

NO. 2019-CR-12300A

THE STATE OF TEXAS	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
VS.	§	186TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
JIMMY COUNG DUC TRAN	§	BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

CHARGE OF THE COURT

MEMBERS OF THE JURY:

The defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, stands charged by indictment with the offense of capital murder, alleged to have been committed on or about the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of August, 2019, in Bexar County, Texas. The defendant has pleaded not guilty.

1.

Our law provides that a person commits the offense of murder if he intentionally or knowingly causes the death of an individual.

Our law provides that a person commits the offense of capital murder if he intentionally causes the death of an individual in the course of committing or attempting to commit the felony offense of robbery.

2.

A person commits the felony offense of robbery if, in the course of committing theft, as defined hereinafter, and with intent to obtain or maintain control of the property, he intentionally or knowingly causes bodily injury to another; or

he intentionally or knowingly threatens or places another in fear of imminent bodily injury or death.

3.

A person commits the offense of theft if he unlawfully appropriates property with intent to deprive the owner of property.

4.

"Individual" means a human being who is alive.

"In the course of committing" an offense means conduct that occurs in an attempt to commit, during the commission, or in immediate flight after the attempt or commission of the offense.

"Attempt" to commit an offense occurs if, with specific intent to commit an offense, a person does an act amounting to more than mere preparation that tends, but fails, to effect the commission of the offense intended.

"Deadly weapon" means a firearm or anything manifestly designed, made, or adapted for the purpose of inflicting death or serious bodily injury; or anything that in the manner of its use or intended use is capable of causing death or serious bodily injury.

"Firearm" means any device designed, made, or adapted to expel a projectile through a barrel by using the energy generated by an explosion or burning substance or any device readily convertible to that use.

"Bodily injury" means physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition.

"Serious bodily injury" means bodily injury that creates a substantial risk of death or that causes death, serious permanent disfigurement, or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ.

"Appropriation" and "appropriate" mean to acquire or otherwise exercise control over property other than real property. Appropriation of property is unlawful if it is without the owner's effective consent.

"Property" means tangible or intangible personal property or documents, including money, that represents or embodies anything of value.

"Deprive" means to withhold property from the owner permanently or for so extended a period of time that a major portion of the value or enjoyment of the property is lost to the owner.

"Effective consent" means assent in fact, whether express or apparent, and includes consent by a person legally authorized to act for the owner. Consent is not effective if induced by deception or coercion.

"Owner" means a person who has title to the property, possession of the property, or a greater right to possession of the property than the person charged.

For the offense of murder, a person acts intentionally, or with intent, with respect to a result of his conduct when it is his conscious objective or desire to cause the result. A person acts knowingly, or with knowledge, with respect to a result of his conduct when he is aware that his conduct is reasonably certain to cause the result.

For the offense of capital murder, a person acts intentionally, or with intent, with respect to a result of his conduct when it is his conscious objective or desire to cause the result.

For the offense of robbery, a person acts intentionally, or with intent, with respect to the nature of his conduct or to a result of his conduct when it is his conscious objective or desire to engage in the conduct or cause the result.

For the offense of robbery, a person acts knowingly, or with knowledge, with respect to a result of his conduct when he is aware that his conduct is reasonably certain to cause the result. A person acts knowingly, or with knowledge, with respect to the nature of his conduct or to circumstances surrounding his conduct when he is aware of the nature of his conduct or that the circumstances exist.

For the offense of theft, a person acts intentionally, or with intent, with respect to the nature of his conduct or to a

result of his conduct when it is his conscious objective or desire to engage in the conduct or cause the result.

6.

Our law provides a person is criminally responsible as a party to an offense if the offense is committed by his own conduct, or by the conduct of another for which he is criminally responsible, or by both. Each party to an offense may be charged with commission of the offense.

Mere presence at the scene of an offense will not make a person a party to an offense.

A person is criminally responsible for an offense committed by the conduct of another if acting with intent to promote or assist the commission of the offense he solicits, encourages, directs, aids or attempts to aid the other person to commit the offense.

If, in the attempt to carry out a conspiracy to commit one felony, another felony is committed by one of the conspirators as a party to the offense, all conspirators are guilty as parties of the felony actually committed, though having no intent to commit it, if the offense was committed in furtherance of the unlawful purpose and was one that should have been anticipated as a result of the carrying out of the conspiracy.

Capital murder and robbery are felony offenses.

The term "conspiracy", as used in these instructions, means an agreement between two or more persons, with intent that a felony be committed, that they, or one or more of them, engage in conduct that would constitute the offense and he or one or more of them performs an overt act in pursuance of the agreement.. An agreement constituting a conspiracy may be inferred from acts of the parties.

7.

You are instructed that an accomplice, as the term is hereinafter used, means any person connected with the crime charged, as a party thereto, and includes all persons who are connected with the crime, as such parties, by unlawful act or omission on their part transpiring either before or during the time of the commission of the offense, and whether or not they were present and participated in the commission of the crime.

You are instructed that a conviction cannot be had upon the testimony of an accomplice witness unless the jury first believes that the accomplice witness' testimony is true and that it shows the defendant is guilty of the offense charged against him, and even then you cannot convict unless the accomplice witness' testimony is corroborated by other evidence tending to connect the defendant with the offense charged, and the corroboration is not sufficient if it merely shows the

commission of the offense, but it must tend to connect the defendant with its commission.

Proof that the defendant was present at the scene of any crime that was committed is not, in itself, sufficient to corroborate the testimony of an accomplice. That evidence, however, can be considered along with other suspicious circumstances.

The witness, Sebastian Espinar, is an accomplice, if an offense was committed, and you cannot convict the defendant upon the testimony of Sebastian Espinar unless you first believe that the portion of his testimony that ascribes guilt to the defendant is true and shows that the defendant is guilty as charged, and then you cannot convict the defendant upon said testimony unless you further believe that there is other evidence in the case, outside of the evidence of the testimony of Sebastian Espinar, tending to connect the defendant with the offense committed, if you find that an offense was committed. The corroboration is not sufficient if it merely shows the commission of the offense, but it must tend to connect the defendant with its commission, and then from all of the evidence you must believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of the offense charged against him.

You are instructed that it is a defense to this prosecution if the conduct of the defendant was justified by law.

A person in lawful possession of tangible, movable property is justified in using force against another when and to the degree the actor reasonably believes the force is immediately necessary to prevent or terminate the other's unlawful interference with the property.

A person unlawfully dispossessed of tangible, movable property by another is justified in using force against the other when and to the degree the actor reasonably believes the force is immediately necessary to recover the property if the actor uses the force immediately or in fresh pursuit after the dispossession and:

- (1) the actor reasonably believes the other had no claim of right when he dispossessed the actor; or
- (2) the other accomplished the dispossession by using force, threat, or fraud against the actor.

A person is justified in using deadly force against another to protect tangible, movable property:

- (1) if he would be justified in using force against the other as described above; and
- (2) when and to the degree he reasonably believes the deadly force is immediately necessary to prevent the



other who is fleeing immediately after committing burglary (defined below\*\*), robbery (as previously defined), aggravated robbery (defined below\*\*), or theft (as previously defined) during the nighttime from escaping with the property; and

(3) he reasonably believes that:

(A) the property cannot be recovered by any other means; or

(B) the use of force other than deadly force to recover the property would expose the actor or another to a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury.

\*\* Our law provides that a person commits the offense of burglary of a vehicle if, without the effective consent of the owner, he breaks into or enters a vehicle or any part of a vehicle with intent to commit any felony or theft.

Our law provides that a person commits the offense of aggravated robbery if the person commits a robbery, as previously defined, and uses or exhibits a deadly weapon.

By the term "enter," as used above, is meant to intrude any part of the body or any physical object connected with the body into the vehicle.

A "vehicle" includes any device in, on, or by which any person or property is or may be propelled, moved, or drawn in the normal course of commerce or transportation.

The applicable instructions in Paragraphs 3 and 4 have the same meaning here.

For the offenses of burglary of a vehicle and aggravated robbery, a person acts intentionally, or with intent, with respect to the nature of his conduct or to a result of his

conduct when it is his conscious objective or desire to engage in the conduct or cause the result. A person acts knowingly, or with knowledge, with respect to the nature of his conduct or to circumstances surrounding his conduct when he is aware of the nature of his conduct or that the circumstances exist. A person acts knowingly, or with knowledge, with respect to a result of his conduct when he is aware that his conduct is reasonably certain to cause the result.

You are also instructed that a person is justified in using force or deadly force against another to protect tangible, movable property of a third person if, under the circumstances as he reasonably believes them to be, such person would be justified, as noted above, in using force or deadly force to protect his own property and

- (1) he reasonably believes the unlawful interference constitutes attempted or consummated theft of tangible, movable property; or
- (2) he reasonably believes the third person has requested his protection of the property;

"Reasonable belief" means a belief that would be held by an ordinary and prudent person in the same circumstances as the defendant.

"Deadly force" means force that is intended or known by the person using it to cause, or in the manner of its use or intended use is capable of causing, death or serious bodily injury.

"Bodily injury", "Serious bodily injury", "attempt", and "property" as defined in Paragraph 4, apply and have the same meaning here.

The defendant is not required to prove the defense of protection of property. The state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's conduct was not justified by protection of property.

Now, keeping in mind these general instructions on protection of one's own property and protection of a third person's property, even if you unanimously find that the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt the elements of the offense as instructed herein, you must next decide whether the State has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant's conduct was not justified by protection of one's own property or protection of a third person's property.

Therefore, if you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, did commit the charged offense of capital murder or, if applicable, one of the lesser included offenses of murder or manslaughter;

But you further find from the evidence that, or you have a reasonable doubt as to whether, at the time he did so:

- (1) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran was unlawfully dispossessed of tangible, movable property by Andres Gerardo Salinas;

and

- (2) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran reasonably believed the use of deadly force was immediately necessary to recover the property and used the deadly force immediately or in fresh pursuit after the dispossession; and
- (3) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran reasonably believed that Andres Gerardo Salinas had no claim of right when he dispossessed Jimmy Coung Duc Tran of the property or that Andres Gerardo Salinas accomplished the dispossession by using force, threat, or fraud against Jimmy Coung Duc Tran; and
- (4) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran reasonably believed the use of deadly force was immediately necessary to prevent Andres Gerardo Salinas, who was fleeing immediately after committing burglary, robbery, aggravated robbery, or theft during the nighttime, from escaping with the property; and
- (5) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran reasonably believed that the property could not be recovered by any other means or that the use of force other than deadly force to recover the property would expose Jimmy Coung Duc Tran or another to a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury;

OR, you find from the evidence that, or you have a reasonable

doubt as to whether, at the time he did so:

- A) If Jimmy Coung Duc Tran was protecting the property of Sebastian Espinar's, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran would have been justified to use deadly force to protect that property as if it had been his own property, as set out in numbers (1) through (5), above, and
- B) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran reasonably believed
  - (a) the unlawful interference with Sebastian Espinar's property constituted attempted or consummated theft of tangible, movable property or
  - (b) Sebastian Espinar had requested his protection of the property of Sebastian Espinar.

Then you will find in favor of the defendant on this justification defense and find that the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, acted in protection of his own property or protection of a third person's property.

However, if you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, did commit the charged offense of capital murder or, if applicable, one of the lesser included offenses of murder or manslaughter;

And you further find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that:

- (1) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran was not unlawfully dispossessed

of tangible, movable property by Andres Gerardo Salinas; or

(2) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe the use of force was immediately necessary to recover the property and used the force immediately or in fresh pursuit after the dispossession; or

(3) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe that Andres Gerardo Salinas had no claim of right when he dispossessed Jimmy Coung Duc Tran of the property and Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe that Andres Gerardo Salinas accomplished the dispossession by using force, threat, or fraud against Jimmy Coung Duc Tran; or

(4) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe the use of deadly force was immediately necessary to prevent Andres Gerardo Salinas, who was fleeing immediately after committing burglary, robbery, aggravated robbery, or theft during the nighttime, from escaping with the property; or

(5) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe that the property could not be recovered by any other means and Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe that the use of force other than deadly force to recover the property would expose Jimmy Coung Duc Tran

or another to a substantial risk of death or serious  
bodily injury;

AND, you find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that:

- A) Jimmy Coung Duc Tran would not have been justified to use deadly force to protect Sebastian Espinar's property even if it had been Jimmy Coung Duc Tran's own property, as set out in numbers (1) through (5), above, or
- B) Even if he would have been so justified, as noted above, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran did not reasonably believe
  - (a) the unlawful interference with Sebastian Espinar's property constituted attempted or consummated theft of tangible, movable property and
  - (b) Sebastian Espinar had not requested Jimmy Coung Duc Tran's protection of the property of Sebastian Espinar.

Then, you will find against the defendant on this justification defense and find that the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, did not act in protection of his own property or protection of a third person's property.

Now, if you unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of August, 2019, in Bexar County, Texas, the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, either acting alone or together as a party with Sebastian Espinar, did intentionally cause the death of an individual, namely, Andres Gerardo Salinas, by shooting Andres Gerardo Salinas with a deadly weapon, namely, a firearm, and Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, either acting alone or together as a party with Sebastian Espinar, was in the course of committing or attempting to commit the offense of robbery of Andres Gerardo Salinas;

Or, if you unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that Jimmy Coung Duc Tran entered into a conspiracy with Sebastian Espinar to commit the felony offense of robbery and that on or about the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of August, 2019, in Bexar County, Texas, in an attempt to carry out this agreement, Sebastian Espinar did intentionally cause the death of an individual, namely, Andres Gerardo Salinas, by shooting Andres Gerardo Salinas with a deadly weapon, namely, a firearm, and Sebastian Espinar was in the course of committing or attempting to commit the offense of robbery of Andres Gerardo Salinas and such shooting of and intentionally cause the death of Andres Gerardo Salinas was committed in furtherance of the unlawful purpose to commit robbery and was an offense that should have



been anticipated as a result of the carrying out of the conspiracy to commit robbery;

And you find against the defendant on his justification defense that he acted in protection of his own property or in protection of Sebastian Espinar's property, as instructed in paragraph 8;

Then you will find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, guilty of the offense of capital murder as charged in the indictment, and do not consider any of the lesser included offenses in Paragraphs 10 through 12.

But if you do not so believe, or if you have a reasonable doubt thereof, or you find in favor of the defendant on his justification defense that he acted in protection of his own property or in protection of Sebastian Espinar's property, as instructed in paragraph 8,

Then you will acquit the defendant of the offense of capital murder as charged in the indictment, say by your verdict "not guilty" of the charged offense of capital murder, and proceed to Paragraph 10 to consider whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the offense of murder, which is a lesser included offense of capital murder.

10.

Now, if you unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of August, 2019, in Bexar County, Texas, the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, either acting alone or together as a party with Sebastian Espinar, did intentionally cause the death of an individual, namely, Andres Gerardo Salinas, by shooting Andres Gerardo Salinas with a deadly weapon, namely, a firearm;

And you find against the defendant on his justification defense that he acted in protection of his own property or in protection of Sebastian Espinar's property as instructed in Paragraph 8;

Then you will find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, guilty of the lesser included offense of murder, and do not consider the other lesser included offense as instructed in Paragraphs 11 and 12.

But if you do not so believe, or if you have a reasonable doubt thereof, or you find in favor of the defendant on his justification defense that he acted in protection of his own property or in protection of Sebastian Espinar's property, as instructed in paragraph 8,

Then you will acquit the defendant of the lesser included offense of murder, say by your verdict "not guilty" of murder as instructed in this Paragraph, and next consider Paragraphs 11

and 12 to decide whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty of the offense of manslaughter, which is a lesser included offense of murder.

Our law provides that a person commits the offense of manslaughter if he recklessly causes the death of an individual.

For the offense of manslaughter a person acts recklessly, or is reckless, with respect to the result of his conduct when he is aware of but consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will occur. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that its disregard constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of care that an ordinary person would exercise under all the circumstances as viewed from the actor's standpoint.

12.

Now, if you unanimously find from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of August, 2019, in Bexar County, Texas, Sebastian Espinar did recklessly cause the death of an individual, namely, Andres Gerardo Salinas, by shooting Andres Gerardo Salinas with a deadly weapon, namely, a firearm, and that the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, acting with intent to promote or assist the commission of the offense of manslaughter, solicited, encouraged, directed, aided or attempted to aid Sebastian Espinar to commit the offense of manslaughter;

And you find against the defendant on his justification defense that he acted in protection of his own property or in protection of Sebastian Espinar's property as instructed in Paragraph 8;

Then you will find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, guilty of the lesser included offense of manslaughter.

But if you do not so believe, or if you have a reasonable doubt thereof, or you find in favor of the defendant on his justification defense that he acted in protection of his own property or in protection of Sebastian Espinar's property, as instructed in paragraph 8,

Then you will say by your verdict "not guilty" of manslaughter.

You are instructed that if there is any testimony or any evidence before you in this case regarding the defendant's having committed an offense or act of misconduct other than the offense alleged against him in the indictment in this case, you cannot consider said testimony or evidence for any purpose unless you find and believe beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed such other offense or act of misconduct, if any were committed, and even then you may only consider the same in determining the motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, consciousness of guilt, and/or identity, if any, of the defendant, and/or to rebut a defensive theory, if it does, and for no other purpose.

Our law provides a defendant may testify in his own behalf if he elects to do so. This, however, is a right accorded a defendant; and, in the event he elects not to testify, that fact cannot be taken as a circumstance against him.

In this case, the defendant has elected not to testify; and you are instructed that you cannot and must not refer or allude to that fact throughout your deliberations or take it into consideration for any purpose whatsoever as a circumstance against him.

Written or recorded statements made by a witness to investigators or other officers or police reports made by officers and tendered by the prosecution to the defense for purposes of cross-examination are not part of the evidence unless introduced in evidence. Many times statements and reports may be marked with an exhibit number but are neither offered nor received in evidence. I can send only statements and reports received in evidence to the jury room.

The Grand Jury Indictment is not evidence of guilt. It is the means whereby a defendant is brought to trial in a felony prosecution. It is not evidence, nor can it be considered by you in determining whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty.

All persons are presumed to be innocent and no person may be convicted of an offense unless each element of the offense is proved beyond a reasonable doubt. The fact that a person has been arrested, confined, or indicted for, or otherwise charged with, the offense gives rise to no inference of guilt at his trial.

The law does not require a defendant to prove his innocence or produce any evidence at all. The presumption of innocence alone is sufficient to acquit the defendant, unless the jurors are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt



after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case.

The burden of proof in all criminal cases rests upon the State throughout the trial, and never shifts to the defendant. The prosecution has the burden of proving the defendant guilty and it must do so by proving, each and every element of the offense charged beyond a reasonable doubt. If it fails to do so, you must find the defendant "Not Guilty."

It is not required that the prosecution prove guilt beyond all possible doubt; it is required that the prosecution's proof excludes all "reasonable doubt" concerning the defendant's guilt.

In the event you have a reasonable doubt as to the defendant's guilt after considering all the evidence before you, and these instructions, you will acquit him and say by your verdict "Not guilty."

During your deliberations in this case, you must not consider, discuss, nor relate any matters not in evidence before you. You should not consider nor mention any personal knowledge or information you may have about any fact or person connected with this case which is not shown by the evidence.

During your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone by any means about this case. You may not use any electronic device such as telephone, cell

phone, smart phone, or computer; or media such as, the internet, any internet service, or any text or instant messaging service; or any internet chat room, blog, or website, to communicate with anyone any information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I accept your verdict.

You are instructed that you are not to let bias, prejudice, or sympathy play any part in your deliberations. You are the exclusive judges of the facts proved, of the credibility of the witnesses and of the weight to be given the testimony but the law of the case you must receive from the Court as contained in these instructions, and be governed by them.

You must disregard any comment or statement made by the Court during the trial or in these instructions which may seem to indicate an opinion with respect to any fact, item of evidence or verdict to be reached in this case. No such indication was intended.

You are instructed that the statements of counsel made during the course of the trial or during the argument, if not supported by evidence, or statements of law made by counsel, if not in harmony with the law as stated to you by the Court in these instructions, are to be wholly disregarded.


After argument of counsel, you will retire to the jury room, select your own Presiding Juror and proceed with your deliberations. After you have reached a unanimous verdict the

Presiding Juror will certify your verdict by filling in the appropriate forms attached to this charge and signing his or her name as Presiding Juror. A unanimous vote means all 12 jurors must agree. The forms are not intended to suggest to you what your verdict should be.

Your sole duty at this time is to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty under the indictment in this cause; and restrict your deliberations to the issue of whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty, and nothing else. If the Jury wishes to communicate with the Court, they shall notify the bailiff.

Any and all communication relative to the case must be written, prepared by the presiding juror, and submitted to the Court through the bailiff.

Respectfully submitted,



JUDGE KRISTINA ESCALONA  
186th Judicial District  
Bexar County, Texas

**FILED**

**\_\_\_\_\_ O'CLOCK \_\_\_\_\_ M**

**APR - 5 2023**

**GLORIA A. MARTINEZ**  
District Clerk, Bexar County, Texas

BY

**DEPUTY**  


NO. 2019-CR-12300A

THE STATE OF TEXAS                    §                    IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
VS.    §                    186TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
JIMMY COUNG DUC TRAN                §                    BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

CAPITAL MURDER

VERDICT FORM

We, the Jury, find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, not guilty of the offense of capital murder as charged in the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING JUROR

OR

VERDICT FORM

We, the Jury, find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, guilty of the offense of capital murder as charged in the indictment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING JUROR

*Heriberto Rodriguez*

NO. 2019-CR-12300A

THE STATE OF TEXAS                   §           IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
VS.                                       §           186TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
JIMMY COUNG DUC TRAN               §           BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

***Complete this verdict form only if you have completed the previous verdict form by finding the defendant "not guilty" of the offense of capital murder.***

MURDER

VERDICT FORM

We, the Jury, find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, not guilty of the lesser-included offense of murder.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING JUROR

OR

VERDICT FORM

We, the Jury, find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, guilty of the lesser included offense of murder.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING JUROR

NO. 2019-CR-12300A

THE STATE OF TEXAS                    §                    IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
VS.    §                    186TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
JIMMY COUNG DUC TRAN                §                    BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

*Complete this verdict form only if you have completed the previous verdict form by finding the defendant "not guilty" of the lesser included offense of murder.*

MANSLAUGHTER

VERDICT FORM

We, the Jury, find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, not guilty of the lesser-included offense of manslaughter.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING JUROR

OR

VERDICT FORM

We, the Jury, find the defendant, Jimmy Coung Duc Tran, guilty of the lesser included offense of manslaughter.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDING JUROR