Defendant's Proposed Jury Instruction No. 14

MEDICAL NECESSITY

Necessity is a defense to criminal conduct where the conduct was necessary to avoid a harm more serious than that sought to be prevented by the statute defining the offense. You must find Jordan Crittle not quilty if you find the following:

Mr. Crittle was faced with a choice of evils and chose One: the lesser evil;

Two: Mr. Crittle acted to prevent imminent harm;

Mr. Crittle reasonably anticipated a causal relation Three:

between his conduct and the harm to be avoided; and

there were no other legal alternatives to violating the Four: law.

Belief in the causal connection is reasonable when a licensed physician has recommended the use of marijuana for relief of a physical condition.1

A person has no legal alternatives when any legal alternative would have been ineffective or resulted in intolerable side effects.²

The defense must prove necessity by a preponderance of the evidence. This means that the facts Jordan Crittle seeks to prove are more likely true than not true. If you believe that Mr. Crittle's conduct was necessary to avoid a more serious harm, then you must find him not quilty.

United States v. Bailey, 444 U.S. 394, 410 (1980) (defining the defense of necessity); Raich v. Gonzalez, 500 F.3d 850, 859 (2007) (as modified) (listing elements of medical necessity defense); 9th Cir. Model 6.6 (defining "preponderance of the evidence").

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

 $^{^{1}}$ Raich, 500 F.3d at 860.

²Raich, 500 F.3d at 860.

Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions and Memorandum in Support Thereof