

The distinguishing features of a criminal trial are what are known in the language of the law as the presumption of innocence and the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The law presumes a defendant to be innocent of crime. Thus, a defendant, although accused, begins the trial with a clean slate -- with no evidence favoring conviction. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit a defendant, unless you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt, after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case.

This last-mentioned requirement, that you be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt, is what is called the burden of proof. It is not required that the prosecution prove guilt beyond all possible doubt, for it is rarely possible to prove anything to an absolute certainty. Rather, the test is one of reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt must be proof of such a convincing character that, after consideration, you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in your important affairs. A defendant is never to be convicted on mere suspicion or conjecture.

The burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt always rests upon the prosecution. This burden never shifts throughout the trial, for the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence. A defendant has the absolute right not to testify, and

you must not draw any inference against the defendant for not testifying. Thus a reasonable doubt may arise not only from the evidence produced, but also from a lack of evidence. Since the burden is upon the prosecution to prove every essential element of the crime charged, beyond a reasonable doubt, a defendant has the right to rely upon the failure of the prosecution to establish such proof. A defendant may also rely upon evidence brought out on cross-examination of witnesses for the prosecution.

USE NOTE

McCurry v. State, 538 P.2d 100 (Alaska 1975); Davenport v. State, 519 P.2d 452 (Alaska 1974).

This instruction is usually given twice, once at the beginning of trial and once with the closing instructions.

Comment [sf1]: insert at
approximately 6
"