

N.C.P.I.—Criminal 208.82

ASSAULT UPON AN OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF THE STATE OR OF ANY POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OR PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATOR. MISDEMEANOR. G.S. 14-33(c)(4)

General Criminal Volume

Replacement June 2011

NOTE WELL: *Where there is evidence of justification or excuse (such as self defense or resisting unlawful arrest) use N.C.P.I.--Crim. 208.81 series and not this instruction.*

The defendant has been charged with assault¹ upon a(n)

- a) [officer] [employee] of [the State] [a political subdivision of the State] while such [officer] [employee] was [discharging] [attempting to discharge] a duty of his office.
- b) public transit operator² while such public transit operator was [discharging] [attempting to discharge] a duty of that office.

For you to find the defendant guilty of this offense, the State must prove four things beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant assaulted the victim by intentionally³ (*describe assault*).

Second, that the victim was

- a) an [officer] [employee] of [the State] [a political subdivision of the State]
- b) a public transit operator.

Third, that the victim was [discharging] [attempting to discharge] a duty of the victim's office. (*Describe duty, e.g., magistrate issuing a warrant*) is a duty of that office.⁴

¹ If a definition of assault is needed, see N.C.P.I.—Crim. 120.20.

² A public transit operator includes a public employee or a private contractor employed as a public transit operator.

³ If a definition of intent is needed, see N.C.P.I.—Crim. 120.10.

⁴ When the State contends that the victim was doing one thing that would be a duty of his office, but the evidence is that he may have been doing something else that would not be a duty of his office, describe what would and what would not be a duty of the victim's office.

N.C.P.I.—Criminal 208.82

ASSAULT UPON AN OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF THE STATE OR OF ANY POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OR PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATOR. MISDEMEANOR. G.S. 14-33(c)(4)

General Criminal Volume

Replacement June 2011

And Fourth, that the defendant knew or had reasonable grounds to know that the victim was

- a) an [officer] [employee] of [the State] [a political subdivision of the State]
- b) a public transit operator.

If you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the alleged date, the defendant intentionally assaulted the victim, that the victim was a(n) (*state victim's title*) and was [discharging] [attempting to discharge] a duty of his office, and that the defendant knew or had reasonable grounds to know that the victim was a(n) (*state victim's title*), it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty.⁵ If you do not so find or have a reasonable doubt as to one or more of these things, it would be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.

⁵ If there is to be an instruction on lesser included offenses, the last phrase should be: ". . . you will not return a verdict of guilty of assault upon an [officer] [employee] of [the State] [a political subdivision of the State]."