Rcv'd by: HD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

USDC - BALTIMORE
'24 JUN 17 AM10:50

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	
V.	*	**Criminal No. MJM-21-470**
	*	
NICHELLE HENSON	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	

* *

Objections to Government Verdict Form

The defendant objects strenuously to the government's proposed verdict form. **The government's proposed verdict form is a glaring attempt to railroad this jury into a conviction!** It denies the defendant, the fundamental right to a fair trial.

This form, with its stark "guilty" or "not guilty" options, disregards the fundamental principle of our justice system: the presumption of innocence.

This form is a **blank check** for the government. It offers the jury **no guidance** on the elements the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt for each charge. Are they even sure what those elements are? **Shouldn't the jury be clear on what the government needs to show to take away Nichelle Henson freedom?**

The government's form is akin to a multiple-choice test with only one passing grade. It fails to ensure the jury grasps the essential elements the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt for each charge: bank fraud and false statements. Without clear guidance on these

elements, the jury is left to guess at the necessary standard, potentially convicting Nichelle Henson based on misunderstanding or incomplete information.

This form also fails to ensure the jury's **certainty**. Where's the option for jurors who have doubts? The government wants a quick "guilty" or "not guilty," not a thoughtful examination of the evidence. **Shouldn't jurors be absolutely sure before convicting someone?**

Furthermore, the form lacks any mechanism to confirm the jury's certainty. A jury verdict is a momentous decision, one that should not be rushed or taken lightly. The absence of a "question of doubt" element deprives Nichelle Henson of a crucial safeguard. Jurors with lingering doubts may be pressured to convict simply because there's no option to express their hesitation.

This one-sided approach prioritizes speed and a conviction over a fair and just outcome. The government's eagerness to secure a verdict at any cost is deeply concerning.

This is not about finding the truth; it's about a **win for the government at all costs**. **The defendant demands a fair and balanced verdict form!**

Therefore, the defense proposes the attached verdict form that respects the jury's role. It ensures they understand their responsibility and have the tools to deliver a just verdict. Only with this level of clarity can the defendant have a fair trial. This revised form includes:

1. **Clear definitions of the elements the government must prove for each charge (bank fraud and false statements).**
2. **Separate sections for each charge to avoid confusion.**

3. **A "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard for each element, reminding jurors of the high burden the prosecution bears.**
4. **A "not guilty due to reasonable doubt" option, acknowledging the jury's right to acquit if unsure.**

This form fosters a thorough understanding of the case and a well-considered verdict. It levels the playing field, giving both the government and the defendant a fair chance.

The defendant moves to preserve her right to lodge further objections with respect to the proposed verdict form. The defense reserves its right to be heard on the verdict form.

