

**11.53A**  
**Unauthorized Entry—Limited Authority Doctrine—Home Invasion And Residential Burglary**

The defendant's entry into a dwelling of another is “without authority” if, at the time of entry into the dwelling, the defendant has an intent to commit a criminal act within the dwelling regardless of whether the defendant was initially invited into or received consent to enter the dwelling.

However, the defendant's entry into the dwelling is “with authority” if the defendant enters the dwelling without criminal intent and was initially invited into or received consent to enter the dwelling, regardless of what the defendant does after he enters.

**Committee Note**

This instruction should be given *only* when an issue arises regarding the defendant's criminal intent when he entered the dwelling, and whether this intent, or lack thereof, affects the status of his entry—“with authority” or “without authority”. See *People v. Bush*, 157 Ill.2d 248, 253–54, 623 N.E.2d 1361, 1364 (1993).

The “limited-authority” doctrine provides that a defendant's authority to enter a private residence is limited only to the specific purpose for which he entered. Thus, the defendant's entry into a dwelling is unauthorized if prior to the defendant's entry into the dwelling, the defendant intends to commit a criminal act within the dwelling. When this is the case, the status of his entry is *not affected* by whether he was invited into the dwelling or received consent to enter the dwelling. As noted by the court in *Bush*,

“No individual who is granted access to a dwelling can be said to be an authorized entrant if he intends to commit criminal acts therein, because, if such intentions had been communicated to the owner at the time of entry, it would have resulted in the individual's being barred from the premises *ab initio*.”

*Bush*, 157 Ill.2d at 253–54, 623 N.E.2d at 1364. However, if the defendant does not form his criminal intent until after he has entered the dwelling, then his invited or consented entry into the dwelling is authorized. *Bush*, 157 Ill.2d at 253–54, 623 N.E.2d at 1364; see also *People v. Peeples*, 155 Ill.2d 422, 487–88, 616 N.E.2d 294, 325 (1993).

This “limited authority” doctrine applies to residential burglary by unauthorized entry. *United States v. Glispie*, 2020 IL 125483, ¶ 22, 181 N.E.3d 719, 725. The Illinois Supreme Court has expressly declined to determine whether the limited authority doctrine applies to residential burglary by remaining. *Glispie*, 2020 IL 125483, ¶ 22, 181 N.E.3d at 725 (“The question of whether the doctrine applies to residential burglary by remaining is not before us, and thus we decline to answer it.”)