

be innocent until he is proved guilty beyond  
a reasonable doubt; and the law allows him  
to testify in his own behalf, and the jury should  
fairly and impartially consider his testimony,  
together with all the other evidence in  
the case, and if from all the evidence the  
F. 21 jury have any reasonable doubt as to the  
guilt of the prisoner they should give the  
prisoner the benefit of the doubt and acquit him.

J. M<sup>ch</sup>. Liversay,  
Atty for Dft.

No 5.

The Court instructs the jury that the in-  
formation charges that the defendant  
Antonio Benedict, at the County of Gilpin,  
State of Colorado, on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of June, 1894,  
feloniously, wickedly and against the  
order of nature had venereal affair with  
a certain cow and then and there feloniously,  
wickedly and against the order of nature did carnally  
know the said cow, and then by these feloniously,  
F. 22. wickedly and against the order of nature with  
the said cow did commit and perpetrate  
the abominable, detestable and infamous crime  
against nature of buggery and the Court in-  
structs the jury that if from the evidence  
they entertain a reasonable doubt concern-  
ing any material allegation contained  
in the information, then your verdict should  
be "not guilty."

J. M<sup>ch</sup>. Liversay  
Atty. for Dft.

The Court instructs the jury that among the material facts or elements required to be proven of course beyond a reasonable doubt, is the fact or element of penetration; ¶ 23. and the court further instructs the jury that if from the evidence in this case they entertain a reasonable doubt concerning the matter of penetration then their verdict should be for the defendant.

J. M<sup>c</sup>H Linnay  
Atty. for Dft.

No 10.

The Court instructs the jury, that the credibility of the witnesses is a question exclusively for the jury; that in determining the weight to be given to the testimony of the different witnesses in this case the jury are authorised to consider the relationship of the witnesses to the parties, if the same is proved; their temper, feeling or bias, if any have been shown; their demeanor while testifying; their apparent candor and fairness; their apparent intelligence or lack of intelligence; the reasonableness of the story told by them; their means of information, and all the evidence and circumstances tending to corroborate or contradict such witnesses, if any such are proved, and to give such credit to the testimony of such witnesses, under all the circumstances, such witness seems to be entitled to.

James M<sup>c</sup>H Linnay  
Atty for Dft.

Page 11.

Thereupon comes the defendant <sup>as</sup> submits  
the following instructions which were  
refused by the Court. Said instructions  
are in words <sup>and</sup> figures as follows  
to wit;

L.25 No. 7. The Court instructs the jury that  
the criminal code of this state provides  
that drunkenness shall not <sup>be an</sup> excuse for  
any crime or misdemeanor, unless  
such drunkenness be occasioned by  
the fraud, contrivance or force of some  
other person or persons, for the purpose  
of causing the perpetration of an offense,  
still, if you believe from the evidence in  
this case that the prisoner at the time  
of the alleged perpetration of the crime  
charged in the information was drunk  
or intoxicated to such a degree that he  
did not know the nature or quality of  
the act or did not know what he was  
doing, or that what he was doing was  
wrong, or that he was utterly unable  
to form any intention at all, then you  
should acquit him.

L.26

Refused to give excepted to J. M<sup>c</sup>W<sup>illiam</sup>  
by deft. J. M<sup>c</sup>W<sup>illiam</sup> Atty for Dft. Atty for deft.  
No 8.

Refused  
Clayton T. Becker  
Judge.

Page 12.

The Court instructs the jury, that the  
wrongful intent is the very essence of  
gist of a crime, without which it cannot  
exist, <sup>as</sup> if the jury believe from the  
evidence that at the time of the alleg-  
ed perpetration of the crime charged

7. 27. in the information the prisoner was drunk or intoricated to such a degree that he was unable or incapable of forming an intention, then you should acquit him.

Refused to give excepted to  
by Dft & J.M.W. Livesay  
Atty for Dft.

J. M<sup>W</sup>. Livesay  
Atty for Dft.

No 9.

The Court instructs the Jury that there is only one criterion by which the guilt of men is to be tested, ~~as~~ that is whether the mind is criminal; that the essence of an offence is the wrongful or evil intent, without which it cannot exist; that there must be a union or joint operation of act & intention and if under the evidence in this case either element was lacking then your verdict should be for the defendant

J. M<sup>W</sup>. Livesay  
Atty for Dft.

Refused to give, excepted to  
by Dft & J.M.W. Livesay

Atty for Dft.

And all of said instructions have an endorsement thereon.

"Filed in District Court June 21<sup>st</sup>/894

Richard Harvey  
Clerk."

The defendant submitted the following form of verdict which is in words & figures as follows to wit.

Page 13