**CR 421.19 Self-defense, defense of residence - use of non-deadly force R.C. 2901.05 (effective 4/6/21) *[Rev. 11/5/22]***

**COMMENT**

Effective 3/28/19, R.C. 2901.05 shifted the burden of proof from a defendant having to prove self-defense, defense of another, or defense of a residence by a preponderance of the evidence to the state having to disprove at least one of the elements of self-defense, defense of another, or defense of a residence beyond a reasonable doubt. Under the amended statute, the defendant retains the burden of production, which is the burden of producing evidence “that tends to support” that the defendant used the force in self-defense, defense of another, or defense of a residence. *State v. Petway*, 11th Dist. Lake No. 2019-L-124, 2020-Ohio-3848.

See Crim.R. 12.2 regarding notice of self-defense that the defendant who proposes to offer evidence or argue self-defense must file.

R.C. 2901.05, which shifted the burden to the state, applies to all trials occurring on and after 3/28/19, regardless of when the underlying alleged criminal conduct occurred. *State v. Brooks*, Slip Opinion No. 2022-Ohio-2478.

A trial court is not required to instruct the jury on self-defense in every situation in which the presentation is attempted; rather, a court need only instruct the jury on self-defense if sufficient evidence is introduced that, if believed, would raise a question in the minds of reasonable jurors concerning the existence of such issue. *See State v. Hatfield*, 9th Dist. Summit No. 23716, 2008-Ohio-2431; *State v. Bitting*, 9th Dist. Summit No. 29238, 2019-Ohio-2304, *appeal not allowed*, 157 Ohio St.3d 1407, 2019-Ohio-3731.

A trial court may not refuse a requested instruction if it is a “correct, pertinent statement of the law” and “appropriate to the facts.” *Smith v. Lessin*, 67 Ohio St.3d 487 (1993). It is within the sound discretion of the trial court to determine whether the evidence is sufficient to require a jury instruction. *State v. Mitts*, 81 Ohio St.3d 223, 1998-Ohio-635; *see also State v. Wolons*, 44 Ohio St.3d 64 (1989). The trial court cannot give a jury instruction on the affirmative defense of self-defense if there is insufficient evidence. *See Stateten v. Schwendeman*, 4th Dist. Athens No. 17CA7, 2018-Ohio-240. In deciding whether the evidence was sufficient, the trial court neither resolves evidentiary conflicts nor assesses the credibility of witnesses, as both are functions reserved for the trier of fact. *State v. Jones*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-120570 and C-120571, 2013-Ohio-4775, citing *State v. Williams*, 197 Ohio App.3d 505, 2011-Ohio-6267 (1st Dist.). *See also State v. Berry*, 3d Dist. Defiance No. 4-12-03, 2013-Ohio-2380 (“Sufficiency of the evidence is a test of adequacy rather than credibility or weight of the evidence.”).

The Fourth District held that the phrase “tends to support” as used in R.C. 2901.05(B)(1) does not create a new standard for determining whether a defendant is entitled to a self-defense instruction. *State v. Tolle*, 4th Dist. Adams No. 19CA1095, 2020-Ohio-935. The evidence must be sufficient to raise a question in the mind of a reasonable juror, as is already required under the existing standard. *State v. Melchior*, 56 Ohio St.2d 15 (1978). The Eleventh District held that in order for evidence to “tend to support” that force was used in self-defense, it must “serve, contribute, or conduce in some degree or way” to support that the force was used in self-defense. *State v. Petway*, *supra. See also* *State v. Parrish,* 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-190379, 2020-Ohio-4807.

If there is a factual question about whether the force used was deadly or non-deadly, the court should give the full instruction on deadly force contained in OJI-CR 421.21 as well as non-deadly force. *See State v. Triplett*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga No. 97522, 2012-Ohio-3804.

But *see also* *State v. Petway*, 11th Dist. Lake No. 2019-L-124, 2020-Ohio-3848.

Evidence adduced from whatever source that, when viewed in the light most favorable to the defendant, is sufficient to cast a reasonable doubt as to guilt.  *Parrish*, 2020-Ohio-4807.

1. GENERAL. A person is allowed to use non-deadly force in (self-defense) (defense of his/her residence). The state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, when using non-deadly force, did not act in (self-defense) (defense of his/her residence).

2. STATE’S PROOF. To prove that the defendant’s use of non-deadly force was not in (self-defense) (defense of his/her residence), the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt at least one of the following:

(A) the defendant was at fault in creating the situation giving rise to (*describe the event in which the use of non-deadly force occurred*); or

(B) the defendant did not have reasonable grounds to believe that he/she was in (imminent) (immediate) danger of bodily harm; or

(C) the defendant did not have an honest belief, even if mistaken, that he/she was in (imminent) (immediate) danger of bodily harm; or

(D) the defendant used unreasonable force.

**COMMENT**

The defendant is presumed to have acted in self-defense when in his/her residence or vehicle. *See* OJI-CR 421.23; R.C. 2901.05(B)(2).

The statute does not define self-defense, and therefore the Committee believes that the common-law elements of self-defense are applicable. *See State v. Williford*, 49 Ohio St.3d 247 (1990); *State v. Jackson*, 22 Ohio St.3d 281 (1986); *State v. Robbins*, 58 Ohio St.2d 74 (1979), citing *State v. Melchior*, 56 Ohio St.2d 15 (1978); *State v. Gray*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 26473, 2016-Ohio-5869.

If self-defense is an issue, the defendant may not introduce evidence of prior instances of a victim's conduct to prove that the victim was the initial aggressor. *State v. Barnes*, 94 Ohio St.3d 21, 2002-Ohio-68; *see also* *State v. Hale*, 119 Ohio St.3d 118, 2008-Ohio-3426. The Committee believes that evidence of prior instances of a victim’s conduct is admissible for other purposes, such as the defendant’s reasonable belief in acting in self-defense. For example, see “Battered Person” at OJI-CR 417.43 and Evid.R. 404(B).

3. NON-DEADLY FORCE. “Non-deadly force” means any force that does not carry with it a substantial risk that it will proximately result in the death of a person.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from R.C. 2901.01; *State v. Hale*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. CA-11473 (Oct. 13, 1989). Absent other circumstances, a punch is “non-deadly force,” even if it results in death or great bodily injury or harm. *State v. Davis*, 10th Dist. Franklin No. 17AP-438, 2018-Ohio-58. On the other hand, use of a weapon or other object that could cause death or great bodily harm, including a small knife, may be considered “deadly force.” *State v. Brown*, 5th Dist. Stark No. 2018CA107, 2019-Ohio-2187.

If there is a factual question about whether the force used was deadly or non-deadly, the court should give the full instruction on deadly force contained in OJI-CR 421.21 as well as non-deadly force. *See State v. Triplett*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga No. 97522, 2012-Ohio-3804.

4. PROXIMATE CAUSE. OJI-CR 417.23.

5. DEADLY FORCE (ADDITIONAL). OJI-CR 421.21.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from R.C. 2901.01; *State v. Dale,*2d Dist. Champaign No. 2012 CA 20, 2013-Ohio-2229. “Deadly force” is based on the type or degree of force used, not the result of the force.

If there is a factual question about whether the force used was deadly or non-deadly, the court should give the full instruction on deadly force contained in OJI-CR 421.21 as well as non-deadly force. *See State v. Triplett*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga No. 97522, 2012-Ohio-3804.

6. AT FAULT. The defendant did not act in self-defense if the state proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was at fault in creating the (situation) (incident) (argument) that resulted in the injury. The defendant was at fault if the defendant was the initial aggressor and

(*Use appropriate alternative[s])*

(A) (*insert name of victim[s]*) did not escalate the (situation) (incident) (argument) by being the first to use or attempt to use (non-deadly force) (deadly force);

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Hendrickson*, 4th Dist. Athens No. 08CA12, 2009-Ohio-4416; *State v. Galluzzo*, 2d Dist. Champaign No. 99CA25 (Mar. 30, 2001).

(*or)*

(B) provoked (*insert name of victim[s]*) into using force;

**COMMENT**

              Drawn from *State v. Gillespie*, 172 Ohio App.3d 304, 2007-Ohio-3439 (2d Dist.).

*(or)*

(C) did not withdraw from the (situation) (incident) (argument);

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Melchior*, 56 Ohio St.2d 15 (1978).

(*or*)

(D) withdrew from the (situation) (incident) (argument) but did not (inform [*insert name of victim(s)*]) (reasonably indicate by words or acts to [*insert name of victim(s)*]) of his/her withdrawal.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Melchior*, 56 Ohio St.2d 15 (1978).

Self-defense is not precluded because the defendant was engaged in criminal activity when he/she was attacked.*State v. Stevenson*, 10th Dist. Franklin No. 17AP-512, 2018-Ohio-5140; *State v. Turner*, 171 Ohio App.3d 82, 2007-Ohio-1346 (2d Dist.).

7. TEST FOR REASONABLE GROUNDS AND HONEST BELIEF. In deciding whether the defendant had reasonable grounds to believe and an honest belief that he/she was in (imminent) (immediate) danger of bodily harm, you must put yourself in the position of the defendant, with his/her characteristics, his/her knowledge or lack of knowledge, and under the circumstances and conditions that surrounded him/her at the time. You must consider the conduct of (*insert name of victim[s]*) and decide whether his/her/their acts and words caused the defendant to reasonably and honestly believe that the defendant was about to receive bodily harm.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Koss*, 49 Ohio St.3d 213 (1990).

8. DETERMINING REASONABLE BELIEF (ADDITIONAL). In determining whether the defendant, in using force in (self-defense) (defense of his/her residence), reasonably believed that the force was necessary to prevent injury, loss, or risk to life or safety, you may not consider the possibility of retreat by the defendant.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from R.C. 2901.09(C).

9. SUBSTANTIAL RISK. “Substantial risk” means a strong possibility, as contrasted with a remote or (even a) significant possibility, that a certain result may occur or that certain circumstances may exist.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from R.C. 2901.01.

10. WORDS (ADDITIONAL). Words alone do not justify the use of force. Resort to force is not justified by abusive language, verbal threats, or other words, no matter how provocative.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Shane*, 63 Ohio St.3d 630 (1992); *State v. Howard*, 10th Dist. Franklin No. 16AP-226, 2017-Ohio-8742.

11. UNREASONABLE FORCE (ADDITIONAL). A person is allowed to use force that is reasonably necessary under the circumstances to protect (himself/herself) (his/her residence) from an apparent danger. For you to find the defendant guilty, the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant used more force than reasonably necessary and that the force used was greatly disproportionate to the apparent danger.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Roddy*, 10th Dist. Franklin No. 81AP-499 (Nov. 17, 1981); *State v. Hendrickson*, 4th Dist. Athens No. 08CA12, 2009-Ohio-4416; *State v. Dull*, 3d Dist. Seneca No. 13-12-33, 2013-Ohio-1395; *State v. Gray*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 26473, 2016-Ohio-5869.

12. GREATLY DISPROPORTIONATE (ADDITIONAL). In deciding whether the force used was greatly disproportionate to the apparent danger, you may consider whether the force used shows revenge or a criminal purpose.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from *State v. Hendrickson*, 4th Dist. Athens No. 08CA12, 2009-Ohio-4416; *State v. Waller*, 4th Dist. Scioto No. 15CA3683-15CA3684, 2016-Ohio-377.

This instruction should be given only if the instruction on unreasonable force is given to the jury.

13. RESIDENCE. “Residence” means a dwelling in which a person resides either temporarily or permanently or is visiting as a guest.

**COMMENT**

R.C. 2901.05(D)(3).

14. DWELLING. “Dwelling” means a (building) (*specify conveyance of any kind*) that has a roof over it and that is designed to be occupied by people lodging in the (building) (*specify conveyance*) at night, regardless of whether the (building) (*specify conveyance*) is temporary or permanent or is mobile or immobile. (A [building] [*specify conveyance*] includes, but is not limited to, an attached porch, and a [building] [*specify conveyance*] with a roof over it includes, but is not limited to, a tent.)

**COMMENT**

Drawn from R.C. 2901.05(D)(2).

15. IMMEDIATE FAMILY. “Immediate family” means a person’s spouse, parents, brothers and sisters of the whole or the half blood, and children, including adopted children.

**COMMENT**

Drawn from R.C. 2905.21, R.C. 2930.01.

16. BATTERED PERSON SYNDROME (ADDITIONAL). OJI-CR 417.43; R.C. 2901.06.

**COMMENT**

There is no duty to retreat from one’s own home before resorting to force in self-defense against a cohabitant with an equal right to be in the home. *See State v. Thomas*, 77 Ohio St.3d 323 (1997).

17. CONCLUSION. If you find that the state proved beyond a reasonable doubt all of the elements of (*insert name of applicable offense[s]*) and that the state proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not act in (self-defense) (defense of his/her residence), you must find the defendant guilty.

If you find that the state failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any of the elements of (*insert name of applicable offense[s]*) or if you find that the state failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not act in (self-defense) (defense of his/her residence), you must find the defendant not guilty.