

Ala. Code 1975, § 13A-6-3(a)(2)

Manslaughter
(Provocation)

The defendant is charged with manslaughter.

A person commits the crime of manslaughter if he/she causes the death of another person under circumstances that would constitute murder, except that he/she causes the death due to a sudden heat of passion caused by provocation recognized by law, and before a reasonable time for the passion to cool and for reason to reassert itself.

To convict, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following elements:

- (1) A person, **[insert name of deceased]**, is dead;
- (2) The defendant caused the death of **[insert name of deceased]** by **[describe the act, such as shooting him/her]**;
- (3) The defendant did so intentionally; **(AND)**
- (4) The defendant caused the death due to a sudden heat of passion caused by provocation recognized by law, and before a reasonable time for the passion to cool and for reason to reassert itself.

[Read as appropriate]: A *person*, when referring to the victim, means a human being, including an unborn child in utero at any stage of development, regardless of viability. [13A-6-1(a)(3)]

A person acts *intentionally* when it is his/her purpose to cause the death of another person. [13A-2-2(1)]

[Read as appropriate - Transferred Intent]: A person acts *intentionally* when it is his/her purpose to cause the death of a specific person, regardless of whether the deceased person is actually the person whose death the defendant allegedly wished to cause. See *Ex parte Jackson*, 614 So. 2d 405, 406-407 (Ala. 1993); *Farrior v. State*, 728 So. 2d 691, 695-696 (Ala. Crim. App. 1998).

[Read all appropriate - Intoxication]: A person who creates a risk, but is unaware that he/she has created that risk solely because of voluntary intoxication, acts recklessly with regards to that risk. *Intoxication* includes a disturbance of mental or physical capacities resulting from the introduction of any substance into the body. *Voluntary intoxication* means intoxication caused by substances that the actor knowingly introduced into his/her body, the tendency of which to cause intoxication he/she knows or ought to know, unless he/she introduces them under circumstances that would afford a defense to the charge. *Intoxication* in itself does not constitute mental disease or defect.

Intoxication is generally not a defense. However, *involuntary intoxication* is a defense if as a result the actor lacks capacity either to appreciate the criminality of his/her conduct or to conform his/her conduct to the requirements of law. *Intoxication*, whether voluntary or involuntary, is admissible in evidence whenever it is relevant to negate an element of the offense charged. When recklessness establishes an element of an offense and the actor is unaware of a risk because of *voluntary intoxication*, his/her unawareness is immaterial in a prosecution for that offense. [13A-3-2]

A person does not commit the crime of murder, however, if he/she was moved to act by a sudden heat of passion caused by provocation recognized by law, and before there had been a reasonable time for the passion to cool and for reason to reassert itself.

The defendant must have been provoked at the time he/she did the act; that is, he/she must have been deprived of self-control by the provocation. The state of mind must be such that the suddenly excited passion suspends the exercise of judgment, but it is not required that the passion be so overpowering as to destroy volition. The law presumes that the passion disturbed the defendant's reasoning and led him/her to act regardless of the admonition of the law.

Lawful provocation requires that the defendant was moved to act:

1. By a sudden heat of passion caused by provocation recognized by law;
(AND)
2. Before there had been a reasonable time for the passion to cool and for reason to reassert itself.

The burden of injecting the issue of killing under legal provocation is on the defendant, but this does not shift the burden of proof. [13A-6-2(b)]

Once the defendant has injected the issue, the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was not lawfully provoked to do the act which caused the death by a sudden heat of passion. *Ex parte McGriff*, 908 So. 2d 1024, 1033-1034 (Ala. 2004).

Legal provocation does not apply to a prosecution for, or preclude a conviction of, manslaughter or other crime. [13A-6-2(b)]

[Read as appropriate]: Mere words, no matter how insulting, never reduce murder to manslaughter. The provocation can, in no case, be less than an assault, either actually committed or menaced. The assault must be of such a nature as to reasonably convince the mind that the defendant had cause for believing, and did believe, that he/she would be presently assaulted and that he/she struck, not in consequence of a previously formed design, general or specific, but in consequence of the passion suddenly aroused by the blow given, or apparently about to be given.

[Read as appropriate]: When the deceased has made threats against the defendant which have been communicated to the defendant, he/she is not authorized thereby to commence an attack or to act upon the communicated threats until the deceased has committed some overt act, or made some hostile demonstration. In such a case, however, the law allows the threatened party to act with greater dispatch and upon a perhaps slightly less overt act than is required on the part of a defendant who was not threatened previously by the deceased. The mere fear of an attack will not justify action on the part of the defendant. He/she cannot avail himself/herself of communicated threats until the deceased firsts commits some overt act or makes some hostile demonstration which would be calculated to reasonably impress upon the defendant the bona fide belief that he/she was in imminent peril. This does not mean that the supposed facts generating the belief must be real, for the facts may be appearances only, and yet justify as prompt action as if they were real.

You may find the defendant not guilty due to provocation only if you find that:

1. The defendant's heat of passion had not had time to cool before he/she committed the alleged murder; (**AND**)
2. The defendant had not had time to return to a reasonable frame of mind after the provocation in question. [See Use Notes.]

If you find from the evidence that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of the elements of manslaughter, then you shall find the defendant guilty of manslaughter.

If you find that the State has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more of the elements of manslaughter, then you cannot find the defendant guilty of manslaughter.

[If lesser-included offenses are included, the Court should instruct on those offenses at this point.]

Use Notes

Although courts have reached different conclusions as to what constitutes adequate legal provocation, in *Rogers v. State*, 819 So. 2d 643, 662 (Ala. Crim. App. 2001), the Court of Criminal Appeals recognized 3 situations in which murder may be reduced to manslaughter on the basis of the existence of legal provocation: "(1) when the accused witnesses his/her spouse in the act of adultery; (2) when the accused is assaulted or faced with an imminent assault on himself/herself; and (3) when the accused witnesses an assault on a family member or close relative." See also *Cox v. State*, 500 So. 2d 1296, 1298 (Ala. Crim. App. 1986) (holding that "the mere appearance of imminent assault may be sufficient to arouse heat of passion"). Once a defendant has injected into the trial the issue of provocation related to one of those situations, the defendant is entitled

to have the trial court instruct the jury that the State bears the burden of disproving that the defendant acted out of the heat of passion brought about by adequate provocation. *Riggs v. State*, 138 So. 3d 1014, 1024 (Ala. Crim. App. 2013).

Simply hearing about a spouse's infidelity or possible infidelity is not legally sufficient to constitute provocation. See *Knight v. State*, 907 So. 2d 470, 477- 479 (Ala. Crim. App. 2004).

If there is evidence that the defendant was intoxicated at the time of the murder, the defendant is entitled to an instruction on applicable lesser included offense(s). See *Peterson v. State*, 520 So. 2d 238 (Ala. Crim. 1987); *Saunders v. State*, 10 So. 3d 53 (Ala. Crim. 2007).

For unborn child exceptions see 13A-6-1(b) through (e).

[Approved 10-14-15.]