

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY  
AT LOUISVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PLAINTIFF

v.

CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 3:98CR-152-S

SAMEER ABDEL SHABAN  
a/k/a SAMIR SHABAN  
a/k/a MOHID OMAR

DEFENDANTS

**COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY**

Members of the Jury:

It is now my duty to instruct you on the rules of law that you must follow and apply in deciding this case. When I have finished you will go to the jury room and begin your deliberations.

It will be your duty to decide whether the United States has proved beyond a reasonable doubt the specific facts necessary to find the defendant guilty of the crimes charged in the indictment.

You must make your decision only on the basis of the testimony and other evidence presented here during the trial; and you must not be influenced in any way by either sympathy or prejudice for or against the defendant or the United States.

You must also follow the law as I explain it to you whether you agree with that law or not. You must follow all of the instructions as a whole; you may not single out, or disregard, any of the court's instructions on the law.

The indictment or formal charge against any defendant is not evidence of guilt. The defendant is presumed by the law to be innocent. The law does not require a defendant to prove innocence or produce any evidence at all. This means that a defendant has no obligation to testify. Therefore, if a defendant does not testify during a trial, you may not draw any inference or suggestion of guilt from that fact, nor may you consider this in any way in reaching your verdict. The United States has the burden of proving a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and if it fails to do so you must find the defendant not guilty.

While the United States' burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that a defendant's guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the United States' proof exclude any "reasonable doubt" concerning a defendant's guilt.

A "reasonable doubt" is a doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs.

You must consider only the evidence that I have admitted in the case. The term "evidence" includes the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits admitted in the record. Remember that anything the lawyers say is not evidence in the case. It is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you.

In considering the evidence you may make deductions and reach conclusions which reason and common sense lead you to make. You need not be concerned about whether the evidence is direct or circumstantial. "Direct evidence" is the testimony of one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eye witness. "Circumstantial evidence" is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances indicating that the defendant is either guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight you may give to either direct or circumstantial evidence.

Now, in saying that you must consider the evidence, I do not mean that you must accept all of the evidence as true or accurate. You should decide whether you believe what each witness had to say, and how important that testimony was. In making that decision you may believe or disbelieve any witness, in whole or in part. Also, the number of witnesses testifying concerning any particular dispute is not controlling.

In deciding how much of a witness' testimony to believe, I suggest that you ask yourself a few questions: Did the witness impress you as one who was telling the truth? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth or a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness have a good memory? Did the witness have the opportunity and ability to observe accurately the things he or she testified about? Did the witness appear to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly?

You should also ask yourself whether there was evidence tending to prove that the witness testified falsely concerning some important fact; or, whether there was evidence that at some other time the witness said or did something, or failed to say or do something, which was different from the testimony given before you during the trial.

The fact that a witness has pled guilty to a felony offense is another factor you may consider in deciding whether you believe the testimony of that witness.

However, a simple mistake by a witness does not necessarily mean that the witness was not telling the truth as he or she remembers it, because people naturally tend to forget some things or remember other things inaccurately. So, if a witness has made a misstatement, you need to consider whether that was simply an innocent lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood.

The testimony of some witnesses must be considered with more caution than the testimony of other witnesses.

In this case the United States called as one of its witnesses a person named as a co-defendant in the indictment, with whom the United States has entered into a plea agreement providing for a lesser sentence than the witness would otherwise be exposed to for the offense to which he pled guilty. Such plea bargaining, as it's called, has been approved as lawful and proper, and is expressly provided for in the rules of this court. However, a witness who hopes to gain more favorable treatment in his or her own case may have a reason to make a false statement because he wants to strike a good bargain with the United States. So, while a witness of that kind may be entirely truthful when testifying, you should consider his testimony with more caution than the testimony of other witnesses.

And, of course, the fact that a witness has pled guilty to a crime charged in the indictment is not evidence, in and of itself, of the guilt of the defendant.

In any criminal case the United States must prove the identity of the defendant as the person who committed the alleged crime.

When a witness points out and identifies a defendant as the person who committed a crime, you must first decide, as with any other witness, whether that witness is telling the truth as he or she understands it. Then, if you believe the witness was truthful, you must still decide how accurate the identification was. Again, I suggest that you ask yourself a number of questions: Did the witness have an adequate opportunity at the time of the crime to observe the person in question? What length of time did the witness have to observe the person? What were the prevailing conditions at that time in terms of visibility or distance and the like? Had the witness known or observed the person at earlier times?

You may also consider the circumstances surrounding the later identification itself including, for example, the manner in which the defendant was presented to the witness for identification, and the length of time that elapsed between the incident in question and the witness' identification of the defendant.

After examining all of the testimony and evidence in the case, if you have a reasonable doubt as to the identity of the defendant as the perpetrator of the offense charged, you must find the defendant not guilty.



In this case, as you know, the indictment charges two separate offenses called "counts." I will not read it to you at length because you will be given a copy of the indictment for study during your deliberations.

## **BANK FRAUD**

Count 2 of the indictment accuses the defendant of the crime of bank fraud.

Title 18, United States Code, Section 1344 makes it a federal crime or offense for anyone to commit a fraud upon a financial institution.

The defendant can be found guilty of that crime only if all of the following facts are proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: That the defendant executed or attempted to execute a scheme to obtain money owned by or under the custody and control of National City Bank of Kentucky by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises that were material;

Second: That the defendant did so knowingly;

Third: That National City Bank of Kentucky was insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The parties have stipulated, or agreed, that this is true.

The word "scheme" includes any plan or course of action intended to deceive others and to obtain, by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises, money or property from persons so deceived.

A statement or representation is "false" or "fraudulent" within the meaning of this statute if it relates to a material fact and is known to be untrue or is made with reckless indifference as to its truth or falsity, and is made or caused to be made with intent to defraud. A statement or representation may also be "false" or "fraudulent" when it constitutes a half-truth or effectively conceals a material fact, with intent to defraud.

To act with "intent to defraud" means to act knowingly and with intent to deceive, for the purpose of causing some loss to another or bringing about some gain to one's self.

It is not necessary for the United States to prove that the defendant profited from the execution or the attempted execution of an illegal scheme.

Something is "material" if it is relevant to the decision to be made by the officers or employees of the institution involved and has the capacity of influencing them in making that decision.

It is not necessary, however, to prove that the institution involved was, in fact, influenced or misled.

The guilt of a defendant in a criminal case may be proved without evidence that he personally did every act involved in the commission of the crime charged. The law recognizes that, ordinarily, anything a person can do for himself may also be accomplished through direction of another person as an agent, or by acting together with, or under the direction of, another person or persons in a joint effort.

So, if the acts or conduct of an agent or associate of a defendant is intentionally directed or authorized by that defendant, or if a defendant aids and abets another person by intentionally joining together with that person in the commission of a crime, then the law holds the defendant responsible for the conduct of that other person just as though the defendant had engaged in such conduct himself.

Notice, however, that before any defendant can be held criminally responsible for the conduct of others it is necessary that the defendant associate himself in some way with the crime, and intentionally participate in it. Mere presence at the scene of a crime and even knowledge that a crime is being committed are not sufficient to establish that a defendant either directed or aided and abetted the crime. You must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was a participant and not merely a knowing spectator.

### SOCIAL SECURITY FRAUD

Count 3 of the indictment accuses the defendant of the crime of Social Security fraud.

Title 42, United States Code, Section 408(a)(7)(b) makes it a federal crime or offense for anyone to falsely represent a Social Security number as their own for any purpose.

The defendant can be found guilty of that crime only if all of the following facts are proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

First: That the defendant, for any purpose, falsely represented a number to be the Social Security number assigned to him;

Second: That the number so represented was not the Social Security number assigned to him;

Third: That the defendant made the representation with the intent to deceive.

To act "with intent to deceive" means to act with the intent to mislead another.

You will note that the indictment charges that the offenses were committed "on or about" a certain date. The United States does not have to prove with certainty the exact date of the alleged offenses. It is sufficient if the United States proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

The word "knowingly," as that term has been used in these instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident.

The defendant is on trial only for the specific offenses alleged in the indictment. The question of punishment should never be considered by the jury in any way in deciding the case. If the defendant is convicted the matter of punishment is for the judge to determine.

Any verdicts you reach in the jury room, whether guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. In other words, to return verdicts you must all agree. Your deliberations will be secret; you will not have to explain your verdicts to anyone.

It is your duty as jurors to discuss the case with one another in an effort to reach agreement if you can do so. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after full consideration of the evidence with the other members of the jury. While you are discussing the case do not hesitate to re-examine your own opinion and change your mind if you become convinced that you were wrong. But do not give up your honest beliefs solely because the others think differently or merely to get the case over with.



When you go to the jury room you should first select one of your members to act as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations and will speak for you here in court.

A form of verdict has been prepared for your convenience.

You will take the verdict form to the jury room and when you have reached unanimous agreement you will have your foreperson fill in the verdict form, date and sign it, and then return to the courtroom.