FELONIOUS RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS FROM A PERMITTED CONSTRUCTION SITE--GOODS VALUED IN EXCESS OF \$300 AND LESS THAN \$1,000. FELONY. G.S. 14-72.6

The defendant has been charged with felonious receiving stolen goods from a permitted construction site.

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

 $\underline{\text{First}}$, that the property was stolen by someone other than the defendant.

Second, that the defendant [received] [concealed] that property.

Third, that the defendant, at the time (he) (she) [received] [concealed] that property, knew² or had reasonable grounds to believe it was stolen.

Fourth, that the defendant [received] [concealed] that property with a dishonest purpose. (State what purpose was, e.g., permanently depriving owner of his property) is a dishonest purpose.)

¹In the event there is some dispute as to "receiving," the jury should be told what will constitute receiving or concealing goods.

 $^{^2}$ This knowledge may be actual, or it may be implied when the circumstances are sufficient to lead the party charged to believe the property was stolen. <u>S. v. Parker</u>, 316 N.C. 295, 303 (1986).

N.C.P.I.--Crim. 216.41 Page 2 of 2

FELONIOUS RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS FROM A PERMITTED CONSTRUCTION SITE--GOODS VALUED IN EXCESS OF \$300 AND LESS THAN \$1,000. FELONY. G.S. 14-72.6. (Continued).

Fifth, that the property was valued in excess of three hundred dollars (\$300) but less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000).

And Sixth, that the property was taken from a permitted construction site, that is a site where a permit, license, or other authorization had been issued by the state or local government entity for the placement of new construction or improvement to real property.

If you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the alleged date, the defendant, with a dishonest purpose, [received] (or) [concealed] property valued in excess of three hundred dollars (\$300) but less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000), which (he) (she) knew or had reasonable grounds to believe someone else had stolen, and the property was taken from a permitted construction site, it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty. If you do not so find or have a reasonable doubt of as to one or more of these things, it would be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.³

³If there is evidence to support the submission of a lesser included offense, this last phrase would be amended as follows "If you do not so find or have a reasonable doubt as to one or more of these things, then you would not return a verdict of guilty felonious receiving stolen property from a permitted construction site, but would consider whether the defendant is guilty of"