



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Document Scanning Lead Sheet

Aug-10-2018 5:35 pm

Case Number: CGC-16-550128

Filing Date: Aug-10-2018 5:34

Filed by: LINDA FONG

Image: 06453170

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

DEWAYNE JOHNSON VS. MONSANTO COMPANY ET AL

001C06453170

Instructions:

Please place this sheet on top of the document to be scanned.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEWAYNE JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MONSANTO COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. CGC-16-550128

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Honorable Judge Suzanne R. Bolanos

Department: 504

INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Members of the jury, you have now heard all the evidence. The attorneys will have one last chance to talk to you in closing argument. But before they do, it is my duty to instruct you on the law that applies to this case. You must follow these instructions as well as those that I previously gave you. You will have a copy of my instructions with you when you go to the jury room to deliberate. I have provided each of you with your own copy of the instructions.

You must decide what the facts are. You must consider all the evidence and then decide what you think happened. You must decide the facts based on the evidence admitted in this trial.

Do not allow anything that happens outside this courtroom to affect your decision. Do not talk about this case or the people involved in it with anyone, including family and persons living in your household, friends and coworkers, spiritual leaders, advisors, or therapists. Do not do any research on your own or as a group. Do not use dictionaries or other reference materials.

These prohibitions on communications and research extend to all forms of electronic communications. Do not use any electronic devices or media, such as a cell phone or smart phone, PDA, computer, tablet device, the Internet, any Internet service, any text or instant-messaging service, any Internet chat room, blog, or website, including social networking websites or online diaries, to send or receive any information to or from anyone about this case or your experience as a juror until after you have been discharged from your jury duty.

Do not investigate the case or conduct any experiments. Do not contact anyone to assist you, such as a family accountant, doctor, or lawyer. Do not visit or view the scene of any event involved in this case. If you happen to pass by the scene, do not stop or investigate. All jurors must see or hear the same evidence at the same time. Do not read, listen to, or watch any news accounts of this trial. You must not let bias, sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion influence your decision.

If you violate any of these prohibitions on communications and research, including prohibitions on electronic communications and research, you may be held in contempt of court or face other sanctions. That means that you may have to serve time in jail, pay a fine, or face other punishment for that violation.

I will now tell you the law that you must follow to reach your verdict. You must follow the

1 law exactly as I give it to you, even if you disagree with it. If the attorneys have said anything
2 different about what the law means, you must follow what I say.

3 In reaching your verdict, do not guess what I think your verdict should be from something I
4 may have said or done.

5 Pay careful attention to all the instructions that I give you. All the instructions are important
6 because together they state the law that you will use in this case. You must consider all of the
7 instructions together.

8 After you have decided what the facts are, you may find that some instructions do not apply.
9 In that case, follow the instructions that do apply and use them together with the facts to reach your
10 verdict.

11 If I repeat any ideas or rules of law during my instructions, that does not mean that these
12 ideas or rules are more important than the others. In addition, the order in which the instructions are
13 given does not make any difference.

INSTRUCTION NO. 2

You must decide what the facts are in this case only from the evidence you have seen or heard during the trial, including any exhibits that I admit into evidence. Sworn testimony, documents, or anything else may be admitted into evidence. You may not consider as evidence anything that you saw or heard when court was not in session, even something done or said by one of the parties, attorneys, or witnesses.

What the attorneys say during the trial is not evidence. In their opening statements and closing arguments, the attorneys talk to you about the law and the evidence. What the lawyers say may help you understand the law and the evidence, but their statements and arguments are not evidence.

The attorneys' questions are not evidence. Only the witnesses' answers are evidence. You should not think that something is true just because an attorney's question suggested that it was true. However, the attorneys for both sides have agreed that certain facts are true. This agreement is called a stipulation. No other proof is needed and you must accept those facts as true in this trial.

Each side had the right to object to evidence offered by the other side. If I sustained an objection to a question, ignore the question and do not guess as to why I sustained the objection. If the witness did not answer, you must not guess what he or she might have said. If the witness already answered, you must ignore the answer.

During the trial I granted a motion to strike testimony that you heard. You must totally disregard that testimony. You must treat it as though it did not exist.

INSTRUCTION NO. 3

A witness is a person who has knowledge related to this case. You will have to decide whether you believe each witness and how important each witness's testimony is to the case. You may believe all, part, or none of a witness's testimony.

In deciding whether to believe a witness's testimony, you may consider, among other factors, the following:

- (a) How well did the witness see, hear, or otherwise sense what he or she described in court?
- (b) How well did the witness remember and describe what happened?
- (c) How did the witness look, act, and speak while testifying?
- (d) Did the witness have any reason to say something that was not true? For example, did the witness show any bias or prejudice or have a personal relationship with any of the parties involved in the case or have a personal stake in how this case is decided?
- (e) What was the witness's attitude toward this case or about giving testimony?

Sometimes a witness may say something that is not consistent with something else he or she said. Sometimes different witnesses will give different versions of what happened. People often forget things or make mistakes in what they remember. Also, two people may see the same event but remember it differently. You may consider these differences, but do not decide that testimony is untrue just because it differs from other testimony.

However, if you decide that a witness did not tell the truth about something important, you may choose not to believe anything that witness said. On the other hand, if you think the witness did not tell the truth about some things but told the truth about others, you may accept the part you think is true and ignore the rest.

Do not make any decision simply because there were more witnesses on one side than on the other. If you believe it is true, the testimony of a single witness is enough to prove a fact.

You must not be biased in favor of or against any witness because of his or her disability, gender, race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, national origin, or socioeconomic status.

INSTRUCTION NO. 4

For purposes of these instructions and the verdict form, the term “Monsanto” shall refer to Defendant Monsanto Company.

INSTRUCTION NO. 5

A corporation, Monsanto, is a party in this lawsuit. Monsanto is entitled to the same fair and impartial treatment that you would give to an individual. You must decide this case with the same fairness that you would use if you were deciding the case between individuals.

When I use words like “person” or “he” or “she” in these instructions to refer to a party, those instructions also apply to Monsanto.

INSTRUCTION NO. 6

A party must persuade you, by the evidence presented in court, that what he or she is required to prove is more likely to be true than not true. This is referred to as “the burden of proof.”

After weighing all of the evidence, if you cannot decide that something is more likely to be true than not true, you must conclude that the party did not prove it. You should consider all the evidence, no matter which party produced the evidence.

In criminal trials, the prosecution must prove that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. But in civil trials, such as this one, the party who is required to prove something need prove only that it is more likely to be true than not true.

INSTRUCTION NO. 7

Certain facts must be proved by clear and convincing evidence, which is a higher burden of proof. This means the party must persuade you that it is highly probable that the fact is true. I will tell you specifically which facts must be proved by clear and convincing evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. 8

Evidence can come in many forms. It can be testimony about what someone saw or heard or smelled. It can be an exhibit admitted into evidence. It can be someone's opinion.

Direct evidence can prove a fact by itself. For example, if a witness testifies she saw a jet plane flying across the sky, that testimony is direct evidence that a plane flew across the sky. Some evidence proves a fact indirectly. For example, a witness testifies that he saw only the white trail that jet planes often leave. This indirect evidence is sometimes referred to as "circumstantial evidence." In either instance, the witness's testimony is evidence that a jet plane flew across the sky.

As far as the law is concerned, it makes no difference whether evidence is direct or indirect. You may choose to believe or disbelieve either kind. Whether it is direct or indirect, you should give every piece of evidence whatever weight you think it deserves.

INSTRUCTION NO. 9

During the trial, you received deposition testimony that was read from the deposition transcript or shown by video. A deposition is the testimony of a person taken before trial. At a deposition the person is sworn to tell the truth and is questioned by the attorneys. You must consider the deposition testimony that was presented to you in the same way as you consider testimony given in court.

INSTRUCTION NO. 10

Before trial, each party has the right to ask another party to admit in writing that certain matters are true. If the other party admits those matters, you must accept them as true. No further evidence is required to prove them.

INSTRUCTION NO. 11

A party may offer into evidence any oral or written statement made by an opposing party outside the courtroom.

When you evaluate evidence of such a statement, you must consider these questions:

1. Do you believe that the party actually made the statement? If you do not believe that the party made the statement, you may not consider the statement at all.
2. If you believe that the statement was made, do you believe it was reported accurately?

You should view testimony about an oral statement made by a party outside the courtroom with caution.

INSTRUCTION NO. 12

During the trial you heard testimony from expert witnesses. The law allows an expert to state opinions about matters in his or her field of expertise even if he or she has not witnessed any of the events involved in the trial.

You do not have to accept an expert's opinion. As with any other witness, it is up to you to decide whether you believe the expert's testimony and choose to use it as a basis for your decision. You may believe all, part, or none of an expert's testimony. In deciding whether to believe an expert's testimony, you should consider:

- a. The expert's training and experience;
- b. The facts the expert relied on; and
- c. The reasons for the expert's opinion.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

The law allows expert witnesses to be asked questions that are based on assumed facts. These are sometimes called “hypothetical questions.” In determining the weight to give to the expert’s opinion that is based on the assumed facts, you should consider whether the assumed facts are true.

INSTRUCTION NO. 14

If the expert witnesses disagreed with one another, you should weigh each opinion against the others. You should examine the reasons given for each opinion and the facts or other matters that each witness relied on. You may also compare the experts' qualifications.

INSTRUCTION NO. 15

A substantial factor in causing harm is a factor that a reasonable person would consider to have contributed to the harm. It must be more than a remote or trivial factor. It does not have to be the only cause of the harm.

Conduct is not a substantial factor in causing harm if the same harm would have occurred without that conduct.

INSTRUCTION NO. 16

Mr. Johnson claims that the design of Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro® was defective because Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro® did not perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform. To establish that claim, Mr. Johnson must prove all of the following:

1. That the product is one about which an ordinary consumer can form reasonable minimum safety expectations;
2. That Monsanto manufactured, distributed or sold Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro®;
3. That the Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro® used by Mr. Johnson did not perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform when used or misused in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way;
4. That Mr. Johnson was harmed; and
5. That Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro®'s failure to perform safely was a substantial factor in causing Mr. Johnson's harm.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

3

- 5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4

1 **INSTRUCTION NO. 18**

2 Mr. Johnson claims that Monsanto was negligent by not using reasonable care to warn or
3 instruct about a dangerous condition of Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro® or about facts that made the
4 Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro® products likely to be dangerous. To establish this claim, Mr.
5 Johnson must prove all of the following:
6

- 7 1. That Monsanto manufactured, distributed, or sold Roundup Pro® or Ranger
8 Pro®;
9 2. That Monsanto knew or reasonably should have known that the Roundup Pro® or
10 Ranger Pro® was dangerous or was likely to be dangerous when used or misused
11 in a reasonably foreseeable manner;
12 3. That Monsanto knew or reasonably should have known that users would not
13 realize the danger;
14 4. That Monsanto failed to adequately warn of the danger of Roundup Pro® or
15 Ranger Pro® products;
16 5. That a reasonable manufacturer, distributor, or seller under the same or similar
17 circumstances would have warned of the danger or instructed on the safe use of
18 the Roundup Pro® or Ranger Pro® products;
19 6. That Mr. Johnson was harmed; and
20 7. That Monsanto's failure to warn or instruct was a substantial factor in causing Mr.
21 Johnson's harm.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INSTRUCTION NO. 19

If you decide that Mr. Johnson has proved his claim against Monsanto, you also must decide how much money will reasonably compensate Mr. Johnson for the harm. This compensation is called "damages."

The amount of damages must include an award for each item of harm that was caused by Monsanto's wrongful conduct, even if the particular harm could not have been anticipated.

Mr. Johnson does not have to prove the exact amount of damages that will provide reasonable compensation for the harm. However, you must not speculate or guess in awarding damages.

INSTRUCTION NO. 20

The damages claimed by Mr. Johnson for the harm caused by Monsanto fall into two categories called economic damages and noneconomic damages. The parties have stipulated to the amount of economic damages. The stipulated amount has already been included on the verdict form. You will, however, be asked on the verdict form to state the amount of noneconomic damages, if any.

INSTRUCTION NO. 21

The following are the specific items of noneconomic damages claimed by Mr. Johnson:

1. Past and future physical pain, mental suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, disfigurement, physical impairment, inconvenience, grief, anxiety, humiliation, emotional distress and any other similar damages.

No fixed standard exists for deciding the amount of these noneconomic damages.

You must use your judgment to decide a reasonable amount based on the evidence and your common sense.

To recover for future pain, mental suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, disfigurement, physical impairment, inconvenience, grief, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, Mr. Johnson must prove that he is reasonably certain to suffer that harm.

For future noneconomic damages, determine the amount in current dollars paid at the time of judgment that will compensate Mr. Johnson for future noneconomic damages.

INSTRUCTION NO. 22

The arguments of the attorneys are not evidence of damages. Your award must be based on your reasoned judgment applied to the testimony of the witnesses and the other evidence that has been admitted during trial.

INSTRUCTION NO. 23

If you decide Mr. Johnson has suffered damages that will continue for the rest of his life, you must determine how long he will probably live. According to National Vital Statistics Report published by the National Center for Health Statistics, a 46-year-old male is expected to live another 33 years. This is the average life expectancy. Some people live longer and others die sooner.

This published information is evidence of how long a person is likely to live but is not conclusive. In deciding a person's life expectancy, you should also consider, among other factors, that person's health, habits, activities, lifestyle, and occupation.

INSTRUCTION NO. 24

Mr. Johnson seeks damages from Monsanto under more than one legal theory. However, each item of damages may be awarded only once, regardless of the number of legal theories alleged.

INSTRUCTION NO. 25

If you decide that Monsanto's conduct caused Mr. Johnson harm, you must decide whether that conduct justifies an award of punitive damages. The purposes of punitive damages are to punish a wrongdoer for the conduct that harmed the plaintiff and to discourage similar conduct in the future. You must not include in an award of punitive damages any amount intended as compensation for loss, harm, or damage that Mr. Johnson has incurred or may incur.

You may award punitive damages against Monsanto only if Mr. Johnson proves that Monsanto engaged in that conduct with malice or oppression. To do this, Mr. Johnson must prove one of the following by clear and convincing evidence:

1. That the conduct constituting malice or oppression was committed by one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of Monsanto, who acted on behalf of Monsanto; or
2. That the conduct constituting malice or oppression was authorized by one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of Monsanto; or
3. That one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of Monsanto knew of the conduct constituting malice or oppression and adopted or approved that conduct after it occurred.

"Malice" means that Monsanto acted with intent to cause injury or that Monsanto's conduct was despicable and was done with a willful and knowing disregard of the rights or safety of another. A person acts with knowing disregard when he or she is aware of the probable dangerous consequences of his or her conduct and deliberately fails to avoid those consequences.

"Oppression" means that Monsanto's conduct was despicable and subjected Mr. Johnson to cruel and unjust hardship in knowing disregard of his rights.

"Despicable conduct" is conduct that is so vile, base, or contemptible that it would be looked down on and despised by reasonable people.

An employee is a "managing agent" if he or she exercises substantial independent authority and judgment in his or her corporate decision making such that his or her decisions ultimately determine corporate policy.

1 There is no fixed formula for determining the amount of punitive damages, and you are not
2 required to award any punitive damages. If you decide to award punitive damages, you should
3 consider all of the following factors in determining the amount:

4 (a) How reprehensible was Monsanto's conduct? In deciding how reprehensible Monsanto's
5 conduct was, you may consider, among other factors:

- 6 1. Whether the conduct caused physical harm;
- 7 2. Whether Monsanto's disregarded the health or safety of others;
- 8 3. Whether Mr. Johnson was financially weak or vulnerable and Monsanto knew Mr. Johnson
9 was financially weak or vulnerable and took advantage of him;
- 10 4. Whether Monsanto's conduct involved a pattern or practice; and
- 11 5. Whether Monsanto acted with trickery or deceit.

12 (b) Is there a reasonable relationship between the amount of punitive damages and Mr. Johnson's
13 harm or between the amount of punitive damages and potential harm to Mr. Johnson that
14 Monsanto knew was likely to occur because of its conduct?

15 (c) In view of Monsanto's financial condition, what amount is necessary to punish it and
16 discourage future wrongful conduct? You may not increase the punitive award above an
17 amount that is otherwise appropriate merely because Monsanto has substantial financial
18 resources. Any award you impose may not exceed Monsanto's ability to pay.

19 Punitive damages may not be used to punish Monsanto for the impact of its alleged
20 misconduct on persons other than Mr. Johnson.

INSTRUCTION NO. 26

You must not consider, or include as part of any award, attorneys' fees or expenses that the parties incurred in bringing or defending this lawsuit.

INSTRUCTION NO. 27

You have heard references to Agent Orange. The defendant in this case did not make Agent Orange and you should not consider that product or any references to it for any purpose.

INSTRUCTION NO. 28

You have been told about lawsuits that were filed against Monsanto in which a plaintiff claimed to have developed NHL after being exposed to Roundup, or to Roundup as well as other chemicals. You may consider these lawsuits only on the issue of whether Monsanto had been placed on notice of claims of NHL in people exposed to Roundup. You are instructed that a complaint contains nothing more than allegations made against another party, and so the existence of such complaints is not evidence that Roundup in fact causes NHL.

INSTRUCTION NO. 29

During Dr. Portier's cross-examination, reference was made to the California EPA. You must disregard this reference and not consider it for any purpose.

INSTRUCTION NO. 30

The following exhibits are being admitted for the limited purpose of showing Monsanto's state of mind regarding the state of the science, and for no other purpose:

1. EPA, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances, Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED) Glyphosate (Sept. 1993) [Exhibit DX2489]; and
2. EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs, Glyphosate Issue Paper: Evaluation of Carcinogenic Potential dated September 12, 2016 [Exhibit DX2481]

INSTRUCTION NO. 31

You must not consider whether any of the parties in this case has insurance. The presence or absence of insurance is totally irrelevant. You must decide this case based only on the law and the evidence.

INSTRUCTION NO. 32

When you go to the jury room, the first thing you should do is choose a presiding juror. The presiding juror should see to it that your discussions are orderly and that everyone has a fair chance to be heard.

It is your duty to talk with one another in the jury room and to consider the views of all the jurors. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after you have considered the evidence with the other members of the jury. Feel free to change your mind if you are convinced that your position should be different. You should all try to agree. But do not give up your honest beliefs just because the others think differently.

Please do not state your opinions too strongly at the beginning of your deliberations or immediately announce how you plan to vote as it may interfere with an open discussion. Keep an open mind so that you and your fellow jurors can easily share ideas about the case.

You should use your common sense and experience in deciding whether testimony is true and accurate. However, during your deliberations, do not make any statements or provide any information to other jurors based on any special training or unique personal experiences that you may have had related to matters involved in this case. What you may know or have learned through your training or experience is not a part of the evidence received in this case.

Sometimes jurors disagree or have questions about the evidence or about what the witnesses said in their testimony. If that happens, you may ask to have testimony read back to you or ask to see any exhibits admitted into evidence that have not already been provided to you. Also, jurors may need further explanation about the laws that apply to the case. If this happens during your discussions, write down your questions and give them to the clerk. I will talk with the attorneys before I answer so it may take some time. You should continue your deliberations while you wait for my answer. I will do my best to answer them. When you write me a note, do not tell me how you voted on an issue until I ask for this information in open court.

Your decision must be based on your personal evaluation of the evidence presented in the case. Each of you may be asked in open court how you voted on each question.

1 While I know you would not do this, I am required to advise you that you must not base your
2 decision on chance, such as a flip of a coin. If you decide to award damages, you may not agree in
3 advance to simply add up the amounts each juror thinks is right and then, without further
4 deliberations, make the average your verdict.

5 You may take breaks, but do not discuss this case with anyone, including each other, until all
6 of you are back in the jury room.

INSTRUCTION NO. 33

If you have taken notes during the trial, you may take your notebooks with you into the jury room.

You may use your notes only to help you remember what happened during the trial. Your independent recollection of the evidence should govern your verdict. You should not allow yourself to be influenced by the notes of other jurors if those notes differ from what you remember.

At the end of the trial, your notes will be collected and destroyed.

INSTRUCTION NO. 34

You may request in writing that trial testimony be read to you. I will have the court reporter read the testimony to you. You may request that all or a part of a witness's testimony be read.

Your request should be as specific as possible. It will be helpful if you can state:

1. The name of the witness;
2. The subject of the testimony you would like to have read; and
3. The name of the attorney or attorneys asking the questions when the testimony was given.

The court reporter is not permitted to talk with you when she or he is reading the testimony you have requested.

While the court reporter is reading the testimony, you may not deliberate or discuss the case.

You may not ask the court reporter to read testimony that was not specifically mentioned in a written request. If your notes differ from the testimony, you must accept the court reporter's record as accurate.

INSTRUCTION NO. 35

I will give you verdict forms with questions you must answer. I have already instructed you on the law that you are to use in answering these questions. You must follow my instructions and the forms carefully. You must consider each question separately. Although you may discuss the evidence and the issues to be decided in any order, you must answer the questions on the verdict forms in the order they appear. After you answer a question, the form tells you what to do next. At least 9 of you must agree on an answer before you can move on to the next question. However, the same 9 or more people do not have to agree on each answer.

All 12 of you must deliberate on and answer each question regardless of how you voted on any earlier question. Unless the verdict form tells all 12 jurors to stop and answer no further questions, every juror must deliberate and vote on all of the remaining questions.

When you have finished filling out the forms, your presiding juror must write the date and sign it at the bottom of the last page and then notify the court attendant that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.

INSTRUCTION NO. 36

The jury will soon begin deliberating, but you are still alternate jurors and are bound by my earlier instructions about your conduct.

Until the jury is discharged, do not talk about the case or about any of the people or any subject involved in it with anyone, not even your family or friends, and not even with each other. Do not have any contact with the deliberating jurors. Do not decide how you would vote if you were deliberating. Do not form or express an opinion about the issues in this case, unless you are substituted for one of the deliberating jurors.

INSTRUCTION NO. 37

In this case, I have exercised my right to comment on the evidence. However, you the jury are the exclusive judges of all questions of fact and of the credibility of the witnesses. You are free to completely ignore my comments on the evidence and to reach whatever verdict you believe to be correct, even if it is contrary to any or all of those comments.

INSTRUCTION NO. 38

After your verdict is read in open court, you may be asked individually to indicate whether the verdict expresses your personal vote. This is referred to as “polling” the jury and is done to ensure that at least nine jurors have agreed to each decision.

The verdict form that you will receive asks you to answer several questions. You must vote separately on each question. Although nine or more jurors must agree on each answer, it does not have to be the same nine for each answer. Therefore, it is important for each of you to remember how you voted on each question so that if the jury is polled, each of you will be able to answer accurately about how you voted.

Each of you will be provided a draft copy of the verdict form for your use in keeping track of your votes.

INSTRUCTION NO. 39

If, during the trial, any of you had a question that you believed should be asked of a witness, you were instructed to write out the question and provide it to me through my courtroom staff. I shared your questions with the attorneys, after which I decided whether the question could be asked.

If a question was asked and answered, you are to consider the answer as you would any other evidence received in the trial. Do not give the answer any greater or lesser weight because it was initiated by a juror question.

If the question was not asked, do not speculate as to what the answer might have been or why it was not asked. There are many legal reasons why a suggested question cannot be asked of a witness. Give the question no further consideration.

INSTRUCTION NO. 40

During the trial, materials have been shown to you to help explain testimony or other evidence in the case. Some of these materials have been admitted into evidence, and you will be able to review them during your deliberations.

Other materials have also been shown to you during the trial, but they have not been admitted into evidence. You will not be able to review them during your deliberations because they are not themselves evidence or proof of any facts. You may, however, consider the testimony given in connection with those materials.

INSTRUCTION NO. 41

Members of the jury, this completes your duties in this case. On behalf of the parties and their attorneys, thank you for your time and your service. It can be a great personal sacrifice to serve as a juror, but by doing so you are fulfilling an extremely important role in California's system of justice. Each of us has the right to a trial by jury, but that right would mean little unless citizens such as each of you are willing to serve when called to do so. You have been attentive and conscientious during the trial, and I am grateful for your dedication.

Throughout the trial, I continued to admonish you that you could not discuss the facts of the case with anyone other than your fellow jurors and then only during deliberations when all twelve jurors were present. I am now relieving you from that restriction, but I have another admonition.

You now have the absolute right to discuss or not to discuss your deliberations and verdict with anyone, including members of the media. It is appropriate for the parties, their attorneys, or representatives to ask you to discuss the case, but any such discussion may occur only with your consent and only if the discussion is at a reasonable time and place. You should immediately report any unreasonable contact to the court.

If you do choose to discuss the case with anyone, feel free to discuss it from your own perspective, but be respectful of the other jurors and their views and feelings.

Thank you for your time and your service; you are discharged.