

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA**  
**Case No. SC05-\_\_\_**

**In the matter of Standard Jury  
Instruction Concerning Translators**

---

**REPORT (NO. 05-01) OF THE**  
**COMMITTEE ON STANDARD**  
**JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

The Honorable Terry P. Lewis  
Circuit Judge, Leon County Courthouse  
Chair, Interpreter Subcommittee  
Supreme Court Committee on  
Standard Jury Instructions (Civil)  
301 S. Monroe Street, Ste. 313  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1861  
(850) 577-4308  
(850) 577-4477 (fax)

Scott D. Makar (FBN709697)  
Chair, Supreme Court Committee on  
Standard Jury Instructions (Civil)  
Office of General Counsel  
117 West Duval Street, Suite 480  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202  
(904) 630-1847  
(904) 630-1316 (fax)

and

Tracy Raffles Gunn (FBN0984371)  
Vice-Chair, Supreme Court  
Committee on Standard Jury  
Instructions (Civil)  
Fowler, White, Boggs, Banker P.A.  
501 E. Kennedy Boulevard, Ste. 1700  
Tampa, Florida 33602  
(813) 228-7411  
(813) 229-8313 (fax)

**REPORT (NO. 05-01) OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON STANDARD  
JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

**To the Chief Justice and Justices of  
the Supreme Court of Florida:**

The Committee on Standard Jury Instructions in Civil Cases recommends for your consideration that The Florida Bar be authorized to publish for public comment newly-prepared instructions on the use of interpreters<sup>1</sup> in civil cases. This Report regarding these proposed instructions is filed pursuant to Article V, section 2(a), Florida Constitution, and the Court's request dated January 6, 2005 seeking proposed standard jury instructions on this topic.

**I. INTRODUCTION AND DESCRIPTION OF APPENDICES.**

At its February 2002 meeting, the Committee began considering possible standard instructions for the use of interpreters in civil cases. This effort arose as the Committee reviewed various proposals to revise existing preliminary instructions. Several proposed instructions and notes on use were discussed and debated over the next two years. After much deliberation and effort, the Committee at its July 2004 meeting concluded that it was without authority to proceed further and decided to advise this Court of the status of the matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this Report, an "interpreter" means a person who provides contemporaneous verbal translation of the testimony of a witness. A "translator" means a person who converts written materials from one language to another. The term "translation" is used to mean the result of either one of these processes as the context requires. The proposed instructions address the use of interpreters, but can easily be adapted by trial courts to address the use of translators.

In response, in a letter dated January 6, 2005, Justice R. Fred Lewis sought from this Committee (as well as the Committee on Standard Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases) “one or more proposed standard jury instructions for use in cases where testimony is provided through a translator.” Thereafter, the Committee discussed the matter at its February 2005 meeting and substantially finalized its recommendations and proposed instructions at its July 2005 meeting.

The Committee has consulted with the Committee on Standard Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases, and the Committees have discussed this topic at past meetings including a joint meeting. The Committee, however, has not formally coordinated its final recommendations or this Report with that Committee.

The following appendices are attached to this Report:

- Appendix A: Proposed instructions.
- Appendix B: Relevant excerpts from the Committee’s minutes.
- Appendix C: Materials the Committee considered.

## II. THE PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONS.

The two proposed instructions, Proposal A-1 and Proposal A-2, are intended for use during trial when witnesses testify in languages other than English. The proposals are identical except that Proposal A-2 permits jurors to raise questions about the accuracy of a translation and contains a note on use suggesting ways to resolve such questions. The Committee was fairly evenly divided over the appropriateness of this additional procedure. Hence, the Committee has provided alternative proposals for the Court’s consideration.

Both instructions are based on the proposition that jurors are to consider the same evidence, which means that they must consider only the official court interpreter’s translation of a witness’s testimony into English. Jurors are told to disregard any contrary meanings of the non-English words that a witness used. Both contain a preliminary instruction, a proposed oath to be administered to the interpreter, an instruction to be used immediately prior to a witness’s testimony and the translation thereof, and a final instruction.

Proposal A-2 instructs the jurors to raise their hands if they have a question about the accuracy of the English translation. They are told not to ask questions or

make comments in front of other jurors, but simply to alert the judge that they have a question. The jurors are told that the judge will attempt to resolve such questions, and a note on use suggests some possible ways to do so. The instruction emphasizes, however, that if questions still remain in jurors minds, the jurors must rely solely on the official interpretation.

### III. CONCLUSION

The Committee recommends that the instructions be published for public comment. The Committee anticipates that public comment will result and that, at the Court's direction, further revisions may be warranted.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Scott D. Makar (FBN709697)  
Chair, Supreme Court Committee on  
Standard Jury Instructions (Civil)  
Office of General Counsel  
117 West Duval Street, Suite 480  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202  
(904) 630-1847  
(904) 630-1316 (fax)

Tracy Raffles Gunn (FBN0984371)  
Vice-Chair, Supreme Court Committee on  
Standard Jury Instructions (Civil)  
Fowler, White, Boggs, Banker P.A.  
501 E. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 1700  
Tampa, Florida 33602  
(813) 228-7411  
(813) 229-8313 (fax)

and

The Honorable Terry P. Lewis  
Circuit Judge, Leon County Courthouse  
Chair, Interpreter Subcommittee  
301 S. Monroe Street, Ste. 313  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1861  
(850) 577-4308  
(850) 577-4477 (fax)

**APPENDIX A: PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONS.**

**PROPOSAL A-1**

**USE OF INTERPRETERS**

1  
2  
3 a. *Preliminary Instruction:*  
4

5 **During this trial, it is possible that one or more witnesses may testify in**  
6 **[identify language(s)] [a language other than English]. Although some of you**  
7 **may know [identify language] [the language a witness uses], it is important that**  
8 **all jurors consider the same evidence. The only evidence you may consider,**  
9 **therefore, is that provided through the official court interpreter(s). You must**  
10 **base your decision only on this official English translation and disregard any**  
11 **contrary meaning of the [identify language] [non-English] words a witness uses.**  
12

13 b. *Just Before Witness Testifies:*  
14

15 **The law requires that the court appoint a qualified interpreter to assist a**  
16 **witness who [does not readily speak or understand the English language] [has**  
17 **an impairment of hearing or speech] in testifying. The interpreter in this case**  
18 **is [name of interpreter ]. [He][She] does not work for either side in this case and**  
19 **is completely neutral in the matter. [He][She] is here solely to assist us in**  
20 **communicating with the witness. [He][She] will repeat only what is said and**  
21 **will not add, omit, or summarize anything. The interpreter’s oath will now be**  
22 **administered to the [him][her].**  
23

24 c. *Oaths to Interpreter/Witness:*  
25  
26

27 **(Oath to Interpreter): Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will make a true**  
28 **interpretation to the witness of all questions or statements made to [him][her]**  
29 **in a language which that person understands, and interpret the witness’s**  
30 **statements into the English language, to the best of your abilities, So Help You**  
31 **God?**  
32



1 **base your decision only on this official English translation and disregard any**  
2 **contrary meaning of the [identify language] [non-English] words a witness uses.**

3  
4 b. *Just Before Witness Testifies:*

5  
6 **The law requires that the court appoint a qualified interpreter to assist a**  
7 **witness who [does not readily speak or understand the English language] [has**  
8 **an impairment of hearing or speech] in testifying. The interpreter in this case**  
9 **is [name of interpreter ]. [He][She] does not work for either side in this case and**  
10 **is completely neutral in the matter. [He][She] is here solely to assist us in**  
11 **communicating with the witness. [He][She] will repeat only what is said and**  
12 **will not add, omit, or summarize anything. The interpreter’s oath will now be**  
13 **administered to the [him][her].**

14  
15 c. *Oaths to Interpreter/Witness:*

16  
17 (Oath to Interpreter): **Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will make a true**  
18 **interpretation to the witness of all questions or statements made to him/her in**  
19 **a language which that person understands, and interpret the witness’s**  
20 **statements into the English language, to the best of your abilities, So Help You**  
21 **God?**

22  
23 **The oath will now be administered to the witness through the**  
24 **interpreter.**

25  
26 d. *After Oath Has Been Given:*

27  
28 **You are about to hear testimony of a witness who will be speaking in**  
29 **[identify language]. The witness will testify through the official court**  
30 **interpreter, who will translate the testimony into English. You may only**  
31 **consider the official English translation in deciding your verdict. Some of you**  
32 **may understand [identify language] and may have a question as to the accuracy**  
33 **of the English translation. It is important, however, that all jurors consider the**  
34 **same evidence. Therefore, you must rely only upon the official English**  
35 **translation as evidence in this case and disregard any other contrary**  
36 **interpretation that might be given to the testimony.**

1  
2 e. *Juror Questions:*\*

3  
4 **If you have a question as to the accuracy of the English translation of a**  
5 **witness’s testimony, you may bring this matter to my attention by raising your**  
6 **hand. You should not ask your question or make any comment about the**  
7 **translation in the presence of the other jurors, or otherwise share your**  
8 **question or concern with any of them. I will take steps to see if your question**  
9 **can be answered and any discrepancy resolved. If, however, after such efforts**  
10 **a discrepancy remains in your mind, I emphasize that you must rely only upon**  
11 **the official English translation as provided by the official court interpreter,**  
12 **and disregard any other contrary interpretation.**

13  
14 \* *Refer to Note on Use*

15  
16 f. *Final Instruction:*

17  
18 **During this trial, [a witness] [some witnesses] testified in [identify**  
19 **language(s)]. Although some of you may know [identify language(s)], it is**  
20 **important that all jurors consider the same evidence. The only evidence you**  
21 **may consider, therefore, is that provided through the official court**  
22 **interpreter(s). You must base your decision only on this official English**  
23 **translation and disregard any contrary meaning of the [identify language]**  
24 **[non-English] word a witness used.**

25  
26 NOTE ON USE.

27  
28 1. General concerns over the ability of bi-lingual jurors to set aside their  
29 own understanding of what a non-English speaking witness has said, in favor of the  
30 official English interpretation, can be addressed by full inquiry into the issue during  
31 jury selection. As an additional safeguard to ensure accurate and fair proceedings,  
32 the court may wish to have a procedure for bi-lingual jurors to question the  
33 accuracy of the official English interpretation. There are several procedures or  
34 methods that may be used for this purpose (e.g. written questions by jurors  
35 reviewed by the court, attorneys, and interpreter outside the presence of the jurors;  
36 conference at side bar or in chambers with the juror, attorneys and court interpreter;  
37 or some combination thereof). The Committee has not set forth any specific  
38 procedure to allow flexibility in this regard. The important thing is that the method

1 chosen be sufficiently discreet to insure that the juror does not share his or her  
2 concerns with other jurors. The court should also assure itself that the juror has the  
3 ability and commitment to base his or her decision only upon the official English  
4 translation, even if there remains a question or disagreement in the juror's mind as  
5 to its accuracy.

**APPENDIX B:**  
**RELEVANT EXCERPTS FROM THE COMMITTEE'S MINUTES.**

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE**  
**ON STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

Judicial Meeting Room  
Supreme Court of Florida  
Tallahassee, Florida  
**February 22-23, 2002**

...

2. **PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION** (Tab 15).

Gerald and Lewis, T. reported. They reported that they were given three aspects to explore in relation to the preliminary instruction: (i) the use of interpreters; (ii) the cautionary instruction to jurors not to investigate; and (iii) the use of written questions.

The subcommittee has started its work. In attempting to draft a preliminary instruction as to these matters, Gerald and Lewis have become concerned that they are making policy. Further, Gerald expressed a concern about the preliminary instruction warning jurors not to investigate on their own could become too specific. Following up on the concern that it would be impossible to list for jurors all of the devices they should not use to investigate on their own, Altenbernd asked about the use of Palm Pilots by jurors.

Walbolt suggested that the subcommittee continue its work and report back at the July 2002 meeting at The Breakers. **The subcommittee will report at the July 2002 meeting.**

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE  
ON STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

The Breakers  
Palm Beach, Florida  
**July 11-13, 2002**

...

12. **PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION** (Tab 15).

Lewis reported for the subcommittee. The subcommittee has been working on a preliminary instruction to deal with (i) an admonition to jurors not to investigate the case independently; (ii) how the jury is to ask questions; and (iii) the role of the official translator.

A brief discussion took place about how a trial judge ensures a translation is accurate and how a bilingual juror can bring to the trial judge's attention an inaccurate translation. It was suggested that the preliminary instruction should allow such a juror to bring the inaccurate translation to the trial judge's attention.

**The subcommittee will continue to work and will report at the November 2002 meeting.**

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE  
ON STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

Marriott Waterside  
Tampa, FL  
**November 14-15, 2002**

...

8. **PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION** (Tab 15).

Lewis reported for the subcommittee. He directed the committee's attention to pages 15-13 through 15-15 [Tab 10-7 through 10-9 below]. The subcommittee

has submitted three proposed instructions: (I) Use of Interpreters; (ii) Questioning By Jurors; and (iii) Preliminary Instructions.

Lewis first reported on the Use of Interpreters instruction.

Stewart asked if the proposal was asking a juror to wait until the testimony is over before bringing it to the Court's attention. He did not think that was workable. He thought there must be some flexibility for addressing the situation immediately when it occurs.

Altonaga was also concerned about the timing issue. She would prefer a more flexible procedure. She was also concerned that the proposed instruction assumes that judges are allowing jurors to ask questions.

Gunn stated that the instruction had to protect against jurors simply blurting out their concerns. Stewart agreed and said that a written procedure was probably necessary. Pillans observed, however, that there may be some subtleties that jurors will not be able to express in writing. He thought there should be flexibility in the process in this regard, as well.

Kahn observed that there is not much, if any, distinction between the situation being addressed by the proposed instruction and the situation where a juror simply disagrees with what the expert is saying. Lewis responded that the problem being addressed is more of a pure problem of interpretation. Eaton added that monolingual jurors are at a disadvantage if the situation is not corrected. Lewis also added that, without a reconciliation of the perceived misinterpretation, the juror becomes a witness.

Graham explained that this is major problem in South Florida. Often his cure does not involve a formal written process, but rather a practical solution under the circumstances. Lumish agreed that it is a big problem in South Florida, but thought that a process is needed to keep jurors from blurting out what they think was said.

Altonaga stated that there are various situations in which this issue arises. She thought that the proposed instruction might be better if it offered alternative approaches. Stewart agreed that these incidents arise in a variety of circumstances and that to force judges to handle these incidents in the same way every time would be counterproductive. He thought that alternative approaches might be effectively covered with a note on use.

Austin asked whether this issue might be better covered under the rules of judicial administration. Lumish agreed that some of the discussion seemed to be getting close to telling judges how to run their courtrooms. She would simply establish a simple procedure of telling the juror to raise a hand to get the Court's attention. Altonaga observed that sometimes the judge is not looking at the jury. Brown and Lewis believed that there is nothing wrong with having a structure in place for dealing with the issue. The structure should track the procedure for juror questions, as the two issues are quite similar.

Wagner asked whether the subcommittee had researched the law as to what happens when the interpreter says one thing and a juror says another. Is the law clear that the interpreter's version controls the record (assuming that the two versions are not reconciled by the Court)?

Kahn added that the Florida Supreme Court started a project to certify interpreters two years ago. He will investigate the status of that project.

Lewis will revise the proposed instructions with the committee's comments in mind and will draft a note on use. The subcommittee will report back at the February 2003 meeting.

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE  
ON STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

Casa Monica Hotel  
St. Augustine, Florida  
**February 20-21, 2003**

...

12. **PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION** (Tab 15).

Lewis reported for the subcommittee. He directed the committee's attention to a handout that was distributed at the meeting. He started with page three of the handout - Use Of Interpreters. It was agreed that this instruction would become instruction 1.9 in the instruction book [Reporter's note: later, it was decided that

page two of the handout - Questioning by Jurors - would actually become instruction 1.9].

Altonaga observed that, in her courthouse, the clerk administers the oath, not the judge.

Brown suggested deleting the word “judgment” from “best of your skill and judgment” in the oath.

Cacciatore was troubled by the words, “if there remains a disagreement” in the last paragraph.

Austin was concerned that this issue might be a judicial administration issue rather than a substantive law issue. He was not sure that it was within the province of this committee.

Gunn asked whether any committee member had a problem with a simple notification process as set forth in the proposed instruction. Kahn responded that he had a problem with it. He believes the issue is more complex than this instruction anticipates. There is a linguistic aspect to the problem, he stated, as people simply process languages they know. He believes this is a fact-intensive area, and not susceptible to an instruction such as this proposal.

Lewis stated that all of the sample instructions he has seen make it clear that the interpreter’s version of the testimony must prevail.

Lumish suggested that the proposed instruction should be truncated after the explanation of the notification procedure. She thought trial judges and the parties could work it out for themselves from that point forward. Lewis said he disagreed with that approach. He would include the further language of the proposal. Gerald said that trial judges make rulings on matters such as these all the time, however, and that they do not need to be told what to do. Altenbernd suggested submitting a truncated instruction, with simply the notification procedure set forth, but also informing the Florida Supreme Court of the further concerns the committee discussed.

Griffin suggested tabling the proposed instruction and compiling the law in this area.

The subcommittee will prepare a memorandum explaining the law related to this issue, and will report back at the July 2003 meeting.

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE  
ON STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

The Breakers  
One South County Road  
Palm Beach, Florida 33480  
**July 10-11, 2003**

...

**13. JOINT MEETING WITH SJI CRIMINAL COMMITTEE (Tab 15).**

A joint meeting was held with the Florida Standard Jury Instruction (Criminal) committee.

Altenbernd started the joint meeting by giving an overview of the civil instructions committee. He discussed the committee's history, its meeting procedures, its membership, its subcommittees, and the like.

Dedee Costello then gave a similar overview of the criminal instructions committee.

...

Lewis observed that instructions regarding interpreters would also be an area that the two committees could work together.

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE  
ON STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

The Biltmore Hotel  
Coral Gables, Florida  
**November 13-14, 2003**

...

**11. PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTION (Tab 15).**

Lewis reported for the subcommittee. He directed the committee's attention to page 15-23 [Tab 10-8 below] of the materials. This is the memorandum Lewis submitted on May 1, 2003 on Law Relative To Jury Instructions When Foreign Language Interpreter or Translator Is Used.

Stewart asked Lewis to summarize the findings of his memorandum. Lewis responded that there is no Florida judicial precedent as to what must happen when a juror disagrees with the interpreter's translation. Lewis said that he believes there should be a formalized way to resolve such situations. Altenbernd questioned whether the committee should be drafting such an instruction when there is no guidance. Artigliere responded that the committee should not need guiding authority to draft these type of preliminary instructions

Kahn stated that he has a problem with an instruction that would tell jurors to disregard what they are hearing. Cacciatore agreed with Kahn's observations. Lewis responded that, absent such an instruction, certain jurors can essentially become expert witnesses during deliberations.

Cacciatore recommended that the committee should wait until there are rules or cases in place giving guidance as to this situation.

Altenbernd will communicate with the Florida Rules of Judicial Administration Committee to see if it has looked, or is going to look, at this issue.

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE ON  
STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

The Breakers  
Palm Beach  
**July 8-9, 2004**

...

**b. TRANSLATORS** (Tab 15):

Altenbernd stated that the civil committee considered proposing a standard instruction on translators, but did not come to a resolution. A problem arises when part of the jury is relying on the translator and another part of the jury is relying on their own understanding of the testimony. Costello stated that the criminal committee also considered an instruction on translators, but did not resolve the issue. Altenbernd brought the issue to the attention of the Rules of Judicial Administration Committee, but that committee also declined to act. He is considering writing the Chief Justice of the Florida Supreme Court because the issue may never arise in a case or controversy.

Several members shared their recent experiences with translators. Zayas stated she recently had a case where a mistrial resulted when the translator, an attorney, a juror and the judge all had differing interpretations of the Spanish testimony. Cacciatore also has been involved in a case where certified translators disagreed on the correct translation. Stewart stated that he was involved in a trial where the translators disputed the meaning of Japanese documents and testimony. The trial judge instructed the jury to determine the correct meaning. Berman observed that this issue needs to be resolved by substantive law because a similar problem arises whenever a juror has an area of special knowledge or expertise, for example, a juror that is a lawyer. Altenbernd suggested that the problem can be solved in the evidentiary rules. **Costello and Altenbernd agreed that the civil and criminal committees will write a joint letter to Florida Supreme Court pointing out translator problem.**

**Joint meeting of criminal and civil committees adjourned.**

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE ON  
STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

Stetson University College of Law  
Tampa  
**February 17-18, 2005**

...

**2. TRANSLATORS (Tab 10):**

Makar explained that the Supreme Court wrote a letter to the committee asking it to draft a proposed instruction (pages 10-5 to 10-6). Lewis reported that the subcommittee drafted an instruction on pages 10-14 to 10-17.

Altenbernd explained that the criminal committee has also appointed a subcommittee, chaired by Angelica Zayas, to draft an instruction on translators. Lewis stated that the civil subcommittee can discuss this issue with the criminal subcommittee.

Altenbernd suggested that the committee submit different proposals to the Court reflecting the divided views of the committee, which was split almost evenly on the issue. The submission should also state that there is no controlling law on this issue.

Caldwell observed that this is a substantive area of law, beyond the scope of the committee. Cacciatore and Lewis suggested that the Civil Rules Committee or the Rules of Judicial Administration Committee should consider the issue of how to resolve conflicting interpretations.

Stewart relayed that he has been involved in two trials where there was a problem with translations in Spanish and Japanese. The presiding judges were puzzled as to how to resolve the conflict between translators. One of the judges made the correct interpretation a jury issue. In addition, an instruction may be needed because it is unknown how often a juror thinks the translator made a mistake and does not tell the judge before telling the other jurors about the “correct”

translation. Cacciatore has also encountered problems with an interpreter knowing the “slang” of the dialect of the witness.

Berman opined that the jurors should be required to raise a possible error in the translation so that the trial court can address it. Telling jurors to ignore a problem in translation is not workable. Similarly, Kahn feels that a translation is similar to expert testimony. It is unworkable to tell jurors to disregard their own understanding of the language.

Lewis shared that he often asks jurors in voir dire if they would be able to rely on the interpreter if the juror’s own understanding of the testimony differs from the official translation.

Artigliere questioned whether the procedure for giving testimony through a translator could be changed so that the jurors only hear the official translation, not the foreign testimony. Kahn agreed that changing the procedure so that the jurors only hear the translation is a possible solution. Altenbernd and Stewart countered that this procedure would prevent jurors from observing the demeanor of the witness.

**Makar directed the translation subcommittee to consider the draft instruction and how to inform the jury to rely on the translator rather their own understanding of the evidence. The subcommittee should meet with the criminal subcommittee. Makar will be included on the conference calls with the criminal subcommittee. Makar added Cacciatore, Berman, and Griffin to the subcommittee. The subcommittee will circulate a draft as early as possible.**

...

**SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE ON  
STANDARD JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CIVIL)**

**DRAFT**

**(To Be Approved at November 3-4, 2005 Meeting)**

The Breakers  
West Palm Beach, Florida  
**July 14-15, 2005**

...

**8. TRANSLATORS (Tab 10):**

Lewis directed the committee's attention to the draft instruction on pages 10-27 to 10-29. The Supreme Court asked the committee to draft an instruction on translation, despite the committee's reservations that the substantive law in this area is unclear. At the last meeting, the committee discussed the need for a procedure that would prevent the jurors from hearing the original testimony in the foreign language. For example, the microphone could be placed in front of the interpreter rather than in front of the witness. This type of procedure would prevent a juror who understands the foreign language from reaching a different interpretation of the testimony than the official interpreter. Although the law is clear that the jury must make their decision on the same evidence, a juror may have difficulty putting aside his or her own understanding of the testimony.

The subcommittee's draft instruction is on pages 10-27 to 10-29. Caldwell commented that the committee was almost evenly split on whether the instruction should tell jurors to rely on the official interpretation or instruct the jurors on the procedure to follow if they notice a discrepancy in the translation. Lewis explained that the stricken language on page 10-27 sets forth a procedure for jurors to follow in the event they notice a problem with the translation. Lewis added that when the issue was discussed at a judicial education course, the judges in attendance all felt that the jury should be given a procedure to resolve a discrepancy in the translation.

Artigliere observed that it is the trial court's responsibility to provide a correct translation. Although he prefers jurors to point out any problems in the translation, the correct translation is a question of law for the court rather than a

question of fact for the jury. The issue could also be dealt with in voir dire by asking prospective jurors if they speak the foreign language and, if so, whether they will be able to follow the court's instruction to follow the official interpretation of the evidence.

Altenbernd suggested publishing for comment two alternative instructions: (1) advising the jury that they must rely on the official translation of the evidence; and (2) giving the jury a procedure to resolve a discrepancy in the translation, for example, sending the judge a note. Gunn agreed that the committee might receive valuable comments if they publish both alternatives. **Gunn directed the subcommittee to revise the draft on pages 10-27 to 10-29 and create two alternative instructions to present to the Supreme Court. The first alternative will advise the jury that they must rely on the official translation of the evidence. The second alternative will give the jury a procedure to resolve a discrepancy in the translation, for example, sending the judge a note. After the revised draft is posted on the committee website for review by committee members, it will be sent to the Supreme Court for possible publication and public comment.**

...

**APPENDIX C:**  
**Materials the Committee Considered (Tab 10-1 through 10-32).**

Note: These materials, in part, were originally designated under Tab 15 of the Committee's materials related to Preliminary Instructions. The portions of those materials related to interpreter instructions were later moved in early 2005 to a separate tab, Tab 10, and thereafter supplemented at subsequent meetings under that tab.