**VEHICULAR MANSLAUGHTER IN THE FIRST DEGREE**

**Penal Law 125.13(4)**

**(Cause death of more than one person)**

**(Committed on or after November 1, 2006)**

The (*specify*) count is Vehicular Manslaughter in the First Degree.

Under our law, a person is guilty of Vehicular Manslaughter in the First Degree when he or she[[1]](#footnote-1) operates a motor vehicle[[2]](#footnote-2)

*Select appropriate alternative(s):*

while he or she has .08 of one per centum or more by weight of alcohol in his or her blood as shown by chemical analysis of his or her blood, breath, urine or saliva.[[3]](#footnote-3)

*or*  while he or she is in an intoxicated condition.[[4]](#footnote-4)

*or*  while his or her ability to operate such a vehicle is impaired by the use of a drug. [[5]](#footnote-5)

or while his or her ability to operate such motor vehicle is impaired by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs.[[6]](#footnote-6)

and as a result of such intoxication [or impairment by the use of a drug, or by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs], operates such motor vehicle in a manner that causes the death of more than one other person.[[7]](#footnote-7)

[The term drug used in that definition includes *(specify)*.][[8]](#footnote-8)

[*NOTE: Here, either add the appropriate Vehicle and Traffic Law 1192 charge or, if that Vehicle and Traffic Law provision has been separately charged to the jury, cross-reference the applicability of that charge to this crime.*]

Under our law, if the People prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was operating a motor vehicle while unlawfully intoxicated [or impaired by the use of alcohol or a drug or by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs[[9]](#footnote-9)] and while doing so caused the death of more than one person, then you may, but are not required to, infer that, as a result of such intoxication [or impairment by the use of alcohol or a drug or by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs], the defendant operated the motor vehicle in a manner that caused the deaths.[[10]](#footnote-10)

In order for you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, the People are required to prove, from all the evidence in the case, beyond a reasonable doubt, both of the following three elements:

1. That on or about  *(date)* , in the County of  *(county)* , the defendant,  *(defendant's name)*, operated a motor vehicle:

*Select appropriate alternative(s):*

while the defendant had .08 of one per centum or more by weight of alcohol in his/her blood as shown by chemical analysis of his/her blood, breath, urine or saliva.

*or*  while the defendant was in an intoxicated condition.

*or*  while the defendant's ability to operate such vehicle was impaired by the use of a drug;

or while the defendants ability to operate such motor vehicle was impaired by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs.

2. That the defendant operated such motor vehicle in a manner that caused the death of more than one other person, and

3. That the defendant did so as a result of that intoxication [or impairment by the use of a drug, or by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs].

If you find the People have proven beyond a reasonable doubt each of those elements, you must find the defendant guilty of this crime.

If you find the People have not proven beyond a reasonable doubt any one or more of those elements, you must find the defendant not guilty of this crime.

1. At this point, Vehicular Manslaughter in the First Degree states: commits the crime of vehicular manslaughter in the second degree as defined in section 125.12 of this article... This charge omits the statutory language and sets forth the elements and alternatives for the underlying offense. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 2 At this point, the statute for the underlying offense of Vehicular Manslaughter in the Second Degree (PL 125.12[1]) states: in violation of subdivision two, three, four or four-a of section eleven hundred ninety-two of the vehicle and traffic law.... This charge substitutes the operative language of each of those subdivisions. The court should select the appropriate subdivision(s) to charge. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *See* Vehicle & Traffic Law 1192(2). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *See* Vehicle & Traffic Law 1192(3). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *See* Vehicle & Traffic Law 1192(4). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. *See* Vehicle & Traffic Law 1192(4-a). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The text of the statute contains two references to causing the death of another person. In order to avoid redundancy and for clarity, the pattern charge contains one reference to such term. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 8 *See* Vehicle & Traffic Law 114-a and Public Health Law 3306. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. This paragraph reproduces the "rebuttable presumption" (*i.e*., a permissible inference) set forth in Penal Law 120.03(last paragraph). The words here in brackets, "by the combined influence of drugs or of alcohol and any drug or drugs," while an alternative element of the crime, do not appear at this point in the presumption statute as a predicate to the permissible inference which follows. The permissible inference which follows, however, does recite those words. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Penal Law 125.12. *See People v. Mojica,* 62 A.D.3d 100 (2d Dept. 2009). *See also* Legislative Memorandum in support of this statute, which states that the addition of the rebuttable presumption provision would create a causal link between a driver who causes serious physical injury or death and a presumption that it was his or her intoxication or impairment that was the cause of such serious physical injury or death. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)