



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on March 2, 2018

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Jury Instructions: Additions and Revisions to Criminal Jury Instructions	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
<i>Judicial Council of California Criminal Jury Instructions (CALCRIM)</i>	March 2, 2018
Recommended by	Date of Report
Advisory Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions	January 5, 2018
Hon. René Auguste Chouteau, Chair	Contact
	Robin Seeley, 415-865-7710
	<a href="mailto:robin.seeley@jud.ca.gov">robin.seeley@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary

The Advisory Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions recommends approval of the proposed revisions and additions to the *Judicial Council of California Criminal Jury Instructions (CALCRIM)*. These changes will keep *CALCRIM* current with statutory and case authority.

### Recommendation

The Advisory Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions recommends that the Judicial Council, effective March 2, 2018, approve for publication under rule 2.1050 of the California Rules of Court the criminal jury instructions prepared by the committee. Once approved, the revised instructions will be published in the next official edition of the *Judicial Council of California Criminal Jury Instructions*.

A table of contents and the proposed revisions to the criminal jury instructions are attached at pages 9–100.

## **Previous Council Action**

At its meeting on July 16, 2003, the Judicial Council adopted what is now rule 10.59 of the California Rules of Court, which established the advisory committee and its charge.<sup>1</sup> In August 2005, the council voted to approve the *CALCRIM* instructions under what is now rule 2.1050 of the California Rules of Court.

Since that time, the committee has complied with both rules by regularly proposing to the council additions and changes to *CALCRIM*. The council approved the last *CALCRIM* release at its September 2017 meeting.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

The committee recommends proposed revisions to the following instructions: *CALCRIM* Nos. 332, 359, 360, 840, 1002, 1032, 1300, 1850, 2100, 2101, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2125, 2126, 2521, and 3100. It also recommends adoption of the following new instructions: *CALCRIM* Nos. 377, 2102, 2114, 2765, 3001, and 3002.

The committee revised the instructions based on comments or suggestions from justices, judges, and attorneys; proposals by staff and committee members; and recent developments in the law.

Below is an overview of some of the proposed changes, focusing on the new instructions.

### **Proposed NEW *CALCRIM* No. 377, Presence of Support Person/Dog**

In *People v. Chenault* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 1503, 1517–1518, the court suggested in dicta that instructing on the presence of a support dog was a “preferred practice” to minimize potential prejudice. See Penal Code section 868.4. Penal Code section 868.5 provides that “supporting persons” may assist prosecution witnesses. Although the committee had previously received feedback that a pattern jury instruction on this subject was not necessary, the tide has turned and it now proposes this draft.

### **Proposed NEW *CALCRIM* Nos. 2102 and 2114, with revisions to related *CALCRIM* Nos. 2100, 2101, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2125, and 2126**

The state legislature amended Vehicle Code sections 23152 and 23153 to include new violations for driving with .04 percent or more blood alcohol content with a passenger for hire. These code sections go into effect on July 1, 2018. The committee drafted new instructions to cover these new violations. It also made necessary revisions to other related instructions with cross-references in the bench notes: *CALCRIM* Nos. 2100, 2101, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2125, and 2126.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 10.59(a) states: “The committee regularly reviews case law and statutes affecting jury instructions and makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for updating, amending, and adding topics to the council’s criminal jury instructions.”

### **Proposed NEW CALCRIM No. 2765, Misappropriation of Public Money**

A recent case, *People v. Spaccia* (2017) 12 Cal.App.5th 1278, 1291, found fault with CALJIC No. 7.26.1 on misappropriation of public money. The committee decided to draft a correct, more inclusive instruction that encompasses the provisions of Penal Code sections 424(a)(1–7) to assist courts in instructing on these crimes.

### **Proposed New CALCRIM Nos. 3001 and 3002, Failure to Appear While on Bail, Failure to Appear While on Own Recognizance Release**

Deputy District Attorney Craig Fisher of San Diego County proposed instructions on these offenses. The committee agreed these could be helpful to judges and practitioners.

### **CALCRIM Nos. 1850, 2125, and 3100, instructions with potential issues regarding bifurcated trials**

A trial judge commented that the bench notes in these instructions could be more clear. In particular, she mentioned that attorneys had been uncertain about the distinction between elements and sentencing enhancements. In response to these concerns, the committee carefully reviewed and edited the language in the “Instructional Duty” section of the bench notes and added two new paragraphs in the “Related Issues” section of the bench notes (i.e., “Defense Stipulation to Prior Convictions” and “Motion for Bifurcated Trial.”)

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

The proposed additions and revisions to *CALCRIM* circulated for public comment from November 21 through December 31, 2017. The committee received input from two different commentators. The text of all comments received and committee responses is included in a comment chart attached at pages 5–8.

Rule 2.1050 of the California Rules of Court requires the committee to regularly update, amend, and add topics to *CALCRIM* and to submit its recommendations to the council for approval. The proposed revised instructions are necessary to ensure that the instructions remain clear, accurate, and complete; therefore, the advisory committee considered no alternative actions.

### **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

No implementation costs are associated with this proposal. To the contrary, under the publication agreement, the official publisher, LexisNexis, will print a new edition and pay royalties to the Judicial Council. The council’s contract with West Publishing provides additional royalty revenue.

The official publisher will also make the revised content available free of charge to all judicial officers in both print and HotDocs document assembly software. With respect to commercial publishers, the council will register the copyright of this work and continue to license its publication of the instructions under provisions that govern accuracy, completeness, attribution, copyright, fees and royalties, and other publication matters. To continue to make the instructions

freely available for use and reproduction by parties, attorneys, and the public, the council provides a broad public license for their noncommercial use and reproduction.

### **Attachments**

1. Chart of comments, at pages 5–8
2. Full text of revised *CALCRIM* instructions, including table of contents, at pages 9–100

## CALCRIM 2017, Summer Invitation to Comment

### Revised CALCRIM Instructions

The longer comments have been lightly edited.

EInstruction	Commentator	Comment	Response
	Judge Kent Hamlin, Superior Court of Fresno County	<p>Position: Comment on Behalf of Org.:</p> <p>I have comments regarding proposed changes to the Bench Notes for four instructions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <u>Bench notes to CALCRIM 224 should read:</u> If intent or mental state is the only element proved by circumstantial evidence, do not give this instruction. Give CALCRIM No. 225, Circumstantial Evidence: Intent or Mental State.</li> <li>2) <u>Bench notes to CALCRIM 225 should read:</u> Give this instruction when the defendant's intent or mental state is the only element of the offense that rests substantially or entirely on circumstantial evidence. If other elements of the offense also rest substantially or entirely on circumstantial evidence, do not give this instruction. Give CALCRIM No. 224, Circumstantial Evidence: Sufficiency of Evidence.</li> </ol> <p>I do not understand the rationale for the proposed changes that eliminate the words, "do not give this instruction." Either it is a case where circumstantial evidence is only pointed to as evidence of mental state or intent, in which case the judge must give 225, or it is a case where circumstantial evidence may prove some other element of the crime, in which case the judge must give 224. If there is any question which instruction applies, 224 should be given. A judge should <i>never</i> give both instructions, as 225 is entirely subsumed within 224.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) <u>Bench notes to CALCRIM 359 should read:</u> The court has a sua sponte duty to instruct on corpus delicti whenever an accused's extrajudicial <b>confession or</b></li> </ol>	<p>The committee agrees with the first two comments and will retract the proposed changes.</p> <p>Comments 3 &amp; 4 raise issues outside the scope of the current invitation to comment. The committee will consider them at its next meeting.</p>

## CALCRIM 2017, Summer Invitation to Comment

### Revised CALCRIM Instructions

The longer comments have been lightly edited.

EInstruction	Commentator	Comment	Response
		<p><b>admissions</b> form part of the prosecution’s evidence. (People v. Howk (1961) 56 Cal.2d 687, 707 [16 Cal.Rptr. 370, 365 P.2d 426]). However, if the defendant’s extrajudicial statements are a part of the crime itself, as with criminal threats, robbery or conspiracy, for example, this instruction should not be given, even upon request.</p> <p>This more accurately frames the issue for the trial judge. It is a misstatement of the law to instruct the jurors that, “That other evidence need only be slight and need only be enough to support a reasonable inference that the crime is committed,” when the only statements of the defendant in evidence are “verbal acts,” such as a criminal threat or other statement in the course of the commission of the crime. The <i>corpus delicti</i> rule is not implicated at all in that setting. This instruction is designed to prevent a defendant from being convicted of a crime he did not commit, based only on his admission or confession. I appreciate the committee wanted to get away from the use of the terms “confession” and “admission,” but this instruction without further guidance has been a dangerous pitfall ever since the Supreme Court ruled in <i>People v. Diaz</i> (2015) 60 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 1176, that CALCRIM 358 must still be given, even in cases where the defendant’s statements are an element of the crime.</p> <p>4) Accordingly, the <u>Bench Note to CALCRIM 358</u> should also be <u>modified</u>, under the paragraph entitled, “Related Instructions”: If the out-of-court oral statement made by the defendant in evidence is a confession or admission, then <u>CALCRIM No. 359</u>, Corpus Delicti: Independent Evidence of a Charged Crime, may also be given, together with the bracketed cautionary instruction. If the extrajudicial statement of</p>	

## CALCRIM 2017, Summer Invitation to Comment

### Revised CALCRIM Instructions

The longer comments have been lightly edited.

EInstruction	Commentator	Comment	Response
		<p>the defendant in evidence is part of the crime itself, as with criminal threats, robbery or conspiracy, for example, that instruction should not be given, even upon request.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these important modifications.</p>	
2102, 2110, 2114, 2125, 2126, 2765, 3001, 3002, 224, 225, 332, 360, 359, 840, 1002, 1032, 1300, 1850, 2100, 2101, 2110, 2111, 2112, 3100, 2521	Orange County Bar Association	We agree with the proposed modifications for these instructions.	No response necessary
377	Orange County Bar Association	<p>We propose additional language in <b>bold</b> as follows: purpose . . . , <b>nor let it influence your decision in any way.</b> Or, alternatively, reword this entirely and pattern it after the more extensive language of CALJIC No. 1.09 in <b>bold</b> as follows: <b>The fact that [during the trial,] a [support] (person/dog) (was/is) present in the courtroom must not be considered by you for any purpose. You must disregard the (person's/dog's) presence and decide the case solely on the evidence presented. You must not consider the testimony of any witness to be more or less believable because of the (person/s/dog/s) presence. You must not speculate as to why the (person/dog) (was/is) present. In determining the issues in the case, disregard the matter entirely.</b></p> <p>As to the BENCH NOTES section, we propose adding the additional word “<b>exclusively</b>” for clarification as follows:</p>	<p>The committee respectfully disagrees with the first suggestion.</p> <p>First, it would never copy a CALJIC instruction, if only to avoid committing copyright infringement.</p> <p>Second, the committee believes that “less is more.” The suggestion to add more examples would undercut the blanket admonition to not let the presence of the support person or dog influence the jury’s decision in any way.</p> <p>The committee respectfully disagrees with the proposed paraphrasing of the bench note. The distinction between support dogs and support</p>

## CALCRIM 2017, Summer Invitation to Comment

### Revised CALCRIM Instructions

The longer comments have been lightly edited.

<b>E</b> Instruction	Commentator	Comment	Response
		The court may give this instruction on request. If <b>exclusively</b> instructing on support person, this instruction only applies to prosecution witnesses.	persons and the witnesses they may support is clear. Even in the unlikely event that a trial featured both support persons and support dogs, the instruction would still only apply to prosecution witnesses when assisted by support persons.



# Table of Contents

## Winter 2018 CALCRIM Proposed Revisions

<b>Instruction Number</b>	<b>Instruction Title</b>
NEW 377	Presence of Support Person/Dog
NEW 2102, 2114, REVISED 2110, 2125, 2126	New DUI Crimes When Driving With “Passengers for Hire” as well as necessary cross-referenced instructions
NEW 2765	Misappropriation of Public Money
NEW 3001, 3002	Failure to Appear While on Bail, Failure to Appear While on Own Recognizance Release
332, 360	Expert Witness Testimony, Statements to an Expert
359	Corpus Delicti
840	Inflicting Injury on Spouse, Cohabitant, or Fellow Parent Resulting in Traumatic Condition
1002, 1032	Rape of Intoxicated Woman or Spouse, Sodomy of Intoxicated Person
1300	Criminal Threat
1850, 2100, 2101, 2111, 2112, 3100	Instructions With Potential Issues Regarding Bifurcated Trials
2521	Carrying Concealed Firearm Within Vehicle

**377. Presence of Support Person/Dog (Pen. Code, §§ 868.4, 868.5)**

---

\_\_\_\_\_ *<insert name of witness>* **(will have/has/had) a (person/dog) present during (his/her) testimony. Do not consider the support (person's/dog's) presence for any purpose.**

---

*New March 2018*

**BENCH NOTES**

***Instructional Duty***

The court may give this instruction on request. If instructing on support persons, this instruction only applies to prosecution witnesses.

**AUTHORITY**

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 868.4, 868.5.

**2102. Driving With 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol Causing Injury With a Passenger for Hire (Veh. Code, § 23153(e))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_] with causing injury to another person while driving with a blood-alcohol level of 0.04 percent or more [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23153(e)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant drove a vehicle;
2. When (he/she) drove, the defendant's blood-alcohol level was 0.04 percent or more by weight;
3. When (he/she) drove with that blood-alcohol level, (he/she) also (committed an illegal act/ [or] neglected to perform a legal duty);
4. When (he/she) drove, there was a passenger for hire in the vehicle;

**AND**

5. The defendant's (illegal act/ [or] failure to perform a legal duty) caused bodily injury to another person.

A person is a *passenger for hire* when the person or someone else pays, or is expected to pay, for the ride, the payment is or will be with money or something else of value, and the payment is made to, or expected to be made to, the owner, operator, agent or any other person with an interest in the vehicle.

[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of the defendant's (blood/breath) was taken within three hours of the defendant's [alleged] driving and that a chemical analysis of the sample showed a blood-alcohol level of 0.04 percent or more, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant's blood-alcohol level was 0.04 percent or more at the time of the alleged offense.]

[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Public Health.]

[The People allege that the defendant committed the following illegal act[s]: \_\_\_\_\_ <list name[s] of offense[s]>.

To decide whether the defendant committed \_\_\_\_\_ <list name[s] of offense[s]>, please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

[The People [also] allege that the defendant failed to perform the following legal (duty/duties) while driving the vehicle: (the duty to exercise ordinary care at all times and to maintain proper control of the vehicle/ \_\_\_\_\_ <insert other duty or duties alleged>).]

[You may not find the defendant guilty unless all of you agree that the People have proved that the defendant (committed [at least] one illegal act/[or] failed to perform [at least] one duty).

<Alternative A—unanimity required; see Bench Notes>

[You must all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]

<Alternative B—unanimity not required; see Bench Notes>

[But you do not have to all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]

[Using *ordinary care* means using reasonable care to prevent reasonably foreseeable harm to someone else. A person fails to exercise ordinary care if he or she (does something that a reasonably careful person would not do in the same situation/ [or] fails to do something that a reasonably careful person would do in the same situation).]

[An act causes bodily injury to another person if the injury is the direct, natural, and probable consequence of the act and the injury would not have happened without the act. A *natural and probable consequence* is one that a reasonable person would know is likely to happen if nothing unusual intervenes. In deciding whether a consequence is natural and probable, consider all of the circumstances established by the evidence.]

[There may be more than one cause of injury. An act causes bodily injury to another person only if it is a substantial factor in causing the injury. A *substantial factor* is more than a trivial or remote factor. However, it need not be the only factor that causes the injury.]

---

## BENCH NOTES

### ***Instructional Duty***

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant committed an act forbidden by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to specify the predicate offense alleged and to instruct on the elements of that offense. (*People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].)

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant neglected to perform a duty imposed by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the duty allegedly neglected. (See *People v. Minor, supra*, 28 Cal.App.4th at pp. 438–439.) If the prosecution alleges that the defendant neglected the general duty of every driver to exercise ordinary care (see *People v. Oyass* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243]), the court should give the bracketed definition of “ordinary care.”

If causation is at issue, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proximate cause. (*People v. Bernhardt* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 567, 590–591 [35 Cal.Rptr. 401].) If the evidence indicates that there was only one cause of injury, the court should give the first bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “direct, natural, and probable” language. If there is evidence of multiple causes of injury, the court should also give the second bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “substantial factor” definition. (See *People v. Autry* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 351, 363 [43 Cal.Rptr.2d 135]; *People v. Pike* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 732, 746–747 [243 Cal.Rptr. 54].)

There is a split in authority over whether there is a **sua sponte** duty to give a unanimity instruction when multiple predicate offenses are alleged. (*People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30] [unanimity instruction required], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735] [unanimity instruction not required but preferable]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438] [unanimity instruction not required]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906] [unanimity instruction not required, failure to give harmless error if was required].) If the court concludes that a unanimity

instruction is appropriate, give the unanimity alternative A. If the court concludes that unanimity is not required, give the unanimity alternative B.

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23153(e); Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” if there is evidence that the defendant’s blood-alcohol level was below 0.04 percent at the time of the test.

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayian* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

Do **not** give this instruction if the court has bifurcated the trial. Instead, give CALCRIM No. 2126, Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial. See the Bench Notes to CALCRIM No. 3100, Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial, for an extensive discussion of bifurcation. If the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2110, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

### ***Defenses—Instructional Duty***

On request, if supported by the evidence, the court must instruct on the “imminent peril/sudden emergency” doctrine. (*People v. Boulware* (1940) 41 Cal.App.2d 268, 269–270 [106 P.2d 436].) The court may use the bracketed instruction on sudden emergency in CALCRIM No. 590, *Gross Vehicular Manslaughter While Intoxicated*.

### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2100, *Driving a Vehicle or Operating a Vessel Under the Influence Causing Injury*.

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

CALCRIM No. 595, *Vehicular Manslaughter: Speeding Laws Defined*.

### **AUTHORITY**

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23153(e); *Burg v. Municipal Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 257, 265–266 [198 Cal.Rptr. 145, 673 P.2d 732].
- Partition Ratio ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152; *People v. Bransford* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 885, 890 [35 Cal.Rptr.2d 613, 884 P.2d 70].
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, § 23153(e); Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Must Instruct on Elements of Predicate Offense ▶ *People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].
- Negligence—Ordinary Care ▶ Pen. Code, § 7(2); Restatement Second of Torts, § 282.
- Causation ▶ *People v. Rodriguez* (1960) 186 Cal.App.2d 433, 440 [8 Cal.Rptr. 863].
- Unanimity Instruction ▶ *People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906].
- Statute Constitutional ▶ *Burg v. Municipal Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 257, 273 [198 Cal.Rptr. 145, 673 P.2d 732].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

## LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

- Driving With 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol With a Passenger for Hire ► Veh. Code, § 23152(e).

## RELATED ISSUES

See the Related Issues section in CALCRIM No. 2111, *Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol* and CALCRIM No. 2100, *Driving a Vehicle or Operating a Vessel Under the Influence Causing Injury*.

**2103–2109. Reserved for Future Use**



## **2110. Driving Under the Influence (Veh. Code, § 23152(a))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with driving under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug) [or under the combined influence of an alcoholic beverage and a drug] [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant drove a vehicle;

**AND**

2. When (he/she) drove, the defendant was under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug) [or under the combined influence of an alcoholic beverage and a drug].

A person is *under the influence* if, as a result of (drinking [or consuming] an alcoholic beverage/ [and/or] taking a drug), his or her mental or physical abilities are so impaired that he or she is no longer able to drive a vehicle with the caution of a sober person, using ordinary care, under similar circumstances.

The manner in which a person drives is not enough by itself to establish whether the person is or is not under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug) [or under the combined influence of an alcoholic beverage and a drug]. However, it is a factor to be considered, in light of all the surrounding circumstances, in deciding whether the person was under the influence.

[An *alcoholic beverage* is a liquid or solid material intended to be consumed that contains ethanol. Ethanol is also known as ethyl alcohol, drinking alcohol, or alcohol. [An *alcoholic beverage* includes \_\_\_\_\_ <insert type[s] of beverage[s] from Veh. Code, § 109 or Bus. & Prof. Code, § 23004, e.g., wine, beer>.]

[A *drug* is a substance or combination of substances, other than alcohol, that could so affect the nervous system, brain, or muscles of a person that it would appreciably impair his or her ability to drive as an ordinarily cautious person, in full possession of his or her faculties and using reasonable care, would drive under similar circumstances.]

[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more at the time of the chemical analysis, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant was under the influence of an alcoholic beverage at the time of the alleged offense.]

[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Public Health.]

[It is not a defense that the defendant was legally entitled to use the drug.]

[If the defendant was under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [and/or] a drug), then it is not a defense that something else also impaired (his/her) ability to drive.]

---

*New January 2006; Revised June 2007, April 2008, August 2015, March 2018*

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime. Give this instruction if the defendant is charged with a misdemeanor or a felony based on prior convictions.

If the defendant is charged with one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) If the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*. If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690].)

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent”

explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23610; Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent” if there is no substantial evidence that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was at or above 0.08 percent at the time of the test. In addition, if the test falls within the range in which no presumption applies, 0.05 percent to just below 0.08 percent, do not give this bracketed sentence. (*People v. Wood* (1989) 207 Cal.App.3d Supp. 11, 15 [255 Cal.Rptr. 537].) The court should also consider whether there is sufficient evidence to establish that the test result exceeds the margin of error before giving this instruction for test results of 0.08 percent. (Compare *People v. Campos* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 4–5 [188 Cal.Rptr. 366], with *People v. Randolph* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 11 262 Cal.Rptr. 378].)

The statute also creates a rebuttable presumption that the defendant was not under the influence if his or her blood alcohol level was less than 0.05 percent. (*People v. Gallardo* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 489, 496 [27 Cal.Rptr.2d 502].) Depending on the facts of the case, the defendant may be entitled to a pinpoint instruction on this presumption. It is not error to refuse an instruction on this presumption if the prosecution’s theory is that the defendant was under the combined influence of drugs and alcohol. (*People v. Andersen* (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 1241, 1250 [32 Cal.Rptr.2d 442].)

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayan* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

Give the bracketed sentence stating that “it is not a defense that something else also impaired (his/her) ability to drive” if there is evidence of an additional source of impairment such as an epileptic seizure, inattention, or falling asleep.

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2111, *Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol*.

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

**AUTHORITY**

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(a).
- Alcoholic Beverage Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 109; Bus. & Prof. Code, § 23004.
- Drug Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 312.
- Driving ▶ *Mercer v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 753, 768 [280 Cal.Rptr. 745, 809 P.2d 404].
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, § 23610; Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Mandatory Presumption Unconstitutional Unless Instructed as Permissive Inference ▶ *People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].
- Under the Influence Defined ▶ *People v. Schoonover* (1970) 5 Cal.App.3d 101, 105–107 [85 Cal.Rptr. 69]; *People v. Enriquez* (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 661, 665–666 [49 Cal.rptr.2d 710].
- Manner of Driving ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 84 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170]; *People v. McGrath* (1928) 94 Cal.App. 520, 524 [271 P. 549].
- Legal Entitlement to Use Drug Not a Defense ▶ Veh. Code, § 23630.
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

***Secondary Sources***

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare §§ 272-277.

2 Witkin, California Evidence (5th ed. 2012), Demonstrative, Experimental, and Scientific Evidence § 56.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02[1] (Matthew Bender).

## LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

If the defendant is charged with felony driving under the influence based on prior convictions, then the misdemeanor offense is a lesser included offense. The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate if the prior convictions have been proved. If the jury finds that the prior convictions have not been proved, then the offense should be set at a misdemeanor.

- Attempted Driving Under the Influence ► Pen. Code, § 664; Veh. Code, § 23152(a); *People v. Garcia* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d Supp.1, 3–4 [262 Cal.Rptr. 915].

## RELATED ISSUES

### ***Driving***

“[S]ection 23152 requires proof of volitional movement of a vehicle.” (*Mercer v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 753, 768 [280 Cal.Rptr. 745, 809 P.2d 404].) However, the movement may be slight. (*Padilla v. Meese* (1986) 184 Cal.App.3d 1022, 1029 [229 Cal.Rptr. 310]; *Henslee v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 445, 450–453 [214 Cal.Rptr. 249].) Further, driving may be established through circumstantial evidence. (*Mercer, supra*, 53 Cal.3d at p. 770; *People v. Wilson* (1985) 176 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 9 [222 Cal.Rptr. 540] [sufficient evidence of driving where the vehicle was parked on the freeway, over a mile from the on-ramp, and the defendant, the sole occupant of the vehicle, was found in the driver’s seat with the vehicle’s engine running].) See CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

### ***PAS Test Results***

The results of a preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) test “are admissible upon a showing of either compliance with title 17 or the foundational elements of (1) properly functioning equipment, (2) a properly administered test, and (3) a qualified operator . . . .” (*People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203].)

### ***Presumption Arising From Test Results—Timing***

Unlike the statute on driving with a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more, the statute permitting the jury to presume that the defendant was under the

influence if he or she had a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more does not contain a time limit for administering the test. (Veh. Code, § 23610; *People v. Schrieber* (1975) 45 Cal.App.3d 917, 922 [119 Cal.Rptr. 812].) However, the court in *Schrieber, supra*, noted that the mandatory testing statute provides that “the test must be incidental to both the offense and to the arrest and . . . no substantial time [should] elapse . . . between the offense and the arrest.” (*Id.* at p. 921.)

**2114. Driving With 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol With a Passenger for Hire (Veh. Code, § 23152(e))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_] with driving with a blood-alcohol level of 0.04 percent or more with a passenger for hire [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(e)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant drove a vehicle;
2. When (he/she) drove, the defendant's blood-alcohol level was 0.04 percent or more by weight;

**AND**

3. When (he/she) drove, there was a passenger for hire in the vehicle.

A person is a *passenger for hire* when the person or someone else pays, or is expected to pay, for the ride, the payment is or will be with money or something else of value, and the payment is made to, or expected to be made to, the owner, operator, agent or any other person with an interest in the vehicle.

[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of the defendant's (blood/breath) was taken within three hours of the defendant's [alleged] driving and that a chemical analysis of the sample showed a blood alcohol level of 0.04 percent or more, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.04 percent or more at the time of the alleged offense.]

[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Public Health.]

---

*New March 2018, effective July 2018*

## BENCH NOTES

### ***Instructional Duty***

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime. Give this instruction if the defendant is charged with a misdemeanor or a felony based on prior convictions.

Do **not** give this instruction if the court has bifurcated the trial. Instead, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. See the Bench Notes to CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial*, for an extensive discussion of bifurcation.

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23152(e); Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” if there is no substantial evidence that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was at or above 0.4 percent at the time of the test.

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayian* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2110, *Driving Under the Influence*.



CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

## **AUTHORITY**

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(e).
- Partition Ratio ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152; *People v. Bransford* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 885, 890 [35 Cal.Rptr.2d 613, 884 P.2d 70].
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, §§ 23152(e), 23610; Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

### ***Secondary Sources***

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare §§ 272-277

.

## **RELATED ISSUES**

### ***Defense Stipulation to Prior Convictions***

The defendant may stipulate to the truth of the prior convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) If the defendant stipulates, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)

### ***Motion for Bifurcated Trial***

Either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington*, *supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.)

**2125. Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions (Veh. Code, §§ 23550, 23550.5 & 23566)**

---

If you find the defendant guilty of ([causing injury while] driving under the influence/ [or] [causing injury while] driving with a blood alcohol level of (0.08/0.04) percent or more), [or the lesser offense of driving under the influence [or driving with a blood alcohol level of (0.08/0.04) percent or more]], you must then determine whether the People have proved the additional allegation that the defendant has been convicted of (another/other) driving under the influence offense[s] before. It has already been determined that the defendant is the person named in exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert numbers or descriptions of exhibits>*. You must decide whether the evidence proves that the defendant was convicted of the alleged crime[s].

**The People allege that the defendant has been convicted of:**

[1.] A violation of \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert Veh. Code section violated>*, on \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert date of conviction>*, in the \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert name of court>*, in Case Number \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert docket or case number>*(;/.)

[AND *<Repeat for each prior conviction alleged>*.]

[Consider the evidence presented on this allegation only when deciding whether the defendant was previously convicted of the crime[s] alleged [or for the limited purpose of \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert other permitted purpose, e.g., assessing credibility of the defendant>*]. Do not consider this evidence for any other purpose.]

[You must consider each alleged conviction separately.] The People have the burden of proving (the/each) alleged conviction beyond a reasonable doubt. If the People have not met this burden [for any alleged conviction], you must find that the alleged conviction has not been proved.

---

*New January 2006, Revised March 2018*

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proof of the alleged prior convictions. ~~Give this instruction if the defendant does not admit the prior conviction and the court has not granted a bifurcated trial on the prior conviction.~~

~~Any prior convictions are a sentencing factor for the trial court and not an element of the offense. (*People v. Burris* (2005) 34 Cal.4th 1012, 1016, fn. 3 [22 Cal.Rptr.3d 876, 103 P.3d 276].) The defendant may stipulate to the truth of the prior convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) If the defendant stipulates, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)~~

~~In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) Do not give this instruction if the court has bifurcated the trial. Instead, If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With .08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. See the Bench Notes to CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial*, for an extensive discussion of bifurcation.~~

This instruction **must** be given with the appropriate instruction defining the elements of the driving under the influence offense charged, CALCRIM Nos. 2100, 2101, 2110, 2111.

On request, the court should give the bracketed limiting instruction regarding the evidence of the prior convictions. (See *People v. Valentine* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 170, 182, fn. 7 [228 Cal.Rptr. 25, 720 P.2d 913].) There is no sua sponte duty to give the limiting instruction and the defense may prefer that no limiting instruction be given. (See *People v. Griggs* (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1139 [2 Cal.Rptr.3d 380].)

The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate if the prior convictions have or have not been proved.

## AUTHORITY

- Enhancements. ▶ Veh. Code, §§ 23550, 23550.5 & 23566.

- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].
- Judge Determines if Defendant Person Named in Documents ▶ Pen. Code, § 1025(b); *People v. Garcia* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 1159, 1165 [132 Cal.Rptr.2d 694].
- Limiting Instruction on Prior Conviction ▶ *People v. Valentine* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 170, 182, fn. 7 [228 Cal.Rptr. 25, 720 P.2d 913]; *People v. Griggs* (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1139 [2 Cal.Rptr.3d 380].

### ***Secondary Sources***

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 222–225.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02[3][d] (Matthew Bender).

## **RELATED ISSUES**

### ***Ten-Year “Washout” Period***

Effective January 1, 2005, prior convictions for driving under the influence within ten years of the current offense may be used for enhancement purposes. (See Veh. Code, §§ 23550, 23550.5 & 23566.)

### ***Order of Convictions, Not Offenses Relevant***

In order for the sentencing enhancements for multiple driving under the influence offenses to apply, the conviction for the other offense or offenses must predate the current offense. (*People v. Snook* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1210, 1216 [69 Cal.Rptr.2d 615, 947 P.2d 808].) The date on which the other offenses occurred is not relevant. (*Ibid.*)

### ***All Offenses Must Occur Within Time Period***

“[F]or a fourth DUI offense to be charged as a felony, the offense must be committed within [. . . ten] years of three or more separate DUI violations resulting in convictions, and all four must occur within a period of [. . . ten] years.” (*People v. Munoz* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 12, 20 [125 Cal.Rptr.2d 182].)

### ***Prior Felony Reduced to Misdemeanor***

In *People v. Camarillo* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1386, 1389 [101 Cal.Rptr.2d 618], the defendant had been previously convicted of a felony driving under the influence offense. After successful completion of probation, that felony was

reduced to a misdemeanor under Penal Code section 17(b). (*Ibid.*) The court held that that conviction could not later be used as a prior *felony* conviction to enhance the defendant's sentence. (*Ibid.*)

**Defense Stipulation to Prior Convictions**

The defendant may stipulate to the truth of the prior convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) If the defendant stipulates, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)

**Motion for Bifurcated Trial**

Either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.)

See also the Related Issues section and Bench Notes to CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial*.

**2126. Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial (Veh. Code, §§ 23550, 23550.5 & 23566)**

---

**The People have alleged that the defendant was previously convicted of (another/other) driving under the influence offense[s]. It has already been determined that the defendant is the person named in exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ <insert numbers or descriptions of exhibits>. You must decide whether the evidence proves that the defendant was convicted of the alleged crime[s].**

**The People allege that the defendant has been convicted of:**

**[1.] A violation of \_\_\_\_\_ <insert Veh. Code section violated>, on \_\_\_\_\_ <insert date of conviction>, in the \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of court>, in Case Number \_\_\_\_\_ <insert docket or case number>(;/.)**

**[AND <Repeat for each prior conviction alleged>.]**

**[In deciding whether the People have proved the allegation[s], consider only the evidence presented in this proceeding. Do not consider your verdict or any evidence from the earlier part of the trial.]**

**You may not return a finding that (the/any) alleged conviction has or has not been proved unless all 12 of you agree on that finding.**

---

*New January 2006, Revised March 2018*

**BENCH NOTES**

***Instructional Duty***

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proof of the alleged prior convictions. Give this instruction if the court has granted a bifurcated trial. The court **must also give** CALCRIM No. 221, *Reasonable Doubt: Bifurcated Trial*.

Give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “In deciding whether the People have proved” on request.

The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate if the prior conviction has been proved. (Pen. Code, § 1158.)

## AUTHORITY

- Enhancements ▶ Veh. Code, §§ 23550, 23550.5 & 23566.
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].
- Bifurcation ▶ *People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–79 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41].
- Judge Determines if Defendant Person Named in Documents ▶ Pen. Code, § 1025(b); *People v. Garcia* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 1159, 1165 [132 Cal.Rptr.2d 694].

### *Secondary Sources*

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 222–225.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02[3][d] (Matthew Bender).

## RELATED ISSUES

See the Related Issues section in CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*, and CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial*.

**2127–2129. Reserved for Future Use**

## **2765. Misappropriation of Public Money (Pen. Code § 424(a)(1-7))**

---

**The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with misappropriating public money [in violation of Penal Code section 424(a)(\_\_\_\_)<insert correct paragraph>].**

**To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:**

- 1. The defendant was responsible for receiving, safekeeping, transferring, or distributing public money;  
[AND]**
- 2. The defendant, while responsible for receiving, safekeeping, transferring, or distributing public money:**

*<select the element that corresponds to the paragraph of Pen. Code § 424(a) with which defendant is charged>*

- <(a)(1)>* **[took some of that money for (his/her) own or someone else's use without legal authority;]**
- <(a)(2)>* **[loaned, made a profit from, or used some of that money without legal authority;]**
- <(a)(3)>* **[knowingly kept a false account or made a false entry or erasure in any account of the money.]**
- <(a)(4)>* **[fraudulently changed, falsified, hid, destroyed, or obliterated an accounting of that money.]**
- <(a)(5)>* **[willfully refused or failed to disburse, on demand, any public money in (his/her) control in response to a draft, order, or warrant drawn upon that money by competent authority;]**
- <(a)(6)>* **[willfully failed to transfer any public money when the transfer was required by law;]**
- <(a)(7)>* **[willfully failed or refused to disburse any money that (he/she) had received to a person legally authorized to receive that money, despite having a legal duty to do so;]**

*<give element 3 when instructing on Pen. Code § 424(a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(5), (a)(6), (a)(7)>*

**[AND]**

- 3. When the defendant did so, (he/she) (knew that (he/she) was not following the law on receiving, safekeeping, transferring, or distributing public money or was acting without legal authority/ [or]**



was criminally negligent in failing to know the legal requirements for or restrictions on (his/her) conduct).]

A person who is *responsible for* public money only needs to have some control over the money. That control does not need to be a major part of that person's job.

[*Criminal negligence* involves more than ordinary carelessness, inattention, or mistake in judgment. A person acts with criminal negligence when the way he or she acts is so different from the way an ordinarily careful person would act in the same situation that his or her act amounts to disregard for the consequences of that act.]

[A person acts *fraudulently* when he or she makes a false statement, misrepresents information, hides the truth, or otherwise does something with the intent to deceive.]

[The term *public money* includes all funds, bonds, and evidence of indebtedness received or held by state, county, district, city, town, or public agency officers in their official capacity. It also includes money received from selling bonds or other evidence of indebtedness authorized by the legislative body of any city, county, district, or public agency.]

[A person commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.]

---

*New March 2018*

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

## AUTHORITY

- Definition of Public Funds/Moneys ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 424(b), 426.
- Definition of Responsible for/Charged With ▶ *People v. Groat* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 1228, 1232 [24 Cal.Rptr.2d 15]
- Definition of Fraudulent Behavior ▶ *People v. Pugh* (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 66, 72 [127 Cal.Rptr.2d 770].

- Criminal Negligence Requirement ▶ *Stark v. Superior Court* (2011) 52 Cal.4th 368, 399 [128 Cal.Rptr.3d 611, 257 P.3d 41].

**2767–2799. Reserved for Future Use**

negligent in failing to know the legal requirements for or restrictions on (his/her) conduct).]

A person who is *responsible for* public money only needs to have some control over the money. That control does not need to be a major part of that person's job.

[*Criminal negligence* involves more than ordinary carelessness, inattention, or mistake in judgment. A person acts with criminal negligence when the way he or she acts is so different from the way an ordinarily careful person would act in the same situation that his or her act amounts to disregard for the consequences of that act.]

[A person acts *fraudulently* when he or she makes a false statement, misrepresents information, hides the truth, or otherwise does something with the intent to deceive.]

[The term *public money* includes all funds, bonds, and evidence of indebtedness received or held by state, county, district, city, town, or public agency officers in their official capacity. It also includes money received from selling bonds or other evidence of indebtedness authorized by the legislative body of any city, county, district, or public agency.]

[A person commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.]

---

New March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

## AUTHORITY

- Definition of Public Funds/Moneys ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 424(b), 426.
- Definition of Responsible for/Charged With ▶ *People v. Groat* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 1228, 1232 [24 Cal.Rptr.2d 15]
- Definition of Fraudulent Behavior ▶ *People v. Pugh* (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 66, 72 [127 Cal.Rptr.2d 770].

- Criminal Negligence Requirement ► *Stark v. Superior Court* (2011) 52 Cal.4th 368, 399 [128 Cal.Rptr.3d 611, 257 P.3d 41].

**2767–2799. Reserved for Future Use**

**3001. Failure to Appear While on Bail (Pen. Code, § 1320.5)**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with failing to appear while out of custody on bail [in violation of Penal Code section 1320.5].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant was (charged with/convicted of) the commission of a felony in (this case/case number \_\_\_\_);
2. The defendant was released from custody on bail in (this/that) case;
3. The defendant was required to appear in court at a specific date, time and place in (this/that) case;
4. The defendant willfully failed to appear in court as required;

**AND**

5. When the defendant willfully failed to appear in court as required, (he/she) did so in order to evade the process of the court.

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

[If you find the defendant willfully failed to appear within 14 days of the date assigned for appearance you may, but are not required to, infer that the failure to appear was for the purpose of evading the process of the court.]

---

*New March 2018*

**BENCH NOTES**

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

## **AUTHORITY**

Elements. Pen. Code, § 1320.5.

Willfully defined. Pen. Code, § 7(1); *People v. Lara* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 102, 107.

Specific intent. *People v. Sutton* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 795, 799-800; *People v. Wesley* (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 519.

Mandatory presumption unconstitutional unless instructed as permissive inference. *People v. Forrester* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 1697, 1703.

### ***Secondary Sources***

4 Witkin & Epstein, Cal. Criminal Law (4th Ed. 2012), Pretrial Proceedings, § 116.

5 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 91, *Sentencing*, § 91.48 (Matthew Bender).

**3002. Failure to Appear While on Own Recognizance Release (Pen. Code, § 1320)**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with failing to appear while released from custody on (his/her) own recognizance [in violation of Penal Code section 1320((a)/(b))].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant was (charged with/convicted of) the commission of a (felony/misdemeanor) in (this case/case number \_\_\_\_);
2. The defendant was released from custody on (his/her) own recognizance pursuant to a signed written release;
3. The defendant willfully failed to appear in court as required;

**AND**

4. When the defendant willfully failed to appear in court as required, (he/she) did so in order to evade the process of the court.

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

*A signed written release* must contain the following:

1. Defendant's promise to appear as ordered by a judge or magistrate;
2. Defendant's promise to obey all reasonable conditions imposed by a judge or magistrate;
3. Defendant's promise not to leave the state without permission from the court;
4. Defendant's agreement to waive extradition if he or she fails to appear as required and is arrested outside the State of California;

**AND**

5. Defendant's acknowledgement that he or she has been informed of the consequences and penalties for violations of the conditions of release.

[If you find the defendant willfully failed to appear within 14 days of the date assigned for appearance you may, but are not required to, infer that the failure to appear was for the purpose of evading the process of the court.]

---

New March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

## AUTHORITY

Elements. Pen. Code, § 1320.

Requirement of written agreement conforming to Pen. Code, § 1318: *People v. Hernandez* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 1182; *People v. Jenkins* (1983) 146 Cal.App.3d 22.

Split of authority over whether substantial compliance with Penal Code section 1318 is sufficient: *People v. Carroll* (2014) 222 Cal.App.4th 1406 [Yes]; *People v. Mohammed* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 920 [No].

Willfully defined. Pen. Code, § 7(1); *People v. Lara* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 102, 107.

Specific intent. *People v. Sutton* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 795, 799-800; *People v. Wesley* (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 519.

Mandatory presumption unconstitutional unless instructed as permissive inference. *People v. Forrester* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 1697, 1703.

## *Secondary Sources*

4 Witkin & Epstein, Cal. Criminal Law (4th Ed. 2012), Pretrial Proceedings, §§ 135-139.

**3003-3099. Reserved for Future Use**



### 332. Expert Witness Testimony

---

(A witness was/Witnesses were) allowed to testify as [an] expert[s] and to give [an] opinion[s]. You must consider the opinion[s], but you are not required to accept (it/them) as true or correct. The meaning and importance of any opinion are for you to decide. In evaluating the believability of an expert witness, follow the instructions about the believability of witnesses generally. In addition, consider the expert's knowledge, skill, experience, training, and education, the reasons the expert gave for any opinion, and the facts or information on which the expert relied in reaching that opinion. You must decide whether information on which the expert relied was true and accurate.

You may disregard any opinion that you find unbelievable, unreasonable, or unsupported by the evidence.

[An expert witness may be asked a hypothetical question. A *hypothetical question* asks the witness to assume certain facts are true and to give an opinion based on the assumed facts. It is up to you to decide whether an assumed fact has been proved. If you conclude that an assumed fact is not true, consider the effect of the expert's reliance on that fact in evaluating the expert's opinion.]

[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 on which each witness relied. You may also compare the experts' qualifications.]

---

New January 2006 ~~insert date of council approval~~; March 2018

#### BENCH NOTES

##### *Instructional Duty*

When expert testimony is received at trial, the court must **sua sponte** instruct the jury on evaluating the expert's testimony. (Pen. Code, § 1127b.)

Give the bracketed paragraph beginning, "An expert witness may be asked a hypothetical question," if an expert witness responded to a hypothetical question.

Give the bracketed paragraph beginning, "If the expert witnesses disagreed with one another," if there is conflicting expert testimony.

## AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ Pen. Code, § 1127b.
- Inadmissible Case-Specific Hearsay Not Basis for Expert Testimony ▶ *People v. Sanchez* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 665, 684-686 [204 Cal.Rptr.3d 102, 374 P.3d 320] *People v. Vega-Robles* (2017) 9 Cal. App. 5th 382, 416 [215 Cal.Rptr.3d 284].

### *Secondary Sources*

5 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, § 642.

1 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Opinion Evidence, § 85.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 71, *Scientific and Expert Evidence*, § 71.04 (Matthew Bender).

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, §§ 85.02[2][a][ii], 85.03[2][b], Ch. 86, *Insanity Trial*, § 86.04[3][a] (Matthew Bender).

### 360. Statements to an Expert

---

\_\_\_\_\_ <Insert name> testified that in reaching (his/her) conclusions as an expert witness, (he/she) considered [a] statement[s] made by \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name>. [I am referring only to the statement[s] \_\_\_\_\_ <insert or describe statements admitted for this limited purpose>.] You may consider (that/those) statement[s] only to evaluate the expert's opinion. Do not consider (that/those) statement[s] as proof that the information contained in the statement[s] is true.

---

New January 2006; March 2018

#### BENCH NOTES

##### *Instructional Duty*

Although the court has no sua sponte duty to give this instruction, it should be given if appropriate under the circumstances. (*People v. Cantrell* (1973) 8 Cal.3d 672, 683 [105 Cal.Rptr. 792, 504 P.2d 1256], disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Wetmore* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 318, 324 [149 Cal.Rptr. 265, 583 P.2d 1308] and *People v. Flannel* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 668, 684–685, fn. 12 [160 Cal.Rptr. 84, 603 P.2d 1].)

This instruction should not be given if all of the statements relied on by the expert were admitted under applicable hearsay exceptions. If some but not all of the defendant's statements were admitted for the limited purpose of evaluating the expert's testimony, specify those statements in the bracketed sentence.

#### AUTHORITY

- Instructional Requirements ▶ *In re Spencer* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 400, 412 [46 Cal.Rptr. 753, 406 P.2d 33].
- [Inadmissible Case-Specific Hearsay Not Basis for Expert Testimony ▶ \*People v. Sanchez\* \(2016\) 63 Cal.4th 665, 684-686 \[204 Cal.Rptr.3d 102, 374 P.3d 320\]; \*People v. Vega-Robles\* \(2017\) 9 Cal. App. 5th 382, 416 \[215 Cal.Rptr. 3d 284\].](#)

##### *Secondary Sources*

5 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, § 113.

3 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 71, *Scientific and Expert Evidence*, § 71.04 (Matthew Bender).

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.02[2][b] (Matthew Bender).

### 359. Corpus Delicti: Independent Evidence of a Charged Crime

---

The defendant may not be convicted of any crime based on (his/her) out-of-court statement[s] alone. You may rely on the defendant's out-of-court statements to convict (him/her) only if you first conclude that other evidence shows that the charged crime [or a lesser included offense] was committed.

That other evidence may be slight and need only be enough to support a reasonable inference that a crime was committed.

This requirement of other evidence does not apply to proving the identity of the person who committed the crime [and the degree of the crime]. If other evidence shows that the charged crime [or a lesser included offense] was committed, the identity of the person who committed it [and the degree of the crime] may be proved by the defendant's statement[s] alone.

You may not convict the defendant unless the People have proved (his/her) guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

---

*New January 2006; Revised August 2006, February 2014, February 2015, September 2017, March 2018*

#### BENCH NOTES

##### ***Instructional Duty***

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on corpus delicti whenever an accused's extrajudicial statements form part of the prosecution's evidence. (*People v. Howk* (1961) 56 Cal.2d 687, 707 [16 Cal.Rptr. 370, 365 P.2d 426], unless the statement was made during the commission of the crime. (*People v. Carpenter* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312, 394 [63 Cal.Rptr.2d 1, 935 P.2d 708].) (*People v. Howk* (1961) 56 Cal.2d 687, 707 [16 Cal.Rptr. 370, 365 P.2d 426], [instruction required for defense admissions].) ~~If the defendant's extrajudicial statements constitute the crime, as with criminal threats, the rationale in *Howk* may not apply, however.~~

~~The corpus be proved by statements made before or after the crime, but can be proved by statements made during the crime. (*People v. Carpenter* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312, 394 [63 Cal.Rptr.2d 1, 935 P.2d 708].)~~

Give the bracketed language in the first paragraph if the court will be instructing on lesser included offenses.

An earlier version of this instruction was upheld in *People v. Reyes* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 1491, 1496 [60 Cal.Rptr.3d 777]. A later case, *People v. Rivas* (2013) 214 Cal.App.4th 1410, 1427-1429 [155 Cal.Rptr.3d 403], found fault with the same earlier version of the instruction without referring to *Reyes*. The instruction has been modified in light of the discussion in *Rivas*.

## **AUTHORITY**

- Instructional Requirements ▶ *People v. Ray* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 313, 342 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 296, 914 P.2d 846]; *People v. Jennings* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 334, 368 [279 Cal.Rptr. 780, 807 P.2d 1009]; *People v. Hawk* (1961) 56 Cal.2d 687, 707 [16 Cal.Rptr. 370, 365 P.2d 426].
- Burden of Proof ▶ *People v. Lara* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 658, 676 [35 Cal. Rptr.2d 886].
- Earlier Version of This Instruction Correctly States the Law ▶ *People v. Rosales* (2014) 222 Cal.App.4th 1254, 1260-1261 [166 Cal.Rptr.3d 620]; *People v. Reyes* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 1491, 1496 [60 Cal.Rptr.3d 777].
- Proof of Identity Independent of “Elements” ▶ *People v. Rivas* (2013) 214 Cal.App.4th 1410, 1427-1429 [155 Cal.Rptr.3d 403].
- Corpus Delicti Rule Does Not Apply Generally to All Uncharged Acts ▶ *People v. Davis* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 617, 636 [86 Cal.Rptr.3d 55].

## ***Secondary Sources***

1 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (4th ed. 2012) Elements, §§ 47–54.

2 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 30, *Confessions and Admissions*, §§ 30.04[2], 30.57 (Matthew Bender).

4 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 85, *Submission to Jury and Verdict*, § 85.04[2][c]; Ch. 87, *Death Penalty*, § 87.13[17][e] (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 140, *Challenges to Crimes*, § 140.01 (Matthew Bender).

## **COMMENTARY**

### ***Harm Caused by Criminal Conduct***

The instruction states that the other evidence need only “be enough to support a reasonable inference that someone’s criminal conduct caused an injury, loss, or harm.” This is based in part on *People v. Alvarez* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1161, 1171 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 903, 46 P.3d 372], in which the court stated that “[t]here is no requirement of independent evidence ‘of every physical act constituting an element of an offense,’ so long as there is some slight or prima facie showing of injury, loss, or harm by a criminal agency.” (Citing *People v. Jones* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 279, 303 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 793, 949 P.2d 890].)

### ***Scope of Corpus Delicti***

The following are not elements of a crime and need not be proved by independent evidence: the degree of the crime charged (*People v. Cooper* (1960) 53 Cal.2d 755, 765 [3 Cal.Rptr. 148, 349 P.2d 964]), the identity of the perpetrator (*People v. Westfall* (1961) 198 Cal.App.2d 598, 601 [18 Cal.Rptr. 356]), elements of the underlying felony when the defendant is charged with felony murder (*People v. Cantrell* (1973) 8 Cal.3d 672, 680–681 [105 Cal.Rptr. 792, 504 P.2d 1256], disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Wetmore* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 318, 324 [149 Cal.Rptr. 265, 583 P.2d 1308] and *People v. Flannel* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 668, 684–685, fn. 12 [160 Cal.Rptr. 84, 603 P.2d 1]), special circumstances when the defendant is charged with a felony-based special circumstance murder as listed in Penal Code section 190.2(a)(17) (Pen. Code, § 190.41; see *People v. Ray* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 313, 341, fn. 13 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 296, 914 P.2d 846]), the knowledge and intent required for aider-abettor liability (*People v. Gutierrez* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 1083, 1128–1129 [124 Cal.Rptr.2d 373, 52 P.3d 572]; *People v. Ott* (1978) 84 Cal.App.3d 118, 131 [148 Cal.Rptr. 479]), or facts necessary for a sentencing enhancement (see *People v. Shoemaker* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 243, 252–256 [20 Cal.Rptr.2d 36]).

## **RELATED ISSUES**

### ***Truth-in-Evidence Initiative***

The “truth-in-evidence” provision of the California Constitution abrogates the corpus delicti rule insofar as it restricts the admissibility of incriminatory extrajudicial statements by an accused. (*People v. Alvarez* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1161, 1173–1174 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 903, 46 P.3d 372]; see Cal. Const., art. I, § 28(d) [Proposition 8 of the June 8, 1982 General Election].) The constitutional provision, however, does not eliminate the rule insofar as it prohibits *conviction* when the only evidence that the crime was committed is the defendant’s own statements outside of court. Thus, the provision does not affect the rule to the extent it requires a jury instruction that no person may be convicted absent evidence of the crime independent of his or her out-of-court statements. (*People v. Alvarez, supra*, 27 Cal.4th at p. 1180.)

**840. Inflicting Injury on Spouse, Cohabitant, or Fellow Parent  
Resulting in Traumatic Condition (Pen. Code, § 273.5(a))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_] with inflicting an injury on [his/her] ([former] spouse/[former] cohabitant/the (mother/father) of (his/her) child/someone with whom (he/she) had, or previously had, an engagement or dating relationship that resulted in a traumatic condition [in violation of Penal Code section 273.5(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant willfully [and unlawfully] inflicted a physical injury on (his/her) ([former] spouse/[former] cohabitant/the (mother/father) of (his/her) child)/someone with whom (he/she) had, or previously had, an engagement or dating relationship);

[AND]

2. The injury inflicted by the defendant resulted in a traumatic condition.

*<Give element 3 when instructing on self-defense or defense of another>*

[AND]

3. The defendant did not act (in self-defense/ [or] in defense of someone else).]

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

A *traumatic condition* is a wound or other bodily injury, whether minor or serious, caused by the direct application of physical force.

[The term *cohabitants* means two unrelated persons living together for a substantial period of time, resulting in some permanency of the relationship. Factors that may determine whether people are cohabiting include, but are not limited to, (1) sexual relations between the parties while sharing the same residence, (2) sharing of income or expenses, (3) joint use or ownership of



property, (4) the parties' holding themselves out as (spouses/domestic partners), (5) the continuity of the relationship, and (6) the length of the relationship.]

**[The term *dating relationship* means frequent, intimate associations primarily characterized by the expectation of affection or sexual involvement independent of financial considerations].]**

[A person may cohabit simultaneously with two or more people at different locations, during the same time frame, if he or she maintains substantial ongoing relationships with each person and lives with each person for significant periods.]

[A person is considered to be the (mother/father) of another person's child if the alleged male parent is presumed under law to be the natural father. \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of presumed father> is presumed under law to be the natural father of \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of child>.]

[A traumatic condition is the *result of* an injury if:

1. The traumatic condition was the natural and probable consequence of the injury;
2. The injury was a direct and substantial factor in causing the condition;

AND

3. The condition would not have happened without the injury.

*A natural and probable consequence* is one that a reasonable person would know is likely to happen if nothing unusual intervenes. In deciding whether a consequence is natural and probable, consider all of the circumstances established by the evidence.

*A substantial factor* is more than a trivial or remote factor. However, it does not need to be the only factor that resulted in the traumatic condition.]

---

New January 2006; Revised June 2007, August 2012, August 2014, February 2015, February 2016, March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give an instruction defining the elements of the crime.

If there is sufficient evidence of self-defense or defense of another, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the defense. Give bracketed element 3 and any appropriate defense instructions. (See CALCRIM Nos. 3470–3477.)

If causation is at issue, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proximate cause. (*People v. Bernhardt* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 567, 590-591 [35 Cal.Rptr. 401]; *People v. Cervantes* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 860, 865–874 [111 Cal.Rptr.2d 148, 29 P.3d 225].) Give the bracketed paragraph that begins, “A traumatic condition is the *result of* an injury if . . . .”

If there is sufficient evidence that an alleged victim’s injuries were caused by an accident, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on accident. (*People v. Gonzales* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 382, 390 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 111].) Give CALCRIM No. 3404, *Accident*.

Give the bracketed language “[and unlawfully]” in element 1 if there is evidence that the defendant acted in self-defense.

Give the third bracketed sentence that begins “A person may cohabit simultaneously with two or more people,” on request if there is evidence that the defendant cohabited with two or more people. (See *People v. Moore* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1323, 1335 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 256].)

Give on request the bracketed paragraph that begins “A person is considered to be the (mother/father)” if an alleged parental relationship is based on the statutory presumption that the male parent is the natural father. (See Pen. Code, § 273.5(d); see also *People v. Vega* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 706, 711 [39 Cal.Rptr.2d 479] [parentage can be established without resort to any presumption].)

If the defendant is charged with an enhancement for a prior conviction for a similar offense within seven years and has not stipulated to the prior conviction, give CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial*. If the court has granted a bifurcated trial, see CALCRIM No. 3101, *Prior Conviction: Bifurcated Trial*.

If there is evidence that the traumatic condition resulted from strangulation or suffocation, consider instructing according to the special definition provided in Pen. Code, § 273.5(c).

The amendment to Penal Code section 273.5(b) adding “someone with whom the offender has, or previously had, an engagement or dating relationship as defined in Penal Code section 243(f)(10)” to the list of potential victims became effective on January 1, 2014.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 273.5(a).
- Traumatic Condition Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 273.5(c); *People v. Gutierrez* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 944, 952 [217 Cal.Rptr. 616].
- Willful Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 7, subd. 1; see *People v. Lara* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 102, 107 [51 Cal.Rptr.2d 402].
- Cohabitant Defined ▶ *People v. Holifield* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 993, 1000 [252 Cal.Rptr. 729]; *People v. Ballard* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 311, 318–319 [249 Cal.Rptr. 806].
- Direct Application of Force ▶ *People v. Jackson* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 574, 580 [91 Cal.Rptr.2d 805].
- Duty to Define Traumatic Condition ▶ *People v. Burns* (1948) 88 Cal.App.2d 867, 873–874 [200 P.2d 134].
- Strangulation and Suffocation ▶ Pen. Code, § 273.5(d).
- General Intent Crime ▶ See *People v. Thurston* (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 1050, 1055 [84 Cal.Rptr.2d 221]; *People v. Campbell* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 305, 307–309 [90 Cal.Rptr.2d 315]; contra *People v. Rodriguez* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 1398, 1402 [7 Cal.Rptr.2d 495] [dictum].
- Simultaneous Cohabitation ▶ *People v. Moore* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1323, 1335 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 256].
- Dating Relationship Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 243(f)(10).

## ***Secondary Sources***

1 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against the Person, §§ 64–67.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, § 142.13[3] (Matthew Bender).

## **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES**

- Attempted Infliction of Corporal Punishment on Spouse ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 664, 273.5(a); *People v. Kinsey* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 1621, 1627, 1628 [47 Cal.Rptr.2d 769] [attempt requires intent to cause traumatic condition, but does not require a resulting “traumatic condition”].
- Misdemeanor Battery ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 242, 243(a); see *People v. Gutierrez* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 944, 952 [217 Cal.Rptr. 616].
- Battery Against Spouse, Cohabitant, or Fellow Parent ▶ Pen. Code, § 243(e)(1); see *People v. Jackson* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 574, 580 [91 Cal.Rptr.2d 805].
- Simple Assault ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 240, 241(a); *People v. Van Os* (1950) 96 Cal.App.2d 204, 206 [214 P.2d 554].

## **RELATED ISSUES**

### ***Continuous Course of Conduct***

Penal Code section 273.5 is aimed at a continuous course of conduct. The prosecutor is not required to choose a particular act and the jury is not required to unanimously agree on the same act or acts before a guilty verdict can be returned. (*People v. Thompson* (1984) 160 Cal.App.3d 220, 224–225 [206 Cal.Rptr. 516].)

### ***Multiple Acts of Abuse***

A defendant can be charged with multiple violations of Penal Code section 273.5 when each battery satisfies the elements of section 273.5. (*People v. Healy* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140 [18 Cal.Rptr.2d 274].)

### ***Prospective Parents of Unborn Children***

Penal Code section 273.5(a) does not apply to a man who inflicts an injury upon a woman who is pregnant with his unborn child. “A pregnant woman is not a ‘mother’ and a fetus is not a ‘child’ as those terms are used in that section.” (*People v. Ward* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 122, 126, 129 [72 Cal.Rptr.2d 531].)

***Termination of Parental Rights***

Penal Code section 273.5 “applies to a man who batters the mother of his child even after parental rights to that child have been terminated.” (*People v. Mora* (1996) 51 Cal.App.4th 1349, 1356 [59 Cal.Rptr.2d 801].)

**1002. Rape of Intoxicated Woman or Spouse (Pen. Code, §§ 261(a)(3), 262(a)(2))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with raping (a woman/his wife) while she was intoxicated [in violation of \_\_\_\_\_ <insert appropriate code section[s]>].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant had sexual intercourse with a woman;
2. He and the woman were (not married/married) to each other at the time of the intercourse;
3. The effect of (a/an) (intoxicating/anesthetic/controlled) substance prevented the woman from resisting;

**AND**

4. The defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the effect of (a/an) (intoxicating/anesthetic/controlled) substance prevented the woman from resisting.

*Sexual intercourse* means any penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or genitalia by the penis. [Ejaculation is not required.]

A person is *prevented from resisting* if he or she is so intoxicated that he or she cannot give legal consent. In order to give legal consent, a person must be able to exercise reasonable judgment. In other words, the person must be able to understand and weigh the physical nature of the act, its moral character, and probable consequences. Legal consent is consent given freely and voluntarily by someone who knows the nature of the act involved.

[\_\_\_\_\_ <If appropriate, insert controlled substance> (is/are) [a] controlled substance[s].]

<Defense: Reasonable Belief Capable of Consent>

[The defendant is not guilty of this crime if he actually and reasonably believed that the woman was capable of consenting to sexual intercourse, even if that belief was wrong. The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not actually and reasonably believe that the woman was capable of consenting. If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty.]

## BENCH NOTES

### ***Instructional Duty***

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give an instruction defining the elements of the crime.

A space is provided to identify controlled substances, if the parties agree.

### ***Defenses—Instructional Duty***

~~The court has~~ There is an sua sponte duty to instruct on the defense of reasonable belief that the person was capable of consent if there is sufficient evidence to support the defense. (See *People v. Giardino-Lujano* (2017) 15 Cal.App.5th 187, (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 454, 472 [98 Cal.Rptr.2d 315].)

### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 1001, *Rape or Spousal Rape in Concert*, may be given in conjunction with this instruction, if appropriate.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 261(a)(3), 262(a)(2).
- Consent Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 261.6.
- Controlled Substances ▶ Health & Safety Code, §§ 11054–11058; see *People v. Avila* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 791, 798, fn. 7 [95 Cal.Rptr.2d 651].
- Penetration Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 263; *People v. Karsai* (1982) 131 Cal.App.3d 224, 233–234 [182 Cal.Rptr. 406], disapproved on other grounds by *People v. Jones* (1988) 46 Cal.3d 585, 600 [250 Cal.Rptr. 635, 758 P.2d 1165].
- Anesthetic Effect ▶ See *People v. Avila* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 791, 798–799 [95 Cal.Rptr.2d 651] [in context of sodomy].
- General Intent and Knowledge Requirements ▶ *People v. Linwood* (2003) 105 Cal.App.4th 59, 67–72 [129 Cal.Rptr.2d 73] [statute is not impermissibly vague and uses appropriate criminal negligence standard].
- “Prevented From Resisting” Defined ▶ *People v. Lujano* (2017) 15 Cal.App.5th 187, 192–193 [223 Cal.Rptr.3d 105] [CALCRIM 1032 has correct definition]; *People v. Giardino* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 454, 465–466 [98 Cal.Rptr.2d 315].

- [Reasonable Belief in Capacity to Consent ▶ \*People v. Lujano\* \(2017\) 15 Cal.App.5th 187, 191-192 \[223 Cal.Rptr.3d 105\]; \*People v. Giardino\* \(2000\) 82 Cal.App.4th 454, 471-472 \[98 Cal.Rptr.2d 315\].](#)
- This Instruction Upheld ▶ *People v. Smith* (2010) 191 Cal.App.4th 199, 204-205 [120 Cal.Rptr.3d 52].

### ***Secondary Sources***

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Sex Offenses and Crimes Against Decency, §§ 1–8, 16, 18.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, §§ 142.20[1][a], [5], 142.23[1][e] (Matthew Bender).

Couzens & Bigelow, Sex Crimes: California Law and Procedure §§ 12:16, 12:17 (The Rutter Group).

## **COMMENTARY**

Gender-specific language is used because rape usually occurs between a man and a woman. In keeping with plain English principles, the committee used those terms to make the instruction clear and concrete.

## **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES**

- Attempted Rape ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 663, 261(a)(3).
- Attempted Rape of Intoxicated Spouse ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 663, 262(a)(2).
- Assault ▶ Pen. Code, § 240.
- Battery ▶ Pen. Code, § 242; *People v. Guiterrez* (1991) 232 Cal.App.3d 1624, 1636 [284 Cal.Rptr. 230], disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Cromer* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 889, 901, fn. 3 [103 Cal.Rptr.2d 23, 15 P.3d 243]; but see *People v. Marshall* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 1, 38-39 [61 Cal.Rptr.2d 84, 931 P.2d 262] [battery not a lesser included offense of attempted rape].

## **RELATED ISSUES**

### ***Administering Drugs to Assist Commission of Felony***

A person who administers to someone else any chloroform, ether, laudanum, or any controlled substance, anesthetic, or intoxicating agent, with the intent to



enable or assist himself or herself or any other person to commit a felony is guilty of a felony. (Pen. Code, § 222.)

See the Related Issues section to CALCRIM No. 1000, *Rape or Spousal Rape by Force, Fear, or Threats*.

### **1032. Sodomy of an Intoxicated Person (Pen. Code, § 286(i))**

---

**The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with sodomy of a person while that person was intoxicated [in violation of Penal Code section 286(i)].**

**To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:**

- 1. The defendant committed an act of sodomy with another person. ;**
- 2. The effect of (a/an) (intoxicating/anesthetic/controlled) substance prevented the other person from resisting;**

**AND**

- 3. The defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the effect of that substance prevented the other person from resisting.**

***Sodomy* is any penetration, no matter how slight, of the anus of one person by the penis of another person. [Ejaculation is not required.]**

**A person is *prevented from resisting* if he or she is so intoxicated that he or she cannot give legal consent. In order to give legal consent, a person must be able to exercise reasonable judgment. In other words, the person must be able to understand and weigh the physical nature of the act, its moral character, and probable consequences. Legal consent is consent given freely and voluntarily by someone who knows the nature of the act involved.**

**[\_\_\_\_\_ <If appropriate, insert controlled substance[s]> (is/are) [a] controlled substance[s].]**

**<Defense: Reasonable Belief Capable of Consent>**

**[The defendant is not guilty of this crime if (he/she) actually and reasonably believed that the other person was capable of consenting to the act, even if that belief was wrong. The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not actually and reasonably believe that the other person was capable of consenting. If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty.]**

---

***New January 2006; March 2018***

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give an instruction defining the elements of the crime.

A space is provided to identify controlled substances if the parties agree that there is no issue of fact.

### ~~*Defenses—Instructional Duty*~~

~~The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the defense of reasonable belief the person was capable of consent if there is sufficient evidence to support the defense. (See *People v. Giardino* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 454, 472 [98 Cal.Rptr.2d 315].)~~

### *Related Instructions*

CALCRIM No. 1031, *Sodomy in Concert*, may be given in conjunction with this instruction if appropriate.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 286(i); *People v. Avila* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 791, 802–803 [95 Cal.Rptr.2d 651].
- Anesthetic Effect Defined ▶ *People v. Avila* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 791, 798–799 [95 Cal.Rptr.2d 651].
- Consent Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 261.6.
- Controlled Substances Defined ▶ Health & Safety Code, §§ 11054–11058; see *People v. Avila* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 791, 798, fn. 7 [95 Cal.Rptr.2d 651].
- Prevented From Resisting Defined ▶ [\*People v. Lujano\* \(2017\) 15 Cal.App.5th 187, 192-193 \[223 Cal.Rptr.3d 105\]](#)[CALCRIM 1032 has correct definition]; [\*People v. Giardino\* \(2000\) 82 Cal.App.4th 454, 465–466 \[98 Cal.Rptr.2d 315\]](#)[in context of rape].
- Reasonable Belief in Capacity to Consent ▶ [\*People v. Lujano\* \(2017\) 15 Cal.App.5th 187, 191-192 \[223 Cal.Rptr.3d 105\]](#); [\*People v. Giardino\* \(2000\) 82 Cal.App.4th 454, 471-472 \[98 Cal.Rptr.2d 315\]](#).
- Sodomy Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 286(a); see *People v. Singh* (1923) 62 Cal.App. 450, 452 [217 P. 121] [ejaculation is not required].

### *Secondary Sources*

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Sex Offenses and Crimes Against Decency, §§ 26, 29.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, § 142.20[1][b], [5] (Matthew Bender).

Couzens & Bigelow, Sex Crimes: California Law and Procedure §§ 12:16, 12:17 (The Rutter Group).

### **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES**

- Assault ► Pen. Code, § 240.
- Attempted Sodomy of Intoxicated Person ► Pen. Code, §§ 664, 286(i).
- Battery ► Pen. Code, § 242.

### **RELATED ISSUES**

See the Related Issues section under CALCRIM No. 1030, *Sodomy by Force, Fear, or Threats*.

### 1300. Criminal Threat (Pen. Code, § 422)

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with having made a criminal threat [in violation of Penal Code section 422].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant willfully threatened to unlawfully kill or unlawfully cause great bodily injury to \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of complaining witness or member[s] of complaining witness's immediate family>;
2. The defendant made the threat (orally/in writing/by electronic communication device);
3. The defendant intended that (his/her) statement be understood as a threat [and intended that it be communicated to \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of complaining witness>];
4. The threat was so clear, immediate, unconditional, and specific that it communicated to \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of complaining witness> a serious intention and the immediate prospect that the threat would be carried out;
5. The threat actually caused \_\_\_\_\_ <insert name of complaining witness> to be in sustained fear for (his/her) own safety [or for the safety of (his/her) immediate family];

AND

6. \_\_\_\_\_'s <insert name of complaining witness> fear was reasonable under the circumstances.

Someone commits an act *willfully* when he or she does it willingly or on purpose.

In deciding whether a threat was sufficiently clear, immediate, unconditional, and specific, consider the words themselves, as well as the surrounding circumstances.

Someone who intends that a statement be understood as a threat does not have to actually intend to carry out the threatened act [or intend to have someone else do so].

*Great bodily injury* means significant or substantial physical injury. It is an injury that is greater than minor or moderate harm.

*Sustained fear* means fear for a period of time that is more than momentary, fleeting, or transitory.

[An immediate ability to carry out the threat is not required.]

[An *electronic communication device* includes, but is not limited to: a telephone, cellular telephone, pager, computer, video recorder, or fax machine.]

[*Immediate family* means (a) any spouse, parents, and children; (b) any grandchildren, grandparents, brothers and sisters related by blood or marriage; or (c) any person who regularly lives in the other person's household [or who regularly lived there within the prior six months].]

---

New January 2006; Revised August 2006, June 2007, February 2015, February 2016, March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give an instruction defining the elements of the crime.

A specific crime or the elements of any specific Penal Code violation that might be subsumed within the actual words of any threat need not be identified for the jury. (See *People v. Butler* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 745, 758 [102 Cal.Rptr.2d 269].) The threatened acts or crimes may be described on request depending on the nature of the threats or the need to explain the threats to the jury. (*Id.* at p. 760.)

When the threat is conveyed through a third party, give the appropriate bracketed language in element three. (*People v. Felix* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 905, 913 [112 Cal.Rptr.2d 311]; *In re Ryan D.* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 854, 861–862 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 193] [insufficient evidence minor intended to convey threat to victim].)

Give the bracketed definition of “electronic communication” on request. (Pen. Code, § 422; 18 U.S.C., § 2510(12).)

If there is evidence that the threatened person feared for the safety of members of his or her immediate family, the bracketed phrase in element 5 and the final bracketed paragraph defining “immediate family” should be given on request. (See Pen. Code, § 422; Fam. Code, § 6205; Prob. Code, §§ 6401, 6402.)

If instructing on attempted criminal threat, give the third element in the bench notes of CALCRIM No. 460, *Attempt Other Than Attempted Murder*. (*People v. Chandler* (2014) 60 Cal.4th 508, 525 [176 Cal.Rptr.3d 548, 332 P.3d 538].)

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 422; *In re George T.* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 620, 630 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 61, 93 P.3d 1007]; *People v. Melhado* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1529, 1536 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 878].
- Great Bodily Injury Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 12022.7(f).
- Sufficiency of Threat Based on All Surrounding Circumstances ▶ *People v. Mendoza* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1340 [69 Cal.Rptr.2d 728]; *People v. Butler* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 745, 752–753 [102 Cal.Rptr.2d 269]; *People v. Martinez* (1997) 53 Cal.App.4th 1212, 1218–1221 [62 Cal.Rptr.2d 303]; *In re Ricky T.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1132, 1137–1138 [105 Cal.Rptr.2d 165]; *People v. Solis* (2001) 90 Cal.App.4th 1002, 1013–1014 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 464]; see *People v. Garrett* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 962, 966–967 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 33].
- Crime that Will Result in Great Bodily Injury Judged on Objective Standard ▶ *People v. Maciel* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 679, 685 [6 Cal.Rptr.3d 628].
- [Threatening Hand Gestures Not Verbal Threats Under Penal Code Section 422 ▶ \*People v. Gonzalez\* \(2017\) 2 Cal.5th 1138, 1147 \[218 Cal.Rptr.3d 150, 394 P.3d 1074\].](#)
- Threat Not Required to Be Unconditional ▶ *People v. Bolin* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 297, 339–340 [75 Cal.Rptr.2d 412, 956 P.2d 374], disapproving *People v. Brown* (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1251, 1256 [25 Cal.Rptr.2d 76]; *People v. Stanfield* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1162 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d 328].
- Conditional Threat May Be True Threat, Depending on Context ▶ *People v. Melhado* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1529, 1540 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 878].
- Immediate Ability to Carry Out Threat Not Required ▶ *People v. Lopez* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 675, 679 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 252].

- Sustained Fear ▶ *In re Ricky T.* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 1132, 1139–1140 [105 Cal.Rptr.2d 165]; *People v. Solis* (2001) 90 Cal.App.4th 1002, 1024 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 464]; *People v. Allen* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 1149, 1155–1156 [40 Cal.Rptr.2d 7].
- Verbal Statement, Not Mere Conduct, Is Required ▶ *People v. Franz* (2001) 88 Cal.App.4th 1426, 1441–1442 [106 Cal.Rptr.2d 773].
- Statute Not Unconstitutionally Vague ▶ *People v. Maciel* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 679, 684–686 [6 Cal.Rptr.3d 628].
- Attempted Criminal Threats ▶ *People v. Chandler* (2014) 60 Cal.4th 508, 525 [176 Cal.Rptr.3d 548, 332 P.3d 538].
- Statute Authorizes Only One Conviction and One Punishment Per Victim, Per Threatening Encounter ▶ *People v. Wilson* (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 193, 202 [183 Cal.Rptr.3d 541].

### *Secondary Sources*

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 24–30.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 142, *Crimes Against the Person*, § 142.11A[1] (Matthew Bender).

## **COMMENTARY**

This instruction uses the current nomenclature “criminal threat,” as recommended by the Supreme Court in *People v. Toledo* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 221, 224, fn. 1 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 315, 26 P.3d 1051] [previously called “terrorist threat”]. (See also Stats. 2000, ch. 1001, § 4.)

## **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES**

- Attempted Criminal Threat ▶ See Pen. Code, § 422; *People v. Toledo* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 221, 230–231 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 315, 26 P.3d 1051].
- Threatening a public officer of an educational institution in violation of Penal Code section 71 may be a lesser included offense of a section 422 criminal threat under the accusatory pleadings test. (*In re Marcus T.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 468, 472–473 [107 Cal.Rptr.2d 451].) But see *People v. Chaney* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 253, 257–258 [31 Cal.Rptr.3d 714], finding that a violation of section 71 is not a lesser included offense of section 422 under the accusatory pleading test when the pleading does not specifically allege the



intent to cause (or attempt to cause) a public officer to do (or refrain from doing) an act in the performance of official duty.

## **RELATED ISSUES**

### ***Ambiguous and Equivocal Poem Insufficient to Establish Criminal Threat***

In *In re George T.* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 620, 628–629 [16 Cal.Rptr.3d 61, 93 P.3d 1007], a minor gave two classmates a poem containing language that referenced school shootings. The court held that “the text of the poem, understood in light of the surrounding circumstances, was not ‘as unequivocal, unconditional, immediate, and specific as to convey to [the two students] a gravity of purpose and an immediate prospect of execution of the threat.’ ” (*Id.* at p. 638.)

### ***Related Statutes***

Other statutes prohibit similar threatening conduct against specified individuals. (See, e.g., Pen. Code, §§ 76 [threatening elected public official, judge, etc., or staff or immediate family], 95.1 [threatening jurors after verdict], 139 [threatening witness or victim after conviction of violent offense], 140 [threatening witness, victim, or informant].)

### ***Unanimity Instruction***

If the evidence discloses a greater number of threats than those charged, the prosecutor must make an election of the events relied on in the charges. When no election is made, the jury must be given a unanimity instruction. (*People v. Butler* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 745, 755, fn. 4 [102 Cal.Rptr.2d 269]; *People v. Melhado* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1529, 1534, 1539 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 878].)

### ***Whether Threat Actually Received***

If a threat is intended to and does induce a sustained fear, the person making the threat need not know whether the threat was actually received. (*People v. Teal* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 277, 281 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 644].)

### 1850. Petty Theft With Prior Conviction (Pen. Code, § 666)

---

If you find the defendant guilty of petty theft, you must then decide whether the People have proved the additional allegation that the defendant has been convicted of a theft offense before and served a term in a penal institution as a result of that conviction. It has already been determined that the defendant is the person named in exhibits \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert numbers or descriptions of exhibits>*. You must decide whether the evidence proves that the defendant was previously convicted of the alleged crime[s].

To prove this allegation, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant was previously convicted of a theft offense;

AND

2. The defendant served a term in a penal institution for that conviction.

The People allege that the defendant was previously convicted of:

[1.] A violation of \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert code section violated>*, on \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert date of conviction>*, in the \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert name of court>*, in Case Number \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert docket or case number>* (;/.)

[AND *<Repeat for each prior conviction alleged>*.]

[\_\_\_\_\_ *<insert name of penal institution>* is a *penal institution*.]

[A *penal institution* includes [a] (city jail/county jail/state prison/any facility, camp, hospital, or institution operated to confine, treat, employ, train, and discipline persons in the legal custody of the Department of Corrections/federal prison/\_\_\_\_\_ *<specify other institution>*).]

[Consider the evidence presented on this allegation only when deciding whether the defendant was previously convicted of the crime[s] alleged [or for the limited purpose of \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert other permitted purpose, e.g., assessing credibility of the defendant>*]. Do not consider this evidence for any other purpose.]

[You must consider each alleged conviction separately.] The People have the burden of proving this allegation beyond a reasonable doubt. If the People have not met this burden, you must find that the allegation has not been proved.

---

New January 2006; Revised August 2015, ~~+March 2018+~~

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proof of the alleged prior conviction. (See Pen. Code, § 1025 [on defendant's denial, jury must decide issue of prior convictions]; *People v. Barre* (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 961, 965 [14 Cal.Rptr.2d 307].)

~~The prior conviction and incarceration requirement of Penal Code section 666 is a sentencing factor for the trial court and not an element of a section 666 offense. (*People v. Bouzas* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 467, 478–480 [279 Cal.Rptr. 847, 807 P.2d 1076]; *People v. Stevens* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 982, 987 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 13].) Thus, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Bouzas, supra*, 53 Cal.3d at pp. 478–480; *People v. Stevens, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 987; *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41].)~~

~~Give this instruction only if the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial. Do not give this instruction if the court has bifurcated the trial.~~

~~If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (Pen. Code, §§ 1025, 1093; see *People v. Bouzas, supra*, 53 Cal.3d at pp. 471–472, 480.)~~

~~The enhancement allegation under To be convicted of a violation of Penal Code section 666 applies only if the , defendant has must have been previously convicted of a crime listed in Penal Code sections 368(d) or (e) or 667(e)(2)(Ce)(iv), or previously convicted under Penal Code section 368(d) or (e); or be or is required to register under the Sex Offender Registration Act. If applicable, give CALCRIM No. 3100, *Prior Conviction: NonBifurcated Trial*.~~

If the court grants a bifurcated trial, on either of the offenses described in the paragraph above or a qualifying prior theft conviction, give CALCRIM No. 3101, *Prior Conviction: Bifurcated Trial*.

### **AUTHORITY**

- Enhancement ▶ Pen. Code, § 666; *People v. Bruno* (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 1102, 1105 [237 Cal.Rptr. 31]; *People v. Bean* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d 639, 642 [261 Cal.Rptr. 784].
- Convictions From Other States ▶ Pen. Code, § 668; *People v. Perry* (1962) 204 Cal.App.2d 201, 204 [22 Cal.Rptr. 54].
- Prior Incarceration Requirement ▶ *People v. James* (1957) 155 Cal.App.2d 604, 612 [318 P.2d 175] [service of partial term is sufficient]; *People v. Valenzuela* (1981) 116 Cal.App.3d 798, 803 [172 Cal.Rptr. 284] [custody resulting from credit for time served is sufficient]; but see *People v. Cortez* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 510, 513–514 [29 Cal.Rptr.2d 445] [participation in work release program alone is insufficient].
- Penal Institution Defined ▶ *Ex parte Wolfson* (1947) 30 Cal.2d 20, 26 [180 P.2d 326] [includes county jail]; *People v. Valenzuela* (1981) 116 Cal.App.3d 798, 803, 804, 807–808 [172 Cal.Rptr. 284] [includes California Rehabilitation Center]; see Pen. Code, §§ 667.5(h) [defining state prison or federal penal institution for purposes of prior prison term enhancement], 969b [prima facie evidence of prior conviction and term served in any state or federal penitentiary, reformatory, or county or city jail], 6081, 6082 [prison defined]; Welf. & Inst. Code, § 851 [excludes juvenile hall].

### ***Secondary Sources***

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Property, § 9.

3 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (4th ed. 2012) Punishment, § 417.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 143, *Crimes Against Property*, § 143.01[3] (Matthew Bender).

### **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES**

If the defendant is charged with felony petty theft based on a prior conviction, then the misdemeanor offense is a lesser included offense. The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate if the prior conviction has been proved. If the jury finds that the prior conviction has not been proved, then the offense should be set at a misdemeanor.

There is no crime of attempted petty theft with a prior conviction. None of the elements of Penal Code section 666 may be attempted. (*People v. Bean* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d 639, 642, fn. 4 [261 Cal.Rptr. 784].)

## RELATED ISSUES

### ***Jury Findings on Prior Convictions***

The jury must determine the truth of the prior conviction unless jury trial is waived or the defendant admits to the prior conviction. If more than one prior conviction is charged, the jury must make a separate finding on each charged prior. (Pen. Code, § 1158; *People v. Barre* (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 961, 965–966 [14 Cal.Rptr.2d 307].)

### ***Judicial Notice of Prior Conviction***

It is error for a trial court to take judicial notice of a defendant's alleged prior conviction when a reasonable juror could only understand the notice to mean that the court conclusively determined the prior-conviction allegation to be true. (*People v. Barre* (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 961, 965–966 [14 Cal.Rptr.2d 307] .)

### ***Defense Stipulation to Prior Convictions***

The prior conviction and incarceration requirement of Penal Code section 666 is a sentencing factor for the trial court and not an element of a section 666 offense. (*People v. Bouzas* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 467, 478–480 [279 Cal.Rptr. 847, 807 P.2d 1076]; *People v. Stevens* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 982, 987 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 13].) Thus, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Bouzas, supra*, 53 Cal.3d at pp. 478–480; *People v. Stevens, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 987; *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].)

The defendant may stipulate to the truth of the prior convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) If the defendant stipulates, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See Pen. Code, §§ 1025, 1093; *People v. Bouzas, supra*, 53 Cal.3d at pp. 471–472, 480; *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)

**Motion for Bifurcated Trial**

Either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.)

**1851–1859. Reserved for Future Use**

## **2100. Driving a Vehicle or Operating a Vessel Under the Influence Causing Injury (Veh. Code, § 23153(a), (f), (g))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with causing injury to another person while (driving a vehicle/operating a vessel) under the [combined] influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug/ [or] an alcoholic beverage and a drug) [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23153(a)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant (drove a vehicle/operated a vessel);
2. When (he/she) (drove a vehicle/operated a vessel), the defendant was under the [combined] influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [or] a drug/ [or] an alcoholic beverage and a drug);
3. While (driving a vehicle/operating a vessel) under the influence, the defendant also (committed an illegal act/ [or] neglected to perform a legal duty);

AND

4. The defendant's (illegal act/ [or] failure to perform a legal duty) caused bodily injury to another person.

A person is *under the influence* if, as a result of (drinking [or consuming] an alcoholic beverage/ [and/or] taking a drug), his or her mental or physical abilities are so impaired that he or she is no longer able to (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel) with the caution of a sober person, using ordinary care, under similar circumstances.

[An *alcoholic beverage* is a liquid or solid material intended to be consumed that contains ethanol. Ethanol is also known as ethyl alcohol, drinking alcohol, or alcohol. [An *alcoholic beverage* includes \_\_\_\_\_ <insert type[s] of beverage[s] from Veh. Code, § 109 or Bus. & Prof. Code, § 23004, e.g., wine, beer>.]

[A *drug* is a substance or combination of substances, other than alcohol, that could so affect the nervous system, brain, or muscles of a person that it would appreciably impair his or her ability to (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel) as an ordinarily cautious person, in full possession of his or her faculties and using

reasonable care, would (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel) under similar circumstances.]

[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more at the time of the chemical analysis, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant was under the influence of an alcoholic beverage at the time of the alleged offense.]

[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Public Health.

[The People allege that the defendant committed the following illegal act[s]: \_\_\_\_\_ <list name[s] of offense[s]>.

To decide whether the defendant committed \_\_\_\_\_ <list name[s] of offense[s]>, please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

[The People [also] allege that the defendant failed to perform the following legal (duty/duties) while (driving the vehicle/operating the vessel): (the duty to exercise ordinary care at all times and to maintain proper control of the (vehicle/vessel)/\_\_\_\_\_ <insert other duty or duties alleged>).]

[You may not find the defendant guilty unless all of you agree that the People have proved that the defendant (committed [at least] one illegal act/[or] failed to perform [at least] one duty).

<Alternative A—unanimity required; see Bench Notes>

[You must all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]

<Alternative B—unanimity not required; see Bench Notes>

[But you do not have to all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]

[Using *ordinary care* means using reasonable care to prevent reasonably foreseeable harm to someone else. A person fails to exercise ordinary care if he or she (does something that a reasonably careful person would not do in the same situation/ [or] fails to do something that a reasonably careful person would do in the same situation).]

[An act causes bodily injury to another person if the injury is the direct, natural, and probable consequence of the act and the injury would not have happened without the act. A *natural and probable consequence* is one that a



reasonable person would know is likely to happen if nothing unusual intervenes. In deciding whether a consequence is natural and probable, consider all the circumstances established by the evidence.]

[There may be more than one cause of injury. An act causes bodily injury to another person only if it is a substantial factor in causing the injury. A *substantial factor* is more than a trivial or remote factor. However, it need not be the only factor that causes the injury.]

[It is not a defense that the defendant was legally entitled to use the drug.]

[If the defendant was under the influence of (an alcoholic beverage/ [and/or] a drug), then it is not a defense that something else also impaired (his/her) ability to (drive a vehicle/operate a vessel).]

---

New January 2006; Revised June 2007, April 2008, December 2008, August 2015, September 2017, March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant committed an act forbidden by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to specify the predicate offense alleged and to instruct on the elements of that offense. (*People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].)

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant neglected to perform a duty imposed by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the duty allegedly neglected. (See *People v. Minor, supra*, 28 Cal.App.4th at pp. 438–439.) If the prosecution alleges that the defendant neglected the general duty of every driver to exercise ordinary care (see *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243]), the court should give the bracketed definition of “ordinary care.”

If causation is at issue, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proximate cause. (*People v. Bernhardt* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 567, 590–591 [35 Cal.Rptr. 401].) If the evidence indicates that there was only one cause of injury, the court should give the first bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “direct, natural, and probable” language. If there is evidence of multiple causes of injury, the court should also give the second bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “substantial factor” definition. (See *People v. Autry* (1995) 37

Cal.App.4th 351, 363 [43 Cal.Rptr.2d 135]; *People v. Pike* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 732, 746–747 [243 Cal.Rptr. 54].)

There is a split in authority over whether there is a **sua sponte** duty to give a unanimity instruction when multiple predicate offenses are alleged. (*People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30] [unanimity instruction required], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735] [unanimity instruction not required but preferable]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438] [unanimity instruction not required]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906] [unanimity instruction not required, failure to give harmless error if was required].) If the court concludes that a unanimity instruction is appropriate, give the unanimity alternative A. If the court concludes that unanimity is not required, give the unanimity alternative B.

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent” explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23610; Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent” if there is no evidence that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was at or above 0.08 percent at the time of the test. In addition, if the test falls within the range in which no presumption applies, 0.05 percent to just below 0.08 percent, do not give this bracketed sentence. (*People v. Wood* (1989) 207 Cal.App.3d Supp. 11, 15 [255 Cal.Rptr. 537].) The court should also consider whether there is sufficient evidence to establish that the test result exceeds the margin of error before giving this instruction for test results of 0.08 percent. (Compare *People v. Campos* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 4–5 [188 Cal.Rptr. 366], with *People v. Randolph* (1989) 213 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 11 [262 Cal.Rptr. 378].)

The statute also creates a rebuttable presumption that the defendant was not under the influence if his or her blood alcohol level was less than 0.05 percent. (*People v. Gallardo* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 489, 496 [27 Cal.Rptr.2d 502].) Depending on the facts of the case, the defendant may be entitled to a pinpoint instruction on this presumption. It is not error to refuse an instruction on this presumption if the prosecution’s theory is that the defendant was under the combined influence of drugs and alcohol. (*People v. Andersen* (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 1241, 1250 [32 Cal.Rptr.2d 442].)

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayan* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

Give the bracketed sentence stating that “it is not a defense that something else also impaired (his/her) ability to drive” if there is evidence of an additional source of impairment such as an epileptic seizure, inattention, or falling asleep.

If the defendant is charged with one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington*, *supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) If the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*. If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 690].)

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

### ***Defenses—Instructional Duty***

On request, if supported by the evidence, the court must instruct on the “imminent peril/sudden emergency” doctrine. (*People v. Boulware* (1940) 41 Cal.App.2d 268, 269–270 [106 P.2d 436].) The court may use the bracketed instruction on sudden emergency in CALCRIM No. 590, *Gross Vehicular Manslaughter While Intoxicated*.

### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2101, *Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol Causing Injury*.

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

CALCRIM No. 595, *Vehicular Manslaughter: Speeding Laws Defined*.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23153(a), (f), (g); *People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641].
- Alcoholic Beverage Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 109, Bus. & Prof. Code, § 23004.
- Drug Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 312.
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, § 23610; Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Under the Influence Defined ▶ *People v. Schoonover* (1970) 5 Cal.App.3d 101, 105–107 [85 Cal.Rptr. 69]; *People v. Enriquez* (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 661, 665–666 [49 Cal.Rptr.2d 710].
- Must Instruct on Elements of Predicate Offense ▶ *People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].
- Negligence—Ordinary Care ▶ Pen. Code, § 7, subd. 2; Restatement Second of Torts, § 282; *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243] [ordinary negligence standard applies to driving under the influence causing injury].
- Causation ▶ *People v. Rodriguez* (1960) 186 Cal.App.2d 433, 440 [8 Cal.Rptr. 863].
- Legal Entitlement to Use Drug Not a Defense ▶ Veh. Code, § 23630.
- Unanimity Instruction ▶ *People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

## Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare §§ 272-277.

2 Witkin, California Evidence (5th ed. 2012) Demonstrative, Experimental, and Scientific Evidence § 56.

5 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 91, *Sentencing*, § 91.36 (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02 (Matthew Bender).

## LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

- Misdemeanor Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent ▸ Veh. Code, § 23152(a) & (b); *People v. Capetillo* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 211, 220 [269 Cal.Rptr. 250].
- Driving Under the Influence Causing Injury is not a lesser included offense of vehicular manslaughter without gross negligence ▸ *People v. Binkerd* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 1143, 1148–1149 [66 Cal.Rptr.3d 675].
- Violations of Vehicle Code section 23153(a), are not lesser included offenses of Vehicle Code section 23153(f) [now 23153(g)] ▸ *People v. Cady* (2016) 7 Cal.App.5th 134, 145-146 [212 Cal.Rptr.3d 319].

## RELATED ISSUES

### ***DUI Cannot Serve as Predicate Unlawful Act***

“[T]he evidence must show an unlawful act or neglect of duty *in addition* to driving under the influence.” (*People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641] [italics in original]; *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 668 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243].)

### ***Act Forbidden by Law***

The term “ ‘any act forbidden by law’ . . . refers to acts forbidden by the Vehicle Code . . . ” (*People v. Clenney* (1958) 165 Cal.App.2d 241, 253 [331 P.2d 696].) The defendant must commit the act when driving the vehicle. (*People v. Capetillo* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 211, 217 [269 Cal.Rptr. 250] [violation of Veh. Code, § 10851 not sufficient because offense not committed “when” defendant was driving the vehicle but by mere fact that defendant was driving the vehicle].)

### ***Neglect of Duty Imposed by Law***

“In proving the person neglected any duty imposed by law in driving the vehicle, it is not necessary to prove that any specific section of [the Vehicle Code] was

violated.” (Veh. Code, § 23153(c); *People v. Oyaas* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243].) “[The] neglect of duty element . . . is satisfied by evidence which establishes that the defendant’s conduct amounts to no more than ordinary negligence.” (*People v. Oyaas, supra*, 173 Cal.App.3d at p. 669.) “[T]he law imposes on any driver [the duty] to exercise ordinary care at all times and to maintain a proper control of his or her vehicle.” (*Id.* at p. 670.)

***Multiple Victims to One Drunk Driving Accident***

“In *Wilkoff v. Superior Court* [(1985) 38 Cal.3d 345, 352 [211 Cal.Rptr. 742, 696 P.2d 134]] we held that a defendant cannot be charged with multiple counts of felony drunk driving under Vehicle Code section 23153, subdivision (a), where injuries to several people result from one act of drunk driving.” (*People v. McFarland* (1989) 47 Cal.3d 798, 802 [254 Cal.Rptr. 331, 765 P.2d 493].) However, when “a defendant commits vehicular manslaughter with gross negligence[, . . . he may properly be punished for [both the vehicular manslaughter and] injury to a separate individual that results from the same incident.” (*Id.* at p. 804.) The prosecution may also charge an enhancement for multiple victims under Vehicle Code section 23558.

See also the Related Issues section in CALCRIM No. 2110, *Driving Under the Influence*.

**2101. Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol Causing Injury (Veh. Code, § 23153(b))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with causing injury to another person while driving with a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23153(b)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant drove a vehicle;
2. When (he/she) drove, the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more by weight;
3. When the defendant was driving with that blood alcohol level, (he/she) also (committed an illegal act/ [or] neglected to perform a legal duty);

**AND**

4. The defendant's (illegal act/ [or] failure to perform a legal duty) caused bodily injury to another person.

[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of the defendant's (blood/breath) was taken within three hours of the defendant's [alleged] driving and that a chemical analysis of the sample showed a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more at the time of the alleged offense.]

[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Public Health.]

[The People allege that the defendant committed the following illegal act[s]: \_\_\_\_\_ <list name[s] of offense[s]>.

To decide whether the defendant committed \_\_\_\_\_ <list name[s] of offense[s]>, please refer to the separate instructions that I (will give/have given) you on (that/those) crime[s].]

**[The People [also] allege that the defendant failed to perform the following legal (duty/duties) while driving the vehicle: (the duty to exercise ordinary care at all times and to maintain proper control of the vehicle/\_\_\_\_\_ <insert other duty or duties alleged>).]**

**[You may not find the defendant guilty unless all of you agree that the People have proved that the defendant (committed [at least] one illegal act/[or] failed to perform [at least] one duty).**

*<Alternative A—unanimity required; see Bench Notes>*

**[You must all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]**

*<Alternative B—unanimity not required; see Bench Notes>*

**[But you do not have to all agree on which (act the defendant committed/ [or] duty the defendant failed to perform).]**

**[Using *ordinary care* means using reasonable care to prevent reasonably foreseeable harm to someone else. A person fails to exercise ordinary care if he or she (does something that a reasonably careful person would not do in the same situation/ [or] fails to do something that a reasonably careful person would do in the same situation).]**

**[An act causes bodily injury to another person if the injury is the direct, natural, and probable consequence of the act and the injury would not have happened without the act. A *natural and probable consequence* is one that a reasonable person would know is likely to happen if nothing unusual intervenes. In deciding whether a consequence is natural and probable, consider all of the circumstances established by the evidence.]**

**[There may be more than one cause of injury. An act causes bodily injury to another person only if it is a substantial factor in causing the injury. A *substantial factor* is more than a trivial or remote factor. However, it need not be the only factor that causes the injury.]**

---

*New January 2006; Revised August 2006, April 2008, August 2015, March 2018*



## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime.

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant committed an act forbidden by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to specify the predicate offense alleged and to instruct on the elements of that offense. (*People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].)

If the prosecution alleges under element 3 that the defendant neglected to perform a duty imposed by law, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the duty allegedly neglected. (See *People v. Minor*, *supra*, 28 Cal.App.4th at pp. 438–439.) If the prosecution alleges that the defendant neglected the general duty of every driver to exercise ordinary care (see *People v. Oyass* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 663, 669 [219 Cal.Rptr. 243]), the court should give the bracketed definition of “ordinary care.”

If causation is at issue, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on proximate cause. (*People v. Bernhardt* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 567, 590–591 [35 Cal.Rptr. 401].) If the evidence indicates that there was only one cause of injury, the court should give the first bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “direct, natural, and probable” language. If there is evidence of multiple causes of injury, the court should also give the second bracketed paragraph on causation, which includes the “substantial factor” definition. (See *People v. Autry* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 351, 363 [43 Cal.Rptr.2d 135]; *People v. Pike* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 732, 746–747 [243 Cal.Rptr. 54].)

There is a split in authority over whether there is a **sua sponte** duty to give a unanimity instruction when multiple predicate offenses are alleged. (*People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30] [unanimity instruction required], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735] [unanimity instruction not required but preferable]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438] [unanimity instruction not required]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906] [unanimity instruction not required, failure to give harmless error if was required].) If the court concludes that a unanimity instruction is appropriate, give the unanimity alternative A. If the court concludes that unanimity is not required, give the unanimity alternative B.

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23152(b); Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” if there is evidence that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was below 0.08 percent at the time of the test.

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayan* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

If the defendant is charged with one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) If the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. ~~2110~~[2125](#), *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*. If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690].)

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

### ***Defenses—Instructional Duty***

On request, if supported by the evidence, the court must instruct on the “imminent peril/sudden emergency” doctrine. (*People v. Boulware* (1940) 41 Cal.App.2d 268, 269–270 [106 P.2d 436].) The court may use the bracketed instruction on sudden emergency in CALCRIM No. 590, *Gross Vehicular Manslaughter While Intoxicated*.

### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2100, *Driving a Vehicle or Operating a Vessel Under the Influence Causing Injury*.

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

CALCRIM No. 595, *Vehicular Manslaughter: Speeding Laws Defined*.

## **AUTHORITY**

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23153(b); *Burg v. Municipal Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 257, 265–266 [198 Cal.Rptr. 145, 673 P.2d 732].
- Partition Ratio ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(b); *People v. Bransford* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 885, 890 [35 Cal.Rptr.2d 613, 884 P.2d 70].
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, § 23153(b); Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Must Instruct on Elements of Predicate Offense ▶ *People v. Minor* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 431, 438–439 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 641]; *People v. Ellis* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1334, 1339 [82 Cal.Rptr.2d 409].
- Negligence—Ordinary Care ▶ Pen. Code, § 7(2); Restatement Second of Torts, § 282.
- Causation ▶ *People v. Rodriguez* (1960) 186 Cal.App.2d 433, 440 [8 Cal.Rptr. 863].
- Unanimity Instruction ▶ *People v. Gary* (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1212, 1218 [235 Cal.Rptr. 30], overruled on other grounds in *People v. Flood* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470, 481 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 180, 957 P.2d 869]; *People v. Durkin* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 13 [252 Cal.Rptr. 735]; *People v. Mitchell* (1986) 188 Cal.App.3d 216, 222 [232 Cal.Rptr. 438]; *People v. Leffel* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 575, 586–587 [249 Cal.Rptr. 906].

- Statute Constitutional ▶ *Burg v. Municipal Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 257, 273 [198 Cal.Rptr. 145, 673 P.2d 732].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

### ***Secondary Sources***

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare §§ 272-277.

5 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 91, *Sentencing*, § 91.36 (Matthew Bender).

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02[1] (Matthew Bender).

## **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES**

- Misdemeanor Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 Percent ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(a) & (b); *People v. Capetillo* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 211, 220 [269 Cal.Rptr. 250].

## **RELATED ISSUES**

See the Related Issues section in CALCRIM No. 2111, *Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol* and CALCRIM No. 2100, *Driving a Vehicle or Operating a Vessel Under the Influence Causing Injury*.

**2102–2109. Reserved for Future Use**

### **2111. Driving With 0.08 Percent Blood Alcohol (Veh. Code, § 23152(b))**

---

**The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_\_\_] with driving with a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(b)].**

**To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:**

- 1. The defendant drove a vehicle;**

**AND**

- 2. When (he/she) drove, the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more by weight.**

**[If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of the defendant's (blood/breath) was taken within three hours of the defendant's [alleged] driving and that a chemical analysis of the sample showed a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more, you may, but are not required to, conclude that the defendant's blood alcohol level was 0.08 percent or more at the time of the alleged offense.]**

**[In evaluating any test results in this case, you may consider whether or not the person administering the test or the agency maintaining the testing device followed the regulations of the California Department of Public Health.]**

---

*New January 2006; Revised August 2006, June 2007, April 2008, August 2015, March 2018*

### **BENCH NOTES**

#### ***Instructional Duty***

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime. Give this instruction if the defendant is charged with a misdemeanor or a felony based on prior convictions.

If the defendant is charged with one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v.*

*Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington*, *supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) If the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*. If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 690].)

The bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” explains a rebuttable presumption created by statute. (See Veh. Code, § 23152(b); Evid. Code, §§ 600–607.) The California Supreme Court has held that a jury instruction phrased as a rebuttable presumption in a criminal case creates an unconstitutional mandatory presumption. (*People v. Roder* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 491, 497–505 [189 Cal.Rptr. 501, 658 P.2d 1302].) In accordance with *Roder*, the instructions have been written as permissive inferences.

The court **must not** give the bracketed paragraph that begins with “If the People have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that a sample of” if there is no substantial evidence that the defendant’s blood alcohol level was at or above 0.08 percent at the time of the test.

If the evidence demonstrates that the person administering the test or agency maintaining the testing device failed to follow the title 17 regulations, give the bracketed sentence that begins with “In evaluating any test results in this case.” (*People v. Adams* (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 559, 567 [131 Cal.Rptr. 190] [failure to follow regulations in administering breath test goes to weight, not admissibility, of the evidence]; *People v. Williams* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 408, 417 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 854, 49 P.3d 203] [same]; *People v. Esayan* (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1031, 1039 [5 Cal.Rptr.3d 542] [results of blood test admissible even though phlebotomist who drew blood not authorized under title 17].)

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2110, *Driving Under the Influence*.

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(b); *Burg v. Municipal Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 257, 265–266 [198 Cal.Rptr. 145, 673 P.2d 732].
- Partition Ratio ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(b); *People v. Bransford* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 885, 890 [35 Cal.Rptr.2d 613, 884 P.2d 70].
- Presumptions ▶ Veh. Code, §§ 23152(b), 23610; Evid. Code, § 607; *People v. Milham* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 487, 503–505 [205 Cal.Rptr. 688].
- Statute Constitutional ▶ *Burg v. Municipal Court* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 257, 273 [198 Cal.Rptr. 145, 673 P.2d 732].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

## Secondary Sources

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (4th ed. 2012) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare §§ 272-277

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02[1] (Matthew Bender).

## LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

If the defendant is charged with felony driving under the influence based on prior convictions, then the misdemeanor offense is a lesser included offense. The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate if the prior convictions have been proved. If the jury finds that the prior convictions have not been proved, then the offense should be set at a misdemeanor.

## RELATED ISSUES

### *Partition Ratio*

In 1990, the Legislature amended Vehicle Code section 23152(b) to state that the “percent, by weight, of alcohol in a person’s blood is based upon grams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood or grams of alcohol per 210 liters of breath.”

Following this amendment, the Supreme Court held that evidence of variability of breath-alcohol partition ratios was not relevant and properly excluded. (*People v. Bransford* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 885, 890–893 [35 Cal.Rptr.2d 613, 884 P.2d 70].) See the Related Issues section in CALCRIM No. 2110, *Driving Under the Influence*.



## 2112. Driving While Addicted to a Drug (Veh. Code, § 23152(c))

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_] with driving while addicted to a drug [in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(c)].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant drove a vehicle;

AND

2. When (he/she) drove, the defendant was addicted to a drug.

A *drug* is a substance or combination of substances, other than alcohol, that could so affect the nervous system, brain, or muscles of a person that it would appreciably impair his or her ability to drive as an ordinarily cautious person, in full possession of his or her faculties and using reasonable care, would drive under similar circumstances.

A person is *addicted* to a drug if he or she:

1. Has become physically dependent on the drug, suffering withdrawal symptoms if he or she is deprived of it;
2. Has developed a tolerance to the drug's effects and therefore requires larger and more potent doses;

AND

3. Has become emotionally dependent on the drug, experiencing a compulsive need to continue its use.

[It is not a defense that the defendant was legally entitled to use the drug.]

---

New January 2006; March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime. Give this instruction if the defendant is charged with a misdemeanor or a felony based on prior convictions.

If the defendant is charged with one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence, the defendant may stipulate to the convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) In addition, either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336; *People v. Weathington*, *supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.) If the defendant does not stipulate and the court does not grant a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*. If the court grants a bifurcated trial, give CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*. If the defendant stipulates to the truth of the convictions, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)

Vehicle Code section 23630 states that the fact that the defendant was legally entitled to use the drug is not a defense to a charge of driving under the influence. (Veh. Code, § 23630.) It is unclear whether this provision applies to the charge of driving while addicted. If the court concludes that the statute does apply, the court may add the bracketed sentence at the end of the instruction: “It is not a defense that the defendant was legally entitled to use the drug.”

In addition, Vehicle Code section 23152(c) states “[t]his subdivision shall not apply to a person who is participating in a narcotic treatment program approved pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 11875) of Chapter 1 of Part 3 of Division 10.5 of the Health and Safety Code.” If there is evidence that the defendant is participating in an approved treatment program, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on this defense.

On request, give CALCRIM No. 2241, *Driver and Driving Defined*.

#### ***Related Instructions***

CALCRIM No. 2125, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2126, *Driving Under the Influence or With 0.08 or 0.04 Percent Blood Alcohol: Prior Convictions—Bifurcated Trial*.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Veh. Code, § 23152(c).
- Drug Defined ▶ Veh. Code, § 312.
- Addict Defined ▶ *People v. O'Neil* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 748, 754 [44 Cal.Rptr. 320, 401 P.2d 928].
- Prior Convictions ▶ *People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].

### *Secondary Sources*

2 Witkin & Epstein, California Criminal Law (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 205–210.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 145, *Narcotics and Alcohol Offenses*, § 145.02[1][a] (Matthew Bender).

### 3100. Prior Conviction: Nonbifurcated Trial (Pen. Code, §§ 1025, 1158)

---

If you find the defendant guilty of a crime, you must also decide whether the People have proved the additional allegation that the defendant was previously convicted of (another/other) crime[s]. It has already been determined that the defendant is the person named in exhibit[s] \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert number[s] or description[s] of exhibit[s]>*. You must decide whether the evidence proves that the defendant was convicted of the alleged crime[s].

The People allege that the defendant has been convicted of:

[1.] A violation of \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert code section alleged>*, on \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert date of conviction>*, in the \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert name of court>*, in Case Number \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert docket or case number>* (;/.)

[AND *<Repeat for each prior conviction alleged>*.]

[Consider the evidence presented on this allegation only when deciding whether the defendant was previously convicted of the crime[s] alleged [or for the limited purpose of \_\_\_\_\_ *<insert other permitted purpose, e.g., assessing credibility of the defendant>*]. Do not consider this evidence as proof that the defendant committed any of the crimes with which he is currently charged or for any other purpose.]

[You must consider each alleged conviction separately.] The People have the burden of proving (the/each) alleged conviction beyond a reasonable doubt. If the People have not met this burden [for any alleged conviction], you must find that the alleged conviction has not been proved.

---

New January 2006; *March 2018*

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

If the defendant is charged with a prior conviction, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to instruct on the allegation. ~~Give this instruction if the defendant does not admit the prior conviction and the court has not granted a bifurcated trial on the prior conviction.~~

If identity is an issue, the court must make the factual determination that the defendant is the person who has suffered the convictions in question before giving this instruction.

Do not give this instruction if the court has bifurcated the trial. Instead, if the court grants bifurcation, do not give this instruction. Give CALCRIM No. 3101, *Prior Conviction: Bifurcated Trial*.

If the defendant is charged with a prison prior, the court must determine whether the jury should decide if the defendant served a separate prison term for the conviction and whether the defendant remained free of prison custody for the “washout” period. (Pen. Code, § 667.5(a) & (b).) The Commentary below discusses these issues further. If the court chooses to submit these issues to the jury, give CALCRIM No. 3102, *Prior Conviction: Prison Prior*, with this instruction.

If the court determines that there is a factual issue regarding the prior conviction that must be submitted to the jury, give CALCRIM No. 3103, *Prior Conviction: Factual Issue for Jury*, with this instruction. The Commentary below discusses this issue further.

On request, the court should give the limiting instruction that begins with “Consider the evidence presented on this allegation only when deciding. . . .” (See *People v. Valentine* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 170, 182, fn. 7 [228 Cal.Rptr. 25, 720 P.2d 913].) There is no sua sponte duty to give the limiting instruction, and the defense may request that no limiting instruction be given. (See *People v. Griggs* (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1139 [2 Cal.Rptr.3d 380].)

The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate whether the prior conviction has been proved. (Pen. Code, § 1158.)

## AUTHORITY

- Statutory Authority ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 1025, 1158.
- Bifurcation ▶ *People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–79 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 885 P.2d 83]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41].
- Judge Determines Whether Defendant Is Person Named in Documents ▶ Pen. Code, § 1025(c); *People v. Garcia* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 1159, 1165 [132 Cal.Rptr.2d 694].

- Limiting Instruction on Prior Conviction ▶ See *People v. Valentine* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 170, 182, fn. 7 [228 Cal.Rptr. 25, 720 P.2d 913]; *People v. Griggs* (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1139 [2 Cal.Rptr.3d 380].
- Disputed Factual Issues ▶ See *People v. Epps* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 19, 23 [104 Cal.Rptr.2d 572, 18 P.3d 2]; *People v. Kelii* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 452, 458–459 [87 Cal.Rptr.2d 674, 981 P.2d 518]; *People v. Wiley* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 580, 592 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 889 P.2d 541]; *Apprendi v. New Jersey* (2000) 530 U.S. 466, 490 [120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435]; *People v. McGee* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 682 [42 Cal.Rptr.3d 899, 133 P.3d 1054]; *People v. Winslow* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 680, 687 [46 Cal.Rptr.2d 901].
- Three-Strikes Statutes ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 667(e), 1170.12.
- Five-Year Enhancement for Serious Felony ▶ Pen. Code, § 667(a)(1).
- Three-Year Enhancement for Prison Prior If Violent Felony ▶ Pen. Code, § 667.5(a).
- One-Year Enhancement for Prison Prior ▶ Pen. Code, § 667.5(b).
- Serious Felony Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 1192(c).
- Violent Felony Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 667.5(c).

### ***Secondary Sources***

5 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Criminal Trial, § 515.

2 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 42, *Arraignment, Pleas, and Plea Bargaining*, § 42.21[6][a] (Matthew Bender).

5 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 91, *Sentencing*, §§ 91.21[2], 91.60, 91.80 (Matthew Bender).

## **COMMENTARY**

### ***Factual Issues—Decided by Jury or Court?***

A prior conviction may present an ancillary factual issue that must be decided before the conviction may be used under a particular enhancement or sentencing statute. For example, the prosecution might seek sentencing under the “three strikes” law, alleging that the defendant was previously convicted of two burglaries. These prior convictions would qualify as “strikes” only if the burglaries were residential. (See *People v. Kelii* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 452, 455 [87 Cal.Rptr.2d 674, 981 P.2d 518].) If the defendant had been specifically convicted of first

degree burglary of an inhabited dwelling, then there would be no issue over whether the prior convictions qualified. If, on the other hand, the defendant had been convicted simply of “burglary,” then whether the offenses were residential would be a factual issue. (*Ibid.*) The question then arises: who decides these ancillary factual issues, the jury or the court?

Penal Code sections 1025(b) and 1158 specifically state that the jury must decide whether the defendant “suffered the prior conviction.” The California Supreme Court has observed that “sections 1025 and 1158 are limited in nature. [Citation.] By their terms, [these sections] grant a defendant the right to have the jury determine only whether he or she ‘suffered’ the alleged prior conviction.” (*People v. Epps* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 19, 23 [104 Cal.Rptr.2d 572, 18 P.3d 2] [internal quotation marks and citation omitted].) Thus, the California Supreme Court has held that the court, not the jury, must decide ancillary facts necessary to establish that a prior conviction comes within a particular recidivist statute. (*People v. Kelii, supra*, 21 Cal.4th at pp. 458–459; *People v. Wiley* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 580, 592 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d 347, 889 P.2d 541]; *People v. McGee* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 682 [42 Cal.Rptr.3d 899, 133 P.3d 1054].) Specifically, the court must determine whether the facts of a prior conviction make the conviction a “serious” felony (*People v. Kelii, supra*, 21 Cal.4th at p. 457); and whether prior convictions charged as serious felonies were “brought and tried separately.” (*People v. Wiley, supra*, 9 Cal.4th at p. 592.)

Penal Code section 1025 was amended in 1997 to further provide that the court, not the jury, must determine whether the defendant is the person named in the documents submitted to prove the prior conviction. (Pen. Code, § 1025(c); see also *People v. Epps, supra*, 25 Cal.4th at pp. 24–25.) The California Supreme Court has held that the defendant still has a statutory right to a jury trial on whether he or she “suffered” the prior conviction, which “may include the question whether the alleged prior conviction *ever even occurred*. For example, in a rare case, the records of the prior conviction may have been fabricated, or they may be in error, or they may otherwise be insufficient to establish the existence of the prior conviction.” (*People v. Epps, supra*, 25 Cal.4th at p. 25 [italics in original].) At the same time, the court also observed that “[t]his procedure would appear to leave the jury little to do except to determine whether those documents are authentic and, if so, are sufficient to establish that the convictions the defendant suffered are indeed the ones alleged.” (*Id.* at p. 27 [italics omitted] [quoting *People v. Kelii, supra*, 21 Cal.4th at p. 459].)

However, in 2000, the United States Supreme Court held that the federal due process clause requires that “[o]ther than the fact of a prior conviction, any fact that increases the penalty for a crime beyond the prescribed statutory maximum must be submitted to a jury, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt.” (*Apprendi v.*

*New Jersey* (2000) 530 U.S. 466, 490 [120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435]; see also *Blakely v. Washington* (2004) 542 U.S. 296 [124 S.Ct. 2531, 159 L.Ed.2d 403].) In *People v. Epps*, *supra*, 25 Cal.4th at p. 28, the California Supreme Court noted that *Apprendi* might have overruled the holdings of *Kelii* and *Wiley*. In *People v. McGee* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 682 [42 Cal.Rptr.3d 899, 133 P.3d 1054], however, the California Supreme Court determined that it was not error for the trial court to examine the record of a prior conviction to determine whether it constitutes a qualifying prior conviction for purposes of a recidivist sentencing statute, because there is a “significant difference” between a “hate crime” enhancement and a traditional sentencing determination.

### ***Prior Prison Term and “Washout” Period***

A similar issue arises over whether the jury or the court must decide if the defendant served a prison term as a result of a particular conviction and if the defendant has been free of custody for sufficient time to satisfy the “washout” period. (See Pen. Code, § 667.5(a) & (b).) In *People v. Winslow* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 680, 687 [46 Cal.Rptr.2d 901], the Court of Appeal held that the jury must determine whether the defendant served a prior prison term for a felony conviction. The other holdings in *Winslow* were rejected by the California Supreme Court. (*People v. Kelii*, *supra*, 21 Cal.4th at pp. 458–459; *People v. Wiley*, *supra*, 9 Cal.4th at p. 592.) However, the *Winslow* holding that the jury must determine if the defendant served a prison term for a felony conviction remains controlling authority.

But, in *People v. Epps*, *supra*, 25 Cal.4th at pp. 25–26, the Court expressed doubt, in dicta, about whether the fact of having served a prison term is properly submitted to the jury. Discussing the 1997 amendment to Penal Code section 1025, the Court noted that

[t]he analysis lists the following questions that the jury would still decide if Senate Bill 1146 became law: . . . ‘Was the defendant sentenced to prison based on that conviction? How long has the defendant been out of custody since he or she suffered the prior conviction?’ . . .

[T]hough we do not have a case before us raising the issue, it appears that many of the listed questions are the sort of legal questions that are for the court under [*Wiley*]. For example, determining . . . whether the defendant was sentenced to prison is “largely legal” (*Kelii*, *supra*, 21 Cal. 4th at p. 455, quoting *Wiley*, *supra*, 9 Cal. 4th at p. 590), and though these questions require resolution of some facts, “a factual inquiry, limited to examining court documents, is . . . ‘the type of inquiry traditionally performed



by judges as part of the sentencing function.” (Kelii, at p. 457, quoting Wiley, at p. 590.) . . . Therefore, the list of questions in the committee analysis should not be read as creating new jury trial rights that did not exist under Wiley.  
(Ibid.)

On the other hand, *Apprendi*, discussed above, could be interpreted as requiring the jury to make these factual findings. (But see *People v. Thomas* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 212, 223 [110 Cal.Rptr.2d 571] [even under *Apprendi*, no federal due process right to have jury determine whether defendant served a prior prison term].)

Until the California Supreme Court resolves this question, the court should consider submitting to the jury the issues of whether the defendant served a prison term and whether the defendant has remained free of custody for sufficient time to satisfy the “washout” period. The court may use CALCRIM No. 3102, *Prior Conviction: Prison Prior*.

## RELATED ISSUES

### ***Review Limited to Record of Conviction***

When determining if a prior conviction comes under a particular recidivist statute, “the trier of fact may consider the entire record of the proceedings leading to imposition of judgment on the prior conviction” but may not consider facts outside the record of conviction. (*People v. Myers* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 1193, 1195 [22 Cal.Rptr.2d 911, 858 P.2d 301]; see also *People v. Riel* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 1153, 1204–1205 [96 Cal.Rptr.2d 1, 998 P.2d 969]; *People v. Henley* (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 555, 564 [85 Cal.Rptr.2d 123].) The prosecution bears the burden of proving that the prior conviction meets the requirements of the enhancement statute. (*People v. Henley, supra*, 72 Cal.App.4th at pp. 564–565.)

### ***Constitutionality of Prior***

The prosecution is not required to prove the constitutional validity of a prior conviction as an “element” of the enhancement. (*People v. Walker* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 380, 386 [107 Cal.Rptr.2d 264].) Rather, following the procedures established in *People v. Sumstine* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 909, 922–924 [206 Cal.Rptr. 707, 687 P.2d 904], and *People v. Allen* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 424, 435–436 [87 Cal.Rptr.2d 682, 981 P.2d 525], the defense may bring a motion challenging the constitutional validity of the prior. These questions are matters of law to be determined by the trial court.

### **Defense Stipulation to Prior Convictions**

The defendant may stipulate to the truth of the prior convictions. (*People v. Weathington* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 69, 90 [282 Cal.Rptr. 170].) If the defendant stipulates, the prior convictions should not be disclosed to the jury unless the court admits them as otherwise relevant. (See *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 809].)

### **Motion for Bifurcated Trial**

Either the defendant or the prosecution may move for a bifurcated trial. (*People v. Calderon* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 69, 77–78 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 333]; *People v. Cline* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1327, 1334–1336 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 41]; *People v. Weathington, supra*, 231 Cal.App.3d at p. 90.)

**2521. Carrying Concealed Firearm Within Vehicle (Pen. Code, § 25400(a)(1))**

---

The defendant is charged [in Count \_\_] with unlawfully carrying a concealed firearm within a vehicle [in violation of Penal Code section 25400].

To prove that the defendant is guilty of this crime, the People must prove that:

1. The defendant carried within a vehicle a firearm capable of being concealed on the person;
2. The defendant knew the firearm was in the vehicle;
3. The firearm was substantially concealed within the vehicle;

**AND**

4. The vehicle was under the defendant's control or direction.

[A *firearm capable of being concealed on the person* is any device designed to be used as a weapon, from which a projectile is expelled or discharged through a barrel by the force of an explosion or other form of combustion and that has a barrel less than 16 inches in length. [A *firearm capable of being concealed on the person* also includes any device that has a barrel 16 inches or more in length that is designed to be interchanged with a barrel less than 16 inches in length.] [A *firearm* also includes any rocket, rocket-propelled projectile launcher, or similar device containing any explosive or incendiary material, whether or not the device is designed for emergency or distress signaling purposes.]]

[The term *firearm capable of being concealed on the person* is defined in another instruction.]

[A firearm does not need to be in working order if it was designed to shoot and appears capable of shooting.]

[Firearms carried openly in belt holsters are not concealed.]

<Defense: Statutory Exemption>

[The defendant did not unlawfully carry a concealed firearm with-in a vehicle if \_\_\_\_\_ <insert defense from Pen. Code, §§ 25450, 25510, 25525, 25600, 25605, 25610, 25525, 25510, or 25450>. The People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant unlawfully carried a concealed firearm within a vehicle. If the People have not met this burden, you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.]

---

New January 2006; Revised February 2012; March 2018

## BENCH NOTES

### *Instructional Duty*

The court has a **sua sponte** duty to give this instruction defining the elements of the crime. If the defendant is charged with any of the sentencing factors in Penal Code section 25400(c), the court must also give the appropriate instruction from CALCRIM Nos. 2540–2546. (*People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 690].)

The court should give the bracketed definition of “firearm capable of being concealed on the person” unless the court has already given the definition in other instructions. In such cases, the court may give the bracketed sentence stating that the term is defined elsewhere.

Penal Code section 25400(a) prohibits carrying a concealed “pistol, revolver, or other firearm capable of being concealed upon the person.” Penal Code section 16530 provides a single definition for this class of weapons. Thus, the committee has chosen to use solely the all-inclusive phrase “firearm capable of being concealed on the person.”

### *Defenses—Instructional Duty*

Exemptions and a justification for carrying a concealed firearm are stated in Penal Code sections 25450, 25525, 25510, 25600, 25605, 25525, 25510, and 25450, 25610. If sufficient evidence has been presented to raise a reasonable doubt about the existence of a legal basis for the defendant’s actions, the court has a **sua sponte** duty to give the bracketed instruction on the defense. (See *People v. Mower* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 457, 478–481 [122 Cal.Rptr.2d 326, 49 P.3d 1067] [discussing affirmative defenses generally and the burden of proof].) Insert the appropriate language in the bracketed paragraph that begins, “The defendant did not unlawfully . . . .”

### *Related Instructions*

CALCRIM No. 2540, *Carrying Firearm: Specified Convictions*.

CALCRIM No. 2541, *Carrying Firearm: Stolen Firearm*.

CALCRIM No. 2542, *Carrying Firearm: Active Participant in Criminal Street Gang*.

CALCRIM No. 2543, *Carrying Firearm: Not in Lawful Possession*.

CALCRIM No. 2544, *Carrying Firearm: Possession of Firearm Prohibited Due to Conviction, Court Order, or Mental Illness*.

CALCRIM No. 2545, *Carrying Firearm: Not Registered Owner*.

CALCRIM No. 2546, *Carrying Concealed Firearm: Not Registered Owner and Weapon Loaded*.

## AUTHORITY

- Elements ▶ Pen. Code, § 25400(a)(1) .
- Firearm Defined ▶ Pen. Code, § 16520.
- Knowledge Required ▶ *People v. Jurado* (1972) 25 Cal.App.3d 1027, 1030–1031 [102 Cal.Rptr. 498]; *People v. Rubalcava* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 322, 331–332 [96 Cal.Rptr.2d 735, 1 P.3d 52].
- Concealment Required ▶ *People v. Nelson* (1960) 185 Cal.App.2d 578, 580–581 [8 Cal.Rptr. 288].
- Factors in Pen. Code, § 25400(c) Sentencing Factors, Not Elements ▶ *People v. Hall* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 128, 135 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 690].
- Justifications and Exemptions ▶ Pen. Code, §§ 25600, 25605, 25525, 25510, 25450.
- Need Not Be Operable ▶ *People v. Marroquin* (1989) 210 Cal.App.3d 77, 82 [258 Cal.Rptr. 290].
- Substantial Concealment ▶ *People v. Wharton* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 72, 75 [6 Cal.Rptr.2d 673] [interpreting now-repealed Pen. Code, § 12020(a)(4)]; *People v. Fuentes* (1976) 64 Cal.App.3d 953, 955 [134 Cal.Rptr. 885] [same].
- Statute Is Not Unconstitutionally Vague ▶ *People v. Hodges* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1348, 1355 [83 Cal.Rptr.2d 619].

## *Secondary Sources*

2 Witkin & Epstein, *California Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) Crimes Against Public Peace and Welfare, §§ 154–159.

6 Millman, Sevilla & Tarlow, *California Criminal Defense Practice*, Ch. 144, *Crimes Against Order*, § 144.01[1][d] (Matthew Bender).

## LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES

If the defendant is charged with one of the sentencing factors that makes this offense a felony, then the misdemeanor offense is a lesser included offense. The statute defines as a misdemeanor all violations of the statute not covered by the specified sentencing factors. (Pen. Code, § 25400(c)(7).) The court must provide the jury with a verdict form on which the jury will indicate if the sentencing factor has been proved. If the jury finds that the sentencing factor has not been proved, then the offense should be set at a misdemeanor.

## RELATED ISSUES

### ***Gun in Unlocked Carrying Case Is Concealed***

“If a firearm is transported in a vehicle in such a manner as to be invisible unless its carrying case is opened, it is concealed in the ordinary and usual meaning of the term.” (*People v. Hodges* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1348, 1355 [83 Cal.Rptr.2d 619].) Thus, carrying a firearm in an unlocked case in a vehicle violates Penal Code section 25400(a)(1). (*Ibid.*) However, Penal Code section 25525 makes it lawful to transport a firearm in a vehicle if it is in a *locked* case.

### ***Not Necessary for Defendant to Possess or Control the Firearm***

“The statute does not require that the defendant have the exclusive possession and control of the firearm.” (*People v. Davis* (1958) 157 Cal.App.2d 33, 36 [320 P.2d 88].) The court in *People v. Davis, supra*, upheld the conviction where the defendant owned and controlled the vehicle and knew of the presence of the firearm below the seat, even though the weapon was placed there by someone else and belonged to someone else. (*Ibid.*)