

**7.01**  
**Definition Of First Degree Murder**

*Use For Cases Where The Offense Is Alleged To Have Occurred Before July 1, 2021.*

A person commits the offense of first degree murder when he kills an individual [without lawful justification] if, in performing the acts which cause the death,

[1] he intends to kill or do great bodily harm to that individual [or another];

[or]

[2] he knows that such acts will cause death to that individual [or another];

[or]

[3] he knows that such acts create a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to that individual [or another];

[or]

[4] he [(is attempting to commit) (is committing)] the offense of \_\_\_\_\_.

**Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-1 (West 2013).

This instruction applies to cases tried under P.A. 84-1450, which abolishes the offense of murder and replaces it with the offense of first degree murder.

Give Instruction 6.05, defining the offense of attempt following the definition of the forcible felony, when the basis for an instruction on felony murder is an alleged attempt to commit a forcible felony. However, no attempt issues instruction should be given unless the defendant also had been charged with an attempt offense.

When the prosecution is for an inchoate offense (i.e., attempt first degree murder, solicitation to commit first degree murder, conspiracy to commit first degree murder), do not give paragraphs [2], [3], or [4]. In addition, modify the murder definition in paragraph [1] in attempt first degree murder cases to require that the defendant had the intent to kill another. See *People v. Harris*, 72 Ill.2d 16, 377 N.E.2d 28 (1978).

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 720. See *People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

When paragraph [4] is given, insert in the blank the applicable forcible felony from those listed in 720 ILCS 5/2-8 (except second degree murder). Follow this instruction with the instruction defining that forcible felony.

The Committee has elected to put the phrase “or another” in brackets because, in the usual case, this portion of the statutory definition is not applicable to the factual context presented, and the presence of this might cause confusion.

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Sets 27.01, 27.04A, 27.04B, 27.05, and 27.06.

**7.01B**  
**Definition Of First Degree Murder**

*Use For Cases Where The Offense Is Alleged To Have Occurred After June 30, 2021.*

A person commits the offense of first degree murder when he kills an individual [without lawful justification] if, in performing the acts which cause the death,

[1] he intends to kill or do great bodily harm to that individual [or another];

[or]

[2] he knows that such acts will cause death to that individual [or another];

[or]

[3] he knows that such acts create a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to that individual [or another];

[or]

[4] he, acting [(alone) (with one or more participants)], [(commits) (attempts to commit)] the offense of \_\_\_\_\_, and [(in the course of) (in furtherance of) (in flight from)] that offense, [(he) (another participant)] causes the death of a person.

**Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-1 (West 2021), as amended by P.A. 101-0652, effective July 1, 2021.

This instruction applies to cases tried under P.A. 84-1450, which abolishes the offense of murder and replaces it with the offense of first degree murder.

The Committee does not take a position as to whether P.A. 101-0652 is retroactive.

When using paragraph [4] alleging felony murder, use the corresponding paragraph [4] of Instruction 7.02B.

Give Instruction 6.05, defining the offense of attempt following the definition of the forcible felony, when the basis for an instruction on felony murder is an alleged attempt to commit a forcible felony. However, no attempt instruction should be given unless the defendant also had been charged with an attempt offense.

When the prosecution is for an inchoate offense (i.e., attempt first degree murder, solicitation to commit first degree murder, conspiracy to commit first degree murder), do not give paragraphs [2], [3], or [4]. In addition, modify the murder definition in paragraph [1] in

attempt first degree murder cases to require that the defendant had the intent to kill another. See *People v. Harris*, 72 Ill.2d 16, 377 N.E.2d 28 (1978).

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 720. See *People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

When paragraph [4] is given, insert in the blank the applicable forcible felony from those listed in 720 ILCS 5/2-8 (except second degree murder). Follow this instruction with the instruction defining that forcible felony.

The Committee has elected to put the phrase “or another” in brackets because, in the usual case, this portion of the statutory definition is not applicable to the factual context presented, and the presence of this might cause confusion.

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Sets 27.01, 27.04A, 27.04B, 27.05, and 27.06.

## 7.01S

### Definition Of Second Degree Murder When First Degree Murder Is Not Charged

A person commits the offense of second degree murder when he kills an individual [without lawful justification] if, in performing the acts which cause the death,

[1] he intends to kill or do great bodily harm to that individual [or another];

[or]

[2] he knows that such acts will cause death to that individual [or another];

[or]

[3] he knows that such acts create a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to that individual [or another].

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.02S.

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in 720 ILCS 5/7-1 through 5/7-14.

In *People v. Burks*, 189 Ill.App.3d 782, 545 N.E.2d 782 (3d Dist. 1989), the appellate court held that the State could elect to bring a charge of second degree murder without first charging the defendant with first degree murder. The indictment in *Burks* alleged that the defendant had committed first degree murder by shooting the victim, but that at the time of the killing he had unreasonably believed the circumstances to be such that if they existed would justify or exonerate his action. In this context, the appellate court stated the following:

“By charging a defendant with second degree murder, the State is alleging that it can prove the elements of first degree murder, but is conceding the presence of mitigating factors. Under these circumstances the defendant bears no burden to prove any mitigating factors. Of course, if the instant defendant is tried by a jury and the cause reaches the deliberations stage, special jury instructions will be needed to explain the elements of the offense.”

*Burks*, 189 Ill.App.3d at 785.

The Committee believes this instruction and Instruction 7.02S comply with the directions of *Burks*. In effect, the State is required to prove the elements of first degree murder, but if it satisfies the jury it has done so, the only verdict and judgment to which it is entitled is guilty of

second degree murder. This result follows because the State, in the *Burks* situation, has conceded the presence of the mitigating factor that reduces the defendant's criminal behavior from first degree murder to second degree murder.

Accordingly, this instruction is identical to Instruction 7.01A except for two changes: (1) the name of the offense is different, and (2) paragraph [4] is omitted. This omission results from the statutory definition of second degree murder which excludes "felony murder" provisions contained in paragraph [4].

This instruction also applies when a defendant is charged with first degree murder, is convicted of second degree murder, and later has that conviction reversed and a new trial ordered. At the new trial, collateral estoppel prevents the State from retrying the defendant for first degree murder. *See People v. Newbern*, 219 Ill.App.3d 333, 354, 579 N.E.2d 583 (4th Dist. 1991); *People v. Thomas*, 216 Ill.App.3d 469, 472-73, 576 N.E.2d 1020 (1st Dist. 1991). Under these circumstances, give Instructions 7.01S and 7.02S.

The Committee has elected to put the phrase "or another" in brackets because, in the usual case, this portion of the statutory definition is not applicable to the factual context presented, and the presence of this phrase might cause confusion.

Use applicable bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

## 7.01X

### **Explanation To Jury Of The Reason For Designating One Category Of First Degree Murder As (Type A) And Another Category Of First Degree Murder As (Type B)**

The terms “(Type A)” and “(Type B)” that I use in referring to first degree murder have no legal significance. I use those terms simply to distinguish between different kinds of first degree murder.

#### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

Pursuant to 720 ILCS 5/9-2(a), as amended by P.A. 84-1450, effective July 1, 1987, a conviction of second degree murder cannot be based upon a charge of first degree murder under 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). Accordingly, when both kinds of first degree murder are charged, one kind under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder) and the other kind under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) (“knowing or intentional murder”), and when the court is going to instruct the jury on the lesser offense of second degree murder, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the first degree murder count under Section 9-1(a)(3) and either Instruction 7.04 or 7.06 should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which the second degree murder instruction is based.

The Committee suggests using the designations (Type A) and (Type B) to distinguish between these two categories of first degree murder. The purpose of this instruction is to explain to the jury why these designations are being used.

The felony murder doctrine, embodied in 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3), is almost never the sole basis for a charge in this State of first degree murder. Instead, the prosecution typically alleges “knowing or intentional murder” under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) when charging first degree murder, and the prosecution adds to those charges a first degree murder count based on the felony murder doctrine if such a count may be supported by the evidence.

Accordingly, the Committee believes that there is no need for this instruction unless the jury is going to be instructed on second degree murder. Since the jury may be instructed on second degree murder as a lesser offense *only* of “knowing or intentional murder” (9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2)) and not of felony murder (9-1(a)(3)), the court must distinguish in its instructions between these two different categories of first degree murder.

For a further discussion of this subject, see the Committee Notes to Instructions 7.02X, 7.04, and 7.06; see also Sample Instruction 27.05 for an example of the utilization of this instruction.

The Committee recommends that this instruction be read to the jury immediately after the

court has read to the jury whichever instruction from the 2.01 series the court found applicable. Failure to use this instruction has been held to be reversible error. *People v. Alvine*, 173 Ill.2d 273, 671 N.E.2d 713 (1996).

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Set 27.05.



**7.02**

**Issues In First Degree Murder (When Second Degree Murder Is Not Also An Issue)**

*Use For Cases Where The Offense Is Alleged To Have Occurred Before July 1, 2021.*

To sustain the charge of first degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_ ;

[or]

[2] he knew that his acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_ ;

[or]

[3] he knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_ ;

[or]

[4] he was [(attempting to commit) (committing)] the offense of \_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

**Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-1 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.01.

Use Instruction 7.02 to set forth the issues in first degree murder only when the court is not also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder. When the court is also instructing on second degree murder, instead of using a separate issues instruction for first degree murder, give the combined issues Instruction 7.04 or 7.06.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert the name of the victim and the name of the felony (see Committee Note to Instruction 7.01) in the appropriate blanks. Modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. See *People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

This instruction--and only one of this instruction--should be given to the jury to explain the issues in first degree murder. Do not give separate issues instructions for each of the different ways first degree murder can be charged under Sections 9-1(a)(1) through (a)(3). Instead, use the appropriate paragraphs within the Second Proposition. *People v. Johnson*, 250 Ill.App.3d 887, 620 N.E.2d 506 (4th Dist. 1993).

When defendant is charged with the murder of a newborn, and evidence exists that the baby may have been stillborn, a jury must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the baby was born alive. *People v. Ehlert*, 274 Ill.App.3d 1026, 1038, 654 N.E.2d 705 (1st Dist. 1995). The *Ehlert* court recommended that this finding be included as the first proposition in the issues instructions, proposing the following modifications to Instruction 7.02:

To sustain the charge of first degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

First: That the baby, Jane Doe, was born alive; and

Second: That after the live birth the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the baby, Jane Doe; and

Third: That when the defendant did so, she intended to kill or do great bodily harm to the baby, Jane Doe, or she knew that her acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to the baby, Jane Doe.

*Ehlert*, 274 Ill.App.3d at 1038.

Use applicable bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.02B

### Issues In First Degree Murder (When Second Degree Murder Is Not Also An Issue)

*Use For Cases Where The Offense Is Alleged To Have Occurred After June 30, 2021.*

To sustain the charge of first degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_.

[or]

[2] he knew that his acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_.

[or]

[3] he knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_.

[or]

[4] he, acting [(alone) (with one or more participants)], [(committed) (attempted to commit)] the offense of \_\_\_\_\_, and [(in the course of) (in furtherance of) (in flight from)] this offense, [(he) (another participant)] caused the death of a person.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

### Committee Note

720 ILCS 5/9-1 (West 2021), as amended by P.A. 101-0652, effective July 1, 2021.

Give Instruction 7.01B.

When using paragraph [4] alleging for felony murder, give Instruction 7.15B.

Use Instruction 7.02B to set forth the issues in first degree murder only when the court is not also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder. When the court is also

instructing on second degree murder, instead of using a separate issues instruction for first degree murder, give the combined issues Instruction 7.04 or 7.06.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert the name of the victim and the name of the felony (see Committee Note to Instruction 7.01B) in the appropriate blanks. Modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. See *People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

This instruction—and only one of this instruction—should be given to the jury to explain the issues in first degree murder. Do not give separate issues instructions for each of the different ways first degree murder can be charged under Sections 9-1(a)(1) through (a)(3). Instead, use the appropriate paragraphs within the Second Proposition. *People v. Johnson*, 250 Ill.App.3d 887, 620 N.E.2d 506 (4th Dist. 1993).

When defendant is charged with the murder of a newborn, and evidence exists that the baby may have been stillborn, a jury must find beyond a reasonable doubt that the baby was born alive. *People v. Ehlert*, 274 Ill.App.3d 1026, 1038, 654 N.E.2d 705 (1st Dist. 1995). The *Ehlert* court recommended that this finding be included as the first proposition in the issues instructions, proposing the following modifications to Instruction 7.02:

To sustain the charge of first degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

First: That the baby, Jane Doe, was born alive; and

Second: That after the live birth the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the baby, Jane Doe; and

Third: That when the defendant did so, she intended to kill or do great bodily harm to the baby, Jane Doe, or she knew that her acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to the baby, Jane Doe.

*Ehlert*, 274 Ill.App.3d at 1038.

Use applicable bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.02S

### Issues In Second Degree Murder When First Degree Murder Is Not Charged

To sustain the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that his acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.01S.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instructions from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim and the name of the felony (see note to Instruction 7.01). When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. See *People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

Use applicable bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.02X

### **Explanation To Jury That It May Not Find Defendant Guilty Of Felony Murder And Not Guilty Of Underlying Felony**

To sustain the charge of first degree murder (Type B), the State must prove that when the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_, the defendant was committing the offense of \_\_\_\_\_. Accordingly, you may find the defendant guilty of first degree murder (Type B) only if you also find the defendant guilty of \_\_\_\_\_.

If you find the defendant not guilty of \_\_\_\_\_, then you must find the defendant not guilty of first degree murder (Type B).

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

This instruction should be used to avoid legally inconsistent verdicts that could arise when the jury is to be instructed on first degree murder under Instruction 7.02 and the *sole* basis for conviction is the felony murder doctrine.

When the felony murder doctrine is the sole basis for conviction, only paragraph [4] of the Second Proposition of Instruction 7.02 should be used.

Insert in the first blank the name of the alleged victim. Insert in the following blanks the name of the underlying felony as used in Instruction 7.02.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Set 27.05.

### 7.03

#### **Definition Of Mitigating Factor—Second Degree Murder—Provocation**

A mitigating factor exists so as to reduce the offense of first degree murder to the lesser offense of second degree murder if, at the time of the killing, the defendant acts under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by [(the deceased) (some other person he endeavors to kill, but he negligently or accidentally kills the deceased)]. Serious provocation is conduct sufficient to excite an intense passion in a reasonable person.

#### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2(a)(1) and (b) (West 2013).

Use applicable bracketed material.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Sets 27.04B and 27.05.



#### 7.04

### Issues Where Jury Instructed On Both First Degree Murder And Second Degree Murder— Provocation

To sustain either the charge of first degree murder or the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that such acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, your deliberations [on these charges] should end, and you should return a verdict of not guilty [of first degree murder].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether a mitigating factor has been proved so that the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder.

You may not consider whether the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder until and unless you have first determined that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the previously stated propositions.

The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder. By this I mean that you must be persuaded, considering all the evidence in this case, that it is more probably true than not true that the following mitigating factor is present: that the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_, acted under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by [(the deceased) (some other person he endeavors to kill, but he negligently or accidentally kills the deceased)].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of second degree murder.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of first degree murder.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1, 9-2(a)(1) and 9-2(b) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.01.

Pursuant to Section 9-2(a), as amended by P.A. 84-1450, the offense of second degree murder may not be based upon first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). When first degree murder is charged under only Section 9-1(a)(3), Instruction 7.02 should be used. When first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) and first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) are both charged and the court is also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the count under Section 9-1(a)(3), and Instruction 7.04 should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which second degree murder may be based. *See* Instructions 7.01X and 7.02X.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim. When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. *See People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

Use bracketed language “[of first degree murder]” and “[on these charges]” when the jury will be instructed on other offenses in addition to first degree murder and second degree murder.

This instruction—and only one of this instruction—should be given to the jury to explain the issues in first degree murder. Do *not* give separate issues instructions for each of the different ways first degree murder can be charged under 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) through (a)(4). Instead, use the appropriate paragraphs within the Second Proposition. *People v. Johnson*, 250 Ill.App.3d 887, 620 N.E.2d 506 (4th Dist. 1993).

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and

should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Set 27.04B.

**7.04X**

**Issues Where Jury Instructed On First Degree Murder And Second Degree Murder  
(Provocation) And Involuntary Manslaughter**

To sustain either the charge of first degree murder or the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that such acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, your deliberations on first degree murder and second degree murder should end, and you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether the defendant is guilty of involuntary manslaughter.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether a mitigating factor has been proved so that the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder.

You may not consider whether the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder until and unless you have first determined that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the previously stated propositions.

The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder. By this I mean that you must be persuaded, considering all the evidence in this case, that it is more probably true than not true that the following mitigating factor is present: that the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_, acted under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by [(the deceased) (some other person he endeavors to kill, but he negligently or accidentally kills the deceased)].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of second degree murder.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of first degree murder.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1(a), 9-2(a)(1) and 9-2(b) (West 2013).

Pursuant to Section 9-2(a), as amended by P.A. 84-1450, the offense of second degree murder may not be based upon first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). When first degree murder is charged under only Section 9-1(a)(3), Instruction 7.02 should be used. When first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) and first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) are both charged and the court is also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder and the lesser included offense of involuntary manslaughter, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the count under Section 9-1(a)(3), and Instruction 7.04X should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter may be based. *See* Instructions 7.01X and 7.02X.

Give Instructions 7.01 (definition of first degree murder), 7.03 (definition of mitigating factor—second degree murder—provocation), 7.07 (definition of involuntary manslaughter), and 7.08 (issues in involuntary manslaughter).

This instruction should be used in conjunction with Instructions 2.01I and 26.01I through 2.01P and 26.01P, the charging and concluding instructions for use when first degree murder, second degree murder, and involuntary manslaughter are all at issue. Do *not* use this instruction in conjunction with any other instruction from the 2.01 and 26.01 series.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

This instruction should be used *only* when the jury is to be instructed on first degree murder, second degree murder (provocation), and involuntary manslaughter.

This instruction should *not* be used if the jury is to be instructed on: (1) second degree murder (belief in justification); (2) second degree murder (belief in justification *and* provocation); (3) first degree murder only; (4) second degree murder only; (5) first degree

murder and second degree murder only; (6) first degree murder and involuntary manslaughter only; or (7) second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter only. *See* Instructions 7.04A, 7.06A, 7.06B, 7.06X, and 7.06Y.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim. When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. *See People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.05

### **Definition Of Mitigating Factor—Second Degree Murder—Belief In Justification**

A mitigating factor exists so as to reduce the offense of first degree murder to the lesser offense of second degree murder if at the time of the killing the defendant believes that circumstances exist which would justify the deadly force he uses, but his belief that such circumstances exist is unreasonable.

#### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2(a)(2) (West 2013).

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Sets 27.01, 27.05, and 27.06.

7.06

**Issues Where Jury Instructed On Both First Degree Murder And Second Degree Murder—  
Belief In Justification**

To sustain either the charge of first degree murder or the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that such acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant was not justified in using the force which he used.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, your deliberations [on these charges] should end, and you should return a verdict of not guilty [of first degree murder].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether a mitigating factor has been proved so that the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder.

You may not consider whether the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder until and unless you have first determined that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the previously stated propositions.

The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder. By this I mean that you must be persuaded, considering all the evidence in this case, that it is more probably true than not true that the following mitigating factor is present: that the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of



\_\_\_\_\_, believed the circumstances to be such that they justified the deadly force he used, but his belief that such circumstances existed was unreasonable.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of second degree murder.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of first degree murder.

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1, 9-2(a), and 9-2(b) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.01.

Pursuant to Section 9-2(a), as amended by P.A. 84-1450, the offense of second degree murder may not be based upon first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). When first degree murder is charged under only Section 9-1(a)(3), Instruction 7.02 should be used. When first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) and first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) are both charged and the court is also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the count under Section 9-1(a)(3), and Instruction 7.06 should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which second degree murder may be based. *See* Instructions 7.01X and 7.02X.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim. When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. *See People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

This instruction—and only one of this instruction—should be given to the jury to explain the issues in first degree murder. Do *not* give separate issues instructions for each of the different ways first degree murder can be charged under 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) through (a)(4). Instead, use the appropriate paragraphs within the Second Proposition. *People v. Johnson*, 250 Ill.App.3d 887, 620 N.E.2d 506 (4th Dist. 1993).

Use bracketed language “[of first degree murder]” and “[on these charges]” when the jury will be instructed on other offenses in addition to first degree murder and second degree murder.

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Set 27.01, 27.05, and 27.06.

## 7.06B

### Issues Where Jury Instructed On Both First Degree Murder And Second Degree Murder— Both Provocation And Belief In Justification

To sustain either the charge of first degree murder or the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that such acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant was not justified in using the force which he used.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, your deliberations [on these charges] should end, and you should return a verdict of not guilty [of first degree murder].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether a mitigating factor has been proved so that the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder.

You may not consider whether the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder until and unless you have first determined that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the previously stated propositions.

The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder. By this I mean that you must be persuaded, considering all the evidence in this case, that it is more probably true than not true that either of the following mitigating factors is present: that the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused

the death of \_\_\_\_\_,

believed the circumstances to be such that they justified the deadly force he used, but his belief that such circumstances existed was unreasonable,

or

acted under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by [(the deceased) (some other person he endeavors to kill, but he negligently or accidentally kills the deceased)].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that either mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder, instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of second degree murder.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that either mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of first degree murder.

#### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1(a), 9-2(a)(1) and (2) (West 2013).

Pursuant to Section 9-2(a), the offense of second degree murder may not be based upon first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). When first degree murder is charged under only Section 9-1(a)(3), Instruction 7.02 should be used. When first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) and first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) are both charged and the court is also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the count under Section 9-1(a)(3), and Instruction 7.06B should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which second degree murder may be based. *See* Instructions 7.01X and 7.02X.

Give Instructions 7.01 (definition of first degree murder), 7.03 (definition of mitigating factor--second degree murder—provocation), and 7.05 (definition of mitigating factor--second degree murder—belief in justification).

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

The Committee added this instruction for use *only* in cases in which the court will instruct the jury on first degree murder and *both* theories of second degree murder: provocation

and belief in justification. Do *not* give this instruction if the jury is to be instructed on only one theory of second degree murder.

If the jury is to be instructed solely on provocation theory second degree murder, give Instruction 7.04.

If the jury is to be instructed solely on belief in justification theory second degree murder, give Instruction 7.06.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim. When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. *See People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

Use the bracketed language “[of first degree murder]” and “[on these charges]” when the jury will be instructed on other offenses in addition to first degree murder and second degree murder.

This instruction—and only one of this instruction—should be given to the jury to explain the issues in first degree murder. Do *not* give separate issues instructions for each of the different ways first degree murder can be charged under 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) through (a)(4). Instead, use the appropriate paragraphs within the Second Proposition. *People v. Johnson*, 250 Ill.App.3d 887, 620 N.E.2d 506 (4th Dist. 1993).

Use the bracketed language “[of first degree murder]” and “[on these charges]” when the jury will be instructed on other offenses in addition to first degree murder and second degree murder.

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

**7.06X**

**Issues Where Jury Instructed On First Degree Murder And Second Degree Murder (Belief In Justification) And Involuntary Manslaughter**

To sustain either the charge of first degree murder or the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that such acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant was not justified in using the force which he used.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, your deliberations on first degree murder and second degree murder should end, and you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether the defendant is guilty of involuntary manslaughter.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether a mitigating factor has been proved so that the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder.

You may not consider whether the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder until and unless you have first determined that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the previously stated propositions.

The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder. By this I mean that you must be persuaded, considering all the evidence in this case, that it is more probably true than not true that the following mitigating

factor is present: that the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_\_, believed the circumstances to be such that they justified the deadly force he used, but his belief that such circumstances existed was unreasonable.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of second degree murder.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of first degree murder.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1(a), 9-2(a)(2) (West 2013).

Pursuant to Section 9-2(a), as amended by P.A. 84-1450, the offense of second degree murder may not be based upon first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). When first degree murder is charged under only Section 9-1(a)(3), Instruction 7.02 should be used. When first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) and first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) are both charged and the court is also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder and the lesser included offense of involuntary manslaughter, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the count under Section 9-1(a)(3), and Instruction 7.06X should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter may be based. *See* Instructions 7.01X and 7.02X.

Give Instructions 7.01 (definition of first degree murder), 7.05 (definition of mitigating factor—second degree murder—belief in justification), 7.07 (definition of involuntary manslaughter), and 7.08 (issues in involuntary manslaughter).

This instruction should be used in conjunction with Instructions 2.01I and 26.01I through 2.01P and 26.01P, the charging and concluding instructions for use when first degree murder, second degree murder, and involuntary manslaughter are all at issue. Do *not* use this instruction in conjunction with any other instruction from the 2.01 and 26.01 series.

This instruction should be used *only* when the jury is to be instructed on first degree murder, second degree murder (belief in justification), and involuntary manslaughter.

This instruction should *not* be used if the jury is to be instructed on: (1) second degree murder (provocation); (2) second degree murder (provocation *and* belief in justification); (3) first degree murder only; (4) second degree murder only; (5) first degree murder and second degree

murder only; (6) first degree murder and involuntary manslaughter only; or (7) second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter only. *See* Instructions 7.04A, 7.04X, 7.06A, 7.06B, and 7.06Y.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim. When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. *See People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist. 1971).

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.



7.06Y

**Issues Where Jury Instructed On First Degree Murder And Second Degree Murder  
(Provocation And Belief In Justification) And Involuntary Manslaughter**

To sustain either the charge of first degree murder or the charge of second degree murder, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so,

[1] he intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] he knew that such acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] he knew that such acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_;

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant was not justified in using the force which he used.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, your deliberations on first degree murder and second degree murder should end, and you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether the defendant is guilty of involuntary manslaughter.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether a mitigating factor has been proved so that the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder.

You may not consider whether the defendant is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder until and unless you have first determined that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the previously stated propositions.

The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder. By this I mean that you must be persuaded, considering all the evidence in this case, that it is more probably true than not true that either of the following

mitigating factors is present: that the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_\_,

believed the circumstances to be such that they justified the deadly force he used, but his belief that such circumstances existed was unreasonable,

or

acted under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by [(the deceased) (some other person he endeavors to kill, but he negligently or accidentally kills the deceased)].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that either mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of second degree murder.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that either mitigating factor is present so that he is guilty of the lesser offense of second degree murder instead of first degree murder, you should find the defendant guilty of first degree murder.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1(a), 9-2(a)(1) and (2) (West 2013).

Pursuant to Section 9-2(a), as amended by P.A. 84-1450, the offense of second degree murder may not be based upon first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) (felony murder). When first degree murder is charged under only Section 9-1(a)(3), Instruction 7.02 should be used. When first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(3) and first degree murder under Section 9-1(a)(1) or 9-1(a)(2) are both charged and the court is also instructing on the lesser offense of second degree murder and the lesser included offense of involuntary manslaughter, Instruction 7.02 should be used for the count under Section 9-1(a)(3), and Instruction 7.06Y should be used for the other first degree murder counts upon which second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter may be based. *See* Instructions 7.01X and 7.02X.

Give Instructions 7.01 (definition of first degree murder), 7.03 (definition of mitigating factor—second degree murder—provocation), 7.05 (definition of mitigating factor—second degree murder—belief in justification), 7.07 (definition of involuntary manslaughter), and 7.08 (issues in involuntary manslaughter).

This instruction should be used in conjunction with Instructions 2.01I and 26.01I through 2.01P and 26.01P, the charging and concluding instructions for use when first degree murder,

second degree murder, and involuntary manslaughter are all at issue. Do *not* use this instruction in conjunction with any other instruction from the 2.01 and 26.01 series.

This instruction should be used *only* when the jury is to be instructed on first degree murder, second degree murder (provocation *and* belief in justification), and involuntary manslaughter.

This instruction should *not* be used if the jury is to be instructed on: (1) second degree murder (provocation only); (2) second degree murder (belief in justification only); (3) first degree murder only; (4) second degree murder only; (5) first degree murder and second degree murder only; (6) first degree murder and involuntary manslaughter only; or (7) second degree murder and involuntary manslaughter only. *See* Instructions 7.04, 7.04X, 7.06, 7.06X, and 7.06B.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blanks the name of the victim. When the intended victim is someone other than the deceased, modify this instruction to fit the transferred intent situation. *See People v. Forrest*, 133 Ill.App.2d 70, 272 N.E.2d 813 (1st Dist.1971).

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.07

### Definition Of Involuntary Manslaughter

A person commits the offense of involuntary manslaughter when he unintentionally causes the death of an individual [without lawful justification] by acts which are performed recklessly and are likely to cause death or great bodily harm to another.

#### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 5.01, defining “recklessness.”

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 7. *See People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Set 27.06.

**7.08**  
**Issues In Involuntary Manslaughter**

To sustain the charge of involuntary manslaughter, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of \_\_\_\_\_; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant performed those acts recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That those acts were likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of involuntary manslaughter.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.07.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blank the victim's name.

The Committee added the phrase “of involuntary manslaughter” in the second to the last paragraph to highlight this offense when the jury is also considering first degree murder or second degree murder. *See, e.g.*, Instruction 26.01I. However, the Committee chose not to place that phrase in brackets because its inclusion should not interfere with the jury's deliberations in any other context.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.09

### Definition Of Reckless Homicide

[1] A person commits the offense of reckless homicide when he unintentionally causes the death of an individual [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)] recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

[or]

[2] A person commits the offense of reckless homicide when he unintentionally causes the death of an individual while driving a vehicle and recklessly using an incline in a roadway, such as a railroad crossing, bridge approach, or hill, to cause the vehicle to become airborne.

### Committee Note

720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 93-682, effective January 1, 2005.

Although the text of the reckless homicide statute as a whole has changed significantly since 2003 (see P.A. 93-213, § 7; P.A. 93-682, § 10; P.A. 95-467; P.A. 95-551; P.A. 95-587; P.A. 95-591; P.A. 95-803, § 10; P.A. 95-876, § 315; P.A. 95-884, § 10; P.A. 96-328, § 330; P.A. 101-173, § 20), the last substantive amendment to section 9-3(a) became effective on January 1, 2005, with the enactment of P.A. 93-682. That amendment added the offense defined in paragraph [2] above.

Give Instruction 5.01 defining the word “recklessness.”

Because Section 9-3 does not include a mental state in the second sentence, the Committee decided to provide a mental state pursuant to 720 ILCS 5/4-3(b) (West 1992). The Committee believes this action to be in accordance with *People v. Anderson*, 148 Ill.2d 15 (1992), which held that even though the criminal hazing statute listed no mental state, Section 4-3(b) still placed on the State the burden of proving either intent, knowledge, or recklessness.

Use applicable paragraph and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.

## 7.09A

### Definition Of Aggravated Reckless Homicide

A person commits the offense of aggravated reckless homicide when he:

[1] unintentionally causes the death of [(an individual) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)] recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm, while upon a public thoroughfare where children pass going to and from school when a school crossing guard is performing official duties.

[or]

[2] unintentionally causes the death of [(an individual) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by driving a motor vehicle recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm, while in a construction or maintenance zone.

[or]

[3] unintentionally causes the death of [(an individual) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)] recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm, while failing or refusing to comply with any lawful order or direction of any ([authorized police officer) (traffic control aide)] engaged in traffic control.

[or]

[4] unintentionally causes the death of 2 or more persons as part of a single course of conduct, while driving a vehicle and recklessly using an incline in a roadway, such as a railroad crossing, bridge approach, or hill, to cause the vehicle to become airborne.

[or]

[5] unintentionally causes the death of a peace officer during performance of his official duties as a peace officer, [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)] recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

[or]

[6] unintentionally causes the death of [(an individual) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm when approaching a stationary authorized

emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights, while on a highway having at least four lanes with not less than two lanes proceeding in the same direction as the defendant's vehicle, and then failing to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, be prepared to stop, and leave a safe distance until safely passed the authorized emergency vehicle, and yield the right-of-way by making a lane change into a lane not adjacent to that of the authorized emergency vehicle if possible with due regard for safety and traffic conditions.

[or]

[7] unintentionally causes the death of [(an individual) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights, while on a roadway where changing lanes would be impossible or unsafe, and then failing to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, and leave a safe distance until safely past the authorized emergency vehicle.

[or]

[8] unintentionally causes the death of a firefighter or other emergency medical services personnel in the performance of their official duties [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights, while on a highway having at least four lanes with not less than two lanes proceeding in the same direction as the defendant's vehicle, and then failing to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, be prepared to stop, and leave a safe distance until safely passed the authorized emergency vehicle, and yield the right-of-way by making a lane change into a lane not adjacent to that of the authorized emergency vehicle if possible with due regard for safety and traffic conditions.

[or]

[9] unintentionally causes the death of a firefighter or other emergency medical services personnel in the performance of their official duties [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights, while on a roadway where changing lanes would be impossible or unsafe, and then failing to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, and leave a safe distance until safely past the authorized emergency vehicle.



## Committee Note

720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-2) and 9-3(e-3) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-467, effective June 1, 2008); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and (e-8) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 93-178, effective January 1, 2004); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-9) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 93-682, effective January 1, 2005); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and (e-8) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-591, effective September 10, 2007); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-10) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-551, effective June 1, 2008; 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-12) and (e-13) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-803, effective January 1, 2009; 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-15) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 101-173, effective January 1, 2020; 625 ILCS 5/11-907 (West 2021), amended by P.A. 102-0336, effective January 1, 2022.

Give Instruction 5.01, defining the word “recklessness.”

When applicable, give Instruction 23.79X, defining the term “authorized emergency vehicle”.

When applicable, define the term “construction or maintenance zone”. See Instruction 4.23 on school speed zones.

In *People v. Phipps*, 238 Ill.2d 54, 69 (2010), and in *People v. Gancarz*, 228 Ill.2d 312, 315–16 (2008), the Illinois Supreme Court recognized that the General Assembly had substantively amended the aggravated reckless homicide offense by enacting P.A. 93-213, § 7, eff. July 18, 2003. That amendment removed the language in 720 ILCS 5/9-3 that defined aggravated reckless homicide while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and then added to the language that defined the aggravated DUI offense in the Illinois Vehicle Code under 625 ILCS 5/11-501(d)(1) (West 2004). This instruction has been amended to properly reflect the changes in P.A. 93-213, as well as the new aggravating factors that were enacted since 2003.

The offense defined in paragraph [1] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-2) and 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-3), after enactment of P.A. 95-467, effective June 1, 2008.

The offense defined in paragraph [2] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-8), after enactment of P.A. 93-178, effective June 1, 2005.

The offense defined in paragraph [3] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and (e-8), after enactment of by P.A. 95-591, effective September 10, 2007).

The offense defined in paragraph [4] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-9), after enactment of P.A. 93-682, effective January 1, 2005.

The offense defined in paragraph [5] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-10), after enactment of P.A. 95-551, effective June 1, 2008.

The offense defined in paragraphs [6] and [7] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-12) and (e-13), after enactment of P.A. 95-803, effective January 1, 2009.

The offense defined in paragraphs [8] and [9] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-15), after enactment of P.A. 101-173, effective January 1, 2020.

Because the reckless homicide statute expressly refers to subsection (c) of Section 11-907 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, the bracketed language used in paragraphs [6], [7], [8], and [9] incorporates the requirements of Scott's Law as set forth in Instruction 23.79 and Instruction 23.79A.

The terms "due caution" and "due regard for safety and traffic conditions" in paragraphs [6], [7], [8], and [9] are undefined in the Illinois Vehicle Code, and the Committee takes no position on their meaning.

Use applicable paragraph and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury

**7.09X**

**Definition Of Under The Influence Of Alcohol--Aggravated Reckless Homicide**

This Instruction has been withdrawn.

**7.09Y**  
**Inferences Of “Reckless” Conduct—Reckless Homicide**

In cases involving the offense of reckless homicide, you may infer that the defendant’s actions were performed recklessly if you find that:

[1] the defendant committed the offense while driving [(at a speed of more than 20 miles per hour in excess of the posted speed limit) (under the influence of alcohol, other drugs, intoxicating compounds, or any combination thereof)] in [(a school speed zone, while children are present) (a construction or maintenance zone, while construction or maintenance workers are present)].

You are never required to make this inference. It is for the jury to determine whether the inference should be drawn. During your deliberations on your verdict you should consider all of the evidence in the case.

[or]

[2] the defendant committed the offense by driving a vehicle approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle that was displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue lights) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights, while on a highway having at least four lanes with not less than two lanes proceeding in the same direction as the defendant’s vehicle, and then failing to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, be prepared to stop, and leave a safe distance until safely passed the authorized emergency vehicle, and yield the right-of-way by making a lane change into a lane not adjacent to that of an authorized emergency vehicle, if possible with due regard for safety and traffic conditions.

You are never required to make this inference. It is for the jury to determine whether the inference should be drawn. During your deliberations on your verdict you should consider all of the evidence in the case.

[or]

[3] the defendant committed the offense by driving a vehicle approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle that was displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue lights) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights, while on a roadway where changing lanes would be impossible or unsafe, and then failing to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, to maintain a safe speed for road conditions, and leave a safe distance until safely past authorized emergency vehicle.

You are never required to make this inference. It is for the jury to determine whether the inference should be drawn. During your deliberations on your verdict you should consider all of the evidence in the case.

### **Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-11), last amended by P.A. 95-876, effective August 21, 2008. 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-14), last amended by P.A. 96-328, effective August 11, 2009; 625 ILCS 5/11-907 (West 2021), amended by P.A. 102-0336, effective January 1, 2022.

Give Instruction 5.01, defining the term “recklessness”.

When applicable give Instruction 23.13, defining the term “driving under the influence of alcohol”.

When applicable give Instruction 23.15, defining the term “driving under the influence of drugs”.

When applicable give Instruction 23.17, defining the term “driving under the combined influence of alcohol and drugs”.

When applicable give Instruction 23.79X, defining the term “authorized emergency vehicle”.

When applicable give Instruction 4.23, defining the term “school speed zone”.

When applicable, define the term “construction or maintenance zone”. See Instruction 4.23 regarding school speed zones.

The inference set forth in paragraph [1] reflects the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-11), enacted by P.A. 59-587, effective June 1, 2008, and last amended by P.A. 95-876, effective August 21, 2008. Paragraph [1] may be given when the defendant is charged with reckless homicide in a “posted school zone” or a “construction or maintenance zone”, and there is evidence that the defendant was either: driving at a speed of more than 20 miles per hour in excess of the posted speed limit; or driving while under the influence of alcohol, other drugs, intoxicating compounds, or any combination thereof.

The inferences set forth in paragraphs [2] and [3] reflect the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-14), enacted by P.A. 95-884, effective January 1, 2009, and last amended by P.A. 96-328, effective August 11, 2009. Paragraphs [2] and [3] may be given when the defendant is charged with reckless homicide, and there is evidence that the defendant also violated Scott’s Law (625 ILCS 5/11-907(c) (West 2020)).

Because the reckless homicide statute expressly refers to subsection (c) of Section 11-907 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, the bracketed language used in paragraphs [2] and [3] incorporates the requirements of Scott’s Law as set forth in Instruction 23.79 and Instruction 23.79A.

For constitutional reasons, an inference in a criminal case may not be mandatory when it operates against a defendant, and it may not shift the burden of proof. The Illinois Supreme Court has not addressed whether the permissive inferences set forth in Section 9-3(e-11) and Section 9-3(e-14) satisfy the requirements of constitutional due process. However, in *People v. Funches*, 212 Ill. 2d 334, 342-43 (2004), the Illinois Supreme Court reiterated that “[a]n inference does not violate due process guarantees where three conditions are satisfied: (1) there must be a rational connection between the basic fact and the presumed fact; (2) the presumed fact must be more likely than not to flow from the basic fact; and (3) the inference must be supported by corroborating evidence of guilt. If there is no corroborating evidence, the leap from the basic fact to the presumed element must still be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.” Applying those factors, the *Funches* court rejected the defendant’s as-applied challenge to the constitutionality of a permissive inference in a criminal statute.

The terms “due caution” and “due regard for safety and traffic conditions” in paragraphs [2] and [3] are undefined in the Illinois Vehicle Code, and the Committee takes no position on their meaning.

Use applicable paragraph and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.

## 7.10 Issues In Reckless Homicide

To sustain the charge of reckless homicide, the State must prove the following propositions:

[1] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of \_\_\_\_ [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)]; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

To sustain the charge of reckless homicide, the State must prove the following propositions:

[2] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of \_\_\_\_ [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant, while driving the vehicle, recklessly used an incline in a roadway to cause the vehicle to become airborne.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

### Committee Note

720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 93-682, effective January 1, 2005.

Although the text of the reckless homicide statute has changed significantly since 2003 (see P.A. 93-213, § 7; P.A. 93-682, § 10; P.A. 95-467; P.A. 95-551; P.A. 95-587; P.A. 95-591;

P.A. 95-803, § 10; P.A. 95-876, § 315; P.A. 95-884, § 10; P.A. 96-328, § 330; P.A. 101-173, § 20), the most recent substantive amendment became effective on January 1, 2005, with the enactment of P.A. 93-682. That amendment added the offense defined in paragraph [2] above.

Give Instruction 7.09.

When applicable, give Instruction 7.09Y (Inferences of ‘Reckless’ Conduct—Reckless Homicide).

Insert in the blank the name of the victim.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. See Instruction 5.03.

Use applicable paragraphs and bracketed material.

The brackets are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.



**7.10A**  
**Issues In Aggravated Reckless Homicide**

To sustain the charge of aggravated reckless homicide, the State must prove the following propositions:

[1] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of [(\_\_\_\_\_) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)]; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That in doing so, the defendant's [(motor vehicle) (snowmobile) (all-terrain vehicle) (watercraft)] was upon a public thoroughfare where children pass going to and from school when a school crossing guard is performing official duties.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[2] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of [(\_\_\_\_\_) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by driving a motor vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant, drove the vehicle recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That in doing so, the defendant was driving in a construction or maintenance zone.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[3] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of [(\_\_\_\_\_) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)]; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That in doing so, the defendant failed or refused to comply with any lawful order or direction of any [(authorized police officer) (traffic control aide)] engaged in traffic control.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[4] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant, while driving the vehicle, recklessly used an incline in a roadway to cause the vehicle to become airborne.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[5] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of a peace officer during performance of his official duties as a peace officer [without lawful justification] by [(driving a motor vehicle) (operating a snowmobile) (operating an all-terrain vehicle) (operating a watercraft)]; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant [(drove a motor vehicle) (operated a snowmobile) (operated an all-terrain vehicle) (operated a watercraft)] in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[6] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of [(\_\_\_\_\_) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle on a highway having at least four lanes with not less than two lanes proceeding in the same direction as the defendant's vehicle, when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights; and

*Fifth Proposition:* That the defendant failed to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, be prepared to stop, and leave a safe distance until safely passed the authorized emergency vehicle, and yield the right-of-way by making a lane change into a lane not adjacent to that of the authorized emergency vehicle, if possible with due regard for safety and traffic conditions.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[7] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of [(\_\_\_\_\_) (two or more persons as part of a single course of conduct)] [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle on a roadway where changing lanes would be impossible or unsafe, when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue) (red and blue) (amber) (yellow)] warning lights; and

*Fifth Proposition:* That the defendant failed to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, and leave a safe distance until safely past the authorized emergency vehicle.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[8] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of a firefighter or other emergency medical services personnel in the performance of their official duties [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle on a highway having at least four lanes with not less than two lanes proceeding in the same direction as the defendant's vehicle, when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue, or red and blue lights) (amber or yellow)] warning lights; and

*Fifth Proposition:* That the defendant failed to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, be prepared to stop, and leave a safe distance until safely passed the authorized emergency vehicle, and yield the right-of-way by making a lane change into a lane not adjacent to that of the authorized emergency vehicle, if possible with due regard for safety and traffic conditions.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

[or]

[9] *First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of a firefighter or other emergency medical services personnel in the performance of their official duties [without lawful justification] by driving a vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm; and

*Fourth Proposition:* That the defendant drove the vehicle on a roadway where changing lanes would be impossible or unsafe, when approaching a stationary authorized emergency vehicle displaying alternately flashing [(red) (red and white) (blue, or red and blue lights) (amber or yellow)] warning lights; and

*Fifth Proposition:* That the defendant failed to proceed with due caution, reduce the speed of the vehicle, maintain a safe speed for road conditions, and leave a safe distance until safely past the authorized emergency vehicle.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

### **Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-2) and 9-3(e-3) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-467, effective June 1, 2008); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and (e-8) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 93-178, effective January 1, 2004); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-9) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 93-682, effective January 1, 2005); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and (e-8) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-591, effective September 10, 2007); 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-10) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-551, effective June 1, 2008; 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-12) and (e-13) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 95-803, effective January 1, 2009; 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-15) (West 2020), amended by P.A. 101-173, effective January 1, 2020; 625 ILCS 5/11-907 (West 2021), amended by P.A. 102-0336, effective January 1, 2022.

Give Instruction 7.09A.

Give Instruction 5.01, defining the term “recklessness.”

When applicable, give Instruction 23.79X, defining the term “authorized emergency vehicle”.

When applicable, define the term “construction or maintenance zone”. See Instruction 4.23 on school speed zones.

When applicable, give Instruction 7.09Y (Inferences of ‘Reckless’ Conduct—Reckless Homicide).

When applicable, insert in the blank the name of the victim.

The propositions in paragraph [1] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-2) and 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-3), after enactment of P.A. 95-467, effective June 1, 2008.

The propositions in paragraph [2] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-8), after enactment of P.A. 93-178, effective June 1, 2005.

The propositions in paragraph [3] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-7) and (e-8), after enactment of by P.A. 95-591, effective September 10, 2007).

The propositions in paragraph [4] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-9), after enactment of P.A. 93-682, effective January 1, 2005.

The propositions in paragraph [5] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-10), after enactment of P.A. 95-551, effective June 1, 2008.

The propositions in paragraphs [6] and [7] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-12) and (e-13), after enactment of P.A. 95-803, effective January 1, 2009.

The propositions in paragraphs [8] and [9] track the language of the reckless homicide statute as codified in 720 ILCS 5/9-3(e-15), the enactment of P.A. 101-173, effective January 1, 2020.

Because the reckless homicide statute expressly refers to subsection (c) of Section 11-907 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, the bracketed language used in paragraphs [6], [7], [8], and [9] incorporates the requirements of Scott's Law as set forth in Instruction 23.79 and Instruction 23.79A.

The terms "due caution" and "due regard for safety and traffic conditions" in paragraphs [6], [7], [8], and [9] are undefined in the Illinois Vehicle Code, and the Committee takes no position on their meaning.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase "or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible" after the word "defendant" in each proposition. See Instruction 5.03.

Use applicable paragraph and bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instructions submitted to the jury.

## 7.11

### **Definition Of Concealment Of Homicidal Death**

A person commits the offense of concealment of homicidal death when he knowingly conceals the death of any other person with knowledge that the other person has died by homicidal means.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3.4(a) (West 2013).



**7.12**  
**Issues In Concealment Of Homicidal Death**

To sustain the charge of concealment of homicidal death, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed acts which concealed the death of \_\_\_\_;  
and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so he knew that \_\_\_\_ had died by homicidal means.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3.4 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.11.

Give Instruction 7.13, defining “homicidal means”.

When applicable, give Instruction 7.14, defining “conceals”.

Insert in the blanks the name of the person whose death was concealed.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

**7.13**  
**Definition Of Homicidal Means**

The term “homicidal means” means any act[s], lawful or unlawful, of a person which cause[s] the death of another person.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

*See 720 ILCS 5/9-3.4(b-5) (West 2013).*

**7.14**  
**Definition Of Conceal**

The word “conceal” means the performing of some act or acts for the purpose of preventing or delaying the discovery of a death by homicidal means. “Conceal” means something more than simply withholding knowledge or failing to disclose information.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

*See* 720 ILCS 5/9-3.4(b-5) (West 2013).

*See People v. Stiles*, 46 Ill.App.3d 359, 360 N.E.2d 1217 (3d Dist. 1977).

Although the statute does not specifically refer to concealment of the “cause of death,” at least two appellate courts have held the statute includes situations where “the body itself is concealed or where the homicidal nature of death is actively concealed, as in making a homicide appear an accident.” *People v. Vath*, 38 Ill.App.3d 389, 395, 347 N.E.2d 813 (5th Dist. 1976), cited with approval in *People v. Hummel*, 48 Ill.App.3d 1002, 1004, 365 N.E.2d 122 (4th Dist. 1977).

## 7.15 Causation In Homicide Cases Excluding Felony Murder

[(For the offense of \_\_\_\_\_, in) (In)] order for you to find that the acts of the defendant caused the death of \_\_\_\_\_, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant's acts [of delivering \_\_\_\_\_] were a contributing cause of the death and that the death did not result from a cause unconnected with the defendant. However, it is not necessary that you find the acts of the defendant were the sole and immediate cause of death.

### Committee Note

The Illinois Supreme Court has held that a defendant's act need not be the sole or immediate cause of death; it is sufficient if the defendant's act contributed to cause the death. *People v. Nere*, 2018 IL 122566, 115 N.E.3d 205; *People v. Brown*, 169 Ill.2d 132, 661 N.E.2d 287 (1996); *People v. Brackett*, 117 Ill.2d 170, 510 N.E.2d 877 (1987). See also *People v. Woodard*, 367 Ill.App.3d 304, 854 N.E.2d 674 (1st Dist. 2006); *People v. Martinez*, 348 Ill.App.3d 521, 810 N.E.2d 199 (1st Dist. 2004).

Use the bracketed material where the defendant delivered multiple controlled substances to the victim but is charged with drug-induced homicide on the basis of less than all of the controlled substances that were delivered. A modification under such circumstances was approved by the Illinois Supreme Court in *People v. Nere*, 2018 IL 122566, 115 N.E.3d 205.

The Committee recommends that this instruction be given whenever causation is an issue under Section 720 ILCS 9-1(a)(1) (intentional murder), 9-1(a)(2) (knowing murder), or 720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (involuntary manslaughter and reckless homicide). However, when felony murder (720 ILCS 9-1(a)(3)) is charged and causation is an issue, Instruction 7.15A should also be given.

For the definition of "proximate cause" in aggravated driving under the influence cases, see Instruction 23.28A.

For the definition of "proximate cause" in all other cases, see Instruction 4.24.

When instructing for offenses with different definitions of causation, such as involuntary manslaughter (720 ILCS 5/9.3) and felony endangerment of the life or health of a child (720 ILCS 5/12C-5(d)), use the first bracketed material naming the appropriate offense.

Insert the name of the alleged victim in the second blank.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase "or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible" after the word "defendant." Give Instruction 5.03.

For an example of the use of this instruction, see Sample Set 27.06.

**7.15A**  
**Causation In Felony Murder Cases**

*Use For Cases Where The Offense Is Alleged To Have Occurred Before July 1, 2021.*

A person commits the offense of first degree murder when he commits the offense of \_\_\_\_\_, and the death of an individual results as a direct and foreseeable consequence of a chain of events set into motion by his commission of the offense of \_\_\_\_\_.

It is immaterial whether the killing is intentional or accidental [(or committed by a confederate without the connivance of the defendant) (or committed by a third person trying to prevent the commission of the offense of \_\_\_\_\_)].

**Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3) (West 2013).

In *People v. Hudson*, 222 Ill.2d 392, 408, 856 N.E.2d 1078 (2006), the supreme court set out the above definition of causation in felony murder cases where the defendant did not perform the acts which caused the death of the deceased. See also *People v. Lowery*, 178 Ill.2d 462, 467, 687 N.E.2d 973 (1997).

When causation is an issue under section 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) (intentional murder), 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(2) (knowing murder) or 720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (reckless homicide) as well as felony murder then Instruction 7.15 should also be given.

For the definition of “proximate cause” in aggravated driving under the influence cases, see Instruction 23.28A.

For the definition of “proximate cause” in all other cases, see Instruction 4.24.

Insert in all three blanks the applicable forcible felony.

Use applicable bracketed material in the second paragraph. In some instances neither clause in the bracketed paragraph is appropriate and under those circumstances the sentence should stop after the word “accidental.” See, e.g., *People v. Brackett*, 117 Ill.2d 170, 510 N.E.2d 877 (1987).

The brackets are provided solely for the guidance of the court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

**7.15B**  
**Causation In Felony Murder Cases**

*Use For Cases Where The Offense Is Alleged To Have Occurred After June 30, 2021.*

A person commits the offense of first degree murder when he commits the offense of \_\_\_\_\_, and the death of an individual results as a direct and foreseeable consequence of a chain of events set into motion by his commission of the offense of \_\_\_\_\_.

It is immaterial whether the killing is intentional or accidental [or committed by a confederate without the connivance of the defendant].

**Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3) (West 2021), as amended by P.A. 101-0652, effective July 1, 2021.

The Committee does not take a position as to whether P.A. 101-0652 is retroactive.

Use this instruction when giving Instruction 7.01B bracket [4] and Instruction 7.02B bracket [4].

In *People v. Hudson*, 222 Ill.2d 392, 408, 856 N.E.2d 1078 (2006), the supreme court set out the above definition of causation in felony murder cases in any situation where the defendant did not perform the acts which caused the death of the deceased. See also *People v. Lowery*, 178 Ill.2d 462, 467, 687 N.E.2d 973 (1997). With the amendment of 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3) by P.A. 101-0652, a defendant may no longer be liable for murder where one resisting the crime causes the death of defendant's co-felon. 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3). This amendment is a legislative rejection of the holdings of *Hudson* and *Lowery*, restricting proximate cause to only those instances where the defendant or his co-felons cause the death of a person during the commission of a forcible felony.

When causation is an issue under section 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) (intentional murder), 720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(2) (knowing murder) or 720 ILCS 5/9-3(a) (reckless homicide) as well as felony murder then Instruction 7.15 should also be given.

For the definition of "proximate cause" in aggravated driving under the influence cases, see Instruction 23.28A.

For the definition of "proximate cause" in all other cases, see Instruction 4.24.

Insert in the blanks the applicable forcible felony.

Where the defendant causes the killing, the sentence in the second paragraph should stop after the word "accidental." See, e.g., *People v. Brackett*, 117 Ill.2d 170, 510 N.E.2d 877 (1987).

## 7.16

### Definition Of Intentional Homicide Of An Unborn Child

A person commits the offense of intentional homicide of an unborn child if, in performing the acts which cause the death of an unborn child, [without lawful justification,] he

[1] intended to cause the death of or do great bodily harm to the pregnant woman or her unborn child;

[or]

[2] knew that such acts would cause death or great bodily harm to the pregnant woman or her unborn child;

[or]

[3] knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to the pregnant woman or her unborn child;

and

[4] he knew that the woman was pregnant.

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1.2 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.17.

Give Instructions 7.24 and 7.25.

Use applicable bracketed paragraphs. *See People v. Gillespie*, 276 Ill.App.3d 495, 659 N.E.2d 12 (1st Dist. 1995) (holding that the defendant's actual knowledge of pregnancy constitutes an element of offense).

Use the phrase "without lawful justification" whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 7 (720 ILCS 5/7-1 *et seq.*). *See People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

Use applicable bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

7.17

**Issues In Intentional Homicide Of An Unborn Child**

To sustain the charge of intentional homicide of an unborn child, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_; and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so, he

[1] intended to cause the death of or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_ or her unborn child;

[or]

[2] knew that such acts would cause death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_ or her unborn child;

[or]

[3] knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_ or her unborn child;

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant knew \_\_\_\_ was pregnant.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1.2 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.16.

Give Instruction 7.24, defining “unborn child”.

Use applicable bracketed paragraphs. The bracketed numbers correspond to the alternatives of the same number in Instruction 7.16, the definitional instruction for this offense. Select the corresponding alternatives to the alternatives selected from the definitional instruction.



The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.18

### Definition Of Voluntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child—Provocation

A person commits the offense of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child when he kills an unborn child [without lawful justification] if, in performing the acts which cause the death, he acts under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by a person, and he

[1] intends to kill or do great bodily harm to that person,

[or]

[2] knows that such acts will cause death to that person,

[or]

[3] knows that such acts create a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to that person, but he negligently or accidentally kills the unborn child.

Serious provocation is conduct sufficient to excite an intense passion in a reasonable person.

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2.1(a) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.19A or 7.19B.

Give Instruction 7.24, defining “unborn child”.

Give Instruction 7.25, defining “person as not including the pregnant woman whose unborn child is killed”.

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 7 (720 ILCS 5/7-1 *et seq.*). See *People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

Section 9-2.1(a) contains no mental state applicable to the defendant’s endeavoring to kill the person causing the serious provocation. Because of Sections 4-3 and 4-9, and cases interpreting those sections (*see People v. Whitlow*, 89 Ill.2d 322, 433 N.E.2d 629 (1982); *People v. Langford*, 195 Ill.App.3d 366, 552 N.E.2d 274 (4th Dist. 1990)), the Committee believes that voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child (under Section 9-2.1(a)) is not an absolute liability offense and must contain some mental states. The Committee decided to use those mental states shown in above paragraphs [1], [2], and [3] because these mental states are consistent with those required for second degree murder of a person and the former offense of voluntary manslaughter.

This latter consideration is particularly important because the Committee believes the Illinois Supreme Court decision in *People v. Reddick*, 123 Ill.2d 184, 526 N.E.2d 141 (1988), is applicable to the relationship between voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child—provocation and intentional homicide of an unborn child. *See* Committee Note to Instructions 7.19A and 7.19B.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

## 7.18A

### Definition Of Voluntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child—Belief In Justification

A person commits the crime of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child when he kills an unborn child [without lawful justification] if, in performing the acts which cause the death, he

[1] intends to kill or do great bodily harm to the pregnant woman or her unborn child,

[or]

[2] knows that such acts will cause death to the pregnant woman or her unborn child,

[or]

[3] knows that such acts create a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to the pregnant woman or her unborn child, and, at the time of the killing, he believes that circumstances exist which would justify the deadly force he uses, but his belief that such circumstances exist is unreasonable.

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2.1(a) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.19A.

Give Instruction 7.24, defining “unborn child”.

Give Instruction 7.25, defining “person as not including the pregnant woman whose unborn child is killed”.

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 7 of Chapter 720. *See People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

Even though the mental state set forth in Section 9-2.1(b) is that the accused “intentionally or knowingly kills an unborn child,” the Committee elaborated upon those mental states, as shown in paragraphs [1], [2], and [3] above. The Committee did so in order to meld the charges of intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child (under Section 9-2.1(b)) into one issues instruction having the same mental states. (*See* Instruction 7.19A and the discussion of *People v. Reddick*, 123 Ill.2d 184, 526 N.E.2d 141(1988), in that instruction’s Committee Note.) The Committee believes that the elaborated mental states contained in this instruction are consistent with the “intentionally or knowingly” language of Section 9-2.1(b).

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

**7.19A**

**Issues In Intentional Homicide Of An Unborn Child When The Jury Is Also To Be Instructed On Voluntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child—Provocation By The Pregnant Woman**

To sustain the charge of intentional homicide of an unborn child, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_; and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so, he

[1] intended to kill or do great bodily harm to the unborn child of \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] knew that his acts would cause death to the unborn child of \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to the unborn child of \_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that both of these propositions have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child and your deliberations should end.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the First Proposition has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child and not guilty of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child and your deliberations should end.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the First Proposition has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, but the Second Proposition has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should now consider the following proposition:

*Third Proposition:* That when the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the pregnant woman's unborn child, he

[1] intended to kill or do great bodily harm to the pregnant woman;

[or]

[2] knew that his acts would cause death to the pregnant woman;

[or]

[3] knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to the pregnant woman.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that this Third Proposition has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child and not guilty of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child and your deliberations should end.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that this Third Proposition has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether the defendant is guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child instead of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child.

To sustain the charge of intentional homicide of an unborn child instead of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following additional proposition:

That the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_\_, did not act under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by the pregnant woman he endeavored to kill, but he negligently or accidentally killed the unborn child of \_\_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt this additional proposition, you should find the defendant guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the State has not proved beyond a reasonable doubt this additional proposition, you should find the defendant guilty of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1.2(a) and 9-2.1(a) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.18.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instructions from Chapter 24-25.00. Any additional proposition to be considered by the jury pursuant to Chapter 24-25.00 must be added to this instruction as a Third Proposition which the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt *before* the jury may consider whether the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt the additional proposition in its determination as to whether the defendant is guilty of murder or voluntary manslaughter.

Because the Committee believes the relationship between intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child is essentially the same as the relationship between murder and voluntary manslaughter (as those offenses were defined in Sections 9-1 and 9-2, prior to the enactment of first degree murder and second degree murder under P.A. 84-1450), the Committee has chosen for this instruction to follow the format used in Instruction 7.02B of the Third Edition.

The Committee also believes that the analysis of the Illinois Supreme Court in *People v. Reddick*, 123 Ill.2d 184, 526 N.E.2d 141 (1988), is applicable to the relationship between intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child. In *Reddick*, the supreme court reassessed the elements of murder and voluntary manslaughter in cases in which a jury is to be instructed on both charges. The supreme court stated the following:

“Thus, under the 1961 Code, if a defendant in a murder trial presents sufficient evidence to raise issues which would reduce the charge of murder to voluntary manslaughter, then to sustain the murder conviction, the People must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that those defenses are meritless, and must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt the statutory elements of murder.

The burden-of-proof instructions regarding both voluntary manslaughter and murder in both of these cases were thus incorrect in placing upon the People the burden of proving the existence of intense passion or unreasonable belief in justification. The instructions should have placed upon the People the burden of disproving the existence of either of these two states of mind.”

*Reddick*, 123 Ill.2d at 197.

This instruction follows the mandate of the supreme court by requiring the State, in order to obtain a conviction for intentional homicide of an unborn child, to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements thereof and then further to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a reducing factor which reduces that charge to voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child is *not* present.

Because the elements of intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child are identical except for the presence of a reducing factor, this issues instruction need not contain a separate set of propositions constituting the elements of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child. The question of the existence of the reducing factor is one which the jury need not consider until it has first found that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of intentional homicide of an unborn child.

In view of *Reddick*, the Committee has not provided a separate issues instruction on the charge of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child—provocation by the pregnant woman because the Committee believes that this charge is not likely to be brought by the State without a defendant also being charged with intentional homicide of an unborn child.



Insert in the blanks the name of the pregnant woman. Use this instruction only if the pregnant woman is the source of the serious provocation. If another person is the source of the serious provocation, use Instruction 7.19B.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.19B

### Issues In Voluntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child—Provocation By A Person Other Than The Pregnant Woman—Transferred Intent

To sustain the charge of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_; and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so, he

[1] intended to kill or do great bodily harm to a person other than \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[2] knew that his acts would cause death to a person other than \_\_\_\_;

[or]

[3] knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to a person other than \_\_\_\_;

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_, acted under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by the person he endeavors to kill, but he negligently or accidentally killed the unborn child of \_\_\_\_.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2.1(a) (West 2013).

This instruction is to be given only when the defendant is charged with voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child under a “transferred intent” theory. In this situation, the State is alleging that the defendant, while acting under a passion caused by serious provocation, endeavored to kill a person (other than a pregnant woman), but he negligently or accidentally

killed an unborn child.

In a transferred intent situation, the offense of intentional homicide of an unborn child is never an issue, because there is no allegation that the defendant either intentionally or knowingly acted to kill either the pregnant woman or the unborn child. The jury need only consider whether the State has proved all the elements of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child beyond a reasonable doubt.

Insert in the blanks the name of the pregnant woman.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

### 7.19C

#### **Issues In Intentional Homicide Of An Unborn Child When The Jury Is Also To Be Instructed On Voluntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child—Belief In Justification**

To sustain either the charge of intentional homicide of an unborn child or the charge of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_; and

*Second Proposition:* That when the defendant did so, he

[1] intended to kill or do great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_ or her unborn child;

[or]

[2] knew that his acts would cause death to \_\_\_\_ or her unborn child;

[or]

[3] knew that his acts created a strong probability of death or great bodily harm to \_\_\_\_\_ or her unborn child.

and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant was not justified in using the force that he used.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty [of intentional homicide of an unborn child and not guilty of voluntary manslaughter] and your deliberations [on these charges] should end.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should go on with your deliberations to decide whether the defendant is guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child instead of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child.

To sustain the charge of intentional homicide of an unborn child instead of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the following additional proposition:

That the defendant, at the time he performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_, did not believe that circumstances existed which would have justified the deadly force he used.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that this additional proposition has

been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty of intentional homicide of an unborn child.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that this additional proposition has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-2.1(a) (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.18A.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instructions from Chapter 24-25.00. Any additional proposition to be considered by the jury pursuant to Chapter 24-25.00 must be added to this instruction as a Fourth Proposition which the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt *before* the jury may consider whether the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt the additional proposition in its determination as to whether the defendant is guilty of murder or voluntary manslaughter.

Because the Committee believes the relationship between intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child is essentially the same as the relationship between murder and voluntary manslaughter (as those offenses were defined in Chapter 38, Sections 9-1 and 9-2, prior to the enactment of first degree murder and second degree murder under P.A. 84-1450), the Committee has chosen for this instruction to follow the format used in Instruction 7.02C of the Third Edition.

The Committee also believes that the analysis of the Illinois Supreme Court in *People v. Reddick*, 123 Ill.2d 184, 526 N.E.2d 141 (1988), is applicable to the relationship between intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child. In *Reddick*, the supreme court reassessed the elements of murder and voluntary manslaughter in cases in which a jury is to be instructed on both charges. The supreme court stated the following:

“Thus, under the 1961 Code, if a defendant in a murder trial presents sufficient evidence to raise issues which would reduce the charge of murder to voluntary manslaughter, then to sustain the murder conviction, the People must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that those defenses are meritless and must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt the statutory elements of murder.

The burden-of-proof instructions regarding both voluntary manslaughter and murder in both of these cases were thus incorrect in placing upon the People the burden of proving the existence of intense passion or unreasonable belief in justification. The

instructions should have placed upon the People the burden of disproving the existence of either of these two states of mind.”

*Reddick*, 123 Ill.2d at 197.

This instruction follows the mandate of the supreme court by requiring the State, in order to obtain a conviction for intentional homicide of an unborn child, to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements thereof and then further to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a reducing factor which reduces that charge to voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child is *not* present.

Because the elements of intentional homicide of an unborn child and voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child are identical except for the presence of a reducing factor, this issues instruction need not contain a separate set of propositions constituting the elements of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child. The question of the existence of the reducing factor is one which the jury need not consider until it has first found that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of intentional homicide of an unborn child.

In view of *Reddick*, the Committee has not provided a separate issues instruction on the charge of voluntary manslaughter of an unborn child—belief in justification because the Committee believes that this charge is not likely to be brought by the State without a defendant also being charged with intentional homicide of an unborn child.

Insert in the blanks the name of the pregnant woman.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

## 7.20

### **Definition Of Involuntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child**

A person commits the offense of involuntary manslaughter of an unborn child when he unintentionally causes the death of an unborn child [without lawful justification] by acts, whether lawful or unlawful, which are performed recklessly and are likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

#### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3.2 (West 2013).

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 7 (720 ILCS 5/7-1 *et seq.*). See *People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

## 7.21

### Issues In Involuntary Manslaughter Of An Unborn Child

To sustain the charge of involuntary manslaughter of an unborn child, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant performed the acts which caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant performed those acts recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That those acts were likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

#### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3.2 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.20.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blank the name of the pregnant woman.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.



## 7.22

### **Definition Of Reckless Homicide Of An Unborn Child**

A person commits the offense of reckless homicide of an unborn child when he unintentionally causes the death of an unborn child [without lawful justification] by driving a motor vehicle recklessly and in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3.2 (West 2013).

Use the phrase “without lawful justification” whenever an instruction is to be given on an affirmative defense contained in Article 7 (720 ILCS 5/7-1 *et seq.*). See *People v. Worsham*, 26 Ill.App.3d 767, 326 N.E.2d 134 (1st Dist. 1975).

## 7.23

### Issues In Reckless Homicide Of An Unborn Child

To sustain the charge of reckless homicide of an unborn child, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant caused the death of the unborn child of \_\_\_\_ by driving a motor vehicle; and

*Second Proposition:* That the defendant drove the motor vehicle recklessly; and

*Third Proposition:* That the defendant drove the motor vehicle in a manner likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

#### Committee Note

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-3.2 (West 2013).

Give Instruction 7.22.

When an affirmative defense instruction is to be given, combine this instruction with the appropriate instruction from Chapter 24-25.00.

Insert in the blank the name of the pregnant woman.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. Give Instruction 5.03.

**7.24**

**Definition Of Unborn Child**

The term “unborn child” means any individual of the human species from fertilization until birth.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1.2(b)(1), 9-2.1(d)(1), and 9-3.2(c)(1) (West 2013).

This instruction should be given whenever Instruction 7.16, 7.18, or 7.22 is given.

**7.25**

**Definition Of Person As Not Including The Pregnant Woman Whose Unborn Child Is Killed**

The word “person” does not include the pregnant woman whose unborn child is killed.

**Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1.2(b)(2), 9-2.1(d)(2), and 9-3.2(c)(2) (West 2013).

This instruction should be given whenever Instruction 7.15, 7.18, 7.20, or 7.22 is given.

## 7.26

### **Exclusion Of Acts Performed Under Illinois Abortion Law Or During Medical Procedures From Homicides Involving Unborn Children**

The offense of [(intentional homicide) (voluntary manslaughter) (involuntary manslaughter) (reckless homicide)] of an unborn child does not apply to acts which cause the death of an unborn child if those acts are performed [(during an abortion to which the pregnant woman has consented) (pursuant to usual and customary standards of medical practice during diagnostic testing or therapeutic treatment)].

#### **Committee Note**

*Instruction and Committee Note Approved January 30, 2015*

720 ILCS 5/9-1.2(c), 9-2.1(e), and 9-3.2(d) (West 2013).

The Committee believes having this instruction available might prove helpful if the court, in its discretion, deemed it advisable to instruct the jury on what a case before it does *not* concern.

Use applicable bracketed material.

The brackets and numbers are present solely for the guidance of court and counsel and should not be included in the instruction submitted to the jury.

**7.27**

**Definition Of Drug Induced Homicide--Delivery Of Controlled Substances**

A person commits the offense of drug induced homicide when he knowingly delivers to another a substance containing \_\_\_\_\_, a controlled substance and any person's death is caused by the [(injection) (inhalation) (absorption) (ingestion)] of any amount of that controlled substance.

**Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-3.3 (West 2019), added by P.A. 85-1259, effective January 1, 1989, and amended by P.A. 87-1198, effective September 25, 1992, amended by P.A. 100-404, effective January 1, 2018.

Give Instruction 7.28.

Insert in the blanks the name of the controlled substance at issue.

If the court chooses to define the word “deliver,” use Instruction 17.05A.

Use applicable bracketed material.

## 7.28

### **Issues In Drug Induced Homicide--Delivery Of Controlled Substances**

To sustain the charge of drug induced homicide, the State must prove the following propositions:

First Proposition: That the defendant knowingly delivered to another a substance containing \_\_\_\_\_, a controlled substance; and

Second Proposition: That any person [(injected) (inhaled) (absorbed) (ingested)] any amount of that controlled substance; and

Third Proposition: That \_\_\_\_\_ death was caused by that [(injection) (inhalation) (absorption) (ingestion)].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

#### **Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-3.3 (West 2019), added by P.A. 85-1259, effective January 1, 1989, and amended by P.A. 87-1198, effective September 25, 1992, amended by P.A. 100-404, effective January 1, 2018.

Give Instruction 7.27.

Insert the name of the controlled substance at issue in the blank in the first proposition.

Insert the name of the victim in the blank in the fourth proposition. Note that the named victim inserted in the third proposition need not be the same person as the person engaging in the conduct described in the second proposition.

Use applicable bracketed material.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. See Instruction 5.03.

## 7.29

### **Definition Of Drug Induced Homicide--Delivery Of Objects Or Segregated Parts Containing LSD**

A person commits the offense of drug induced homicide when he knowingly delivers to another more than 10 [ (objects) (segregated parts of an object) ] containing in them or having on them any amount of any substance containing lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD), and any person dies as a result of the [ (injection) (inhalation) (ingestion) ] of any amount of that LSD.

#### **Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-3.3 (West 1992) (formerly Ill.Rev.Stat. ch. 38, §9-3.3 (1991)), added by P.A. 85-1259, effective January 1, 1989, and amended by P.A. 87-1198, effective September 25, 1992.

Give Instruction 7.30.

If the court chooses to define the word “deliver,” give Instruction 17.05A.

The Committee has divided the definitional and issues instructions for this offense into two separate sets of instructions--one set dealing with delivery of controlled substances as determined by weight (Instructions 7.27 and 7.28), and the other set dealing with delivery of LSD as contained in separate objects or multiple segregated parts of the same object (Instructions 7.29 and 7.30). The Committee believes that this division will avoid jury confusion.

Use applicable bracketed material.



### 7.30

#### **Issues In Drug Induced Homicide--Delivery Of Objects Or Segregated Parts Containing LSD**

To sustain the charge of drug induced homicide, the State must prove the following propositions:

*First Proposition:* That the defendant knowingly delivered to another more than 10 [ (objects) (segregated parts of an object) ] containing in them or having on them any amount of any substance containing lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD); and

*Second Proposition:* That any person [ (injected) (inhaled) (ingested) ] any amount of that LSD; and

*Third Proposition:* That \_\_\_\_\_ died as a result of that [ (injection) (inhalation) (ingestion) ].

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that each one of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant guilty.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that any one of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you should find the defendant not guilty.

#### **Committee Note**

720 ILCS 5/9-3.3 (West 1992) (formerly Ill.Rev.Stat. ch. 38, §9-3.3 (1991)), added by P.A. 85-1259, effective January 1, 1989, and amended by P.A. 87-1198, effective September 25, 1992.

Give Instruction 7.29.

Insert the name of the victim in the blank in the third proposition. Note that the named victim inserted in the third proposition need not be the same person as the person engaging in the conduct described in the second proposition.

Use applicable bracketed material.

When accountability is an issue, ordinarily insert the phrase “or one for whose conduct he is legally responsible” after the word “defendant” in each proposition. See Instruction 5.03.