

ASSAULT OR BATTERY--DEFENSE OF SELF.

The (*state number*) issue reads:

"Did the defendant [assault] [batter] the plaintiff in self-defense?"

You will answer this issue only if you have answered the issue as to whether defendant [assaulted] [battered] the plaintiff "Yes" in favor of the plaintiff.

On this issue the burden of proof is on the defendant.<sup>1</sup> This means that the defendant must prove, by the greater weight of the evidence, three things:<sup>2</sup>

First, that the defendant reasonably believed that it was necessary to use force to protect *himself* from imminent bodily injury or death. A belief is reasonable when a person of ordinary prudence under the same or similar circumstances would believe that force is needed to protect himself from imminent bodily injury or death.

Second, that the defendant used no more force against the plaintiff than was reasonably necessary under the circumstances

---

<sup>1</sup>In criminal cases, the burden of proof is on the State to prove the non-existence of facts tending to show self-defense. See N.C.P.I.--Crim. 206.30. Otherwise, criminal cases may be used to determine a self-defense justification in the civil action. Young v. Warren, 95 N.C. App. 585, 588, 383 S.E.2d 381, 383 (1989); Harris v. Hodges, 57 N.C. App. 360, 361, 291 S.E.2d 346, 347, disc. rev. denied, 306 N.C. 384, 294 S.E.2d 208 (1982).

<sup>2</sup>State v. Marsh, 293 N.C. 353, 354, 237 S.E.2d 745, 747 (1977).

ASSAULT OR BATTERY--DEFENSE OF SELF. (Continued.)

to protect *himself* from bodily injury or death.<sup>3</sup>

Third, that the defendant was not the aggressor. A person who voluntarily and without provocation enters into a fight is not acting in self-defense (unless he first abandons the fight, withdraws from it and gives notice to his adversary that he has done so).

Finally, as to this issue on which the defendant has the burden of proof, if you find by the greater weight of the evidence that the defendant [assaulted] [battered] the plaintiff in self-defense, then it would be your duty to answer this issue "Yes" in favor of the defendant.

If, on the other hand, you fail to so find, then it would be your duty to answer this issue "No" in favor of the plaintiff.

---

<sup>3</sup>Unless such force was used or threatened as would create a reasonable apprehension of death or great bodily harm, the defendant's use of deadly force would be excessive (i.e., unreasonable) as a matter of law. State v. Clay, 297 N.C. 555, 563, 256 S.E.2d 176, 182 (1979), overruled on other grounds, State v. Davis, 305 N.C. 400, 415, 290 S.E.2d 574, 583 (1982).