

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 23-60173-CR-WILLIAMS (GRAHAM)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

CAROLYN DENISE WADE and
TRACY D. WADE,

Defendants.

COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY

Members of the Jury:

It is my duty to instruct you on the rules of law that you must use in deciding this case. After I have completed these instructions, you will go to the jury room and begin your discussions – what we call your deliberations.

You must decide whether the Government has proved the specific facts necessary to find the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Duty to Follow Instructions and the Presumption of Innocence

Your decision must be based only on the evidence presented during the trial. You must not be influenced in any way by either sympathy for or prejudice against the Defendant or the Government.

You must follow the law as I explain it – even if you do not agree with the law – and you must follow all of my instructions as a whole. You must not single out or disregard any of the Court's instructions on the law.

The indictment or formal charge against a defendant isn't evidence of guilt. The law presumes every defendant is innocent. The Defendant does not have to prove his or her innocence or produce any evidence at all. A defendant does not have to testify, and you cannot consider in any way the fact that the Defendant did not testify. The Government must prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. If it fails to do so, you must find the Defendant not guilty.

Definition of “Reasonable Doubt”

The Government’s burden of proof is heavy, but it does not have to prove a defendant’s guilt beyond all possible doubt. The Government’s proof only has to exclude any “reasonable doubt” concerning the Defendant’s guilt.

A “reasonable doubt” is a real doubt, based on your reason and common sense after you have carefully and impartially considered all the evidence in the case.

“Proof beyond a reasonable doubt” is proof so convincing that you would be willing to rely and act on it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs. If you are convinced that the Defendant has been proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, say so. If you are not convinced, say so.

**Consideration of Direct and Circumstantial Evidence;
Argument of Counsel; Comments by the Court**

As I said before, you must consider only the evidence that I have admitted in the case. Evidence includes the testimony of witnesses and the exhibits admitted. But, anything the lawyers say is not evidence and is not binding on you.

You should not assume from anything I have said that I have any opinion about any factual issue in this case. Except for my instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I may have said during the trial in arriving at your own decision about the facts.

Your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence is what matters.

In considering the evidence you may use reasoning and common sense to make deductions and reach conclusions. You should not be concerned about whether the evidence is direct or circumstantial.

“Direct evidence” is the testimony of a person who asserts that he or she has actual knowledge of a fact, such as an eyewitness.

“Circumstantial evidence” is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances that tend to prove or disprove a fact. There is no legal difference in the weight you may give to either direct or circumstantial evidence.

Credibility of Witnesses

When I say you must consider all the evidence, I do not mean that you must accept all 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. The number of witnesses testifying concerning a particular point does not necessarily matter.

To decide whether you believe any witness, 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?
- Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case?
- Did the witness seem to have a good memory?
- Did the witness have the opportunity and ability to accurately observe the things he or she testified about?
- Did the witness appear to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly?
- Did the witness's testimony differ from other testimony or other evidence?

Impeachment of Witnesses Because of Inconsistent Statements

You should also ask yourself whether there was evidence that a witness testified falsely about an important fact. And ask whether there was evidence that at some other time a witness said or did something, or did not say or do something, that was different from the testimony the witness gave during this trial.

But keep in mind that a simple mistake does not mean a witness was not telling the truth as he or she remembers it. People naturally tend to forget some things or remember them inaccurately. So, if a witness misstated something, you must decide whether it was because of an innocent lapse in memory or an intentional deception. The significance of your decision may depend on whether the misstatement is about an important fact or about an unimportant detail.

Persons Not on Trial

In addition, some of the people who may have been involved in these events are not on trial. This does not matter. There is no requirement that all participants of a scheme to defraud be charged and prosecuted in one proceeding.

You may not draw any inference, favorable or unfavorable, towards the Government or the Defendant on trial from the fact that any person in addition to the Defendant is not on trial here. You may also not speculate as to the reasons why other persons are not on trial.

Note-taking

You have been permitted to take notes during the trial. Most of you – perhaps all of you – have taken advantage of that opportunity.

You must use your notes only as a memory aid during deliberations. You must not give your notes priority over your independent recollection of the evidence. And you must not allow yourself to be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors.

I emphasize that notes are not entitled to any greater weight than your memories or impressions about the testimony.

Introduction to Offense Instruction

The superseding indictment charges 10 separate crimes, called “counts,” against the Defendants. Each count has a number. You’ll be given a copy of the superseding indictment to refer to during your deliberations.

Count 1 charges that the Defendants knowingly and willfully conspired to commit wire fraud, in violation in Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349. Defendants are not charged in Count 1 with committing a substantive offense – they are charged with conspiring to commit that offense. I will also give you specific instructions on that conspiracy offense.

Counts 2-3 charge that the Defendants committed what are called “substantive offenses,” specifically, that Defendants committed wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343. Count 2 charges only Defendant Tracy Wade with this offense. Count 3 charges both Defendants with this offense. I will explain the law governing this offense in a moment.

Count 4 charges that the Defendants knowingly and willfully conspired to make false statements to the Small Business Administration, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371. Defendants are not charged in Count 4 with committing a substantive offense – they are charged with conspiring to commit that offense. I will also give you specific instructions on this conspiracy offense.

Counts 5-10 charge that the Defendants made false statements to the Small Business Administration, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Section 645(a). Defendant Carolyn Wade is charged with this offense in Counts 5, 8, and 9. Defendant Tracy Wade is charged with this offense in Counts 6, 7, and 10. I will also explain the law governing this offense.

COUNT 1
Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud
18 U.S.C. § 1349

It's a Federal crime to knowingly and willfully conspire or agree with someone to do something that, if actually carried out, would result in the crime of wire fraud.

A "conspiracy" is an agreement by two or more persons to commit an unlawful act. In other words, it is a kind of partnership for criminal purposes. Every member of the conspiracy becomes the agent or partner of every other member.

The Government does not have to prove that all the people named in the indictment were members of the plan, or that those who were members made any kind of formal agreement. The heart of a conspiracy is the making of the unlawful plan itself, so the Government does not have to prove that the conspirators succeeded in carrying out the plan.

The Defendant can be found guilty of this conspiracy offense only if all the following facts are proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

(1) two or more persons, in some way or manner, agreed to try to accomplish a common and unlawful plan to commit wire fraud, as charged in the superseding indictment;
and

(2) the Defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the plan and willfully joined in it.

A person may be a conspirator even without knowing all the details of the unlawful plan or the names and identities of all the other alleged conspirators.

If the Defendant played only a minor part in the plan but had a general understanding of the unlawful purpose of the plan – and willfully joined in the plan on at least one occasion – that's sufficient for you to find the Defendant guilty.

But simply being present at the scene of an event or merely associating with certain people and discussing common goals and interests doesn't establish proof of a conspiracy. Also, a person who doesn't know about a conspiracy but happens to act in a way that advances some purpose of one doesn't automatically become a conspirator.

COUNTS 2-3
Wire Fraud
18 U.S.C. § 1343

It's a federal crime to use interstate wire, radio, or television communications to carry out a scheme to defraud someone else.

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

- (1) the Defendant knowingly devised or participated in a scheme to defraud someone by using false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises;
- (2) the false pretenses, representations, or promises were about a material fact;
- (3) the Defendant acted with the intent to defraud; and
- (4) the Defendant transmitted or caused to be transmitted by wire some communication in interstate commerce to help carry out the scheme to defraud.

A "scheme to defraud" means any plan or course of action intended to deceive or cheat someone out of money or property by using false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises.

A statement or representation is "false" or "fraudulent" if it is about a material fact that the speaker knows is untrue or makes with reckless indifference to the truth, and makes with the intent to defraud. A statement or representation may be "false" or "fraudulent" when it is a half-truth, or effectively conceals a material fact, and is made with the intent to defraud.

A "material fact" is an important fact that a reasonable person would use to decide whether to do or not do something. A fact is "material" if it has the capacity or natural tendency to influence a person's decision. It doesn't matter whether the decision-maker actually relied on the statement or knew or should have known that the statement was false.

To act with "intent to defraud" means to act knowingly and with the specific intent to use false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises to cause loss or injury. Proving intent to deceive alone, without the intent to cause loss or injury, is not sufficient to prove intent to defraud.

The Government does not have to prove all the details alleged in the indictment about the

precise nature and purpose of the scheme. It also doesn't have to prove that the material transmitted by interstate wire was itself false or fraudulent; or that using the wire was intended as the specific or exclusive means of carrying out the alleged fraud; or that the Defendant personally made the transmission over the wire. And it doesn't have to prove that the alleged scheme actually succeeded in defrauding anyone.

To "use" interstate wire communications is to act so that something would normally be sent through wire, radio, or television communications in the normal course of business.

COUNT 4
General Conspiracy Charge
18 U.S.C. § 371

It's a separate Federal crime for anyone to conspire or agree with someone else to do something that would be another Federal crime if it was actually carried out.

A "conspiracy" is an agreement by two or more people to commit an unlawful act. In other words, it is a kind of "partnership" for criminal purposes. Every member of a conspiracy becomes the agent or partner of every other member.

The Government does not have to prove that all the people named in the indictment were members of the plan, or that those who were members made any kind of formal agreement.

The Government does not have to prove that the members planned together all the details of the plan or the "overt acts" that the indictment charges would be carried out in an effort to commit the intended crime.

The heart of a conspiracy is the making of the unlawful plan itself followed by the commission of any overt act. The Government does not have to prove that the conspirators succeeded in carrying out the plan.

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

- (1) two or more persons in some way agreed to try to accomplish a shared and unlawful plan;
- (2) the Defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the plan and willfully joined in it;
- (3) during the conspiracy, one of the conspirators knowingly engaged in at least one overt act as described in the indictment; and
- (4) the overt act was committed at or about the time alleged and with the purpose of carrying out or accomplishing some object of the conspiracy.

An "overt act" is any transaction or event, even one that may be entirely innocent when viewed alone, that a conspirator commits to accomplish some object of the conspiracy

A person may be a conspirator without knowing all the details of the unlawful plan or the names and identities of all the other alleged conspirators.

If the Defendant played only a minor part in the plan but had a general understanding of the unlawful purpose of the plan and willfully joined in the plan on at least one occasion, that's sufficient for you to find the Defendant guilty.

But simply being present at the scene of an event or merely associating with certain people and discussing common goals and interests doesn't establish proof of a conspiracy. A person who doesn't know about a conspiracy but happens to act in a way that advances some purpose of one doesn't automatically become a conspirator.

COUNT 5-10
False Statements to the SBA
15 U.S.C. § 645(a)

It is a Federal crime to knowingly make any false statement for the purpose of obtaining a loan from the U.S. Small Business Administration ("SBA") or for the purpose of influencing the action of the SBA in any way. The Defendant can be found guilty of this crime only if all of the following facts are proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

- (1) the Defendant knowingly made any false statement; and
- (2) the false statement was for the purpose of obtaining for him or herself or for any applicant any loan or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the SBA.

Aiding and Abetting; Agency
18 U.S.C. § 2

It's possible to prove the Defendant guilty of a crime even without evidence that the Defendant personally performed every act charged.

Ordinarily, any act a person can do may be done by directing another person, or "agent." Or it may be done by acting with or under the direction of others.

A Defendant "aids and abets" a person if the Defendant intentionally joins with the person to commit a crime.

A Defendant is criminally responsible for the acts of another person if the Defendant aids and abets the other person. A Defendant is also responsible if the Defendant willfully directs or authorizes the acts of an agent, employee, or other associate.

But finding that a Defendant is criminally responsible for the acts of another person requires proof that the Defendant intentionally associated with or participated in the crime – not just proof that the Defendant was simply present at the scene of a crime or knew about it.

In other words, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant was a willful participant and not merely a knowing spectator.

Testimony of Accomplice or Alleged Co-Conspirator with Plea Agreement

You must consider some witnesses' testimony with more caution than others.

In this case, the Government has made a plea agreement with Haydee Rivero, f/k/a Haydee Granados, an alleged Co-Conspirator, in exchange for her testimony. Such "plea bargaining," as it's called, provides for the possibility of a lesser sentence than Haydee Rivero, f/k/a Haydee Granados, an alleged Co-Conspirator, would normally face. Plea bargaining is lawful and proper, and the rules of this court expressly provide for it.

But a witness who hopes to gain more favorable treatment may have a reason to make a false statement in order to strike a good bargain with the Government.

So while a witness of that kind may be entirely truthful when testifying, you should consider that testimony with more caution than the testimony of other witnesses.

And the fact that a witness has pleaded guilty to an offense isn't evidence of the guilt of any other person.

Good-Faith Defense

“Good faith” is a complete defense to a charge that requires intent to defraud. A defendant isn’t required to prove good faith. The Government must prove intent to defraud beyond a reasonable doubt.

An honestly held opinion or an honestly formed belief cannot be fraudulent intent – even if the opinion or belief is mistaken. Similarly, evidence of a mistake in judgment, an error in management, or carelessness can’t establish fraudulent intent.

Summaries and Summary Testimony

There has been summary testimony from witnesses at this trial and the Court permitted this testimony in order to aid you in considering the evidence. Therefore, you are to give no greater consideration to summary testimony than you would give to the evidence upon which that testimony is based.

It is for you to decide whether the summary testimony or chart offered by a witness correctly presented the information contained in the documents on which they were based, and what weight to give such evidence

Knowingly; Willfully – General

The word “knowingly” means that an act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of a mistake or by accident.

The word “willfully” means that the act was committed voluntarily and purposely, with the intent to do something the law forbids; that is, with the bad purpose to disobey or disregard the law. While a person must have acted with the intent to do something the law forbids before you can find that the person acted “willfully,” the person need not be aware of the specific law or rule that his or her conduct may be violating.

On or About a Particular Date

You will see that the Indictment charges that a crime was committed “on or about” a certain date. The Government does not have to prove that the crime occurred on an exact date. The Government only has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime was committed on a date reasonably close to the date alleged.

Caution: Punishment

Each count of the indictment charges a separate crime against one or more of the Defendants. You must consider each crime and the evidence relating to it separately. And you must consider the case of each Defendant separately and individually. If you find a Defendant guilty or not guilty of one crime, that must not affect your verdict for any other crime or any other Defendant.

I caution you that each Defendant is on trial only for the specific crimes charged in the indictment. You're here to determine from the evidence in this case whether each Defendant is guilty or not guilty of those specific crimes.

You must never consider punishment in any way to decide whether a Defendant is guilty or not guilty. If you find a Defendant guilty, the punishment is for the Judge alone to decide in accordance with the Sentencing Guidelines.

Duty to Deliberate

Your verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous – in other words, you must all agree. Your deliberations are secret, and you will never have to explain your verdict to anyone.

Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after fully considering the evidence with the other jurors. So you must discuss the case with one another and try to reach an agreement. While you are discussing the case, do not hesitate to reexamine your own opinion and change your mind if you become convinced that you were wrong. But do not give up your honest beliefs just because others think differently or because you simply want to get the case over with.

Remember that, in a very real way, you are judges – judges of the facts. Your only interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

Verdict

When you get to the jury room, choose one of your members to act as foreperson. The foreperson will direct your deliberations and will speak for you in court.

A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.

[Explain verdict]

Take the verdict form with you to the jury room. When you have all agreed on the verdict, your foreperson must fill in the form, sign it, date it, and carry it. Then you will return it to the courtroom.

If you wish to communicate with me at any time, please write down your message or question and give it to the court security officer. The court security officer will bring it to me and I will respond as promptly as possible, after consulting with the attorneys – either in writing or by talking to you in the courtroom. But I caution you not to tell me how many jurors have voted one way or the other at that time.