IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE WESTERN DIVISION

THOMAS C. BARNETT, JR., SHARON B.
TYSON, and DAVID ALAN HARRIS, In
their Capacities as Trustees of THE THOMAS
O. BARNETT TRUST and as Executors of
THE ESTATE OF T.O. BARNETT, deceased,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil No. <u>06-2171-P</u>

ANGELINA VIRGINIA BARNETT,

Defendant.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Jury Instruction No. 1

You have now heard all of the evidence in the case, as well as the final arguments of the lawyers for the parties.

My duty at this point is to instruct you as to the law. It is your duty to accept these instructions of law and apply them to the facts as you determine them, just as it has been my duty to preside over the trial and decide what testimony and evidence is relevant under the law for your consideration.

On these legal matters, you must take the law as I give it to you. If any attorney has stated a legal principle different from any that I state to you in my instructions, it is my instructions that you must follow.

You should not single out any instruction as alone stating the law, but you should consider my instructions as a whole when you retire to deliberate in the jury room.

You should not, any of you, be concerned about the wisdom of any rule that I state. Regardless of any opinion that you may have as to that the law may be - or ought to be - it would violate your sworn duty to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that which I give you.

As members of the jury, you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts. You pass upon the evidence. You determine the credibility of the witnesses. You resolve such conflicts as there may be in the testimony. You draw whatever reasonable inferences you decide to draw from the facts as you have determined them, and you determine the weight of the evidence.

Since you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts, I do not mean to indicate any opinion as to the facts or what your verdict should be. The rulings I have made during the trial are not any indication of my views of what your decision should be as to whether or not the plaintiffs have proven their case.

As to the facts, ladies and gentlemen, you are the exclusive judges. You are to perform the duty of finding the facts without bias or prejudice to any party.

In determining the facts, you are reminded that you took an oath to render judgment impartially and fairly, without prejudice or sympathy and without fear, solely upon the evidence in the case and the applicable law.

Your authority must be exercised with sincere judgment, sound discretion, and in accordance with the rules of law which I give you. In making your determination of the facts in this case, your judgment must be applied only to that which is properly in evidence.

Arguments of counsel are not in evidence, although you may give consideration to those arguments in making up your mind on what inferences to draw from the facts which are in evidence.

From time to time the court has been called upon to pass upon the admissibility of certain evidence, although I have tried to do so, insofar as it was practicable, out of your hearing. You have no concern with the reasons for any such rulings and you are not to draw any inferences from them.

Whether offered evidence is admissible is purely a question of law in the province of the court and outside the province of the jury. In admitting evidence to which objection has been made, the court does not determine what weight should be given to such evidence, nor does it pass on the credibility of the evidence. Of course, you will dismiss from your mind completely, entirely any evidence which has been ruled out of the case by the court, and you will refrain from speculation or conjecture or any guesswork about the nature or effect of any discussion between court and counsel held out of your hearing or sight.

It is the duty of the attorney on each side of a case to object when the other side offers testimony or other evidence which the attorney believes is not properly admissible. Counsel also have the right and duty to ask the court to make rulings of law and to request conferences at the side bar out of the hearing of the jury. All those questions of law must be decided by me, the court. You should not show any prejudice against an attorney or his client because the attorney objected to the admissibility of evidence, or asked for a conference out of the hearing of the jury or asked the court for a ruling on the law.

As I already indicated, my rulings on the admissibility of evidence do not, unless expressly stated by me, indicate any opinion as to the weight or effect of such evidence. You are the sole judges of the credibility of all witnesses and the weight and effect of all evidence.

Your verdict must be based solely upon the evidence developed at this trial, or the lack of evidence.

It would be improper for you to consider any personal feelings you may have about any of the parties' race, religion, national origin, sex or age.

It would be equally improper for you to allow any feelings you might have about the nature of the claim against the defendant to influence you in any way.

The parties in this case are entitled to a trial free from prejudice. Our judicial system cannot work unless you reach your verdict through a fair and impartial consideration of the evidence.

Under your oath as jurors you are not to be swayed by sympathy. You should be guided solely by the evidence presented during the trial, without regard to the consequences of your decision.

You have been chosen to try the issues of fact and reach a verdict on the basis of the evidence or lack of evidence. If you let sympathy interfere with your clear thinking, there is a risk that you will not arrive at a just verdict. All parties to a civil lawsuit are entitled to a fair trial. You must make a fair and impartial decision to that you will arrive at a just verdict.

Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom in accordance with my instructions. You must completely disregard any report which you have read in the press, seen on television, or heard on the radio. Indeed, it would be unfair to consider such reports, since they are not evidence and the parties have no opportunity of contradicting their accuracy or otherwise explaining them away. In short, it would be a violation of your oath as jurors to allow yourselves to be influenced in any manner by such publicity.

The evidence in this case is the sworn testimony of the witnesses.

By contrast, the question of a lawyer is not to be considered by you as evidence. It is the witnesses' answers that are evidence, not the questions.

Testimony that has been stricken or excluded is not evidence and may not be considered by you in rendering your verdict.

Arguments by lawyers are not evidence, because the lawyers are not witnesses. What they have said to you in their opening statements and in their summations is intended to help you understand the evidence to reach your verdict. However, if your recollection of the facts differs from the lawyers' statements, it is your recollection which controls.

Finally, statements which I may have made concerning the quality of the evidence do not constitute evidence.

It is for you alone to decide the weight, if any, to be given to the testimony you have heard and the exhibits you have seen.

You are to decide this case only from the evidence which was presented at this trial. The evidence consists of:

- The sworn testimony of the witnesses who have testified,
 both in person and by deposition;
- 2. The exhibits that were received and marked as evidence; and
- 3. Any facts to which all the lawyers have agreed or stipulated.
- 4. Any other matters that I have instructed you to consider as evidence.

There are two kinds of evidence; direct and circumstantial.

Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact, such as testimony of a witness about what the witness personally observed.

Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence that gives you clues about what happened. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a fact, or a group of facts, that causes you to conclude that another fact exists. It is for you to decide whether a fact has been proved by circumstantial evidence.

For example, if a witness testified that the witness saw it raining outside, that would be direct evidence that it was raining. If a witness testified that the witness saw someone enter a room wearing a raincoat covered with drops of water and carrying a wet umbrella, that would be circumstantial evidence from which you could conclude that it was raining.

You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence.

The law permits you to give equal weight to both, but it is for you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence.

In making your decision, you must consider all the evidence in light of reason, experience and common sense.

Although you must consider all of the evidence, you are not required to accept all of the evidence as true or accurate.

You should not decide an issue by the simple process of counting the number of witnesses who have testified on each side. You must consider all the evidence in the case. You may decide that the testimony of fewer witnesses on one side is more convincing than the testimony of more witnesses on the other side.

Certain testimony has been presented by deposition. A deposition is testimony taken under oath before the trial and preserved in writing. You are to consider that testimony as if it had been given in court.

A verdict or finding may be based on inferences fairly drawn from the facts in evidence. An inference cannot be based on surmise or speculation, and is without probative force if inconsistent with undisputed or clearly established facts. The facts on which an inference may legitimately rest must be established by direct evidence as if they were the very facts in issue. An inference cannot flow from the nonexistence of a fact, or from a complete absence of evidence as to the particular fact.

You are the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility or believability of the witnesses who have testified in this case. You must decide which witnesses you believe and how important you think their testimony is. You are not required to accept or reject everything a witness says. You are free to believe all, none, or part of any person's testimony.

In deciding which testimony you believe, you should rely on your own common sense and everyday experience. There is no fixed set of rules to use in deciding whether you believe a witness, but it may help you to think about the following questions:

- 1. Was the witness able to see, hear, or be aware of the things about which the witness testified?
- 2. How well was the witness able to recall and describe those things?
- 3. How long was the witness watching or listening?
- 4. Was the witness distracted in any way?
- 5. Did the witness have a good memory?
- 6. How did the witness look and act while testifying?
- 7. Was the witness making an honest effort to tell the truth, or did the witness evade questions?
- 8. Did the witness have any interest in the outcome of the case?

- 9. Did the witness have any motive, bias or prejudice that would influence the witness' testimony?
- 10. How reasonable was the witness' testimony when you consider all of the evidence in the case?
- 11. Was the witness' testimony contradicted by what that witness has said or done at another time, by the testimony of other witnesses, or by other evidence?
- 12. Has there been evidence regarding the witness' intelligence, respectability, or reputation for truthfulness?
- 13. Did the witness admit that any part of the witness' testimony was not true?

There may be discrepancies or differences within a witness' testimony or between the testimony of different witnesses. This does not necessarily mean that a witness should be disbelieved. Sometimes when two people observe an event they will see or hear it differently. Sometimes a witness may have an innocent lapse of memory. Witnesses may testify honestly but simply may be wrong about what they thought they saw or remembered. You should consider whether a discrepancy relates to an important fact or only to an unimportant detail.

Usually witnesses are not permitted to testify as to opinions or conclusions. However, a witness who has scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may be permitted to give testimony in the form of an opinion. Those witnesses are often referred to as "expert witnesses."

You should determine the weight that should be given to an expert's opinion. You should consider:

- The education, qualifications, and experience of the witness; and
- 2. The credibility of the witness; and
- 3. The facts relied upon by the witness to support the opinion; and
- 4. The reasoning used by the witness to arrive at the opinion.

You should consider the expert's opinion and give it the weight, if any, that you think it deserves. You are not required to accept the opinion of any expert.

In some cases, the plaintiff has the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence all of the facts necessary to prove his case.

The term "preponderance of the evidence" means that amount of evidence that causes you to conclude that an allegation is probably true. To prove an allegation by a preponderance of the evidence, a party must convince you that the allegation is more likely true than not true.

In this case, however, the plaintiffs must prove their case by clear and convincing evidence. Clear and convincing evidence is a different and higher standard than preponderance of the evidence. To prove an issue by clear and convincing evidence, the party having that burden of proof must show that the proposed conclusion is highly probable and that there is no serious or substantial doubt about the correctness of the conclusions drawn from the evidence.

All of the instructions are equally important. The order in which these instructions are given has no significance. You must follow all of the instructions and not single out some and ignore others.

In reaching your verdict you may consider only the evidence that was admitted. Remember that any questions, objections, statements or arguments made by the attorneys during the trial are not evidence. If the attorneys have stipulated or agreed to any fact, however, you will regard that fact as having been proved.

Testimony that you have been instructed to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered. If evidence has been received only for a limited purpose, you must follow the limiting instructions I have given you. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence received at trial.

Although you must only consider the evidence in this case in reaching your verdict, you are not required to set aside your common knowledge. You are permitted to weigh the evidence in light of your common sense, observations and experience.

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

It is your duty to consult with one another and to reach an agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but do so only after an impartial consideration of the evidence with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and to change your opinion if you are convinced that it is not correct. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

You are about to go into the jury room and begin your deliberations. Any communication with the court -- should always be made to me in writing, signed by your foreperson, and given to one of the marshals. Do not tell me or anyone else how the jury stands on any issue until after the unanimous verdict is reached.

You will now retire to decide the case. In order to prevail, the plaintiffs must sustain the burden of proof as I have explained to you. If you find that the plaintiffs have succeeded, you should return a verdict in their favor.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another and to deliberate with a view to reaching an agreement. Each of you must decide the case for himself, but you should do so only after a consideration of the case with your fellow jurors, and you should not hesitate to change an opinion when convinced that it is erroneous. Your verdict must be unanimous, but you are not bound to surrender your honest convictions concerning the effect or weight of the evidence for the mere purpose of returning a verdict or solely because of the opinion of other jurors. Discuss and weigh your respective opinions dispassionately, without regard to sympathy, without regard to prejudice or favor for either party, and adopt that conclusion which in your good conscience appears to be in accordance with the truth.

Some of you may have taken notes during the trial. Once you retire to the jury room you may refer to your notes, but only to refresh your own memory of the witnesses' testimony. You are free to discuss the testimony of the witnesses with your fellow jurors, but each of you must rely upon your own individual memory as to what a witness did or did not say.

In discussing the testimony, you may not read your notes to your fellow jurors or otherwise tell them what you have written. You should never use your notes to persuade or influence other jurors. Your notes are not evidence. Your notes should carry no more weight than the unrecorded recollection of another juror.

Again, each of you must make your own decision about the proper outcome of this case based on your consideration of the evidence and your discussions with your fellow jurors. No juror should surrender his conscientious beliefs solely for the purpose of returning a unanimous verdict.

When you retire, you should elect one member of the jury as your foreperson. That person will preside over the deliberations and speak for you here in open court.

After you have reached a verdict, your foreperson will fill in the verdict form that has been given to you, sign and date it and advise the marshal outside your door that you are ready to return to the courtroom. Each juror will also sign the verdict form.