

[BUYING] [SELLING] [POSSESSING] ITEM OF PERSONAL PROPERTY ON WHICH THE PERMANENT IDENTIFICATION MARK HAS BEEN [ALTERED] [DESTROYED] [DEFACED] [REMOVED]. G.S. 14-160.1(b). MISDEMEANOR.

The defendant has been charged with [buying] [selling] [possessing] an item of personal property on which the permanent identification mark has been [altered] [destroyed] [defaced] [removed].

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

First, that the defendant [bought] [sold] [possessed'¹] (*describe item of personal property*) which was not his own.

Second, that the personal property once had a [permanent serial number] [manufacturer's identification plate] [permanent distinguishing number or identification mark] on it.

Third, that this [permanent serial number] [manufacturer's identification plate] [permanent distinguishing number or identification mark] had been [altered] [destroyed] [defaced] [removed] in order to [conceal] [misrepresent] the identity of the personal property.

And Fourth, that the defendant knew or had reasonable grounds to believe that this [permanent serial number] [manufacturer's identification plate] [permanent distinguishing number or identification mark] had been so [altered] [destroyed] [defaced] [removed].

¹If a definition of constructive possession is required, see N.C.P.I.--Crim. 104.41.

[BUYING] [SELLING] [POSSESSING] ITEM OF PERSONAL PROPERTY ON WHICH THE PERMANENT IDENTIFICATION MARK HAS BEEN [ALTERED] [DESTROYED] [DEFACED] [REMOVED]. G.S. 14-160.1(b). MISDEMEANOR.
(Continued.)

If you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the alleged date, the defendant [bought] [sold] [possessed] (*describe item of personal property*) which was not his own and had been marked with a [permanent serial number] [manufacturer's identification plate] [permanent distinguishing number or identification mark], which had been [altered] [destroyed] [defaced] [removed] for the purpose of [concealing] [misrepresenting] its identity, and that the defendant knew or had reasonable grounds to believe that this had been done to [conceal] [misrepresent] the identity of the personal property, it would be your duty to return a verdict of guilty. However, 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.