discuss Case With Anyone

In *People v. Danks* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 269, 298–300 [8 Cal.Rptr.3d 767, 82 P.3d 1249], a capital case, two jurors violated the court’s admonition not to discuss the case with anyone by consulting with their pastors regarding the death penalty. The Supreme Court stated:

It is troubling that during deliberations not one but two jurors had conversations with their pastors that ultimately addressed the issue being resolved at the penalty phase in this case. Because jurors instructed not to speak to anyone about the case except a fellow juror during deliberations . . . may assume such an instruction does not apply to confidential relationships, we recommend the jury be expressly instructed that they may not speak to anyone about the case, except a fellow juror during deliberations, and that this includes, but is not limited to, spouses, spiritual leaders or advisers, or therapists. Moreover, the jury should also be instructed that if anyone, other than a fellow juror during deliberations, tells a juror his or her view of the evidence in the case, the juror should report that conversation immediately to the court.

(*Id.* at p. 306, fn. 11.)

The court may, at its discretion, add the suggested language to the second paragraph of this instruction.

Jury Misconduct

It is error to instruct the jury to immediately advise the court if a juror refuses to deliberate or expresses an intention to disregard the law or to decide the case based on penalty, punishment, or any other improper basis. (*People v. Engelman* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 436, 449 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 862, 49 P.3d 209].)

124. Separation Admonition

[You may be permitted to separate during recesses and at the end of the day. I will tell you when to return. Please remember, we cannot begin the trial until all of you are in place, so it is important to be on time.]

Remember, do not talk about the case or about any of the people or any subject involved in it with anyone, including the other jurors. **Do not do research, share information, or talk to each other or to anyone else about the facts of the case or anything else connected with the trial, and do not use any form of electronic or wireless communication, such as _____** *<insert currently popular modes of electronic or wireless communication>* **to do any of those things, either.**

Do not make up your mind **or express any opinion about the case or any issue connected with the trial** ~~about the verdict or any issue~~ until after you have discussed the case with the other jurors during deliberations.

New January 2006 *[insert date of council approval]*

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to admonish the jury “at each adjournment of the court before the submission of the cause to the jury.” Adjournment means continuing proceedings to another court day, not every time the court calls a recess. *People v. Heishman* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 147, 174 [246 Cal.Rptr. 673, 691], citing *People v. Moore* (1971) 15 Cal.App.3d 851, 852-853 [93 Cal.Rptr. 447].

AUTHORITY

- Statutory Authority ▶ Pen. Code, § 1122(b).

Secondary Sources

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 81, *Jury Selection and Opening Statement*, § 81.06[1], Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.05[1] (Matthew Bender).

318. Prior Statements as Evidence

You have heard evidence of [a] statement[s] that a witness made before the trial. If you decide that the witness made (that/those) statement[s], you may use (that/those) statement[s] in two ways:

1. To evaluate whether the witness’s testimony in court is believable;

AND

2. As evidence that the information in (that/those) earlier statement[s] is true.

New January 2006

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has no sua sponte duty to give this instruction. (*People v. Griffin* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 1011, 1026 [251 Cal.Rptr. 643, 761 P.2d 103].) Use this instruction when a testifying witness has been confronted with a prior inconsistent statement.

If prior testimony of an unavailable witness was impeached with a prior inconsistent statement, use CALCRIM No. 319, *Prior Statements of Unavailable Witness*. (*People v. Williams* (1976) 16 Cal.3d 663, 668–669 [128 Cal.Rptr. 888, 547 P.2d 1000].) If the prior statements were obtained by a peace officer in violation of *Miranda*, give CALCRIM No. 356, *Miranda-Defective Statements*.

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ *California v. Green* (1970) 399 U.S. 149, 158 [90 S.Ct. 1930, 26 L.Ed.2d 489]; *People v. Cannady* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 379, 385–386 [105 Cal.Rptr. 129, 503 P.2d 585]; see Evid. Code, §§ 770, 791, 1235, 1236.

This Instruction Upheld ▶ [*People v. Tuggles* \(2009\) 179 Cal.App.4th 339, 363-367 \[100 Cal.Rptr.3d 820\]](#); *People v. Golde* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 101, 120 [77 Cal.Rptr.3d 120].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Hearsay, § 157.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 82, *Witnesses*, § 82.22[3][b], Ch. 83, *Evidence*, § 83.13[3][e], [f], Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.03[2][b] (Matthew Bender).

335. Accomplice Testimony: No Dispute Whether Witness Is Accomplice

If the crime[s] of _____ <insert charged crime[s]> (was/were) committed, then _____ <insert name[s] of witness[es]> (was/were) [an] accomplice[s] to (that/those) crime[s].

You may not convict the defendant of _____ <insert crime[s]> based on the (statement/ [or] testimony) of an accomplice alone. You may use the (statement)/ [or] testimony) of an accomplice to convict the defendant only if:

1. The accomplice's (statement/ [or] testimony) is supported by other evidence that you believe;
2. That supporting evidence is independent of the accomplice's (statement/ [or] testimony);

AND

3. That supporting evidence tends to connect the defendant to the commission of the crime[s].

Supporting evidence, however, may be slight. It does not need to be enough, by itself, to prove that the defendant is guilty of the charged crime, and it does not need to support every fact (mentioned by the accomplice in the statement/ [or] about which the witness testified). On the other hand, it is not enough if the supporting evidence merely shows that a crime was committed or the circumstances of its commission. The supporting evidence must tend to connect the defendant to the commission of the crime.

[The evidence needed to support the (statement/ [or] testimony) of one accomplice cannot be provided by the (statement/ [or] testimony) of another accomplice.]

Any (statement/ [or] testimony) of an accomplice that tends to incriminate the defendant should be viewed with caution. You may not, however, arbitrarily disregard it. You should give that (statement/ [or] testimony) the weight you think it deserves after examining it with care and caution and in the light of all the other evidence.

New January 2006; Revised June 2007, April 2010

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

There is a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the principles governing the law of accomplices, including the need for corroboration, if the evidence at trial suggests that a witness could be an accomplice. (*People v. Tobias* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 327, 331 [106 Cal.Rptr.2d 80, 21 P.3d 758].)

“Whether a person is an accomplice is a question of fact for the jury unless the facts and the inferences to be drawn therefrom are undisputed.” (*People v. Coffman and Marlow* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 1, 104 [17 Cal.Rptr.3d 710, 96 P.3d 30].) Give this instruction only if the court concludes that the witness is an accomplice as a matter of law or the parties agree about the witness’s status as an accomplice. (*People v. Verlinde* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 1146, 1161 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 322] [only give instruction “ ‘if undisputed evidence established the complicity’ ”].) If there is a dispute about whether the witness is an accomplice, give CALCRIM No. 334, *Accomplice Testimony Must Be Corroborated: Dispute Whether Witness Is Accomplice*.

If a codefendant’s testimony tends to incriminate another defendant, the court **must give** an appropriate instruction on accomplice testimony. (*People v. Avila* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491, 562 [43 Cal.Rptr.3d 1, 133 P.3d 1076]; *citing People v. Box* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1153, 1209 [99 Cal.Rptr.2d 69, 5 P.3d 130]; *People v. Alvarez* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 155, 218 [58 Cal.Rptr.2d 385, 926 P.2d 365].) The court **must** also instruct on accomplice testimony when two co-defendants testify against each other and blame each other for the crime. (*Id.* at 218-219).

When the witness is a codefendant whose testimony includes incriminating statements, the court **should not** instruct that the witness is an accomplice as a matter of law. (*People v. Hill* (1967) 66 Cal.2d 536, 555 [58 Cal.Rptr. 340, 426 P.2d 908].) Instead, the court should give CALCRIM No. 334, *Accomplice Testimony Must Be Corroborated: Dispute Whether Witness Is Accomplice*, informing the jury that it must decide whether the testifying codefendant is an accomplice. In addition, the court should instruct that when the jury considers this testimony as it relates to the testifying codefendant’s defense, the jury should evaluate the testimony using the general rules of credibility, but if the jury considers testimony as incriminating evidence against the non-testifying codefendant, the testimony must be corroborated and should be viewed with caution. (See *People v. Coffman and Marlow* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 1, 105 [17 Cal.Rptr.3d 710, 96 P.3d 30].)

If the court concludes that the corroboration requirement applies to an out-of-court statement, use the word “statement” throughout the instruction. (See discussion in Related Issues section to CALCRIM No. 334, *Accomplice Testimony Must Be Corroborated: Dispute Whether Witness Is Accomplice*.)

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ Pen. Code, § 1111; *People v. Guiuan* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 558, 569 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 239, 957 P.2d 928].
- Accomplice May Not Provide Sole Basis for Admission of Other Evidence ▶ *People v. Bowley* (1963) 59 Cal.2d 855, 863 [31 Cal.Rptr. 471, 382 P.2d 591].
- Consideration of Incriminating Testimony ▶ *People v. Guiuan* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 558, 569 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 239, 957 P.2d 928].
- Defense Admissions May Provide Necessary Corroboration ▶ *People v. Williams* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 635, 680 [66 Cal.Rptr.2d 573, 941 P.2d 752].
- Definition of Accomplice as Aider and Abettor ▶ *People v. Stankewitz* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 72, 90–91 [270 Cal.Rptr. 817 793 P.2d 23].
- Extent of Corroboration Required ▶ *People v. Szeto* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 20, 27 [171 Cal.Rptr. 652, 623 P.2d 213].
- One Accomplice May Not Corroborate Another ▶ *People v. Montgomery* (1941) 47 Cal.App.2d 1, 15 [117 P.2d 437], disapproved on other grounds in *Murgia v. Municipal Court* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 286, 301, fn. 11 [124 Cal.Rptr. 204, 540 P.2d 44] and *People v. Dillon* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 441, 454, fn. 2 [194 Cal.Rptr. 390, 668 P.2d 697].
- Presence or Knowledge Insufficient ▶ *People v. Boyd* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 541, 557, fn. 14 [271 Cal.Rptr. 738]; *In re Michael T.* (1978) 84 Cal.App.3d 907, 911 [149 Cal.Rptr. 87].
- Testimony of Feigned Accomplice Need Not Be Corroborated ▶ *People v. Salazar* (1962) 201 Cal.App.2d 284, 287 [20 Cal.Rptr. 25]; but see *People v. Brocklehurst* (1971) 14 Cal.App.3d 473, 476 [92 Cal.Rptr. 340]; *People v. Bohmer* (1975) 46 Cal.App.3d 185, 191–193 [120 Cal.Rptr. 136].
- Uncorroborated Accomplice Testimony May Establish Corpus Delicti ▶ *People v. Williams* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1268, 1317 [248 Cal.Rptr. 834, 756 P.2d 221].
- Witness an Accomplice as a Matter of Law ▶ *People v. Williams* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 635, 679 [66 Cal.Rptr.2d 573, 941 P.2d 752].
- This Instruction Upheld ▶ *People v. Tuggles* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 339, 363-367 [100 Cal.Rptr.3d 820].

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, *California Evidence* (4th ed. 2000) Presentation, §§ 98, 99, 105.

5 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, § 654.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 82, *Witnesses*, § 82.03, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.02[2][b], 85.03[2][b], [d], Ch. 87, *Death Penalty*, § 87.23[4][b] (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 141, *Conspiracy, Solicitation, and Attempt*, § 141.02[5][b] (Matthew Bender).

336. In-Custody Informant

~~The testimony of an in-custody informant should be viewed with caution and close scrutiny. In evaluating such testimony, you should consider the extent to which it may have been influenced by the receipt of, or expectation of, any benefits from the party calling that witness. This does not mean that you may arbitrarily disregard such testimony, but you should give it the weight to which you find it to be entitled in the light of all the evidence in the case. View the (statement/ [or] testimony) of an in-custody informant against the defendant with caution and close scrutiny. In evaluating such (statement/ [or] testimony), you should consider the extent to which it may have been influenced by the receipt of, or expectation of, any benefits. This does not mean that you may arbitrarily disregard such (statement/ [or] testimony), but you should give it the weight to which you find it to be entitled in the light of all the evidence in the case.~~

~~[An in-custody informant is someone[, other than (a/an) (codefendant[,]/ [or] percipient witness[,]/ [or] accomplice[,]/ [or] coconspirator,)] whose testimony is based on [a] statement[s] the defendant allegedly made while both the defendant and the informant were held within a correctional institution.]~~

<Give the following paragraph if the issue of whether a witness was an in-custody informant is in dispute>

~~[An in-custody informant is someone [, other than (a/an) (codefendant[,]/ [or] percipient witness[,]/ [or] accomplice[,]/ [or] coconspirator,)] whose (statement/ [or] testimony) is based on [a] statement[s] the defendant allegedly made while both the defendant and the informant were held within a correctional institution. If you decide that a (declarant/ [or] witness) was not an in-custody informant, then you should evaluate his or her (statement/ [or] testimony) as you would that of any other witness.]~~

<Give the first bracketed phrase if the issue of whether a witness was an in-custody informant is in dispute>

~~[If you decide that a (declarant/ [or] witness) was an in-custody informant, then] (Y/)you may not convict the defendant of *<insert charged crime[s]>* based on the (statement/ [or] testimony) of that in-custody informant alone. [Nor may you find a special circumstance true/ [or] use evidence in aggravation based on the (statement/ [or] testimony) of that in-custody informant alone.]~~

You may use the (statement/ [or] testimony) of an in-custody informant only if:

1. The (statement/ [or] testimony) is supported by other evidence that you believe;
2. That supporting evidence is independent of the (statement/ [or] testimony) ;
AND
3. That supporting evidence tends to connect the defendant to the commission of the crime[s] [or to the special circumstance/ [or] to evidence in aggravation]. The supporting evidence is not sufficient if it merely shows that the charged crime was committed [or proves the existence of a special circumstance/ [or] evidence in aggravation].

[Do not use the (statement/ [or] testimony) of an in-custody informant to support the (statement/ [or] testimony) of another in-custody informant unless you are convinced that _____ <insert name of party calling in-custody informant as witness> has proven it is more likely than not that the in-custody informant has not communicated with another in-custody informant on the subject of the testimony.

<Insert the name of the in-custody informant if his or her statue is not in dispute>
[_____ <insert name of witness> **is an in-custody informant.**]

[_____ <insert name of institution> **is a correctional institution.**]

New January 2006 [insert date of Judicial Council approval].

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court must give this instruction on request. (Pen. Code, § 1127a.)

The court should also be aware of the following statutory provisions relating to in-custody informants: Penal Code sections 1127a(c) [prosecution must disclose consideration given to witness]; 1191.25 [prosecution must notify victim of in-custody informant]; and 4001.1 [limitation on payments to in-custody informants and action that may be taken by in-custody informant].

If there is no issue over whether the witness is an in-custody informant and the parties agree, the court may instruct the jury that the witness “is an in-custody informant.” If there is an issue over whether the witness is an in-custody informant, give the bracketed definition of the term.

The committee awaits guidance from courts of review on the issue of whether this instruction applies to witnesses other than those called by the People. Until the issue is resolved, the committee provides this version consistent with the language of the new statute.

Related Instruction

CALCRIM No. 337, *Witness in Custody or Physically Restrained*.

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Duty ▶ Pen. Code, §§ [1111.5](#), 1127a.

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trials, § 653.

2 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 30, *Confessions and Admissions*, § 30.32[2] (Matthew Bender).

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 82, *Witnesses*, § 82.03A, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.02[2][b], 85.03[2][b] (Matthew Bender).

350. Character of Defendant

You have heard character testimony that the defendant (is a _____ <insert character trait relevant to crime[s] committed> person/ [or] has a good reputation for _____ <insert character trait relevant to crime[s] committed> in the community where (he/she) lives or works).

~~You may take that testimony into consideration along with all the other evidence in deciding whether the People have proved that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.~~

Evidence of the defendant's character for _____ <insert character trait relevant to crime[s] committed> can by itself create a reasonable doubt [whether the defendant committed _____ <insert name[s] of alleged offenses[s] and count[s], e.g., battery, as charged in Count 1>]. However, evidence of the defendant's good character may be countered by evidence of (his/her) bad character for the same trait. You must decide the meaning and importance of the character evidence.

[If the defendant's character for certain traits has not been discussed among those who know (him/her), you may assume that (his/her) character for those traits is good.]

You may take that testimony into consideration along with all the other evidence in deciding whether the People have proved that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

New January 2006, {insert date of council approval}

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has no sua sponte duty to give an instruction on defendant's character; however, it must be given on request. (*People v. Bell* (1875) 49 Cal. 485, 489–490 [jury should be instructed that evidence of good reputation should be weighed as any other fact established and may be sufficient to create reasonable doubt of guilt]; *People v. Jones* (1954) 42 Cal.2d 219, 222 [266 P.2d 38] [character evidence may be sufficient to create reasonable doubt of guilt]; *People v. Wilson* (1913) 23 Cal.App. 513, 523–524 [138 P. 971] [court erred in failing to give requested instruction or any instruction on character evidence].)

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ *People v. Bell* (1875) 49 Cal. 485, 489–490; *People v. Wilson* (1913) 23 Cal.App. 513, 523–524 [138 P. 971]; *People v. Jones* (1954) 42 Cal.2d 219, 222 [266 P.2d 38].
- Character Evidence Must Be Relevant to Offense Charged ▶ *People v. Taylor* (1986) 180 Cal.App.3d 622, 629, [225 Cal.Rptr. 733].
- Admissibility ▶ Evid. Code, §§ 1100–1102.

Secondary Sources

- 1 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Circumstantial Evidence, § 53.
- 4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 82, *Witnesses*, § 82.22[3][d], [e][ii], Ch. 83, *Evidence*, § 83.12[1] (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

No Discussion of Character Is Evidence of Good Character

The fact that the defendant’s character or reputation has not been discussed or questioned among those who know him or her is evidence of the defendant’s good character and reputation. (*People v. Castillo* (1935) 5 Cal.App.2d 194, 198 [42 P.2d 682].) However, the defendant must have resided in the community for a sufficient period of time and become acquainted with the community in order for his or her character to have become known and for some sort of reputation to have been established. (See Evid. Code, § 1324 [reputation may be shown in the community where defendant resides and in a group with which he or she habitually associates]; see also *People v. Pauli* (1922) 58 Cal.App. 594, 596 [209 P. 88] [witness’s testimony about defendant’s good reputation in community was inappropriate where defendant was a stranger in the community, working for a single employer for a few months, going about little, and forming no associations].)

Business Community

The community for purposes of reputation evidence may also be the defendant’s business community and associates. (*People v. Cobb* (1955) 45 Cal.2d 158, 163 [287 P.2d 752].)

370. Motive

The People are not required to prove that the defendant had a motive to commit (any of the crimes/the crime) charged. In reaching your verdict you may, however, consider whether the defendant had a motive.

Having a motive may be a factor tending to show that the defendant is guilty. Not having a motive may be a factor tending to show the defendant is not guilty.

New January 2006

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court does not have a sua sponte duty to instruct on motive. (*People v. Romo* (1975) 14 Cal.3d 189, 196 [121 Cal.Rptr. 111, 534 P.2d 1015] [not error to refuse instruction on motive].)

Do not give this instruction if motive is an element of the crime charged. (See, e.g., CALCRIM No. 1122, *Annoying or Molesting a Child*.)

[Modify this instruction if the court is also instructing on torture. \(*People v. Horvath* \(2012\) 204 Cal.App.4th 100, 111 \[138 Cal.Rptr.3d 499\].\)](#)

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ *People v. Romo* (1975) 14 Cal.3d 189, 195–196 [121 Cal.Rptr. 111, 534 P.2d 1015]; *People v. Young* (1970) 9 Cal.App.3d 106, 110 [87 Cal.Rptr. 767].
- Jury May Consider Motive ▶ *People v. Brown* (1900) 130 Cal. 591, 594 [62 P. 1072]; *People v. Gonzales* (1948) 87 Cal.App.2d 867, 877–878 [198 P.2d 81].
- Proof of Presence or Absence of Motive Not Required ▶ *People v. Daly* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 47, 59 [10 Cal.Rptr.2d 21]; *People v. Scheer* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 1009, 1017–1018 [80 Cal.Rptr.2d 676].
- This Instruction Upheld ▶ *People v. Ibarra* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1174, 1192–1193 [67 Cal.Rptr.3d 871].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Elements, § 4.

1 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Defenses, § 249.

1 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Circumstantial Evidence, § 119.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.03[2][c] (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Entrapment Defense

The court should not instruct on motive if the defendant admits his guilt for the substantive crime and presents an entrapment defense, because in that instance his or her commission of the crime would not be an issue and motive would be irrelevant. (See *People v. Martinez* (1984) 157 Cal.App.3d 660, 669 [203 Cal.Rptr. 833]; *People v. Lee* (1990) 219 Cal.App.3d 829, 841 [268 Cal.Rptr. 595].)

No Conflict With Other Instructions

Motive, intent, and malice are separate and distinct mental states. Giving a motive instruction does not conflict with intent and malice instructions. (*People v. Hillhouse* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469, 503–504 [117 Cal.Rptr.2d 45, 40 P.3d 754] [motive describes the reason a person chooses to commit a crime]; *People v. Snead* (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1088, 1098 [24 Cal.Rptr.2d 922].) Similarly, a motive instruction that focuses on guilt does not conflict with a special circumstance instruction, which the jury is directed to find true or not true. (*People v. Heishman* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 147, 178 [246 Cal.Rptr. 673, 753 P.2d 629] [defendant argued motive to prevent victim from testifying was at core of special circumstance].) A torture murder instruction that requires an intent to cause cruel pain or suffering for the purpose of revenge, extortion, or any sadistic purpose also does not conflict with the motive instruction. The torture murder instruction does not elevate motive to the status of an element of the crime. It simply makes explicit the treatment of motive as an element of proof in torture murder cases. (*People v. Lynn* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 715, 727–728 [206 Cal.Rptr. 181].)

510. Excusable Homicide: Accident

The defendant is not guilty of (murder/ [or] manslaughter) if (he/she) killed someone as a result of accident or misfortune. Such a killing is excused, and therefore not unlawful, if:

1. The defendant was doing a lawful act in a lawful way;
2. The defendant was acting with usual and ordinary caution;

AND

3. The defendant was acting without any unlawful intent.

A person acts with *usual and ordinary caution* if he or she acts in a way that a reasonably careful person would act in the same or similar situation.

The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the killing was not excused. If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty of (murder/ [or] manslaughter).

New January 2006 [\[insert date of council approval\]](#)

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

~~The court has no **sua sponte** duty to instruct on accident. -(*People v. Anderson* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 989, 997-998 [125 Cal.Rptr.3d 408].) has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on lawful acts that excuse homicide when there is evidence supporting that defense. (See *People v. Hampton* (1929) 96 Cal.App. 157, 159-160 [273 P. 854] [court erred in refusing defendant's requested instruction]; *People v. Slater* (1943) 60 Cal.App.2d 358, 369 [140 P.2d 846]; *People v. Bloyd* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 333, 353-354 [233 Cal.Rptr. 368, 729 P.2d 802] [instruction not required when defendant argued the victim killed herself by accident].)~~

When this instruction is given, it should always be given in conjunction with CALCRIM No. 581, *Involuntary Manslaughter: Murder Not Charged* or CALCRIM No. 580, *Involuntary Manslaughter: Lesser Included Offense*, unless vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence is charged. (*People v. Velez* (1983) 144 Cal.App.3d 558, 566-568 [192 Cal.Rptr. 686].) A lawful act can be the

basis of involuntary manslaughter, but only if that act is committed with *criminal* negligence (“in an unlawful manner or without due caution and circumspection”). (Pen. Code, § 192(b).) The level of negligence described in this instruction, 510, is *ordinary* negligence. While proof of ordinary negligence is sufficient to prevent a killing from being excused under Penal Code section 195, subd. 1, proof of ordinary negligence is not sufficient to find a defendant guilty of involuntary manslaughter under Penal Code section 192(b). (*People v. Penny* (1955) 44 Cal.2d 861, 879–880 [285 P.2d 926].)

Related Instructions

CALCRIM No. 3404, *Accident*.

AUTHORITY

- Excusable Homicide If Committed by Lawful Act ▶ Pen. Code, § 195, subd. 1.
- Burden of Proof ▶ Pen. Code, § 189.5; *People v. Frye* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1148, 1154–1155 [10 Cal.Rptr.2d 217].
- Instructing With Involuntary Manslaughter ▶ *People v. Velez* (1983) 144 Cal.App.3d 558, 566–568 [192 Cal.Rptr. 686].
- Misfortune as Accident ▶ *People v. Gorgol* (1953) 122 Cal.App.2d 281, 308 [265 P.2d 69].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Defenses, § 242.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 73, *Defenses and Justifications*, §§ 73.01[5], 73.16 (Matthew Bender).

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.04[1][c] (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, § 142.01[1][b] (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Traditional Self-Defense

In *People v. Curtis* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 1337, 1358–1359 [37 Cal.Rptr.2d 304], the court held that the claim that a killing was accidental bars the defendant from

relying on traditional self-defense not only as a defense, but also to negate implied malice. However, in *People v. Elize* (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 605, 610–616 [84 Cal.Rptr.2d 35], the court reached the opposite conclusion, holding that the trial court erred in refusing to give self-defense instructions where the defendant testified that the gun discharged accidentally. *Elize* relies on two Supreme Court opinions, *People v. Barton* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 186 [47 Cal.Rptr.2d 569, 906 P.2d 531], and *People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094]. Because *Curtis* predates these opinions, *Elize* appears to be the more persuasive authority.

3404. Accident (Pen. Code, § 195)

<General or Specific Intent Crimes>

[The defendant is not guilty of _____ <insert crime[s]> if (he/she) acted [or failed to act] without the intent required for that crime, but acted instead accidentally. You may not find the defendant guilty of _____ <insert crime[s]> unless you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that (he/she) acted with the required intent.]

<Criminal Negligence Crimes>

[The defendant is not guilty of _____ <insert crime[s]> if (he/she) acted [or failed to act] accidentally without criminal negligence. You may not find the defendant guilty of _____ <insert crime[s]> unless you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that (he/she) acted with criminal negligence. *Criminal negligence* is defined in another instruction.]

New January 2006; Revised April 2008

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has no **sua sponte** duty to instruct on accident. (*People v. Anderson* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 989, 997-998 [125 Cal.Rptr.3d 408].) ~~The trial court's "responsibility to instruct on accident . . . generally extends no further than the obligation to provide, upon request, a pinpoint instruction relating the evidence to the mental element required for the charged crime." The trial court need not instruct sua sponte on accident when that theory is used merely to prove that defendant lacked a specific mental state necessary to commit the crime, "assuming the jury received complete and accurate instructions on the requisite mental element of the offense." (*People v. Anderson* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 989, 997-998 [125 Cal.Rptr.3d 408].) (Emphasis in original). The court must instruct on a defense when the defendant requests it and there is substantial evidence supporting the defense. The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on a defense if there is substantial evidence supporting it and either the defendant is relying on it or it is not inconsistent with the defendant's theory of the case.~~

~~When the court concludes that the defense is supported by substantial evidence and is inconsistent with the defendant's theory of the case, however, it should ascertain whether defendant wishes instruction on this alternate theory. (*People v. Gonzales* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 382, 389-390 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 111]; *People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 157 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].)~~

~~Substantial evidence means evidence of a defense, which, if believed, would be sufficient for a reasonable jury to find a reasonable doubt as to the defendant's guilt. (*People v. Salas* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 967, 982–983 [38 Cal.Rptr.3d 624, 127 P.3d 40].)~~

When instructing on the defense of accident and misfortune, only the mental state relevant to the crime charged should be included in the instruction. (*People v. Lara* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 102, 109 [51 Cal.Rptr.2d 402] [trial court erred in instructing on criminal negligence in battery case because battery is a general intent crime].) Give the first paragraph if the defense is raised to a general or specific intent crime. Give the second paragraph if the defense is raised to a crime that is committed by criminal negligence. In either case, the court should insert the specific crime in the space provided. If both intent and negligence crimes are charged, instruct with both paragraphs.

Related Instructions

If murder is charged, see CALCRIM No. 510, *Excusable Homicide: Accidental*.

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 26(5), 195.
- Burden of Proof ▶ *People v. Black* (1951) 103 Cal.App.2d 69, 79 [229 P.2d 61]; *People v. Frye* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1148, 1154–1155 [10 Cal.Rptr.2d 217].
- Misfortune as Accident ▶ *People v. Gorgol* (1953) 122 Cal.App.2d 281, 308 [265 P.2d 69].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Defenses, § 241.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 73, *Defenses and Justifications*, § 73.01[5] (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Misfortune Defined

“‘Misfortune’ when applied to a criminal act is analogous [to] the word ‘misadventure’ and bears the connotation of accident while doing a lawful act.” (*People v. Gorgol* (1953) 122 Cal.App.2d 281, 308 [265 P.2d 69].)

571. Voluntary Manslaughter: Imperfect Self-Defense or Imperfect Defense of Another—Lesser Included Offense (Pen. Code, § 192)

A killing that would otherwise be murder is reduced to voluntary manslaughter if the defendant killed a person because (he/she) acted in (imperfect self-defense/ [or] imperfect defense of another).

If you conclude the defendant acted in complete (self-defense/ [or] defense of another), (his/her) action was lawful and you must find (him/her) not guilty of any crime. The difference between complete (self-defense/ [or] defense of another) and (imperfect self-defense/ [or] imperfect defense of another) depends on whether the defendant’s belief in the need to use deadly force was reasonable.

The defendant acted in (imperfect self-defense/ [or] imperfect defense of another) if:

The defendant actually believed that (he/she/ [or] someone else/ _____ <insert name of third party>) was in imminent danger of being killed or suffering great bodily injury;

AND

The defendant actually believed that the immediate use of deadly force was necessary to defend against the danger;

BUT

At least one of those beliefs was unreasonable.

Belief in future harm is not sufficient, no matter how great or how likely the harm is believed to be.

In evaluating the defendant’s beliefs, consider all the circumstances as they were known and appeared to the defendant.

[If you find that _____ <insert name of decedent/victim> threatened or harmed the defendant [or others] in the past, you may consider that information in evaluating the defendant’s beliefs.]

[If you find that the defendant knew that _____ <insert name of decedent/victim> had threatened or harmed others in the past, you may consider that information in evaluating the defendant’s beliefs.]

[If you find that the defendant received a threat from someone else that (he/she) reasonably associated with _____ <insert name of decedent/victim>, you may consider that threat in evaluating the defendant’s beliefs.]

[Great bodily injury means significant or substantial physical injury. It is an injury that is greater than minor or moderate harm.]

The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not acting in (imperfect self-defense/ [or] imperfect defense of another). If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty of murder.

New January 2006

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on voluntary manslaughter on either theory, heat of passion or imperfect self-defense, when evidence of either is “substantial enough to merit consideration” by the jury. (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 153–163 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094]; *People v. Barton* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 186, 201 [47 Cal.Rptr.2d 569, 906 P.2d 531].)

See discussion of imperfect self-defense in related issues section of CALCRIM No. 505, *Justifiable Homicide: Self-Defense or Defense of Another*.

Perfect Self-Defense

Most courts hold that an instruction on imperfect self-defense **is required** in every case in which a court instructs on perfect self-defense. If there is substantial evidence of a defendant’s belief in the need for self-defense, there will *always* be substantial evidence to support an imperfect self-defense instruction because the reasonableness of that belief will always be at issue. (See *People v. Ceja* (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 78, 85–86 [31 Cal.Rptr.2d 475], overruled in part by *People v. Blakeley* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 82, 91 [96 Cal.Rptr.2d 451, 999 P.2d 675]; see also *People v. De Leon* (1992) 10 Cal.App.4th 815, 824 [12 Cal.Rptr.2d 825].) The court in *People v. Rodriguez* disagreed, however, and found that an imperfect self-defense instruction was not required *sua sponte* on the facts of the case where the defendant’s version of the crime “could only lead to an acquittal based on

justifiable homicide,” and when the prosecutor’s version of the crime could only lead to a conviction of first degree murder. (See *People v. Rodriguez* (1997) 53 Cal.App.4th 1250, 1275 [62 Cal.Rptr.2d 345]; see also *People v. Williams* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 354, 362 [14 Cal.Rptr.2d 441, 841 P.2d 961] [in a rape prosecution, the court was not required to give a mistake-of-fact instruction where the two sides gave wholly divergent accounts with no middle ground to support a mistake-of-fact instruction].)

In evaluating whether the defendant actually believed in the need for self-defense, the jury may consider the effect of antecedent threats and assaults against the defendant, including threats received by the defendant from a third party that the defendant reasonably associated with the aggressor. (*People v. Minifie* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1055, 1065, 1069 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 133, 920 P.2d 1337].) If there is sufficient evidence, the court should give the bracketed paragraphs on prior threats or assaults on request.

Related Instructions

CALCRIM No. 505, *Justifiable Homicide: Self-Defense or Defense of Another*.

CALCRIM 3470, *Right to Self-Defense or Defense of Another (Non-Homicide)*.

CALCRIM 3471, *Right to Self-Defense: Mutual Combat or Initial Aggressor*.

CALCRIM 3472, *Right to Self-Defense: May Not Be Contrived*.

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 192(a).
- Imperfect Self-Defense Defined ▶ *People v. Flannel* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 668, 680–683 [160 Cal.Rptr. 84, 603 P.2d 1]; *People v. Barton* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 186, 201 [47 Cal.Rptr.2d 569, 906 P.2d 531]; *In re Christian S.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 768, 773 [30 Cal.Rptr.2d 33, 872 P.2d 574]; see *People v. Uriarte* (1990) 223 Cal.App.3d 192, 197–198 [272 Cal.Rptr. 693] [insufficient evidence to support defense of another person].
- Imperfect Defense of Others ▶ *People v. ~~Randle~~Michaels* (2002~~5~~) ~~2835~~ Cal.4th ~~486, 529–531~~~~987, 990, 995-1000~~ [28 Cal.Rptr.3d ~~725, 731, 111~~ P.3d ~~987~~], overruled on another ground in *People v. Chun* (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1172 [91 Cal.Rptr.3d 106, 203 P.3d 415]. [~~122 Cal.Rptr.2d 285, 49 P.3d 1032~~].
- Imperfect Self-Defense May be Available When Defendant Set in Motion Chain of Events Leading to Victim’s Attack, but Not When Victim was Legally Justified in Resorting to Self-Defense ▶ *People v. Vasquez* (2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 1176, 1179–1180 [39 Cal.Rptr.3d 433].

- This Instruction Upheld ▶ [People v. Lopez \(2011\) 199 Cal.App.4th 1297, 1306 \[132 Cal.Rptr.3d 248\]](#); *People v. Genovese* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 817, 832 [85 Cal.Rptr.3d 664].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against the Person, § 210.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 73, *Defenses and Justifications*, § 73.11[1][c], [2][a] (Matthew Bender).

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.03[2][g], 85.04[1][c] (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, §§ 142.01[3][d.1], [e], 142.02[1][a], [e], [f], [2][a], [3][c] (Matthew Bender).

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

- Attempted Voluntary Manslaughter ▶ *People v. Van Ronk* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 818, 822 [217 Cal.Rptr. 581]; *People v. Williams* (1980) 102 Cal.App.3d 1018, 1024–1026 [162 Cal.Rptr. 748].

Involuntary manslaughter is *not* a lesser included offense of voluntary manslaughter. (*People v. Orr* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 780, 784 [27 Cal.Rptr.2d 553].)

RELATED ISSUES

Battered Woman’s Syndrome

Evidence relating to battered woman’s syndrome may be considered by the jury when deciding if the defendant actually feared the batterer and if that fear was reasonable. (See *People v. Humphrey* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1082–1089 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 142, 921 P.2d 1].)

Blakeley Not Retroactive

The decision in *Blakeley*—that one who, acting with conscious disregard for life, unintentionally kills in imperfect self-defense is guilty of voluntary manslaughter—may not be applied to defendants whose offense occurred prior to *Blakeley*’s June 2, 2000, date of decision. (*People v. Blakeley* (2000) 23 Cal.4th

82, 91–93 [96 Cal.Rptr.2d 451, 999 P.2d 675].) If a defendant asserts a killing was done in an honest but mistaken belief in the need to act in self-defense and the offense occurred prior to June 2, 2000, the jury must be instructed that an unintentional killing in imperfect self-defense is involuntary manslaughter. (*People v. Johnson* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 566, 576–577 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 802]; *People v. Blakeley*, *supra*, 23 Cal.4th at p. 93.)

Inapplicable to Felony Murder

Imperfect self-defense does not apply to felony murder. “Because malice is irrelevant in first and second degree felony murder prosecutions, a claim of imperfect self-defense, offered to negate malice, is likewise irrelevant.” (See *People v. Tabios* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 1, 6–9 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 753]; see also *People v. Anderson* (1991) 233 Cal.App.3d 1646, 1666 [285 Cal.Rptr. 523]; *People v. Loustana* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 163, 170 [226 Cal.Rptr. 216].)

Fetus

Manslaughter does not apply to the death of a fetus. (*People v. Carlson* (1974) 37 Cal.App.3d 349, 355 [112 Cal.Rptr. 321].) While the Legislature has included the killing of a fetus, as well as a human being, within the definition of murder under Penal Code section 187, it has “left untouched the provisions of section 192, defining manslaughter [as] the ‘unlawful killing of a human being.’” (*Ibid.*)

See also the Related Issues Section to CALCRIM No. 505, *Justifiable Homicide: Self-Defense or Defense of Another*.

Reasonable Person Standard Not Modified by Evidence of Mental Impairment

In *People v. Jefferson* (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 508, 519 [14 Cal.Rptr.3d 473], the court rejected the argument that the reasonable person standard for self-defense should be the standard of a mentally ill person like the defendant. “The common law does not take account of a person’s mental capacity when determining whether he has acted as the reasonable person would have acted. The law holds ‘the mentally deranged or insane defendant accountable for his negligence as if the person were a normal, prudent person.’ (Prosser & Keeton, Torts (5th ed. 1984) § 32, p. 177.)” (*Ibid.*; see also Rest.2d Torts, § 283B.)

**840. Inflicting Injury on Spouse, Cohabitant, or Fellow Parent
Resulting in Traumatic Condition (Pen. Code, § 273.5(a))**

The defendant is charged [in Count __] with inflicting an injury on [his/her] ([former] spouse/[former] cohabitant/the (mother/father) of (his/her) child) that resulted in a traumatic condition [in violation of Penal Code section 273.5(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant willfully [and unlawfully] inflicted a physical injury on [his/her] ([former] spouse/[former] cohabitant/the (mother/father) of (his/her) child);

[AND]

2. The injury inflicted by the defendant resulted in a traumatic condition.

<Give element 3 when instructing on self-defense or defense of another>

[AND]

3. The defendant did not act (in self-defense/ [or] in defense of someone else).]

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

A *traumatic condition* is a wound or other bodily injury, whether minor or serious, caused by the direct application of physical force.

[The term *cohabitants* means two unrelated persons living together for a substantial period of time, resulting in some permanency of the relationship. Factors that may determine whether people are cohabiting include, but are not limited to, (1) sexual relations between the parties while sharing the same residence, (2) sharing of income or expenses, (3) joint use or ownership of property, (4) the parties' holding themselves out as (husband and wife/domestic partners), (5) the continuity of the relationship, and (6) the length of the relationship.]

[A person may cohabit simultaneously with two or more people at different locations, during the same time frame, if he or she maintains substantial ongoing relationships with each person and lives with each person for significant periods.]

[A person is considered to be the (mother/father) of another person's child if the alleged male parent is presumed under law to be the natural father. _____ <insert name of presumed father> is presumed under law to be the natural father of _____ <insert name of child>.]

[A traumatic condition is the *result of an injury* if:

1. The traumatic condition was the natural and probable consequence of the injury;
2. The injury was a direct and substantial factor in causing the condition;

AND

3. The condition would not have happened without the injury.

A natural and probable consequence is one that a reasonable person would know is likely to happen if nothing unusual intervenes. In deciding whether a consequence is natural and probable, consider all of the circumstances established by the evidence.

A substantial factor is more than a trivial or remote factor. However, it does not need to be the only factor that resulted in the traumatic condition.]

| New January 2006; Revised June 2007, *[insert date of council approval]*

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give an instruction defining the elements of the crime.

If there is sufficient evidence of self-defense or defense of another, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the defense. Give bracketed element 3 and any appropriate defense instructions. (See CALCRIM Nos. 3470–3477.)

If causation is at issue, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proximate cause. (*People v. Bernhardt* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 567, 590-591 [35 Cal.Rptr. 401]; *People v. Cervantes* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 860, 865–874 [111 Cal.Rptr.2d 148, 29 P.3d 225].) Give the bracketed paragraph that begins, “A traumatic condition is the *result of* an injury if”

If there is sufficient evidence that an alleged victim’s injuries were caused by an accident, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on accident. (*People v. Gonzales* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 382, 390 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 111].) Give CALCRIM No. 3404, *Accident*.

Give the bracketed language “[and unlawfully]” in element 1 if there is evidence that the defendant acted in self-defense.

Give the third bracketed sentence that begins “A person may cohabit simultaneously with two or more people,” on request if there is evidence that the defendant cohabited with two or more people. (See *People v. Moore* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1323, 1335 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 256].)

Give on request the bracketed paragraph that begins “A person is considered to be the (mother/father)” if an alleged parental relationship is based on the statutory presumption that the male parent is the natural father. (See Pen. Code, § 273.5(d); see also *People v. Vega* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 706, 711 [39 Cal.Rptr.2d 479] [parentage can be established without resort to any presumption].)

If the defendant is charged with an enhancement for a prior conviction for a similar offense within seven years and has not stipulated to the prior conviction, give CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial*. If the court has granted a bifurcated trial, see CALCRIM No. 3101, *Prior Conviction: Bifurcated Trial*.

If there is evidence that the traumatic condition resulted from strangulation or suffocation, consider instructing according to the special definition provided in Pen. Code, § 273.5.

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 273.5(a).
- Traumatic Condition Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 273.5(c); *People v. Gutierrez* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 944, 952 [217 Cal.Rptr. 616].

- Willful Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 7, subd. 1; see *People v. Lara* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 102, 107 [51 Cal.Rptr.2d 402].
- Cohabitant Defined ▶ *People v. Holifield* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 993, 1000 [252 Cal.Rptr. 729]; *People v. Ballard* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 311, 318–319 [249 Cal.Rptr. 806].
- Direct Application of Force ▶ *People v. Jackson* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 574, 580 [91 Cal.Rptr.2d 805].
- Duty to Define Traumatic Condition ▶ *People v. Burns* (1948) 88 Cal.App.2d 867, 873–874 [200 P.2d 134].
- [Strangulation and Suffocation ▶ Pen. Code, § 273.5.](#)
- General Intent Crime ▶ See *People v. Thurston* (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 1050, 1055 [84 Cal.Rptr.2d 221]; *People v. Campbell* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 305, 307–309 [90 Cal.Rptr.2d 315]; contra, *People v. Rodriguez* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 1398, 1402 [7 Cal.Rptr.2d 495] [dictum].
- Simultaneous Cohabitation ▶ *People v. Moore* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1323, 1335 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 256].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against the Person, §§ 63, 64.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, § 142.13[3] (Matthew Bender).

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

- Attempted Infliction of Corporal Punishment on Spouse ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 664, 273.5(a); *People v. Kinsey* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 1621, 1627, 1628 [47 Cal.Rptr.2d 769] [attempt requires intent to cause traumatic condition, but does not require a resulting “traumatic condition”].
- Misdemeanor Battery ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 242, 243(a); see *People v. Gutierrez* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 944, 952 [217 Cal.Rptr. 616].
- Battery Against Spouse, Cohabitant, or Fellow Parent ▶ Pen. Code, § 243(e)(1); see *People v. Jackson* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 574, 580 [91 Cal.Rptr.2d 805].

- Simple Assault ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 240, 241(a); *People v. Van Os* (1950) 96 Cal.App.2d 204, 206 [214 P.2d 554].

RELATED ISSUES

Continuous Course of Conduct

Penal Code section 273.5 is aimed at a continuous course of conduct. The prosecutor is not required to choose a particular act and the jury is not required to unanimously agree on the same act or acts before a guilty verdict can be returned. (*People v. Thompson* (1984) 160 Cal.App.3d 220, 224–225 [206 Cal.Rptr. 516].)

Multiple Acts of Abuse

A defendant can be charged with multiple violations of Penal Code section 273.5 when each battery satisfies the elements of section 273.5. (*People v. Healy* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140 [18 Cal.Rptr.2d 274].)

Prospective Parents of Unborn Children

Penal Code section 273.5(a) does not apply to a man who inflicts an injury upon a woman who is pregnant with his unborn child. “A pregnant woman is not a ‘mother’ and a fetus is not a ‘child’ as those terms are used in that section.” (*People v. Ward* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 122, 126, 129 [72 Cal.Rptr.2d 531].)

Termination of Parental Rights

Penal Code section 273.5 “applies to a man who batters the mother of his child even after parental rights to that child have been terminated.” (*People v. Mora* (1996) 51 Cal.App.4th 1349, 1356 [59 Cal.Rptr.2d 801].)

1151. Pandering (Pen. Code, § 266i)

The defendant is charged [in Count _____] with pandering [in violation of Penal Code section 266i].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of pandering, the People must prove that:

<Alternative 1A—persuaded/procured>

[1. The defendant (persuaded/procured) _____ *<insert name>* to be a prostitute(;/.)]

< Alternative 1B—promises/threats/violence used to cause person to become prostitute>

[1. The defendant used (promises[,]/ threats[,]/ violence[,]/ [or] any device or scheme) to (cause/persuade/encourage/induce) _____ *<insert name>* to become a prostitute(;/.)]

<Alternative 1C—arranged/procured a position>

[1. The defendant (arranged/procured a position) for _____ *<insert name>* to be a prostitute in either a house of prostitution or any other place where prostitution is encouraged or allowed(;/.)]

<Alternative 1D—promises/threats/violence used to cause person to remain>

[1. The defendant used (promises[,]/ threats[,]/ violence[,]/ [or] any device or scheme) to (cause/persuade/encourage/induce) _____ *<insert name>* to remain as a prostitute in a house of prostitution or any other place where prostitution is encouraged or allowed(;/.)]

<Alternative 1E—used fraud>

[1. The defendant used fraud, trickery, or duress [or abused a position of confidence or authority] to (persuade/procure) _____ *<insert name>* to (be a prostitute/enter any place where prostitution is encouraged or allowed/enter or leave California for the purpose of prostitution)(;/.)]

<Alternative 1F—received money>

1. The defendant (received/gave/agreed to receive/agreed to give) money or something of value in exchange for (persuading/attempting to persuade/procuring/attempting to procure) _____ <insert name> to (be a prostitute/enter or leave California for the purpose of prostitution)(;/.)]

[AND]

2. The defendant intended to influence _____ <insert name> to be a prostitute(;/.)]

<Give element 3 when defendant charged with pandering a minor.>

[AND

3. _____ <insert name> was (over the age of 16 years old/under the age of 16) at the time the defendant acted.]

[It does not matter whether _____ <insert name> was (a prostitute already/ [or] an undercover police officer).]

A *prostitute* is a person who engages in sexual intercourse or any lewd act with another person ~~with someone other than the defendant~~ in exchange for money [or other compensation]. **Pandering requires that thean intended act of prostitution be with someone other than the defendant.** A *lewd act* means physical contact of the genitals, buttocks, or female breast of either the prostitute or customer with some part of the other person's body for the purpose of sexual arousal or gratification.

[*Duress* means a direct or implied threat of force, violence, danger, hardship, or retribution that would cause a reasonable person to do [or submit to] something that he or she would not do [or submit to] otherwise. When deciding whether the act was accomplished by duress, consider all the circumstances, including the person's age and (her/his) relationship to the defendant.]

[Under the law, a person becomes one year older as soon as the first minute of his or her birthday has begun.]

New January 2006; Revised April 2011, February 2012

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

In element 1, give the appropriate alternative A-F depending on the evidence in the case. (See *People v. Montgomery* (1941) 47 Cal.App.2d 1, 12, 24, 27–28 [117 P.2d 437] [statutory alternatives are not mutually exclusive], disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Dillon* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 441, 454 fn. 2 [194 Cal.Rptr. 390, 668 P.2d 697] and *Murgia v. Municipal Court* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 286, 301 fn. 11 [124 Cal.Rptr. 204, 540 P.2d 44].)

The committee included “persuade” and “arrange” as options in element one because the statutory language, “procure,” may be difficult for jurors to understand.

Give bracketed element 3 if it is alleged that the person procured, or otherwise caused to act, by the defendant was a minor “over” or “under” the age of 16 years. (Pen. Code, § 266i(b).)

Give the bracketed paragraph defining duress on request if there is sufficient evidence that duress was used to procure a person for prostitution. (Pen. Code, § 266i(a)(5); see *People v. Leal* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 999, 1004–1010 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 869, 94 P.3d 1071] [definition of “duress”].)

Give the bracketed paragraph about calculating age if requested. (Fam. Code, § 6500; *In re Harris* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 813, 849–850 [21 Cal.Rptr.2d 373, 855 P.2d 391].)

Defenses—Instructional Duty

If necessary for the jury’s understanding of the case, the court must instruct **sua sponte** on a defense theory in evidence, for example, that nude modeling does not constitute an act of prostitution and that an act of procuring a person solely for the purpose of nude modeling does not violate either the pimping or pandering statute. (*People v. Hill* (1980) 103 Cal.App.3d 525, 536–537 [163 Cal.Rptr. 99].)

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 266i.
- Prostitution Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 647(b); *People v. Hill* (1980) 103 Cal.App.3d 525, 534–535 [163 Cal.Rptr. 99]; *People v. Romo* (1962) 200 Cal.App.2d 83, 90–91

[19 Cal.Rptr. 179]; *Wooten v. Superior Court* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 422, 431–433 [lewd act requires touching between prostitute and customer].

- Procurement Defined ▶ *People v. Montgomery* (1941) 47 Cal.App.2d 1, 12 [117 P.2d 437], disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Dillon* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 441, 454 fn. 2 [194 Cal.Rptr. 390, 668 P.2d 697] and *Murgia v. Municipal Court* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 286, 301 fn. 11 [124 Cal.Rptr. 204, 540 P.2d 44].
- Proof of Actual Prostitution Not Required ▶ *People v. Osuna* (1967) 251 Cal.App.2d 528, 531–532 [59 Cal.Rptr. 559].
- Duress Defined ▶ *People v. Leal* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 999, 1004–1010 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 869, 94 P.3d 1071]; *People v. Pitmon* (1985) 170 Cal.App.3d 38, 50 [216 Cal.Rptr. 221]; *People v. Cochran* (2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 8, 13–14 [126 Cal.Rptr.2d 416].
- Good Faith Belief That Minor Is 18 No Defense to Pimping and Pandering ▶ *People v. Branch* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 516, 521–522 [109 Cal.Rptr.3d 412].
- Specific Intent Crime ▶ *People v. Zambia* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 965, 980 [127 Cal.Rptr.3d 662, 254 P.3d 965].
- Victim May [Appear to] Be a Prostitute Already ▶ *People v. Zambia* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 965, 981 [127 Cal.Rptr.3d 662, 254 P.3d 965].
- Pandering Requires Services Procured for Person Other Than Defendant ▶ *People v. Dixon* (2011) 191 Cal.App.4th 1154, 1159–1160 [119 Cal.Rptr.3d 901].

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Sex Offenses and Crimes Against Decency, §§ 70–78.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 144, *Crimes Against Order*, § 144.11[3] (Matthew Bender).

Couzens & Bigelow, *Sex Crimes: California Law and Procedure* §§ 12:16, 12:17 (The Rutter Group).

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

- Attempted Pandering ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 664, 266i; *People v. Charles* (1963) 218 Cal.App.2d 812, 819 [32 Cal.Rptr. 653]; *People v. Benenato* (1946) 77 Cal.App.2d 350, 366–367 [175 P.2d 296], disapproved on other grounds in *In re Wright* (1967) 65 Cal.2d 650, 654–655, fn. 3 [56 Cal.Rptr. 110, 422 P.2d 998].

There is no crime of aiding and abetting prostitution. (*People v. Gibson* (2001) 90 Cal.App.4th 371, 385 [108 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)

RELATED ISSUES

See Related Issues section to CALCRIM No. 1150, *Pimping*.

1400. Active Participation in Criminal Street Gang (Pen. Code, § 186.22(a))

The defendant is charged [in Count ___] with participating in a criminal street gang [in violation of Penal Code section 186.22(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant actively participated in a criminal street gang;
2. When the defendant participated in the gang, (he/she) knew that members of the gang engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal gang activity;
3. The defendant willfully assisted, furthered, or promoted felonious criminal conduct by members of the gang either by:
 - a. directly and actively committing a felony offense;

OR

 - b. aiding and abetting a felony offense.

Active participation means involvement with a criminal street gang in a way that is more than passive or in name only.

[The People do not have to prove that the defendant devoted all or a substantial part of (his/her) time or efforts to the gang, or that (he/she) was an actual member of the gang.]

<If criminal street gang has already been defined.>

[A *criminal street gang* is defined in another instruction to which you should refer.]

<If criminal street gang has not already been defined in another instruction.>

[A *criminal street gang* is any ongoing organization, association, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal:

1. That has a common name or common identifying sign or symbol;

2. That has, as one or more of its primary activities, the commission of _____ <insert one or more crimes listed in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33)>;

AND

3. Whose members, whether acting alone or together, engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal gang activity.

In order to qualify as a *primary* activity, the crime must be one of the group's chief or principal activities rather than an occasional act committed by one or more persons who happen to be members of the group.

<Give this paragraph only when the conduct that establishes the primary activity, i.e., predicate offenses, has not resulted in a conviction or sustained juvenile petition.>

[To decide whether the organization, association, or group has, as one of its primary activities, the commission of _____ <insert felony or felonies from Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33)> please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

A pattern of criminal gang activity, as used here, means:

1. [The] (commission of[,]/ [or] attempted commission of[,]/ [or] conspiracy to commit[,]/ [or] solicitation to commit[,]/ [or] conviction of[,]/ [or] (Having/having) a juvenile petition sustained for commission of)

<Give 1A if the crime or crimes are in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33).>

1A. (any combination of two or more of the following crimes/[,][or] two or more occurrences of [one or more of the following crimes]:)

_____ <insert one or more crimes listed in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33)>;

[OR]

<Give 1B if one or more of the crimes are in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(26)–(30).>

1B. [at least one of the following crimes:] _____ *<insert one or more crimes from Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33)>*;

AND

[at least one of the following crimes:] _____ *<insert one or more crimes in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(26)–(30)>*;

- 2. At least one of those crimes was committed after September 26, 1988;**
- 3. The most recent crime occurred within three years of one of the earlier crimes;**

AND

- 4. The crimes were committed on separate occasions or were personally committed by two or more persons.]**

<Give this paragraph only when the conduct that establishes the pattern of criminal gang activity, i.e., predicate offenses, has not resulted in a conviction or sustained juvenile petition.>

[To decide whether a member of the gang [or the defendant] committed _____ *<insert felony or felonies from Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(33)>* please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

The People need not prove that every perpetrator involved in the pattern of criminal gang activity, if any, was a member of the alleged criminal street gang at the time when such activity was taking place.

[The crimes, if any, that establish a pattern of criminal gang activity, need not be gang-related.]

[If you find the defendant guilty of a crime in this case, you may consider that crime in deciding whether one of the group’s primary activities was commission of that crime and whether a pattern of criminal gang activity has been proved.]

[You may not find that there was a pattern of criminal gang activity unless all of you agree that two or more crimes that satisfy these requirements were committed, but you do not have to all agree on which crimes were committed.]

As the term is used here, a *willful act* is one done willingly or on purpose.

Felonious criminal conduct means committing or attempting to commit [any of] the following crime[s]: _____ <insert felony or felonies by gang members that the defendant is alleged to have furthered, assisted, promoted or directly committed>.

[To decide whether a member of the gang [or the defendant] committed _____ <insert felony or felonies listed immediately above>, please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

To prove that the defendant aided and abetted felonious criminal conduct by a member of the gang, the People must prove that:

1. A member of the gang committed the crime;
2. The defendant knew that the gang member intended to commit the crime;
3. Before or during the commission of the crime, the defendant intended to aid and abet the gang member in committing the crime;

AND

4. The defendant's words or conduct did in fact aid and abet the commission of the crime.

Someone *aids and abets* a crime if he or she knows of the perpetrator's unlawful purpose and he or she specifically intends to, and does in fact, aid, facilitate, promote, encourage, or instigate the perpetrator's commission of that crime.

[If you conclude that defendant was present at the scene of the crime or failed to prevent the crime, you may consider that fact in determining whether the defendant was an aider and abettor. However, the fact that a person is present at the scene of a crime or fails to prevent the crime does not, by itself, make him or her an aider and abettor.]

[A person who aids and abets a crime is not guilty of that crime if he or she withdraws before the crime is committed. To withdraw, a person must do two things:

1. **He or she must notify everyone else he or she knows is involved in the commission of the crime that he or she is no longer participating. The notification must be made early enough to prevent the commission of the crime;**

AND

2. **He or she must do everything reasonably within his or her power to prevent the crime from being committed. He or she does not have to actually prevent the crime.**

The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not withdraw. If the People have not met this burden, you may not find the defendant guilty under an aiding and abetting theory.]

New January 2006; Revised August 2006, June 2007, December 2008

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give an instruction defining the elements of the crime.

In element 2 of the paragraph defining a “criminal street gang,” insert one or more of the crimes listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33) that are alleged to be the primary activities of the gang. (See *People v. Sengpadychith* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 316, 323–324 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 851, 27 P.3d 739].)

In element 1A of the paragraph defining a “pattern of criminal gang activity,” insert one or more of the crimes listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e) that have been committed, attempted, or solicited two or more times (See *In re Nathaniel C.* (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 990, 1002–1003 [279 Cal.Rptr. 236] [two instances of same offense, or single incident with multiple participants committing one or more specified offenses, are sufficient]) if the alleged crime or crimes are listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33). Give on request the bracketed phrase “any combination of” if two or more different crimes are inserted in the blank. If one or more of the alleged crimes are listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(26)–(30), give element 1B and insert that crime or crimes and one or more of the crimes listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33). (See Pen. Code, § 186.22(j) [“A pattern of gang activity cannot be established solely by proof of commission of offenses enumerated in paragraphs (26) to (30), inclusive, of subdivision (e), alone.”].)

In the definition of “felonious criminal conduct,” insert the felony or felonies the defendant allegedly aided and abetted. (See *People v. Green* (1991) 227 Cal.App.3d 692, 704 [278 Cal.Rptr. 140].) Note that a defendant’s misdemeanor conduct in the charged case, which is elevated to a felony by operation of Penal Code section 186.22(a), is not sufficient to satisfy the felonious criminal conduct requirement of an active gang participation offense charged under subdivision (a) of section 186.22 or of active gang participation charged as an element of felony firearm charges under section 12025(b)(3) or 12031(a)(2)(C). *People v. Lamas* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 516, 524 [67 Cal.Rptr.3d 179, 169 P.3d 102].

The court should also give the appropriate instructions defining the elements of crimes inserted in the list of alleged “primary activities,” or the definition of “pattern of criminal gang activity” that have not been established by prior convictions or sustained juvenile petitions. The court should also give the appropriate instructions defining the elements of all crimes inserted in the definition of “felonious criminal conduct.”

On request, give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “The People do not need to prove that the defendant devoted all or a substantial part of” (See Pen. Code, § 186.22(i).)

On request, give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If you find the defendant guilty of a crime in this case.” (*People v. Sengpadychith* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 316, 322–323 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 851, 27 P.3d 739]; *People v. Duran* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1448, 1464–1465 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 272].)

On request, give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “You may not find that there was a pattern of criminal gang activity.” (*People v. Funes* (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1506, 1527–1528 [28 Cal.Rptr.2d 758]; see also Related Issues section below on Unanimity.)

On request, the court must give a limiting instruction on the gang evidence. (*People v. Hernandez* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1040, 1051–1052 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 880, 94 P.3d 1080].) If requested, give CALCRIM No. 1403, *Limited Purpose of Evidence of Gang Activity*.

Defenses—Instructional Duty

If there is evidence that the defendant was merely present at the scene or only had knowledge that a crime was being committed, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If you conclude that defendant was present.” (*People v. Boyd* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 541, 557 fn. 14 [271 Cal.Rptr. 738]; *In re Michael T.* (1978) 84 Cal.App.3d 907, 911 [149 Cal.Rptr. 87].)

If there is sufficient evidence that the defendant withdrew, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to give the final bracketed section on the defense of withdrawal.

Related Instructions

This instruction should be used when a defendant is charged with a violation of Penal Code section 186.22(a) as a substantive offense. If the defendant is charged with an enhancement under 186.22(b), use CALCRIM No. 1401, *Felony or Misdemeanor Committed for Benefit of Criminal Street Gang* (Pen. Code, § 186.22(b)(1) (Felony) and § 186.22(d) (Felony or Misdemeanor)).

For additional instructions relating to liability as an aider and abettor, see the Aiding and Abetting series (CALCRIM No. 400 et seq.).

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 186.22(a); *People v. Herrera* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1456, 1468 [83 Cal.Rptr.2d 307].
- Active Participation Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 186.22(i); *People v. Castenada* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 743, 747 [97 Cal.Rptr.2d 906, 3 P.3d 278].
- Criminal Street Gang Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 186.22(f); see *People v. Duran* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1448, 1464–1465 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 272].
- Pattern of Criminal Gang Activity Defined ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 186.22(e), (j); *People v. Gardeley* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 605, 624–625 [59 Cal.Rptr.2d 356, 927 P.2d 713]; *In re Nathaniel C.* (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 990, 1002–1003 [279 Cal.Rptr. 236].
- Willful Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 7(1).
- Applies to Both Perpetrator and Aider and Abettor ▶ *People v. Ngoun* (2001) 88 Cal.App.4th 432, 436 [105 Cal.Rptr.2d 837]; *People v. Castenada* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 743, 749–750 [97 Cal.Rptr.2d 906, 3 P.3d 278].
- Felonious Criminal Conduct Defined ▶ [*People v. Albillar* \(2010\) 51 Cal.4th 47, 54-59](#); *People v. Green* (1991) 227 Cal.App.3d 692, 704 [278 Cal.Rptr. 140].
- Separate Intent From Underlying Felony ▶ *People v. Herrera* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1456, 1467–1468 [83 Cal.Rptr.2d 307].
- Willfully Assisted, Furthered, or Promoted Felonious Criminal Conduct ▶ *People v. Salcido* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 356.
- [Temporal Connection Between Active Participation and Felonious Criminal Conduct](#) ▶ *People v. Garcia* (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 1499, 1509 [64 Cal.Rptr.3d 104, 111].

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, Cal. Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 23–28.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 144, *Crimes Against Order*, § 144.03 (Matthew Bender).

COMMENTARY

The jury may consider past offenses as well as circumstances of the charged crime. (*People v. Duran* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1448, 1464–1465 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 272]; *People v. Sengpadychith* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 316, 322–323 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 851, 27 P.3d 739], disapproving *In re Elodio O.* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 1175, 1181 [66 Cal.Rptr.2d 95], to the extent it only allowed evidence of past offenses.) A “pattern of criminal gang activity” requires two or more “predicate offenses” during a statutory time period. The charged crime may serve as a predicate offense (*People v. Gardeley* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 605, 624–625 [59 Cal.Rptr.2d 356, 927 P.2d 713]), as can another offense committed on the same occasion by a fellow gang member. (*People v. Loeun* (1997) 17 Cal.4th 1, 9–10 [69 Cal.Rptr.2d 776, 947 P.2d 1313]; see also *In re Nathaniel C.* (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 990, 1002–1003 [279 Cal.Rptr. 236] [two incidents each with single perpetrator, or single incident with multiple participants committing one or more specified offenses, are sufficient]; *People v. Ortiz* (1997) 57 Cal.App.4th 480, 484 [67 Cal.Rptr.2d 126].) However, convictions of a perpetrator and an aider and abettor for a single crime establish only one predicate offense (*People v. Zermeno* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 927, 931–932 [89 Cal.Rptr.2d 863, 986 P.2d 196]), and “[c]rimes occurring *after* the charged offense cannot serve as predicate offenses to prove a pattern of criminal gang activity.” (*People v. Duran*, *supra*, 97 Cal.App.4th at 1458 [original italics].) The “felonious criminal conduct” need not be gang-related. (*People v. Albillar* (2010) 51 Cal.4th 47, 54-59.)

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

Predicate Offenses Not Lesser Included Offenses

The predicate offenses that establish a pattern of criminal gang activity are not lesser included offenses of active participation in a criminal street gang. (*People v. Burnell* (2005) 132 Cal.App.4th 938, 944–945 [34 Cal.Rptr.3d 40].)

RELATED ISSUES

Conspiracy

Anyone who actively participates in a criminal street gang with knowledge that its members engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal gang activity, and

who willfully promotes, furthers, assists, or benefits from any felonious criminal conduct by the members, is guilty of conspiracy to commit that felony. (Pen. Code, § 182.5; see Pen. Code, § 182 and CALCRIM No. 415, *Conspiracy*.)

Labor Organizations or Mutual Aid Activities

The California Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act does not apply to labor organization activities or to employees engaged in activities for their mutual aid and protection. (Pen. Code, § 186.23.)

Related Gang Crimes

Soliciting or recruiting others to participate in a criminal street gang, or threatening someone to coerce them to join or prevent them from leaving a gang, are separate crimes. (Pen. Code, § 186.26.) It is also a crime to supply a firearm to someone who commits a specified felony while participating in a criminal street gang. (Pen. Code, § 186.28.)

Unanimity

The “continuous-course-of-conduct exception” applies to the “pattern of criminal gang activity” element of Penal Code section 186.22(a). Thus the jury is not required to unanimously agree on which two or more crimes constitute a pattern of criminal activity. (*People v. Funes* (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1506, 1527–1528 [28 Cal.Rptr.2d 758].)

1401. Felony or Misdemeanor Committed for Benefit of Criminal Street Gang (Pen. Code, § 186.22(b)(1) (Felony) and § 186.22(d) (Felony or Misdemeanor))

If you find the defendant guilty of the crime[s] charged in Count[s] __[,] [or of attempting to commit (that/those crime[s])][,] [or the lesser offense[s] of _____ <insert lesser offense[s]>], you must then decide whether[, for each crime,] the People have proved the additional allegation that the defendant committed that crime (for the benefit of[,]/ at the direction of[,]/ [or] in association with) a criminal street gang. [You must decide whether the People have proved this allegation for each crime and return a separate finding for each crime.]

[You must also decide whether the crime[s] charged in Count[s] ____ (was/were) committed on the grounds of, or within 1,000 feet of a public or private (elementary/ [or] vocational/ [or] junior high/ [or] middle school/ [or] high) school open to or being used by minors for classes or school-related programs at the time.]

To prove this allegation, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant (committed/ [or] attempted to commit) the crime (for the benefit of[,]/ at the direction of[,]/ [or] in association with) a criminal street gang;

AND

2. The defendant intended to assist, further, or promote criminal conduct by gang members.

<If criminal street gang has already been defined.>

[A criminal street gang is defined in another instruction to which you should refer.]

<If criminal street gang has not already been defined in another instruction.>

[A *criminal street gang* is any ongoing organization, association, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal:

1. That has a common name or common identifying sign or symbol;

2. That has, as one or more of its primary activities, the commission of _____ <insert one or more crimes listed in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)-(25), (31)-(33)>;

AND

3. Whose members, whether acting alone or together, engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal gang activity.

In order to qualify as a *primary* activity, the crime must be one of the group's chief or principal activities rather than an occasional act committed by one or more persons who happen to be members of the group.

<Give this paragraph only when the conduct that establishes the primary activity, i.e., predicate offenses, has not resulted in a conviction or sustained juvenile petition.>

[To decide whether the organization, association, or group has, as one of its primary activities, the commission of _____ <insert felony or felonies from Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)-(25), (31)-(33)> please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

A pattern of criminal gang activity, as used here, means:

1. [The] (commission of[,] [or]/ attempted commission of[,] [or]/ conspiracy to commit[,] [or]/ solicitation to commit[,] [or]/ conviction of[,] [or]/ (Having/having) a juvenile petition sustained for commission of):

<Give 1A if the crime or crimes are in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)-(25), (31)-(33).>

1A. (any combination of two or more of the following crimes/[,][or] two or more occurrences of [one or more of the following crimes]:)

_____ <insert one or more crimes listed in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)-(25), (31)-(33)>;

[OR]

<Give 1B if one or more of the crimes are in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(26)-(30).>

1B. [at least one of the following crimes:]_____ <insert one or more crimes from Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)-(25), (31)-(33)>;

AND

[at least one of the following crimes:] _____ <insert one or more crimes in Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(26)–(30)>;

2. At least one of those crimes was committed after September 26, 1988;
3. The most recent crime occurred within three years of one of the earlier crimes;

AND

4. The crimes were committed on separate occasions or were personally committed by two or more persons.]

<Give this paragraph only when the conduct that establishes the pattern of criminal gang activity, i.e., predicate offenses, has not resulted in a conviction or sustained juvenile petition.>

[To decide whether a member of the gang [or the defendant] committed _____ <insert felony or felonies from Pen. Code, § 186.22(e)(1)–(33)> please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

[The crimes, if any, that establish a pattern of criminal gang activity, need not be gang-related.]

[The People need not prove that the defendant is an active or current member of the alleged criminal street gang.]

[If you find the defendant guilty of a crime in this case, you may consider that crime in deciding whether one of the group’s primary activities was commission of that crime and whether a pattern of criminal gang activity has been proved.]

[You may not find that there was a pattern of criminal gang activity unless all of you agree that two or more crimes that satisfy these requirements were committed, but you do not have to all agree on which crimes were committed.]

The People have the burden of proving each allegation beyond a reasonable doubt. If the People have not met this burden, you must find that the allegation has not been proved.

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the sentencing enhancement. (*People v. Sengpadychith* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 316, 327 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 851, 27 P.3d 739]; *Apprendi v. New Jersey* (2000) 530 U.S. 466, 475–476, 490 [120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435].)

In element 2 of the paragraph defining a “criminal street gang,” insert one or more of the crimes listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33) that are alleged to be the primary activities of the gang. (See *People v. Sengpadychith*, *supra*, 26 Cal.4th at 323–324.)

In element 1A of the paragraph defining a “pattern of criminal gang activity,” insert one or more of the crimes listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e) that have been committed, attempted, or solicited two or more times (See *In re Nathaniel C.* (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 990, 1002–1003 [279 Cal.Rptr. 236] [two instances of same offense, or single incident with multiple participants committing one or more specified offenses, are sufficient].) if the alleged crime or crimes are listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33). Give on request the bracketed phrase “any combination of” if two or more different crimes are inserted in the blank. If one or more of the alleged crimes are listed in Penal Code section 186.22(e)(26)–(30), give element 1B and insert that crime or crimes and one or more of the crimes listed in Penal Code section 182.22(e)(1)–(25), (31)–(33). (See Pen. Code, § 186.22(j) [“A pattern of gang activity cannot be established solely by proof of commission of offenses enumerated in paragraphs (26) to (30), inclusive, of subdivision (e), alone.”].)

The court should also give the appropriate instructions defining the elements of crimes inserted in the list of alleged “primary activities,” or the definition of “pattern of criminal gang activity” that have not been established by prior convictions or sustained juvenile petitions.

On request, give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If you find the defendant guilty of a crime in this case.” (*People v. Sengpadychith* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 316, 322–323 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 851, 27 P.3d 739]; *People v. Duran* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1448, 1464–1465 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 272].)

On request, give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “You may not find that there was a pattern of criminal gang activity.” (*People v. Funes* (1994) 23

Cal.App.4th 1506, 1527–1528 [28 Cal.Rptr.2d 758]; see also Related Issues section below on Unanimity.)

On request, the court must give a limiting instruction on the gang evidence. (*People v. Hernandez* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1040, 1051–1052 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 880, 94 P.3d 1080].) If requested, give CALCRIM No. 1403, *Limited Purpose of Gang Evidence*.

The court may bifurcate the trial on the gang enhancement, at its discretion. (*People v. Hernandez* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1040, 1048 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 880, 94 P.3d 1080].)

Related Instructions

CALCRIM No. 1400, *Active Participation in Criminal Street Gang*.

AUTHORITY

- Enhancement ▶ Pen. Code, § 186.22(b)(1).
- “For the Benefit of, at the Direction of, or in Association With Any Criminal Street Gang” Defined ▶ *People v. Albillar* (2010) 51 Cal.4th 47, 59-64 [119 Cal.Rptr.3d 415].
- Specific Intent Defined ▶ *People v. Albillar* (2010) 51 Cal.4th 47, 64-68 [119 Cal.Rptr.3d 415].
- Criminal Street Gang Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 186.22(f); see *People v. Duran* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1448, 1464–1465 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 272].
- Pattern of Criminal Gang Activity Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 186.22(e), (j); *People v. Gardeley* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 605, 624–625 [59 Cal.Rptr.2d 356, 927 P.2d 713]; *In re Nathaniel C.* (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 990, 1002–1003 [279 Cal.Rptr. 236]; see *People v. Zermeno* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 927, 931–932 [89 Cal.Rptr.2d 863, 986 P.2d 196] [conviction of perpetrator and aider and abettor for single crime establishes only single predicate offense].
- Active or Current Participation in Gang Not Required ▶ *In re Ramon T.* (1997) 57 Cal.App.4th 201, 207 [66 Cal.Rptr.2d 816].
- Primary Activities Defined ▶ *People v. Sengpadychith* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 316, 323–324 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 851, 27 P.3d 739].

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, Cal. Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, § 25.

5 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 91, *Sentencing*, § 91.43 (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 144, *Crimes Against Order*, § 144.03 (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Commission On or Near School Grounds

In imposing a sentence under Penal Code section 186.22(b)(1), it is a circumstance in aggravation if the defendant's underlying felony was committed on or within 1,000 feet of specified schools. (Pen. Code, § 186.22(b)(2).)

Enhancements for Multiple Gang Crimes

Separate criminal street gang enhancements may be applied to gang crimes committed against separate victims at different times and places, with multiple criminal intents. (*People v. Akins* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 331, 339–340 [65 Cal.Rptr.2d 338].)

Wobblers

Specific punishments apply to any person convicted of an offense punishable as a felony or a misdemeanor that is committed for the benefit of a criminal street gang and with the intent to promote criminal conduct by gang members. (See Pen. Code, § 186.22(d); see also *Robert L. v. Superior Court* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 894, 909 [135 Cal.Rptr.2d 30, 69 P.3d 951].) However, the felony enhancement provided by Penal Code section 186.22(b)(1) cannot be applied to a misdemeanor offense made a felony pursuant to section 186.22(d). (*People v. Arroyas* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1439, 1449 [118 Cal.Rptr.2d 380].)

Murder—Enhancements Under Penal Code section 186.22(b)(1) May Not Apply at Sentencing

The enhancements provided by Penal Code section 186.22(b)(1) do not apply to crimes “punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for life . . .” (Pen. Code, § 186.22(b)(5); *People v. Lopez* (2005) 34 Cal.4th 1002, 1004 [22 Cal.Rptr.3d 869, 103 P.3d 270].) Thus, the ten-year enhancement provided by Penal Code section 186.22(b)(1)(C) for a violent felony committed for the benefit of the street gang may not apply in some sentencing situations involving the crime of murder.

See also the Related Issues section to CALCRIM No. 1400, *Active Participation in Criminal Street Gang*.

2040. Unauthorized Use of Personal Identifying Information (Pen. Code, § 530.5(a))

The defendant is charged [in Count ___] with the unauthorized use of someone else's personal identifying information [in violation of Penal Code section 530.5(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant willfully obtained someone else's personal identifying information;
2. The defendant willfully used that information for an unlawful purpose;

AND

3. The defendant used the information without the consent of the person whose identifying information (he/she) was using.

Personal identifying information means _____ <insert relevant items from Pen. Code, § 530.55(b)> or an equivalent form of identification.

[As used here, *person* means a human being, whether living or dead, or a firm, association, organization, partnership, business trust, company, corporation, limited liability company, public entity, or any other legal entity.]

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

An *unlawful purpose* includes unlawfully (obtaining/[or] attempting to obtain) (credit[,]/[or] goods[,]/[or] services[,]/[or] real property[,]/ [or] medical information) ~~in the name of the other person~~ without the consent of the eat other person [[or] _____ <insert other unlawful purpose>].

It is not necessary that anyone actually be defrauded or actually suffer a financial, legal, or property loss as a result of the defendant's acts.

New January 2006; Revised August 2006, June 2007, August 2009, April 2010

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

In the definition of personal identifying information, give the relevant items based on the evidence presented.

The definition of unlawful purpose is not limited to acquiring information for financial motives, and may include any unlawful purpose for which the defendant may have acquired the personal identifying information, such as using the information to facilitate violation of a restraining order. (See, e.g., *People v. Tillotson* (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 517, 533 [69 Cal.Rptr.3d 42].)

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 530.5(a).
- Personal Identifying Information Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 530.55(b).
- Person Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 530.55(a).

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Property, § 209.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 143, *Crimes Against Property*, § 143.01[1], [4][h] (Matthew Bender).

**2100. Driving a Vehicle or Operating a Vessel Under the Influence
Causing Injury (Veh. Code, § 23153(a))**

The defendant is charged [in Count ___] with causing injury to another person while (driving a vehicle/operating a vessel) under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug) [or under the combined influence of an alcoholic beverage and a drug] [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23153(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant (drove a vehicle/operated a vessel);
2. When (he/she) (drove a vehicle/operated a vessel), the defendant was under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug) [or under the combined influence of an alcoholic beverage and a drug].
3. While (driving a vehicle/operating a vessel) under the influence, the defendant also (committed an illegal act/ [or] neglected to perform a legal duty);

AND

4. The defendant's (illegal act/ [or] failure to perform a legal duty) caused bodily injury to another person.

A person is *under the influence* if, as a result of (drinking [or consuming] an alcoholic beverage/ [and/or] taking a drug), his or her mental or physical abilities are so impaired that he or she is no longer able to (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel) with the caution of a sober person, using ordinary care, under similar circumstances.

[An *alcoholic beverage* is a liquid or solid material intended to be consumed that contains ethanol. Ethanol is also known as ethyl alcohol, drinking alcohol, or alcohol. [An *alcoholic beverage* includes _____ <insert type[s] of beverage[s] from Veh. Code, § 109 or Bus. & Prof. Code, § 23004, e.g., wine, beer>.]

[A *drug* is a substance or combination of substances, other than alcohol, that could so affect the nervous system, brain, or muscles of a person that it would appreciably impair his or her ability to (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel) as an ordinarily cautious person, in full possession of his or her faculties and using

reasonable care, would (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel) under similar circumstances.

[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more at the time of the chemical analysis, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant was under the influence of an alcoholic beverage at the time of the alleged offense.]

[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Health Services.]

[The People allege that the defendant committed the following illegal act[s]: _____ <list name[s] of offense[s]>.

To decide whether the defendant committed _____ <list name[s] of offense[s]>, please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

[The People [also] allege that the defendant failed to perform the following legal (duty/duties) while (driving the vehicle/operating the vessel): (the duty to exercise ordinary care at all times and to maintain proper control of the (vehicle/vessel)/_____ <insert other duty or duties alleged>).]

[You may not find the defendant guilty unless all of you agree that the People have proved that the defendant (committed [at least] one illegal act/[or] failed to perform [at least] one duty).

<Alternative A—unanimity required; see Bench Notes>

[You must all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]

<Alternative B—unanimity not required; see Bench Notes>

[But you do not have to all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]

[Using *ordinary care* means using reasonable care to prevent reasonably foreseeable harm to someone else. A person fails to exercise ordinary care if he or she (does something that a reasonably careful person would not do in the same situation/ [or] fails to do something that a reasonably careful person would do in the same situation).]

[An act causes bodily injury to another person if the injury is the direct, natural, and probable consequence of the act and the injury would not have happened without the act. A *natural and probable consequence* is one that a

reasonable person would know is likely to happen if nothing unusual intervenes. In deciding whether a consequence is natural and probable, consider all the circumstances established by the evidence.]

[There may be more than one cause of injury. An act causes bodily injury to another person only if it is a substantial factor in causing the injury. A *substantial factor* is more than a trivial or remote factor. However, it need not be the only factor that causes the injury.]

[It is not a defense that the defendant was legally entitled to use the drug.]

[If the defendant was under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [and/or] a drug), then it is not a defense that something else also impaired (his/her) ability to (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel).]

New January 2006; Revised June 2007, April 2008, December 2008

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant committed an act forbidden by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to specify the predicate offense alleged and to instruct on the elements of that offense. (*People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].)

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant neglected to perform a duty imposed by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the duty allegedly neglected. (See *People v. Minor, supra*, 28 Cal.App.4th at pp. 438–439.) If the prosecution alleges that the defendant neglected the general duty of every driver to exercise ordinary care (see *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243]), the court should give the bracketed definition of “ordinary care.”

If causation is at issue, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proximate cause. (*People v. Bernhardt* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 567, 590–591 [35 Cal.Rptr. 401].) If the evidence indicates that there was only one cause of injury, the court should give the first bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “direct, natural, and probable” language. If there is evidence of multiple causes of injury, the court should also give the second bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “substantial factor” definition. (See *People v. Autry* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 351, 363 [43 Cal.Rptr.2d 135]; *People v. Pike* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 732, 746–747 [243 Cal.Rptr. 54].)

There is a split in authority over whether there is a **sua sponte** duty to give a unanimity instruction when multiple predicate offenses are alleged. (*People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30] [unanimity instruction required], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735] [unanimity instruction not required but preferable]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438] [unanimity instruction not required]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906] [unanimity instruction not required, failure to give harmless error if was required].) If the court concludes that a unanimity instruction is appropriate, give the unanimity alternative A. If the court concludes that unanimity is not required, give the unanimity alternative B.

[If the defendant provides substantial evidence of involuntary unconsciousness as a defense to the violation of law or failure to perform a duty, see *People v. Wells* \(2012\) 204 Cal.App.4th 743 \[139 Cal.Rptr.3d 422\].](#)

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent” explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23610; Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent” if there is no evidence that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was at or above 0.08 percent at the time of the test. In addition, if the test falls within the range in which no presumption applies, 0.05 percent to just below 0.08 percent, do not give this bracketed sentence. (*People v. Wood* (1989) 207 Cal.App.3d Supp. 11, 15 [255 Cal.Rptr. 537].) The court should also consider whether there is sufficient evidence to establish that the test result exceeds the margin of error before giving this instruction for test results of 0.08 percent. (Compare *People v. Campos* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 4–5 [188 Cal.Rptr. 366], with *People v. Randolph* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 11 [262 Cal.Rptr. 378].)

The statute also creates a rebuttable presumption that the defendant was not under the influence if his or her blood alcohol level was less than 0.05 percent. (*People v. Gallardo* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 489, 496 [27 Cal.Rptr.2d 502].) Depending on the facts of the case, the defendant may be entitled to a pinpoint instruction on this presumption. It is not error to refuse an instruction on this presumption if the prosecution’s theory is that the defendant was under the combined influence of

drugs and alcohol. (*People v. Andersen* (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 1241, 1250 [32 Cal.Rptr.2d 442].)

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayian* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

Give the bracketed sentence stating that “it is not a defense that something else also impaired (his/her) ability to drive” if there is evidence of an additional source of impairment such as an epileptic seizure, inattention, or falling asleep.

If the defendant is charged with one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) If the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*. If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 690].)

| On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

Defenses—Instructional Duty

On request, if supported by the evidence, the court must instruct on the “imminent peril/sudden emergency” doctrine. (*People v. Boulware* (1940) 41 Cal.App.2d 268, 269–270 [106 P.2d 436].) The court may use the bracketed instruction on sudden emergency in CALCRIM No. 590, *Gross Vehicular Manslaughter While Intoxicated*.

Related Instructions

CALCRIM No. 2101, *Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol Causing Injury*.

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

CALCRIM No. 595, *Vehicular Manslaughter: Speeding Laws Defined*.

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23153(a); *People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641].
- Alcoholic Beverage Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 109, Bus. & Prof. Code, § 23004.
- Drug Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 312.
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, § 23610; Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Under the Influence Defined ▶ *People v. Schoonover* (1970) 5 Cal.App.3d 101, 105–107 [85 Cal.Rptr. 69]; *People v. Enriquez* (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 661, 665–666 [49 Cal.Rptr.2d 710].
- Must Instruct on Elements of Predicate Offense ▶ *People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].
- Negligence—Ordinary Care ▶ Pen. Code, § 7, subd. 2; Restatement Second of Torts, § 282; *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243] [ordinary negligence standard applies to driving under the influence causing injury].
- Causation ▶ *People v. Rodriguez* (1960) 186 Cal.App.2d 433, 440 [8 Cal.Rptr. 863].
- Legal Entitlement to Use Drug Not a Defense ▶ Veh. Code, § 23630.
- Unanimity Instruction ▶ *People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 205–210.

2 Witkin, *California Evidence* (4th ed. 2000) Demonstrative Evidence, § 54.

5 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 91, *Sentencing*, § 91.36 (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02 (Matthew Bender).

LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

- Misdemeanor Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(a) & (b); *People v. Capetillo* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 211, 220 [269 Cal.Rptr. 250].
- Driving Under the Influence Causing Injury is not a lesser included offense of vehicular manslaughter without gross negligence ▶ *People v. Binkerd* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 1143, 1148–1149 [66 Cal.Rptr.3d 675].

RELATED ISSUES

DUI Cannot Serve as Predicate Unlawful Act

“[T]he evidence must show an unlawful act or neglect of duty *in addition to* driving under the influence.” (*People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641] [italics in original]; *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 668 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243].)

Act Forbidden by Law

The term “ ‘any act forbidden by law’ . . . refers to acts forbidden by the Vehicle Code” (*People v. Clenney* (1958) 165 Cal.App.2d 241, 253 [331 P.2d 696].) The defendant must commit the act when driving the vehicle. (*People v. Capetillo* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 211, 217 [269 Cal.Rptr. 250] [violation of Veh. Code, § 10851 not sufficient because offense not committed “when” defendant was driving the vehicle but by mere fact that defendant was driving the vehicle].)

Neglect of Duty Imposed by Law

“In proving the person neglected any duty imposed by law in driving the vehicle, it is not necessary to prove that any specific section of [the Vehicle Code] was violated.” (Veh. Code, § 23153(c); *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243].) “[The] neglect of duty element . . . is satisfied by evidence which establishes that the defendant’s conduct amounts to no more than ordinary negligence.” (*People v. Oyaas, supra*, 173 Cal.App.3d at p. 669.) “[T]he

law imposes on any driver [the duty] to exercise ordinary care at all times and to maintain a proper control of his or her vehicle.” (*Id.* at p. 670.)

Multiple Victims to One Drunk Driving Accident

“In *Wilkoff v. Superior Court* [(1985) 38 Cal.3d 345, 352 [211 Cal.Rptr. 742, 696 P.2d 134]] we held that a defendant cannot be charged with multiple counts of felony drunk driving under Vehicle Code section 23153, subdivision (a), where injuries to several people result from one act of drunk driving.” (*People v. McFarland* (1989) 47 Cal.3d 798, 802 [254 Cal.Rptr. 331, 765 P.2d 493].) However, when “a defendant commits vehicular manslaughter with gross negligence[,] . . . he may properly be punished for [both the vehicular manslaughter and] injury to a separate individual that results from the same incident.” (*Id.* at p. 804.) The prosecution may also charge an enhancement for multiple victims under Vehicle Code section 23558.

See also the Related Issues section in CALCRIM No. 2110, *Driving Under the Influence*.

**2624. Threatening a Witness After Testimony or Information Given
(Pen. Code, § 140(a))**

The defendant is charged [in Count ___] with (using force/ [or] threatening to use force) against a witness [in violation of Penal Code section 140(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. _____ <insert name/description of person allegedly targeted> gave (assistance/ [or] information) to a (law enforcement officer/public prosecutor) in a (criminal case/juvenile court case);

[AND]

2. The defendant willfully (used force/ [or] threatened to use force or violence against _____ <insert name/description of person allegedly targeted>/ [or] threatened to take, damage, or destroy the property of _____ <insert name/description of person allegedly targeted>) because (he/she) had given that (assistance/[or] information).

<Give the following language if the violation is based on a threat>

[AND]

[3. A reasonable listener would interpret the threat, in light of the context and surrounding circumstances, as a serious expression of intent to commit an act of unlawful force or violence rather than just an expression of jest or frustration;]

[OR]

[(3./4.) A reasonable listener would interpret the threat, in light of the context and surrounding circumstances, as a serious expression of intent to commit an act of unlawful taking, damage or destruction of property rather than just an expression of jest or frustration.]

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

[An officer or employee of (a/an) (local police department[,]/ [or] sheriff's office[,]/ [or] _____ <insert title of agency of peace officer enumerated in Pen. Code, § 13519(b)>) is a *law enforcement officer*.]

[A lawyer employed by (a/an/the) (district attorney's office[,]/ [or] Attorney General's office[,]/ [or] city (prosecutor's/attorney's) office) to prosecute cases is a *public prosecutor*.]

[The People do not need to prove that the threat was communicated to _____ <insert name/description of person allegedly targeted> or that (he/she) was aware of the threat.]

New January 2006

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 140(a).
- Witness Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 136(2).
- Victim Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 136(3).
- Public Prosecutor Defined ▶ Gov. Code, §§ 26500, 12550, 41803.
- Law Enforcement Officer Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 13519(b).
- General Intent Offense ▶ *People v. McDaniel* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 278, 283 [27 Cal.Rptr.2d 306].
- Threat Need Not Be Communicated to Target ▶ *People v. McLaughlin* (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 836, 842 [54 Cal.Rptr.2d 4].
- Reasonable Listener Standard ▶ *People v. Lowery* (2011) 52 Cal.4th 419, 427 [128 Cal.Rptr.3d 648].

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Governmental Authority, § 9.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 140, *Challenges to Crimes*, § 140.02; Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, § 142.11A[1][a] (Matthew Bender).

COMMENTARY

Penal Code section 140 does not define “threat.” (Cf. Pen. Code, §§ 137(b), 76 [both statutes containing definition of threat].) In *People v. McDaniel* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 278, 283 [27 Cal.Rptr.2d 306], the Court of Appeal held that threatening a witness under Penal Code section 140 is a general intent crime. According to the holding of *People v. McDaniel*, *supra*, 22 Cal.App.4th at p. 284, there is no requirement that the defendant intend to cause fear to the victim or intend to affect the victim’s conduct in any manner. In *People v. McLaughlin* (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 836, 842 [54 Cal.Rptr.2d 4], the court held that the threat does not need to be communicated to the intended target in any manner. The committee has drafted this instruction in accordance with these holdings. However, the court may wish to consider whether the facts in the case before it demonstrate a sufficiently “genuine threat” to withstand First Amendment scrutiny. (See *In re George T.* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 620, 637–638 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 61, 93 P.3d 1007]; *People v. Gudger* (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 310, 320–321 [34 Cal.Rptr.2d 510]; *Watts v. United States* (1969) 394 U.S. 705, 707 [89 S.Ct. 1399, 22 L.Ed.2d 664]; *United States v. Kelner* (2d Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 1020, 1027.)

2625–2629. Reserved for Future Use

2843. Determining Income: Bank Deposits Method

In this case, the People are [also] using what is called the *bank deposits method* to try to prove that the defendant had unreported taxable income. I will now explain the bank deposits method.

If the People prove that: (a) the defendant engaged in an activity that produced taxable income, (b) the defendant periodically deposited money in bank accounts in (his/her) name or under (his/her) control, and (c) the money deposited did not come from nontaxable sources, then you may but are not required to conclude that these bank deposits are taxable income. Nontaxable sources of the bank deposits include gifts, inheritances, loans, or redeposits or transfers of funds between accounts. If you have a reasonable doubt about whether the People have proved (a), (b), or (c), you must find that the People have not proved under the bank deposits method that the defendant had unreported taxable income.

In order to prove that the defendant had *unreported* taxable income [using the bank deposits method], the People must also prove that the defendant's total taxable bank deposits were substantially greater than the income that the defendant reported on (his/her) tax return for _____ <insert year alleged>.

[There is another factor you may consider in deciding whether the People have proved that the defendant had unreported taxable income under the bank deposits method. If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that: (1) during the year, the defendant spent money from funds not deposited in any bank and (2) those expenditures would not be valid tax deductions, then you may but are not required to conclude that the defendant received money or property during the year. If the People also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the money or property received did not come from nontaxable sources, then you may but are not required to conclude that the money or property was also taxable income. If you have a reasonable doubt about whether the People have proved any of these factors, you may not take the expenditures into account in applying the bank deposits method.]

In order to rely on the bank deposits method of proving taxable income, the People must prove the defendant's cash on hand at the starting point with reasonable certainty. Here the starting point is January 1, _____ <insert year alleged>. *Cash on hand* is cash that the defendant had in (his/her) possession

at the starting point ~~that was not in a bank account~~. The People do not need to show the exact amount of the cash on hand at the starting point, but the People's claimed cash-on-hand figure must be reasonably certain.

In deciding whether the claimed ~~cash-on-hand~~cash on hand figure has been proved with reasonable certainty and whether the People have proved that any money or property the defendant received during the year did not come from nontaxable sources, consider whether law enforcement agents sufficiently investigated all reasonable "leads" concerning the existence and value of other assets and sources of nontaxable income. Law enforcement agents must investigate all reasonable leads that arise during the investigation or that the defendant suggests regarding assets and income. This duty to reasonably investigate applies only to leads that arise during the investigation or to explanations the defendant gives during the investigation. Law enforcement agents are not required to investigate every conceivable asset or source of nontaxable funds.

If you have a reasonable doubt about any of the following:

- A. Whether the investigation reasonably pursued or refuted the defendant's explanations or other leads regarding defendant's assets or income during the year,
- B. Whether the People have proved the defendant's cash on hand at the beginning of _____ *<insert year alleged>* to a reasonable degree of certainty,

OR

- C. Whether the People have proved that the defendant's total bank deposits, together with any nondeductible expenditures the defendant made during the year, were substantially more than the income that the defendant reported on (his/her) tax return for _____ *<insert year alleged>*,

then you must find that the People have not proved under the bank deposits method that the defendant had unreported taxable income.

[If, on the other hand, you conclude that the defendant did have unreported taxable income, you must still decide whether the People have proved all elements of the crime[s] charged [in Count[s] ____].]

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

If the prosecution is relying on the bank deposits method, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction. (See *Holland v. United States* (1954) 348 U.S. 121, 129 [75 S.Ct. 127, 99 L.Ed. 150]; *United States v. Hall* (9th Cir. 1981) 650 F.2d 994, 999.)

The court **must also give** the appropriate instruction on the elements of the offense charged.

Give the bracketed sentence that begins with “If, on the other hand, you conclude” in every case, unless the court is giving CALCRIM No. 2846, *Proof of Unreported Taxable Income: Must Still Prove Elements of Offense*.

AUTHORITY

- Bank Deposits Method Explained ▶ *United States v. Hall* (9th Cir. 1981) 650 F.2d 994, 997, fn. 4; see also Pattern Jury Instructions of the District Judges Association of the Eleventh Circuit, Offense Instruction No. 93.3 (2003); Federal Jury Practice and Instructions, Criminal (5th ed.) § 67.07.
- Sua Sponte Duty to Instruct on Method ▶ *United States v. Hall* (9th Cir. 1981) 650 F.2d 994, 999.
- Requirements for Proof ▶ *United States v. Conaway* (5th Cir. 1993) 11 F.3d 40, 43–44; *United States v. Abodeely* (8th Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 1020, 1024; *United States v. Boulet* (5th Cir. 1978) 577 F.2d 1165, 1167.

2998. Cruelty to Animals (Pen. Code, § 597(a))

The defendant is charged [in Count ___] with cruelty to animals [in violation of Penal Code section 597(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant (maimed[,]/ mutilated[,]/ tortured[,]/ [or] wounded a living animal/ [or] killed a living animal);
2. The defendant intended to (maim[,]/ mutilate[,]/ torture[,]/ [or] wound a living animal/ [or] kill an animal);
AND
3. The defendant acted maliciously.

[*Torture* means every act, failure to act, or neglect that causes or permits unnecessary or unjustifiable physical pain or suffering.]

[*Maiming* means disabling or disfiguring an animal permanently or depriving it of a limb, organ, or other part of the body.]

Someone acts *maliciously* when he or she intentionally does a wrongful act or when he or she acts with the unlawful intent to disturb, annoy, or injure an animal.

New [insert date of council approval]

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

The court will need to modify this instruction if Penal Code sections 597(b), 597(c) or 599(c) apply.

The committee concluded that the definition of “animal” provided in Penal Code section 599b, i.e., that it includes “every dumb creature,” would not be helpful to a jury and that no definition of the word was necessary.

AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 597(a).
- Definition of Torture ▶ Pen. Code, § 599b
- Definition of Malicious ▶ Pen. Code, § 7
- Maiming ▶ See CALCRIM No. 800, *Aggravated Mayhem*

- *Secondary Sources*

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Property, § 265.

2999–3099. Reserved for Future Use

3426. Voluntary Intoxication (Pen. Code, § 22)

You may consider evidence, if any, of the defendant’s voluntary intoxication only in a limited way. You may consider that evidence only in deciding whether the defendant acted [or failed to do an act] with _____ <insert specific intent or mental state required, e.g., “the intent to permanently deprive the owner of his or her property” or “knowledge that . . . ” or “the intent to do the act required”>.

A person is *voluntarily intoxicated* if he or she becomes intoxicated by willingly using any intoxicating drug, drink, or other substance knowing that it could produce an intoxicating effect, or willingly assuming the risk of that effect.

[Do not consider evidence of intoxication in deciding whether _____ <insert non-target offense> was a natural and probable consequence of _____ <insert target offense>.]

In connection with the charge of _____ <insert first charged offense requiring specific intent or mental state> the People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted [or failed to act] with _____ <insert specific intent or mental state required, e.g., “the intent to permanently deprive the owner of his or her property” or “knowledge that . . . ”>. If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty of _____ <insert first charged offense requiring specific intent or mental state>.

<Repeat this paragraph for each offense requiring specific intent or a specific mental state.>

You may not consider evidence of voluntary intoxication for any other purpose. [Voluntary intoxication is not a defense to _____ <insert general intent offense[s]>.]

New January 2006

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has no sua sponte duty to instruct on voluntary intoxication; however, the trial court must give this instruction on request. (*People v. Ricardi* (1992) 9

Cal.App.4th 1427, 1432 [12 Cal.Rptr.2d 364]; *People v. Castillo* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1009, 1014 [68 Cal.Rptr.2d 648, 945 P.2d 1197]; *People v. Saille* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1103, 1119 [2 Cal.Rptr.2d 364, 820 P.2d 588].) Although voluntary intoxication is not an affirmative defense to a crime, the jury may consider evidence of voluntary intoxication and its effect on the defendant's required mental state. (Pen. Code, § 22; *People v. Reyes* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 975, 982–986 [61 Cal.Rptr.2d 39] [relevant to knowledge element in receiving stolen property]; *People v. Mendoza* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1114, 1131–1134 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 428, 959 P.2d 735] [relevant to mental state in aiding and abetting].)

Voluntary intoxication may not be considered for general intent crimes. (*People v. Mendoza* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1114, 1127–1128 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 428, 959 P.2d 735]; *People v. Atkins* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 76, 81 [104 Cal.Rptr.2d 738, 18 P.3d 660]; see also *People v. Hood* (1969) 1 Cal.3d 444, 451 [82 Cal.Rptr. 618, 462 P.2d 370] [applying specific v. general intent analysis and holding that assault type crimes are general intent; subsequently superseded by amendments to Penal Code Section 22 on a different point].)

If both specific and general intent crimes are charged, the court must specify the general intent crimes in the bracketed portion of the last sentence and instruct the jury that voluntary intoxication is not a defense to those crimes. (*People v. Aguirre* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 391, 399–402 [37 Cal.Rptr.2d 48]; *People v. Rivera* (1984) 162 Cal.App.3d 141, 145–146 [207 Cal.Rptr. 756].)

Give the bracketed paragraph beginning, “Do not consider evidence of intoxication,” when instructing on aiding and abetting liability for a non-target offense. (*People v. Mendoza* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1114, 1134 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 428, 959 P.2d 735].)

The court may need to modify this instruction if given with CALCRIM No. 362, *Consciousness of Guilt*. (*People v. Wiidanen* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 526, 528, 533 [135 Cal.Rptr.3d 736].)

Related Instructions

CALCRIM No. 3427, *Involuntary Intoxication*.

CALCRIM No. 625, *Voluntary Intoxication: Effects on Homicide Crimes*.

CALCRIM No. 626, *Voluntary Intoxication Causing Unconsciousness: Effects on Homicide Crimes*.

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ Pen. Code, § 22; *People v. Castillo* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1009, 1014 [68 Cal.Rptr.2d 648, 945 P.2d 1197]; *People v. Saille* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1103, 1119 [2 Cal.Rptr.2d 364, 820 P.2d 588].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* 3d (2000) Defenses, § 26.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 73, *Defenses and Justifications*, § 73.04 (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 124, *Jurisdiction and Disposition Hearings*, § 124.04 (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Implied Malice

“[E]vidence of voluntary intoxication is no longer admissible on the issue of implied malice aforethought.” (*People v. Martin* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 1107, 1114–1115 [93 Cal.Rptr.2d 433], quoting *People v. Reyes* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 975, 984, fn. 6 [61 Cal.Rptr.2d 39].)

Intoxication Based on Mistake of Fact Is Involuntary

Intoxication resulting from trickery is not “voluntary.” (*People v. Scott* (1983) 146 Cal.App.3d 823, 831–833 [194 Cal.Rptr. 633] [defendant drank punch not knowing it contained hallucinogens; court held his intoxication was result of trickery and mistake and involuntary].)

Premeditation and Deliberation

“[T]he trial court has no sua sponte duty to instruct that voluntary intoxication may be considered in determining the existence of premeditation and deliberation.” (*People v. Hughes* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 287, 342 [116 Cal.Rptr.2d 401, 39 P.3d 432], citing *People v. Saille* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1103, 1120 [2 Cal.Rptr.2d 364, 820 P.2d 588]; see *People v. Castillo* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1009, 1018 [68 Cal.Rptr.2d 648, 945 P.2d 1197] [counsel not ineffective for failing to request instruction specifically relating voluntary intoxication to premeditation and deliberation].)

Unconsciousness Based on Voluntary Intoxication Is Not a Complete Defense

Unconsciousness is typically a complete defense to a crime except when it is caused by voluntary intoxication. (*People v. Heffington* (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 1, 8 [107 Cal.Rptr. 859].) Unconsciousness caused by voluntary intoxication is

governed by Penal Code section 22, rather than by section 26 and is only a partial defense to a crime. (*People v. Walker* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 1615, 1621 [18 Cal.Rptr.2d 431] [no error in refusing to instruct on unconsciousness when defendant was voluntarily under the influence of drugs at the time of the crime]; see also *People v. Ochoa* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 353, 423 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 408, 966 P.2d 442] [“if the intoxication is voluntarily induced, it can never excuse homicide. Thus, the requisite element of criminal negligence is deemed to exist irrespective of unconsciousness, and a defendant stands guilty of involuntary manslaughter if he voluntarily procured his own intoxication [citation].”].)

3470. Right to Self-Defense or Defense of Another (Non-Homicide)

Self-defense is a defense to _____ <insert list of pertinent crimes charged>. The defendant is not guilty of (that/those crime[s]) if (he/she) used force against the other person in lawful (self-defense/ [or] defense of another). The defendant acted in lawful (self-defense/ [or] defense of another) if:

1. The defendant reasonably believed that (he/she/ [or] someone else/ [or] _____ <insert name of third party>) was in imminent danger of suffering bodily injury [or was in imminent danger of being touched unlawfully];
2. The defendant reasonably believed that the immediate use of force was necessary to defend against that danger;

AND

3. The defendant used no more force than was reasonably necessary to defend against that danger.

Belief in future harm is not sufficient, no matter how great or how likely the harm is believed to be. The defendant must have believed there was (imminent danger of bodily injury to (himself/herself/ [or] someone else)/[or] an imminent danger that (he/she/[or] someone else) would be touched unlawfully). Defendant's belief must have been reasonable and (he/she) must have acted because of that belief. The defendant is only entitled to use that amount of force that a reasonable person would believe is necessary in the same situation. If the defendant used more force than was reasonable, the defendant did not act in lawful (self-defense/ [or] defense of another).

When deciding whether the defendant's beliefs were reasonable, consider all the circumstances as they were known to and appeared to the defendant and consider what a reasonable person in a similar situation with similar knowledge would have believed. If the defendant's beliefs were reasonable, the danger does not need to have actually existed.

[The slightest touching can be unlawful if it is done in a rude or angry way. Making contact with another person, including through his or her clothing, is enough. The touching does not have to cause pain or injury of any kind.]

[The defendant's belief that (he/she/ [or] someone else) was threatened may be reasonable even if (he/she) relied on information that was not true. However, the defendant must actually and reasonably have believed that the information was true.]

[If you find that _____ <insert name of victim> threatened or harmed the defendant [or others] in the past, you may consider that information in deciding whether the defendant's conduct and beliefs were reasonable.]

[If you find that the defendant knew that _____ <insert name of victim> had threatened or harmed others in the past, you may consider that information in deciding whether the defendant's conduct and beliefs were reasonable.]

[Someone who has been threatened or harmed by a person in the past is justified in acting more quickly or taking greater self-defense measures against that person.]

[If you find that the defendant received a threat from someone else that (he/she) reasonably associated with _____ <insert name of victim>, you may consider that threat in deciding whether the defendant was justified in acting in (self-defense/ [or] defense of another).]

[A defendant is not required to retreat. He or she is entitled to stand his or her ground and defend himself or herself and, if reasonably necessary, to pursue an assailant until the danger of (death/bodily injury/ _____ <insert crime>) has passed. This is so even if safety could have been achieved by retreating.]

The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not act in lawful (self-defense/ [or] defense of another). If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty of _____ <insert crime(s) charged>.

New January 2006; Revised June 2007, April 2008, August 2009, February 2012

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court must instruct on a defense when the defendant requests it and there is substantial evidence supporting the defense. The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on a defense if there is substantial evidence supporting it and either the

defendant is relying on it or it is not inconsistent with the defendant's theory of the case.

When the court concludes that the defense is supported by substantial evidence and is inconsistent with the defendant's theory of the case, however, it should ascertain whether defendant wishes instruction on this alternate theory. (*People v. Gonzales* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 382, 389–390 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 111]; *People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 157 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].)

Substantial evidence means evidence of a defense, which, if believed, would be sufficient for a reasonable jury to find a reasonable doubt as to the defendant's guilt. (*People v. Salas* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 967, 982–983 [38 Cal.Rptr.3d 624, 127 P.3d 40].)

On defense request and when supported by sufficient evidence, the court must instruct that the jury may consider the effect of “antecedent threats and assaults against the defendant on the reasonableness of defendant's conduct.” (*People v. Garvin* (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 484, 488 [1 Cal.Rptr.3d 774].) The court must also instruct that the jury may consider previous threats or assaults by the aggressor against someone else or threats received by the defendant from a third party that the defendant reasonably associated with the aggressor. (See *People v. Pena* (1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 462, 475 [198 Cal.Rptr. 819]; *People v. Minifie* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1055, 1065, 1068 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 133, 920 P.2d 1337]; see also CALCRIM No. 505, *Justifiable Homicide: Self-Defense or Defense of Another*.)

Related Instructions

CALCRIM No. 505, *Justifiable Homicide: Self-Defense or Defense of Another*.
CALCRIM Nos. 3471–3477, Defense Instructions: Defense of Self, Another, Property.

CALCRIM No. 851, *Testimony on Intimate Partner Battering and Its Effects: Offered by the Defense*.

CALCRIM No. 2514, *Possession of Firearm by Person Prohibited by Statute: Self-Defense*.

AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ *People v. Moody* (1943) 62 Cal.App.2d 18 [143 P.2d 978]; *People v. Myers* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 328, 335, 336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 518].
- Lawful Resistance ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 692, 693, 694; Civ. Code, § 50; see also *People v. Myers* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 328, 335 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 518].

- Burden of Proof ▶ Pen. Code, § 189.5; *People v. Banks* (1976) 67 Cal.App.3d 379, 383–384 [137 Cal.Rptr. 652].
- Elements ▶ *People v. Humphrey* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1082 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 142, 921 P.2d 1].
- Imminence ▶ *People v. Aris* (1989) 215 Cal.App.3d 1178, 1187 [264 Cal.Rptr. 167] (overruled on other grounds in *People v. Humphrey* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1089 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 142, 921 P.2d 1]).
- No Duty to Retreat ▶ *People v. Hughes* (1951) 107 Cal.App.2d 487, 494 [237 P.2d 64]; *People v. Hatchett* (1942) 56 Cal.App.2d 20, 22 [132 P.2d 51].
- Temporary Possession of Firearm by Felon in Self-Defense ▶ *People v. King* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 12, 24 [148 Cal.Rptr. 409, 582 P.2d 1000].
- Duty to Retreat Limited to Felon in Possession Cases ▶ *People v. Rhodes* (2005) 129 Cal.App.4th 1339, 1343–1346 [29 Cal.Rptr.3d 226].
- Inmate Self-Defense ▶ *People v. Saavedra* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 561 [67 Cal.Rptr.3d 403].
- Reasonable Belief ▶ *People v. Humphrey* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1073, 1082 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 142, 921 P.2d 1]; *People v. Clark* (1982) 130 Cal.App.3d 371, 377 [181 Cal.Rptr. 682].

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Defenses, §§ 65, 66, 69, 70.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 73, *Defenses and Justifications*, §§ 73.11, 73.12 (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 124, *Jurisdiction and Disposition Hearings*, § 124.04 (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Brandishing Weapon in Defense of Another

The defense of others is a defense to a charge of brandishing a weapon under Penal Code section 417(a)(2). (*People v. Kirk* (1986) 192 Cal.App.3d Supp. 15, 19 [238 Cal.Rptr. 42].)

Reasonable Person Standard Not Modified by Evidence of Mental Impairment
In *People v. Jefferson* (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 508, 519 [14 Cal.Rptr.3d 473], the court rejected the argument that the reasonable person standard for self-defense should be the standard of a mentally ill person like the defendant. “The common law does not take account of a person’s mental capacity when determining whether he has acted as the reasonable person would have acted. The law holds ‘the mentally deranged or insane defendant accountable for his negligence as if the person were a normal, prudent person.’ (Prosser & Keeton, Torts (5th ed. 1984) § 32, p. 177.)” (*Ibid.*; see also Rest.2d Torts, § 283B.)

See also the Related Issues section of CALCRIM No. 505, *Justifiable Homicide: Self-Defense or Defense of Another*.

3517. Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Lesser Included Offenses and Greater Crimes Are Not Separately Charged and the Jury Receives Guilty and Not Guilty Verdict Forms for Greater and Lesser Offenses (Non-Homicide)

If all of you find that the defendant is not guilty of a greater charged crime, you may find (him/her) guilty of a lesser crime if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of that lesser crime. A defendant may not be convicted of both a greater and lesser crime for the same conduct.

[Now I will explain to you which charges are affected by this instruction:]

[_____ <insert crime> is a lesser crime of
_____ <insert crime> [charged in Count ____.]
[_____ <insert crime> is a lesser crime of
_____ <insert crime> [charged in Count ____.]
[_____ <insert crime> is a lesser crime of
_____ <insert crime> [charged in Count ____.]

It is up to you to decide the order in which you consider each crime and the relevant evidence, but I can accept a verdict of guilty of a lesser crime only if you have found the defendant not guilty of the corresponding greater crime.

<Give the following paragraphs if the jury has separate guilty and not guilty forms for both greater and lesser offenses pursuant to Stone v. Superior Court. >

[[For (the/any) count in which a greater and lesser crime is charged,] (Y/y)ou will receive verdict forms of guilty and not guilty for the greater crime and also verdict forms of guilty and not guilty for the lesser crime. Follow these directions before you give me any completed and signed, final verdict form. Return any unused verdict forms to me, unsigned.

- 1. If all of you agree the People have ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, complete and sign the verdict form for guilty of that crime. Do not complete or sign any other verdict form [for that count].**

2. If all of you cannot agree whether the People have ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, inform me only that you cannot reach an agreement and do not complete or sign any verdict form [for that count].
3. If all of you agree that the People have not ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime and you also agree that the People have ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that (he/she) is guilty of the lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty of the greater crime and the verdict form for guilty of the lesser crime.
4. If all of you agree the People have not ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater or lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty of the greater crime and the verdict form for not guilty of the lesser crime.
5. If all of you agree the People have not proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, but all of you cannot agree on a verdict for the lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty of the greater crime and inform me only that you cannot reach an agreement about —the lesser crime.]

<Give the following paragraphs if the jury has a combined verdict form for both greater and lesser offenses.>

[[For (the/any) charge with a lesser crime,] (Y/y)ou will receive a form for indicating your verdict on both the greater crime and the lesser crime. The greater crime is listed first. When you have reached a verdict, have the foreperson complete the form, sign, and date it. Follow these directions before writing anything on the form.

1. If all of you agree that the People have ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime as charged, (write “guilty” in the blank/circle the word “guilty”/check the box for “guilty”) for that crime, then sign, date, and return the form. Do not (write/circle/check) anything for the lesser crime.
2. If all of you cannot agree whether the People have ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime as charged, inform me only that you cannot reach an agreement and do not write anything on the verdict form.

Copyright Judicial Council of California

3. If all of you agree that the People have not ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime and you also agree that the People have ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that (he/she) is guilty of the lesser crime, (write “not guilty” in the blank/circle the words “not guilty”/check the box for “not guilty”) for the greater crime and (write “guilty” in the blank/circle the word “guilty”/check the box for “guilty”) for the lesser crime. You must not (write/circle/check) anything for the lesser crime unless you have (written/circled/checked) “not guilty” for the greater crime.
4. If all of you agree that the People have not ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of either the greater or the lesser crime, (write “not guilty” in the blank/circle the words “not guilty”/check the box for “not guilty”) for both the greater crime and the lesser crime.
5. If all of you agree that the People have not ~~proved beyond a reasonable doubt~~proved that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, but all of you cannot agree on a verdict for the lesser crime, (write “not guilty” in the blank/circle the words “not guilty”/check the box for “not guilty”) for the greater crime, then sign, date, and return the form. Do not (write/circle/check) anything for the lesser crime, and inform me only that you cannot reach an agreement about that crime.]

Whenever I tell you the People must prove something, I mean they must prove it beyond a reasonable doubt [unless I specifically tell you otherwise].

<Give the following paragraph if the court is instructing on a lesser included offense within another lesser included offense.>

[Follow these directions when you decide whether a defendant is guilty or not guilty of _____<insert crime>, which is a lesser crime of _____<insert crime>.]

New January 2006; Revised August 2006; June 2007, February 2012

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

Copyright Judicial Council of California

If lesser included crimes are not charged separately and the jury receives only one verdict form for each count, the court should use CALCRIM 3518 instead of this instruction. For separately charged greater and lesser included offenses, use CALCRIM 3519. In all cases in which one or more lesser included offenses are submitted to the jury, whether charged or not, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the applicable procedures. (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 162 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094] [duty to instruct on lesser included offenses]; *People v. Dewberry* (1959) 51 Cal.2d 548, 555-557 [334 P.2d 852] [duty to instruct that if jury has reasonable doubt of greater offense, must acquit of that charge]; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 309-310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832] [duty to instruct that jury cannot convict of a lesser included offense unless it has concluded that defendant is not guilty of the greater offense]; *Stone v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 503, 519 [183 Cal.Rptr. 647, 646 P.2d 809] [duty to give jury opportunity to render a verdict of partial acquittal on a greater offense], clarified in *People v. Marshall* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799, 826 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 919 P.2d 1280] [no duty to inquire about partial acquittal in absence of indication jury may have found defendant not guilty of greater offense].)

In *Stone v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 31 Cal.3d at p. 519, the Supreme Court suggested that the trial court provide the jury with verdict forms of guilty/not guilty on each of the charged and lesser included offenses. The court later referred to this “as a judicially declared rule of criminal procedure.” (*People v. Kurtzman* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 322, 328 [250 Cal.Rptr. 244, 758 P.2d 572].) However, this is not a mandatory procedure. (*Ibid.*) If the court chooses not to follow the procedure suggested in *Stone*, the court may give CALCRIM No. 3518 in place of this instruction.

Do not give this instruction for charges of murder or manslaughter; instead give the appropriate homicide instruction for lesser included offenses: CALCRIM No. 640, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Defendant Is Charged With First Degree Murder and Jury Is Given Not Guilty Forms for Each Level of Homicide*, CALCRIM No. 641, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Defendant Is Charged With First Degree Murder and Jury Is Given Only One Not Guilty Verdict Form for Each Count; Not To Be Used When Both Voluntary and Involuntary Manslaughter Are Lesser Included Offenses*, CALCRIM No. 642, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Defendant Is Charged With Second Degree Murder and Jury Is Given Not Guilty Forms for Each Level of Homicide*, or CALCRIM No. 643, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Defendant Is Charged With Second Degree Murder and Jury Is Given Only One Not Guilty Verdict Form for Each Count; Not to Be Used When Both Voluntary and Involuntary Manslaughter Are Lesser Included Offenses*.

The court should tell the jury it may not return a guilty verdict on a lesser included offense unless it has found the defendant not guilty of the greater offense. (*People v. Fields, supra*, 13 Cal.4th at pp. 310–311.) If the jury announces that it is deadlocked on the greater offense but, despite the court’s instructions, has returned a guilty verdict on the lesser included offense, the court should again instruct the jury that it may not convict of the lesser included offense unless it has found the defendant not guilty of the greater offense. (*Ibid.*) The court should direct the jury to reconsider the “lone verdict of conviction of the lesser included offense” in light of this instruction. (*Ibid.*; Pen. Code, § 1161.) If the jury is deadlocked on the greater offense but the court nevertheless records a guilty verdict on the lesser included offense and then discharges the jury, retrial on the greater offense will be barred. (*People v. Fields, supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 307; Pen. Code, § 1023.)

The court may not control the sequence in which the jury considers the offenses. (*People v. Kurtzman, supra*, 46 Cal.3d at p. 330.)

AUTHORITY

- Lesser Included Offenses—Duty to Instruct ▶ Pen. Code, § 1159; *People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 162 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].
- Lesser Included Offenses—Standard ▶ *People v. Birks* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 108, 117 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 848, 960 P.2d 1073].
- Reasonable Doubt as to Degree or Level of Offense ▶ Pen. Code, § 1097; *People v. Dewberry* (1959) 51 Cal.2d 548, 555–557 [334 P.2d 852].
- Conviction of Lesser Precludes Retrial on Greater ▶ Pen. Code, § 1023; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 309–310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832]; *People v. Kurtzman* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 322, 329 [250 Cal.Rptr. 244, 758 P.2d 572].
- Court May Ask Jury to Reconsider Conviction on Lesser If Jury Deadlocked on Greater ▶ Pen. Code, § 1161; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832].
- Must Permit Partial Verdict of Acquittal on Greater ▶ *People v. Marshall* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799, 826 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 919 P.2d 1280]; *Stone v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 503, 519 [183 Cal.Rptr. 647, 646 P.2d 809].

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, §§ 630, 631.

Copyright Judicial Council of California

6 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Judgment, § 61.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.03[2][g], 85.05, 85.20 (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Duty to Instruct on Lesser

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct “on lesser included offenses when the evidence raises a question as to whether all of the elements of the charged offense were present [citation] but not when there is no evidence that the offense was less than that charged. [Citations.] The obligation to instruct on lesser included offenses exists even when as a matter of trial tactics a defendant not only fails to request the instruction but expressly objects to its being given. [Citations.] Just as the People have no legitimate interest in obtaining a conviction of a greater offense than that established by the evidence, a defendant has no right to an acquittal when that evidence is sufficient to establish a lesser included offense. [Citations.]” (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 154–155 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].)

Acquittal of Greater Does Not Bar Retrial of Lesser

Where the jury acquits of a greater offense but deadlocks on the lesser, retrial of the lesser is not barred. (*People v. Smith* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 596, 602 [189 Cal.Rptr. 862, 659 P.2d 1152].)

Lesser Included Offenses Barred by Statute of Limitations

The defendant may waive the statute of limitations to obtain a jury instruction on a lesser offense that would otherwise be time-barred. (*Cowan v. Superior Court* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 367, 373 [58 Cal.Rptr.2d 458, 926 P.2d 438].) However, the court has no sua sponte duty to instruct on a lesser that is time-barred. (*People v. Diedrich* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 263, 283 [182 Cal.Rptr. 354, 643 P.2d 971].) If the court instructs on an uncharged lesser offense that is time-barred without obtaining an explicit waiver from the defendant, it is unclear if the defendant must object at that time in order to raise the issue on appeal or if the defendant may raise the issue for the first time on appeal. (See *People v. Stanfill* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1145–1151 [90 Cal.Rptr.2d 885] [reasoning criticized in *People v. Smith* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1182, 1193–1194 [120 Cal.Rptr.2d 185]].) The better practice is to obtain an explicit waiver on the statute of limitations when instructing on a time-barred lesser.

Conviction of Greater and Lesser

The defendant cannot be convicted of a greater and a lesser included offense. (*People v. Moran* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 755, 763 [83 Cal.Rptr. 411, 463 P.2d 763].) If the evidence supports the conviction on the greater offense, the conviction on the lesser included offense should be set aside. (*Ibid.*)

3518. Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Lesser Included Offenses and Greater Crimes Are Not Separately Charged and the Jury Is Given Only One Not Guilty Verdict Form for Each Count (Non-Homicide)

If all of you find that the defendant is not guilty of a greater charged crime, you may find (him/her) guilty of a lesser crime if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of that lesser crime. A defendant may not be convicted of both a greater and lesser crime for the same conduct.

[Now I will explain to you which charges are affected by this instruction:]

[_____ <insert crime> is a lesser crime of
_____ <insert crime> [charged in Count ____].]

[_____ <insert crime> is a lesser crime of
_____ <insert crime> [charged in Count ____].]

[_____ <insert crime> is a lesser crime of
_____ <insert crime> [charged in Count ____].]

It is up to you to decide the order in which you consider each crime and the relevant evidence, but I can accept a verdict of guilty of a lesser crime only if you have found the defendant not guilty of the corresponding greater crime.

[[For count[s] ____,] (Y/you) will receive (a/multiple) verdict form[s]. Follow these directions before you give me any completed and signed final verdict form. Return any unused verdict forms to me, unsigned.

1. If all of you agree the People have proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, complete and sign the verdict form for guilty of that crime. Do not complete or sign any other verdict form [for that count].
2. If all of you agree the People have not proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime and also agree the People have proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that (he/she) is guilty of (the/a) lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for guilty of the lesser crime. Do not complete or sign any other verdict form[s] [for that count].

3. If all of you agree the People have not proved **beyond-a-reasonable doubt** that the defendant is guilty of the greater or lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty.
4. If all of you cannot agree whether the People have proved **beyond-a-reasonable-doubt** that the defendant is guilty of a charged or lesser crime, inform me only that you cannot reach agreement [as to that count] and do not complete or sign any verdict form [for that count].}

Whenever I tell you the People must prove something, I mean they must prove it beyond a reasonable doubt [unless I specifically tell you otherwise].

<Give the following paragraph if the court is instructing on a lesser included offense within another lesser included offense.>

[Follow these directions when you decide whether a defendant is guilty or not guilty of _____<insert crime>, which is a lesser crime of _____<insert crime>.]

New January 2006; Revised August 2006, June 2007, April 2010, Revised February 2012

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

If lesser crimes are not charged separately and the jury receives separate not guilty and guilty verdict forms for each count, the court should use CALCRIM 3517 instead of this instruction. For separately charged greater and lesser included offenses, use CALCRIM 3519.

In all cases in which one or more lesser included offenses are submitted to the jury, whether charged or not, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the applicable procedures. (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 162 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094] [duty to instruct on lesser included offenses]; *People v. Dewberry* (1959) 51 Cal.2d 548, 555-557 [334 P.2d 852] [duty to instruct that if jury has reasonable doubt of greater offense, must acquit of that charge]; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 309-310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832] [duty to instruct that jury cannot convict of lesser included offense unless it has concluded that defendant is not guilty of greater offense]; *Stone v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 503, 519 [183 Cal.Rptr. 647, 646 P.2d 809] [duty to give jury opportunity to render verdict of partial acquittal on greater offense], clarified in *People v. Marshall* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799, 826 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 347,

Copyright Judicial Council of California

919 P.2d 1280] [no duty to inquire about partial acquittal in absence of indication jury may have found defendant not guilty of greater offense].)

In *Stone v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 31 Cal.3d at p. 519, the Supreme Court suggested that the trial court provide the jury with verdict forms of guilty/not guilty on each of the charged and lesser included offenses. The court later referred to this “as a judicially declared rule of criminal procedure.” (*People v. Kurtzman* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 322, 329 [250 Cal.Rptr. 244, 758 P.2d 572].) However, this is not a mandatory procedure. (*Ibid.*) If the court chooses to follow the procedure suggested in *Stone*, the court should give CALCRIM No. 3517 in place of this instruction.

Do not give this instruction for charges of murder or voluntary manslaughter; give CALCRIM No. 640, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Jury Is Given Not Guilty Forms for Each Level of Homicide*, or CALCRIM No. 641, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Jury Is Given Only One Not Guilty Verdict Form for Each Count (Homicide)*.

The court should tell the jury it may not return a guilty verdict on a lesser included offense unless it has found the defendant not guilty of the greater offense. (*People v. Fields*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th at pp. 310–311.) If the jury announces that it is deadlocked on the greater offense but, despite the court’s instructions, has returned a guilty verdict on the lesser included offense, the court should again instruct the jury that it may not convict of the lesser included offense unless it has found the defendant not guilty of the greater offense. (*Ibid.*) The court should direct the jury to reconsider the “lone verdict of conviction of the lesser included offense” in light of this instruction. (*Ibid.*; Pen. Code, § 1161.) If the jury is deadlocked on the greater offense but the court nevertheless records a guilty verdict on the lesser included offense and then discharges the jury, retrial on the greater offense will be barred. (*People v. Fields*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 307; Pen. Code, § 1023.)

The court may not control the sequence in which the jury considers the offenses. (*People v. Kurtzman*, *supra*, 46 Cal.3d at p. 330.)

AUTHORITY

- Lesser Included Offenses—Duty to Instruct ▶ Pen. Code, § 1159; *People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 162 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].
- Lesser Included Offenses—Standard ▶ *People v. Birks* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 108, 117 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 848, 960 P.2d 1073].
- Reasonable Doubt as to Degree or Level of Offense ▶ Pen. Code, § 1097; *People v. Dewberry* (1959) 51 Cal.2d 548, 555–557 [334 P.2d 852].

- Conviction of Lesser Precludes Retrial on Greater ▶ Pen. Code, § 1023; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 309–310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832]; *People v. Kurtzman* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 322, 329 [250 Cal.Rptr. 244, 758 P.2d 572].
- Court May Ask Jury to Reconsider Conviction on Lesser If Jury Deadlocked on Greater ▶ Pen. Code, § 1161; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832].
- Must Permit Partial Verdict of Acquittal on Greater ▶ *People v. Marshall* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799, 826 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 919 P.2d 1280]; *Stone v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 503, 519 [183 Cal.Rptr. 647, 646 P.2d 809].

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, §§ 630, 631.

6 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Judgment, § 61.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.03[2][g], 85.05, 85.20 (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Duty to Instruct on Lesser

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct “on lesser included offenses when the evidence raises a question as to whether all of the elements of the charged offense were present [citation] but not when there is no evidence that the offense was less than that charged. [Citations.] The obligation to instruct on lesser included offenses exists even when as a matter of trial tactics a defendant not only fails to request the instruction but expressly objects to its being given. [Citations.] Just as the People have no legitimate interest in obtaining a conviction of a greater offense than that established by the evidence, a defendant has no right to an acquittal when that evidence is sufficient to establish a lesser included offense. [Citations.]” (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 154–155 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].)

Acquittal of Greater Does Not Bar Retrial of Lesser

When the jury acquits of a greater offense but deadlocks on the lesser, retrial of the lesser is not barred. (*People v. Smith* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 596, 602 [189 Cal.Rptr. 862, 659 P.2d 1152].)

Lesser Included Offenses Barred by Statute of Limitations

Copyright Judicial Council of California

The defendant may waive the statute of limitations to obtain a jury instruction on a lesser offense that would otherwise be time-barred. (*Cowan v. Superior Court* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 367, 373 [58 Cal.Rptr.2d 458, 926 P.2d 438].) However, the court has no sua sponte duty to instruct on a lesser that is time-barred. (*People v. Diedrich* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 263, 283 [182 Cal.Rptr. 354, 643 P.2d 971].) If the court instructs on an uncharged lesser offense that is time-barred without obtaining an explicit waiver from the defendant, it is unclear if the defendant must object at that time in order to raise the issue on appeal or if the defendant may raise the issue for the first time on appeal. (See *People v. Stanfill* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1145–1151 [90 Cal.Rptr.2d 885] [reasoning criticized in *People v. Smith* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1182, 1193–1194 [120 Cal.Rptr.2d 185]].) The better practice is to obtain an explicit waiver on the statute of limitations when instructing on a time-barred lesser.

Conviction of Greater and Lesser

The defendant cannot be convicted of a greater and a lesser included offense. (*People v. Moran* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 755, 763 [83 Cal.Rptr. 411, 463 P.2d 763].) If the evidence supports the conviction on the greater offense, the conviction on the lesser included offense should be set aside. (*Ibid.*)

3519 . Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: Lesser Offenses—For Use When Lesser Included Offenses and Greater Crimes Are Separately Charged (Non-Homicide)

If all of you find that the defendant is not guilty of a greater charged crime, you may find (him/her) guilty of a lesser crime if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of that lesser crime. A defendant may not be convicted of both a greater and lesser crime for the same conduct.

[Now I will explain to you which charges are affected by this instruction:]

[_____ <insert crime>, as charged in Count ____, is a lesser crime to _____ <insert crime> [as charged in Count ____].]

[_____ <insert crime>, as charged in Count ____, is a lesser crime to _____ <insert crime> [as charged in Count ____].]

[_____ <insert crime>, as charged in Count ____, is a lesser crime to _____ <insert crime> [as charged in Count ____].]

It is up to you to decide the order in which you consider each greater and lesser crime and the relevant evidence, but I can accept a verdict of guilty of the lesser crime only if you have found the defendant not guilty of the greater crime.

[[For (the/any) count in which a greater and lesser crime is charged,] (Y/y)ou will receive verdict forms of guilty and not guilty for [each/the] greater crime and lesser crime. Follow these directions before you give me any completed and signed, final verdict form. Return any unused verdict forms to me, unsigned.

1. If all of you agree the People have proved **beyond a reasonable doubt** that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, complete and sign the verdict form for guilty of that crime. Do not complete or sign any verdict form for the [corresponding] lesser crime.
2. If all of you cannot agree whether the People have proved **beyond a reasonable doubt** that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, inform me of your disagreement and do not complete or sign any verdict form for that crime or the [corresponding] lesser crime.

3. If all of you agree the People have not proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime and also agree the People have proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that (he/she) is guilty of the lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty of the greater crime and the verdict form for guilty of the [corresponding] lesser crime. Do not complete or sign any other verdict forms [for those charges].
4. If all of you agree the People have not proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that the defendant is guilty of the greater or lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty of the greater crime and the verdict form for not guilty of the [corresponding] lesser crime.
5. If all of you agree the People have not proved ~~beyond a reasonable doubt~~ that the defendant is guilty of the greater crime, but all of you cannot agree on a verdict for the lesser crime, complete and sign the verdict form for not guilty of the greater crime and inform me about your disagreement on the lesser crime.]

Whenever I tell you the People must prove something, I mean they must prove it beyond a reasonable doubt [unless I specifically tell you otherwise].

<Give the following paragraph if the court is instructing on a lesser included offense within another lesser included offense.>

[Follow these directions when you decide whether a defendant is guilty or not guilty of _____<insert crime>, which is a lesser crime of _____<insert crime>.]

New January 2006; Revised June 2007

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

In all cases in which one or more lesser included offenses are submitted to the jury, whether charged or not, the court has a sua sponte duty to instruct on the applicable procedures. (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 162 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094] [duty to instruct on lesser included offenses]; *People v. Dewberry* (1959) 51 Cal.2d 548, 555-557 [334 P.2d 852] [duty to instruct that if jury has reasonable doubt of

greater offense, must acquit of that charge]; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 309-310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832] [duty to instruct that jury cannot convict of a lesser included offense unless it has concluded that defendant is not guilty of the greater offense]; *Stone v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 503, 519 [183 Cal.Rptr. 647, 646 P.2d 809] [duty to give jury opportunity to render a verdict of partial acquittal on a greater offense], clarified in *People v. Marshall* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799, 826 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 919 P.2d 1280] [no duty to inquire about partial acquittal in absence of indication jury may have found defendant not guilty of greater offense]).

Whenever greater and lesser included crimes are separately charged the court must use this instruction instead of CALCRIM 3517 or 3518.

Do not give this instruction for charges of murder or voluntary manslaughter; give CALCRIM No. 640, *Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Jury Is Given Not Guilty Forms for Each Level of Homicide*, or CALCRIM No. 641, *Procedure Deliberations and Completion of Verdict Forms: For Use When Jury Is Given Only One Not Guilty Verdict Form for Each Count (Homicide)*.

The court should tell the jury it may not return a guilty verdict on a lesser included offense unless it has found the defendant not guilty of the greater offense. (*People v. Fields, supra*, 13 Cal.4th at pp. 310–311.) If the jury announces that it is deadlocked on the greater offense but, despite the court’s instructions, has returned a guilty verdict on the lesser included offense, the court should again instruct the jury that it may not convict of the lesser included offense unless it has found the defendant not guilty of the greater offense. (*Ibid.*) The court should direct the jury to reconsider the “lone verdict of conviction of the lesser included offense” in light of this instruction. (*Ibid.*; Pen. Code, § 1161.) If the jury is deadlocked on the greater offense but the court nevertheless records a guilty verdict on the lesser included offense and then discharges the jury, retrial on the greater offense will be barred. (*People v. Fields, supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 307; Pen. Code, § 1023.)

The court may not control the sequence in which the jury considers the offenses. (*People v. Kurtzman, supra*, 46 Cal.3d at p. 330.)

AUTHORITY

- Lesser Included Offenses—Duty to Instruct ▶ Pen. Code, § 1159; *People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 162 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].
- Lesser Included Offenses—Standard ▶ *People v. Birks* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 108, 117 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 848, 960 P.2d 1073].

- Reasonable Doubt as to Degree or Level of Offense ▶ Pen. Code, § 1097; *People v. Dewberry* (1959) 51 Cal.2d 548, 555–557 [334 P.2d 852].
- Conviction of Lesser Precludes Retrial on Greater ▶ Pen. Code, § 1023; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 309–310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832]; *People v. Kurtzman* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 322, 329 [250 Cal.Rptr. 244, 758 P.2d 572].
- Court May Ask Jury to Reconsider Conviction on Lesser If Jury Deadlocked on Greater ▶ Pen. Code, § 1161; *People v. Fields* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289, 310 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 282, 914 P.2d 832].
- Must Permit Partial Verdict of Acquittal on Greater ▶ *People v. Marshall* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799, 826 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 919 P.2d 1280]; *Stone v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 503, 519 [183 Cal.Rptr. 647, 646 P.2d 809].

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, §§ 630, 631.

6 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Judgment, § 61.

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.03[2][g], 85.05, 85.20 (Matthew Bender).

RELATED ISSUES

Duty to Instruct on Lesser

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct “on lesser included offenses when the evidence raises a question as to whether all of the elements of the charged offense were present [citation] but not when there is no evidence that the offense was less than that charged. [Citations.] The obligation to instruct on lesser included offenses exists even when as a matter of trial tactics a defendant not only fails to request the instruction but expressly objects to its being given. [Citations.] Just as the People have no legitimate interest in obtaining a conviction of a greater offense than that established by the evidence, a defendant has no right to an acquittal when that evidence is sufficient to establish a lesser included offense. [Citations.]” (*People v. Breverman* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142, 154–155 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 870, 960 P.2d 1094].)

Acquittal of Greater Does Not Bar Retrial of Lesser

Where the jury acquits of a greater offense but deadlocks on the lesser, retrial of the lesser is not barred. (*People v. Smith* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 596, 602 [189 Cal.Rptr. 862, 659 P.2d 1152].)

Lesser Included Offenses Barred by Statute of Limitations

The defendant may waive the statute of limitations to obtain a jury instruction on a lesser offense that would otherwise be time-barred. (*Cowan v. Superior Court* (1996) 14 Cal.4th 367, 373 [58 Cal.Rptr.2d 458, 926 P.2d 438].) However, the court has no sua sponte duty to instruct on a lesser that is time-barred. (*People v. Diedrich* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 263, 283 [182 Cal.Rptr. 354, 643 P.2d 971].) If the court instructs on an uncharged lesser offense that is time-barred without obtaining an explicit waiver from the defendant, it is unclear if the defendant must object at that time in order to raise the issue on appeal or if the defendant may raise the issue for the first time on appeal. (See *People v. Stanfill* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1145–1151 [90 Cal.Rptr.2d 885] [reasoning criticized in *People v. Smith* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 1182, 1193–1194 [120 Cal.Rptr.2d 185]].) The better practice is to obtain an explicit waiver on the statute of limitations when instructing on a time-barred lesser.

Conviction of Greater and Lesser

The defendant cannot be convicted of a greater and a lesser included offense. (*People v. Moran* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 755, 763 [83 Cal.Rptr. 411, 463 P.2d 763].) If the evidence supports the conviction on the greater offense, the conviction on the lesser included offense should be set aside. (*Ibid.*)

3520–3529. Reserved for Future Use

3590. Final Instruction on Discharge of Jury

You have now completed your jury service in this case. On behalf of all the judges of the court, please accept my thanks for your time and effort.

Now that the case is over, you may choose whether or not to discuss the case and your deliberations with anyone.

[I remind you that under California law, you must wait at least 90 days before negotiating or agreeing to accept any payment for information about the case.]

Let me tell you about some rules the law puts in place for your convenience and protection.

The lawyers in this case, the defendant[s], or their representatives may now talk to you about the case, including your deliberations or verdict. Those discussions must occur at a reasonable time and place and with your consent.

Please tell me immediately if anyone unreasonably contacts you without your consent.

Anyone who violates these rules is violating a court order and may be fined.

~~Please immediately report to the court any unreasonable contact, made without your consent, by the lawyers in this case, their representatives, or the defendant[s].~~

~~A lawyer, representative, or defendant who violates these rules violates a court order and may be fined.~~

[I order that the court's record of personal juror identifying information, including names, addresses, and telephone numbers, be sealed until further order of this court.

If, in the future, the court is asked to decide whether this information will be released, notice will be sent to any juror whose information is involved. You may oppose the release of this information and ask that any hearing on the release be closed to the public. The court will decide whether and under what conditions any information may be disclosed.]

Again, thank you for your service. You are now excused.

New January 2006

BENCH NOTES

Instructional Duty

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction on discharge of the jury. (Code Civ. Proc., § 206.) The court may give the bracketed portions at its discretion. (*Id.*, § 237.)

Code of Civil Procedure section 237(a)(2) requires the court to seal the personal identifying information of jurors in a criminal case following the recording of the jury's verdict. Access to the sealed records may be permitted on a showing of good cause in a petition to the court, as provided by subdivisions (b) through (d).

Section 14 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration states that "it is appropriate for the trial judge to thank jurors for their public service, but the judge's comments should not include praise or criticism of the verdict or the failure to reach a verdict."

AUTHORITY

- Statutory Authority. ▶ Code Civ. Proc., §§ 206, 237.
- Jury Tampering. ▶ Pen. Code, § 116.5.

Secondary Sources

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.05[1], [4][c] (Matthew Bender).

3591–3599. Reserved for Future Use