

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Crim. No. 21-cr-642 (JDB)
DARRELL NEELY,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

GOVERNMENT’S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Pursuant to the Court’s February 9, 2023 and May 3, 2023 minute orders, the government hereby proposes the following final jury instructions, subject to issues that arise during trial:

1. Furnishing the Jury with a Copy of the Instructions, Redbook 2.100
2. Function of the Court, Redbook 2.101
3. Function of the Jury, Redbook 2.102
4. Jury’s Recollection Controls, Redbook 2.103
5. Notetaking by Jurors, Redbook 1.105
6. Evidence in the Case – Stipulations, Redbook 2.104, *as applicable*
7. Statements of Counsel, Redbook 2.105
8. Indictment Not Evidence, Redbook 2.106
9. Burden of Proof – Presumption of Innocence, Redbook 2.107
10. Reasonable Doubt, Redbook 2.108
11. Direct and Circumstantial Evidence, Redbook 2.109
12. Credibility of Witnesses, Redbook 2.200
13. Nature of Charges Not to Be Considered, Redbook 2.110
14. Preparation of Witnesses
15. Number of Witnesses, Redbook 2.111
16. Inadmissible and Stricken Evidence, Redbook 2.112, *as applicable*

17. Law Enforcement Officer Testimony, Redbook 2.207
18. Right of Defendant Not to Testify, Redbook 2.208 *or* Defendant as Witness, Redbook 2.209, *as applicable*
19. Consciousness of Guilt – Flight, *as applicable*
20. Count One, 18 U.S.C. §§ 231(a)(3), 2
21. Count Two, 18 U.S.C. § 641
22. Count Three, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1)
23. Count Four, 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2)
24. Count Five, 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(D)
25. Count Six, 18 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G)
26. Consider Only Offenses Charged
27. Proof of State of Mind, Redbook 3.101
28. Multiple Counts – One Defendant, Redbook 2.402
29. Unanimity—General, Redbook 2.405
30. Verdict Form Explanation, Redbook 2.407
31. Exhibits During Deliberations, Redbook 2.501
32. Redacted Exhibits, Redbook 2.500
33. Selection of Foreperson, Redbook 2.502
34. Possible Punishment Not Relevant, Redbook 2.505
35. Cautionary Instruction on Publicity, Communication, and Research, Redbook 2.508
36. Communication Between Court and Jury During Jury’s Deliberations, Redbook 2.509
37. Attitude and Conduct of Jurors in Deliberations, Redbook 2.510
38. Excusing Alternate Jurors, Redbook 2.511
39. Delivering the Verdict

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Instruction No. 1: Furnishing Jury with Copy of Instructions

I will provide you with a copy of my instructions. During your deliberations, you may, if you want, refer to these instructions. While you may refer to any particular portion of the instructions, you are to consider the instructions as a whole and you may not follow some and ignore others. If you have any questions about the instructions, you should feel free to send me a note. Please leave your instructions in the jury room when you conclude your deliberations.

Instruction No. 2: Function of the Court

My function is to conduct this trial in an orderly, fair, and efficient manner; to rule on questions of law; and to instruct you on the law that applies in this case. It is your duty to accept the law as I instruct you. You should consider all the instructions as a whole. You may not ignore or refuse to follow any of them.

Instruction No. 3: Function of the Jury

Your function, as the jury, is to determine what the facts are in this case. You are the sole judges of the facts. While it is my responsibility to decide what is admitted as evidence during the trial, you alone decide what weight, if any, to give to that evidence. You alone decide the credibility or believability of the witnesses.

As I explained earlier, as human beings, we all have personal likes and dislikes, opinions, prejudices, and biases. Generally, we are aware of these things, but you also should consider the possibility that you have implicit biases, that is, biases of which you may not be consciously aware. Personal prejudices, preferences, or biases have no place in a courtroom, where the goal is to arrive at a just and impartial verdict. All people deserve fair treatment in the legal system regardless of any personal characteristic, such as race, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, disability, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, education, or income level, or any other personal characteristic. You should determine the facts solely from a fair consideration of the evidence.

You may not take anything I may have said or done during the trial as indicating how I think you should decide this case. If you believe that I have expressed or indicated any such opinion, you should ignore it. The verdict in this case is your responsibility alone.

Instruction No. 4: Jury's Recollection Controls

If any reference by me or the attorneys to the evidence is different from your own memory of the evidence, it is your memory that should control during your deliberations.

Instruction No. 5: Notetaking by Jurors

During the trial, I have permitted those jurors who wanted to do so to take notes. You may take your notebooks with you to the jury room and use them during your deliberations if you wish. As I told you at the beginning of the trial, your notes are only to be an aid to your memory. They are not evidence in the case, and they should not replace your own memory of the evidence. Those jurors who have not taken notes should rely on their own memory of the evidence. The notes are intended to be for the notetaker's own personal use.

Instruction No. 6: Evidence in the Case – Stipulations *[as applicable]*

During your deliberations, you may consider only the evidence properly admitted in this trial. The evidence in this case consists of the sworn testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits that were admitted into evidence, and the facts and testimony stipulated to by the parties.

During the trial, you were told that the parties had stipulated—that is, agreed—to certain facts. You should consider any stipulation of fact to be undisputed evidence.

When you consider the evidence, you are permitted to draw, from the facts that you find have been proven, any reasonable inferences that you feel are justified in light of your experience. You should give any evidence the weight that you think it is fairly entitled to receive.

Instruction No. 7: Statements of Counsel

The statements and arguments of the lawyers are not evidence. They are only intended to assist you in understanding the evidence. Likewise, the questions of the lawyers are not evidence.

Instruction No. 8: Indictment Not Evidence

An indictment is merely the formal way of accusing a person of a crime. You must not consider the indictment as evidence of any kind—you may not consider it as any evidence of Mr. Neely's guilt or draw any inference of guilt from it.

Instruction No. 9: Burden of Proof — Presumption of Innocence

Every defendant in a criminal case is presumed to be innocent. This presumption of innocence remains with Mr. Neely throughout the trial unless and until the government has proven he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts throughout the trial. The law does not require Mr. Neely to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence at all. If you find that the government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt every element of an offense with which he is charged, it is your duty to find him guilty of that offense. On the other hand, if you find the government has failed to prove any element of an offense beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find Mr. Neely not guilty of that offense.

Instruction No. 10: Reasonable Doubt

The government has the burden of proving Mr. Neely guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Some of you may have served as jurors in civil cases, where it is only necessary to prove that a fact is more likely true than not, or, in some cases, that its truth is highly probable. In criminal cases such as this one, the government's proof must be more powerful than that. It must be beyond a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubt, as the name implies, is a doubt based on reason—a doubt for which you have a reason based on the evidence or lack of evidence in the case. If, after careful, honest, and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you cannot say that you are firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt, then you have a reasonable doubt.

Reasonable doubt is the kind of doubt that would cause a reasonable person, after careful and thoughtful reflection, to hesitate to act in the graver or more important matters in life. However, it is not an imaginary doubt, nor a doubt based on speculation or guesswork; it is a doubt based on reason. The government is not required to prove guilt beyond all doubt, or to a mathematical or scientific certainty. Its burden is to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Instruction No. 11: Direct and Circumstantial Evidence

There are two types of evidence from which you may determine what the facts are in this case—direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. When a witness, such as an eyewitness, asserts actual knowledge of a fact, that witness’s testimony is direct evidence. On the other hand, evidence of facts and circumstances from which reasonable inferences may be drawn is circumstantial evidence.

Let me give you an example. Assume a person looked out a window and saw that snow was falling. If he later testified in court about what he had seen, his testimony would be direct evidence that snow was falling at the time he saw it happen. Assume, however, that he looked out a window and saw no snow on the ground, and then went to sleep and saw snow on the ground after he woke up. His testimony about what he had seen would be circumstantial evidence that it had snowed while he was asleep.

The law says that both direct and circumstantial evidence are acceptable means of proving a fact. The law does not favor one form of evidence over another. It is for you to decide how much weight to give to any particular evidence, whether direct or circumstantial. You are permitted to give equal weight to both. Circumstantial evidence does not require a greater degree of certainty than direct evidence. In reaching a verdict in this case, you should consider all of the evidence presented, both direct and circumstantial.

Instruction No. 12: Credibility of Witnesses

In determining whether the government has proved the charges against the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, you must consider the testimony of all the witnesses who have testified.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses. You alone determine whether to believe any witness and the extent to which a witness should be believed. Judging a witness's credibility means evaluating whether the witness has testified truthfully and also whether the witness accurately observed, recalled, and described the matters about which the witness testified.

As I instructed you at the beginning of trial and again just now, you should evaluate the credibility of witnesses free from prejudices and biases.

You may consider anything else that in your judgment affects the credibility of any witness. For example, you may consider the demeanor and the behavior of the witness on the witness stand; the witness's manner of testifying; whether the witness impresses you as having an accurate memory; whether the witness has any reason for not telling the truth; whether the witness had a meaningful opportunity to observe the matters about which he or she has testified; whether the witness has any interest in the outcome of this case, stands to gain anything by testifying, or has friendship or hostility toward other people concerned with this case.

In evaluating the accuracy of a witness's memory, you may consider the circumstances surrounding the event, including the time that elapsed between the event and any later recollections of the event, and the circumstances under which the witness was asked to recall details of the event.

You may consider the reasonableness or unreasonableness, the probability or improbability, of the testimony of a witness in determining whether to accept it as true and accurate. You may consider whether the witness has been contradicted or supported by other evidence that you credit.

If you believe that any witness has shown him or herself to be biased or prejudiced, for or against either side in this trial, or motivated by self-interest, you may consider and determine whether

such bias or prejudice has colored the testimony of the witness so as to affect the desire and capability of that witness to tell the truth.

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

Instruction No. 13: Nature of Charges Not to Be Considered

One of the questions you were asked when we were selecting this jury was whether the nature of the charges themselves would affect your ability to reach a fair and impartial verdict. I asked you that question because you must not allow the nature of a charge to affect your verdict. You must consider only the evidence that has been presented in this case in reaching a fair and impartial verdict.

Instruction No. 14: Preparation of Witnesses¹

You may have heard testimony about witnesses meeting with attorneys or investigators before they testified. You are instructed that it is perfectly proper for a lawyer or investigator to interview a witness in preparation for trial.

¹ Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 93 at 21, *United States v. St. Cyr*, 22-cr-185-JDB (D.D.C. March 10, 2023).

Instruction No. 15: Number of Witnesses

The weight of the evidence is not necessarily determined by the number of witnesses testifying for each side. Rather, you should consider all the facts and circumstances in evidence to determine which of the witnesses you believe. You may find that the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side is more believable than the testimony of a greater number of witnesses on the other side, or you might find the opposite.

Instruction No. 16: Inadmissible and Stricken Evidence *[as applicable]*

The lawyers in this case sometimes objected when the other side asked a question, made an argument, or offered evidence that the objecting lawyer believed was not proper. You must not hold such objections against the lawyer who made them or the party he or she represents. It is the lawyers' responsibility to object to evidence that they believe is not admissible.

If, during the course of the trial, I sustained an objection to a lawyer's question, you should ignore the question, and you must not speculate as to what the answer would have been. If, after a witness answered a question, I ruled that the answer should be stricken, you should ignore both the question and the answer and they should play no part in your deliberations.

Instruction No. 17: Law Enforcement Officer Testimony

You have heard testimony from officers of the United States Capitol Police, the Metropolitan Police Department, United States Secret Service, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A law enforcement officer's testimony should be evaluated by you just as any other evidence in the case. In evaluating the officer's credibility, you should use the same guidelines that you apply to the testimony of any witness. In no event should you give either greater or lesser weight to the testimony of any witness merely because he or she is a law enforcement officer.

[Instruction No. 18: Right of Defendant Not to Testify] *[if applicable]*

Every defendant in a criminal case has an absolute right not to testify. Mr. Neely has chosen to exercise this right. You must not hold this decision against him, and it would be improper for you to speculate as to the reason or reasons for his decision. You must not assume the defendant is guilty because he chose not to testify.

[Instruction No. 18: Defendant as Witness] *[if applicable]*

A defendant has a right to become a witness in his own behalf. His testimony should not be disbelieved merely because he is the defendant. In evaluating his testimony, however, you may consider the fact that the defendant has a vital interest in the outcome of the trial. As with the testimony of any other witness, you should give the defendant's testimony as much weight as in your judgment it deserves.

Instruction No. 19: Consciousness of Guilt – Flight *[if applicable]*²

You have heard testimony that after the crime was supposed to have been committed and Mr. Neely was charged, Mr. Neely, who resides in the Washington, DC area, failed to attend a required court hearing in this case on September 21, 2022. You also heard that Mr. Neely was arrested in North Carolina on September 25, 2022.

If you believe that Mr. Neely fled Washington, DC to North Carolina, then you may consider this conduct, along with all the other evidence, in deciding whether the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he committed the crime charged. This conduct may indicate that he thought he was guilty of the crime charged and was trying to avoid punishment. On the other hand, sometimes an innocent person may fail to attend court hearings, or leave his home area, for some other reason. Whether or not this evidence causes you to find that the defendant was conscious of his guilt of the crime charged, and whether that indicates that he committed the crime charged, is entirely up to you as the sole judges of the facts.

² See Third Circuit Model Criminal Jury Instruction § 4.30; Sixth Circuit Pattern Jury Instruction § 7.14.

THE SPECIFIC OFFENSES

I will now instruct you on the specific offenses charged in the indictment. The indictment in this case contains six counts:

1. Civil Disorder and Aiding and Abetting;
2. Theft of Government Property;
3. Entering or Remaining in a Restricted Building or Grounds;
4. Disorderly or Disruptive Conduct in a Restricted Building or Grounds;
5. Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building; and
6. Parading, Demonstrating, or Picketing in a Capitol Building.

Instruction No. 20: Count One – Civil Disorder and Aiding and Abetting³

Count One of the indictment charges Mr. Neely with civil disorder, and also charges him with attempting to commit the offense of civil disorder, and aiding and abetting others to commit that offense. I will first explain the elements of the substantive offense, along with its associated definitions. Then, I will explain how to determine whether the defendant attempted the offense and whether the defendant aided and abetted the offense.

Elements

In order to find Mr. Neely guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, Mr. Neely knowingly committed an act with the intended purpose of obstructing, impeding, or interfering with one or more law enforcement officers.

Second, at the time of the Mr. Neely’s actual act, the law enforcement officer or officers were engaged in the lawful performance of their official duties incident to and during a civil disorder.

Third, the civil disorder in any way or degree obstructed, delayed, or adversely affected either commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce or the conduct or performance of any federally protected function.

Definitions

A person acts “knowingly” if he realizes what he is doing and is aware of the nature of his conduct, and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. In deciding whether Mr. Neely acted knowingly, you may consider all of the evidence, including what Mr. Neely did or said.

³ 18 U.S.C. §§ 231(a)(3), 2; Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 93 at 21, *United States v. St. Cyr*, 22-cr-185-JDB (D.D.C. March 10, 2023); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 122 at 25, *United States v. Williams*, No. 21-cr-618-ABJ (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2022); *see also* Transcript of Bench Verdict, ECF No. 76 at 9, *United States v. Nassif*, 21-cr-421-JDB (D.D.C. Dec. 8, 2022) (definition of knowingly); Transcript of Bench Verdict, ECF No. 81 at 12, *United States v. Brock*, 21-cr-140-JDB (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2022) (same).

The term “civil disorder” means any public disturbance involving acts of violence by groups of three or more persons, which (a) causes an immediate danger of injury to another individual, (b) causes an immediate danger of damage to another individual’s property, (c) results in injury to another individual, or (d) results in damage to another individual’s property.

The term “commerce” means commerce or travel between one state, including the District of Columbia, and any other state, including the District of Columbia. It also means commerce wholly within the District of Columbia.

The term “federally protected function” means any function, operation, or action carried out, under the laws of the United States, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or by an officer or employee thereof.

The term “department” includes executive departments. The Department of Homeland Security, which includes the United States Secret Service, is an executive department.

The term “agency” includes any department, independent establishment, commission, administration, authority, board, or bureau of the United States.

The term “law enforcement officer” means any officer or employee of the United States or the District of Columbia while engaged in the enforcement or prosecution of any criminal laws of the United States or the District of Columbia.

For the U.S. Capitol Police and Metropolitan Police Department on January 6, 2021, the term “official duties,” means policing the U.S. Capitol Building and Grounds, and enforcing federal law and D.C. law in those areas.

Attempt

In Count One, the defendant is also charged with attempt to commit the crime of civil disorder. Attempting to commit this offense is not a separate offense but an alternative way in which the government alleges that Mr. Neely committed this same offense in Count One. In order to find

Mr. Neely guilty of attempt to commit civil disorder, you must find that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following two elements:

First, that Mr. Neely intended to commit the crime of civil disorder, as I have defined that offense above.

Second, that Mr. Neely took a substantial step toward committing civil disorder which strongly corroborates or confirms that the defendant intended to commit that crime.

With respect to the first element of attempt, you may not find Mr. Neely guilty of attempt to commit civil disorder merely because he thought about it. You must find that the evidence proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the Mr. Neely's mental state passed beyond the stage of thinking about the crime to actually intending to commit it.

With respect to the substantial step element, you may not find Mr. Neely guilty of attempt to commit civil disorder merely because he made some plans to or some preparation for committing that crime. Instead, you must find that Mr. Neely took some firm, clear, undeniable action to accomplish his intent to commit obstruction of an official proceeding. However, the substantial step element does not require the government to prove that Mr. Neely did everything except the last act necessary to complete the crime.

Aiding and Abetting

In this case, the government further alleges that Mr. Neely aided and abetted others in committing civil disorder as charged in Count One. Aiding and abetting others in committing this offense is not a separate offense but an alternative way in which the government alleges that Mr. Neely committed this same offense in Count One. A person may be guilty of an offense if he aided and abetted another person in committing the offense. It is not necessary that all the people who committed the crime be caught or identified. It is sufficient if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed by someone and that Mr. Neely knowingly and intentionally aided and

abetted that person in committing the crime.

In order to find Mr. Neely guilty of civil disorder because he aided and abetted others in committing this offense, you must find that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt the following five requirements:

First, that others committed civil disorder by committing each of the elements of the offense charged, as I have explained above.

Second, that Mr. Neely knew that civil disorder was going to be committed or was being committed by others.

Third, that Mr. Neely performed an act or acts in furtherance of the offense.

Fourth, that Mr. Neely knowingly performed that act or those acts for the purpose of aiding, assisting, soliciting, facilitating, or encouraging others in committing the offense of civil disorder.

Fifth, that the defendant did that act or those acts with the intent that others commit the offense of civil disorder.

To show that Mr. Neely performed an act or acts in furtherance of the offense charged, the government needs to show some affirmative participation by the defendant which at least encouraged others to commit the offense. That is, you must find that Mr. Neely's act or acts did, in some way, aid, assist, facilitate, or encourage others to commit the offense; it is enough if Neely's act or acts further aid, assist, facilitate, or encourage only one or some parts or phases of the offense.

In deciding whether Mr. Neely had the required knowledge and intent to satisfy the fourth requirement for aiding and abetting, you may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence, including Mr. Neely's words and actions and other facts and circumstances. However, evidence that Mr. Neely merely associated with persons involved in a criminal venture or was merely present or was merely a knowing spectator during the commission of the offense is not enough for you to find Mr. Neely guilty as an aider and abettor. If the evidence shows that the defendant knew that the

offense was being committed or was about to be committed, but does not also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it was Mr. Neely's intent and purpose to aid, assist, encourage, facilitate, or otherwise associate himself with the offense, you may not find the Mr. Neely guilty of civil disorder as an aider and abettor. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Neely in some way participated in the offense committed by others as something the defendant wished to bring about and to make succeed.

The government is not required to prove that anyone discussed or agreed upon a specific time or method of committing the crime. The government is not required to prove that the crime was committed in the particular way planned or agreed upon. Nor need the government prove that the principal offender and the person alleged to be the aider and abettor directly communicated with each other.

Instruction No. 21: Count Two – Theft of Government Property⁴

Count Two of the Indictment charges Mr. Neely with theft of United States government property, specifically a U.S. Capitol Police patch, badge, name tag, and baseball hat.

Elements

In order to find the defendant guilty of theft of United States government property, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the U.S. Capitol Police patch, badge, name tag, or baseball hat described in the indictment belonged to the United States or any of its departments or agencies.

Second, that Mr. Neely stole, embezzled, purloined, or knowingly converted to his own use a U.S. Capitol Police patch, badge, name tag, or baseball hat.

Third, that Mr. Neely intended to deprive, without right, the United States government of the use or benefit of the property. It does not matter whether the defendant knew that the U.S. Capitol Police patch, badge, name tag, or baseball hat belonged to the government, only that he knew it did not belong to him.⁵

⁴ 18 U.S.C. § 641; Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 122 at 34, *Williams*, No. 21-cr-618 (ABJ) (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2022); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 83 at 29, *United States v. Thompson*, 21-cr-161-RBW (D.D.C. April 14, 2022); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 158 at 24, *United States v. Barnett*, 21-cr-83-CRC (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2023); William J. Bauer Pattern Criminal Jury Instructions of the Seventh Circuit at 286–88 (“The government need only prove that the defendant intended to deprive the owner of the use of the money or property; the government need not prove that the defendant knew the money or property belonged to the government”).

⁵ Consistent with the Court’s ruling on the parties’ motions in limine, ECF No. 80 at 12, the Government reserves the opportunity to argue, either at the pretrial conference or final charge conference, against an abandonment instruction if not supported by the evidence. *See United States v. Hurt*, 527 F.3d 1347, 1351 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (“A theory-of-defense instruction is in order if there is ‘sufficient evidence from which a reasonable jury could find’ for the defendant on his theory.”).

**Instruction No. 22: Count Three – Entering or Remaining
in a Restricted Building or Grounds⁶**

Count Three of the Indictment charges Mr. Neely with entering or remaining in a restricted building or grounds.

Elements

In order to find Mr. Neely guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that Mr. Neely entered or remained in a restricted building or grounds without lawful authority to do so.

Second, that Mr. Neely did so knowingly.

Definitions

The term “restricted building or grounds” means any posted, cordoned off, or otherwise restricted area of a building or grounds where a person protected by the Secret Service is or will be temporarily visiting.

The term “person protected by the Secret Service” includes the Vice President and the immediate family of the Vice President.

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning as that described for Count One.

⁶ See 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(1); *United States v. Jabr*, 4 F.4th 97, 101 (D.C. Cir. 2021); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 93 at 21, *St. Cyr*, 22-cr-185-JDB (D.D.C. March 10, 2023); Final Jury Instructions at 30, *United States v. Sheppard*, No. 21-cr-203-JDB (D.D.C. 2023) (not yet docketed).

**Instruction No. 23: Count Four – Disorderly or Disruptive Conduct
in a Restricted Building⁷**

Count Four of the Indictment charges Mr. Neely with disorderly or disruptive conduct in a restricted building or grounds.

Elements

In order to find Mr. Neely guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that Mr. Neely engaged in disorderly or disruptive conduct in, or in proximity to, any restricted building or grounds.

Second, that Mr. Neely did so knowingly, and with the intent to impede or disrupt the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions.

Third, that Mr. Neely's conduct in fact impeded or disrupted the orderly conduct of Government business or official functions.

Definitions

“Disorderly” conduct is that which tends to disturb the public peace, offend public morals, or undermine public safety. For example, disorderly conduct occurs when a person is unreasonably loud and disruptive under the circumstances, or interferes with another person by jostling against or unnecessarily crowding that person.

Conduct is “disruptive” if it interrupts an event, activity, or the normal course of process.

Even mere presence in an unlawful mob or riot is disorderly in the sense that it furthers the

⁷ 18 U.S.C. § 1752(a)(2); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 158 at 18–20, *United States v. Barnett*, 21-cr-83-CRC (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2023); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 86 at 22-23, *United States v. Robertson*, No. 21-cr-34 (CRC) (D.D.C. April 8, 2022); Redbook 6.643; *see also* Transcript of Bench Verdict, ECF No. 76 at 14-16, *Nassif*, 21-cr-421-JDB (D.D.C. Dec. 8, 2022) (definitions of disorderly and disruptive); Transcript of Bench Verdict, ECF No. 81 at 18–20, *Brock*, 21-cr-140-JDB (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2022) (same); *id.* at 12, 21 (inferring intent from the natural and probable consequences of actions).

mob's disturbance of the public peace and disruptive in the insofar as it disturbs the normal and peaceful conditions of the Capitol grounds and buildings.

The term "restricted building or grounds" has the same meaning as in the instructions for Count Three.

The term "knowingly" has the same meanings as in the instructions for Count One.

The law permits you to infer that a person intends the natural and probable consequences of their actions.

Instruction No. 24: Count Five – Disorderly Conduct in a Capitol Building⁸

Count Five of the Indictment charges Mr. Neely with disorderly or disruptive conduct in a Capitol Building.

Elements

In order to find Mr. Neely guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that Mr. Neely engaged in disorderly or disruptive conduct in any of the United States Capitol Buildings.

Second, that Mr. Neely did so with the intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of a session of Congress or either House of Congress.

Third, that Mr. Neely acted willfully and knowingly.

Definitions

The term “United States Capitol Buildings” includes the United States Capitol located at First Street, Southeast, in Washington, D.C.

The term “disorderly or disruptive conduct” has the same meaning described in the instructions for Count Four defining “disorderly conduct” and “disruptive conduct.”

A person acts “willfully” if he acts with the intent to do something that the law forbids, that is, to disobey or disregard the law. “Willfully” does not, however, require proof that the defendant be aware of the specific law or rule that her conduct may be violating.

⁸ 40 U.S.C. §§ 5101, 5104(e)(2)(D); *see Bryan v. United States*, 524 U.S. 184, 190 (1998); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 93 at 32, *St. Cyr*, No. 22-cr-185-JDB (D.D.C. March 10, 2023); Final Jury Instructions at 33–34, *Sheppard*, No. 21-cr-203 (JDB) (D.D.C. 2023); Transcript of Bench Verdict, ECF No. 76 at 22, *Nassif*, 21-cr-421-JDB (D.D.C. Dec. 8, 2022); Transcript of Bench Verdict, ECF No. 81 at 23, *Brock*, 21-cr-140-JDB (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2022).

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning as that described in the instructions for Count One.

**Instruction No. 25: Count Six – Parading, Demonstrating,
or Picketing in a Capitol Building⁹**

Count Six of the Indictment charges Mr. Neely with parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a Capitol building.

In order to find Mr. Neely guilty of this offense, you must find that the government proved each of the following two elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that Mr. Neely paraded, demonstrated, or picketed in any of the United States Capitol Buildings.

Second, that Mr. Neely acted willfully and knowingly.

The terms “parade” and “picket” have their ordinary meanings.

The term “demonstrate” refers to conduct that would disrupt the orderly business of Congress by, for example, impeding or obstructing passageways, hearings, or meetings, but does not include activities such as quiet praying.

The term “United States Capitol Buildings” has the same meaning as in the instruction for Count Five.

The term “knowingly” has the same meaning as that described in the instructions for Count One.

The term “willfully” has the same meaning as that described in the instructions for Count Five.

⁹ 40 U.S.C. § 5104(e)(2)(G); Final Jury Instructions, ECF No. 93 at 34, *St. Cyr*, No. 22-cr-185-JDB (D.D.C. March 10, 2023); Final Jury Instructions at 35, *Sheppard*, No. 21-cr-203 (JDB) (D.D.C. 2023); *Bynum v. United States Capitol Police Board*, 93 F. Supp. 2d 50, 58 (D.D.C. 2000).

Instruction No. 26: Consider Only Offenses Charged¹⁰

You are here to decide whether the Government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the offenses charged. The defendant is not on trial for any act, conduct, or offense not charged in the indictment. It is not up to you whether anyone other than the defendant should be prosecuted for any of the offenses charged. The fact that another person may also be guilty is no defense to a criminal charge. The question of the possible guilt of others should not enter your thinking as you decide whether this defendant has been proved guilty of the offenses charged.

¹⁰ Final Jury Instructions at 36, *Sheppard*, 21-cr-203-JDB (D.D.C. 2023); *see also* Sixth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions, Defining the Crime and Related Matters No. 2.01(3) (2021).

Instruction No. 27: Proof of State of Mind

Someone's intent or knowledge ordinarily cannot be proved directly, because there is no way of knowing what a person is actually thinking, but you may infer someone's intent or knowledge from the surrounding circumstances. You may consider any statement made or acts done by the defendant, and all other facts and circumstances received in evidence which indicate his intent or knowledge.

It is entirely up to you, however, to decide what facts to find from the evidence received during this trial. You should consider all the circumstances in evidence that you think are relevant in determining whether the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant acted with the necessary state of mind.

Instruction No. 28: Multiple Counts—One Defendant

Each count of the indictment charges a separate offense. You should consider each offense, and the evidence which applies to it, separately, and you should return separate verdicts as to each count. The fact that you may find the defendant guilty or not guilty on any one count of the indictment should not influence your verdict with respect to any other count of the indictment.

CONCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS

Instruction No. 29: Unanimity—General

A verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror, and in order to return a verdict, each juror must agree on the verdict. In other words, your verdict on each count must be unanimous.

Instruction No. 30: Verdict Form Explanation

You will be provided with a Verdict Form for use when you have concluded your deliberations. The form is not evidence in this case, and nothing in it should be taken to suggest or convey any opinion by me as to what the verdict should be. Nothing in the form replaces the instructions of law I have already given you, and nothing in it replaces or modifies the instructions about the elements which the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

The form is meant only to assist you in recording your verdict. Please follow the instructions closely.

Instruction No. 31: Exhibits During Deliberation

I will be sending into the jury room with you the exhibits that have been admitted into evidence. You may examine any or all of them as you consider your verdict. Please keep in mind that exhibits that were only marked for identification but were not admitted into evidence will not be given to you to examine or consider in reaching your verdict.

Instruction No. 32: Redacted Exhibits

During the course of this trial, a number of exhibits were admitted in evidence. Sometimes only portions of an exhibit were admitted, such as portions of a longer video, a document with some words or pictures blacked out or otherwise removed, or a video played without audio. There are a variety of reasons why only a portion of an exhibit is admitted, including that the other portions are inadmissible or implicate an individual's privacy. As you examine the exhibits, and you see or hear portions where there appear to be omissions, you should consider only the portions that were admitted. You should not guess as to what has been taken out or why, and you should not hold it against either party. You are to decide the facts only from the evidence that is before you.

Instruction No. 33: Selection of Foreperson

When you return to the jury room, you should first select a foreperson to preside over your deliberations and to be your spokesperson here in court. There are no specific rules regarding how you should select a foreperson. That is up to you. However, as you go about the task, be mindful of your mission—to reach a fair and just verdict based on the evidence.

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

Instruction No. 34: Possible Punishment Not Relevant

The question of possible punishment of the defendant in the event of a conviction is not a concern of yours and should not enter into or influence your deliberations in any way. The duty of imposing a sentence in the event of a conviction rests exclusively with me. Your verdict should be based solely on the evidence in this case, and you should not consider the matter of punishment at all.

**Instruction No. 35: Cautionary Instruction on Publicity,
Communications, Research**

I would like to remind you that, in some cases, there may be reports in the newspaper or on the radio, internet, or television concerning this case. If there should be such media coverage in this case, you may be tempted to read, listen to, or watch it. You must not read, listen to, or watch such reports because you must decide this case solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom. If any publicity about this trial inadvertently comes to your attention, do not discuss it with other jurors or anyone else. Just let me or my clerk know as soon after it happens as you can, and I will then briefly discuss it with you.

As you retire to the jury room to deliberate, I also wish to remind you of an instruction I gave you at the beginning of the trial. During deliberations, you may not communicate with anyone not on the jury about this case. This includes any electronic communication such as email or text or any blogging about the case. In addition, you may not conduct any independent investigation during deliberations. This means you may not conduct any research in person or electronically via the internet or in another way.

Instruction No. 36: Communications Between Court and Jury During Deliberations

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with me, you may send a note by the clerk or marshal, signed by your foreperson or by one or more members of the jury. No member of the jury should try to communicate with me about the case except by such a signed note, and I will never communicate with any member of the jury on any matter concerning the merits of this case, except in writing or orally here in open court.

Bear in mind also that you are never, under any circumstances, to reveal to any person— not the clerk, the marshal, or me—how jurors are voting until after you have reached a unanimous verdict. This means that you should never tell me, in writing or in open court, how the jury is divided on any matter—for example, 6-6 or 7-5 or 11-1, or in any other fashion— whether the vote is for conviction or acquittal or on any other issue in the case.

Instruction No. 37: Attitude and Conduct of Jurors in Deliberations

The attitude and conduct of jurors at the beginning of their deliberations are matters of considerable importance. It may not be useful for a juror, upon entering the jury room, to voice a strong expression of an opinion on the case or to announce a determination to stand for a certain verdict. When one does that at the outset, a sense of pride may cause that juror to hesitate to back away from an announced position after a discussion of the case. Furthermore, many juries find it useful to avoid an initial vote upon retiring to the jury room. Calmly reviewing and discussing the case at the beginning of deliberations is often a more useful way to proceed. Remember that you are not partisans or advocates in this matter, but you are judges of the facts.

Instruction No. 38: Excusing Alternate Jurors

The last thing I must do before you begin your deliberations is to excuse the alternate jurors. As I told you before, the selection of an alternate was an entirely random process; it's nothing personal. We selected two seats to be the alternate seats before any of you entered the courtroom. Since the rest of you have remained healthy and attentive, I can now excuse the jurors in seats [] and [].

Before you leave, I am going to ask you to tear out a page from your notebook, and to write down your name and daytime phone number and hand this to the clerk. I do this because it is possible that we will need to summon you back to rejoin the jury in case something happens to a regular juror. Since that possibility exists, I am also going to instruct you not to discuss the case with anyone until we call you. My earlier instruction on use of the Internet still applies; do not research this case or communicate about it on the Internet. In all likelihood, we will be calling you to tell you there has been a verdict and you are now free to discuss the case; there is, however, the small chance that we will need to bring you back on to the jury. Thank you very much for your service, and please report back to the jury office to turn in your badge on your way out.

Instruction No. 39: Delivering the Verdict

When you have reached your verdict, just send me a note informing me of this fact, and have your foreperson sign the note. Do not tell me what your verdict is. The foreperson should fill out and sign the verdict form that will be provided. I will then call you into the courtroom and ask your foreperson to read your verdict in open court.

Thank you. You may now retire to begin your deliberations.