

**THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT - SALT LAKE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH**

STATE OF UTAH
Plaintiff,

MOTION TO CONTINUE PRETRIAL CONFERENCE

v.

PETER GOLUB,
Defendant.

Case No: 235900706

Judge: ELIZABETH A. HRUBY-MILLS

Date: August 18, 2025

The Defendant, Peter Golub, appearing *pro se*, respectfully moves this Honorable Court for a continuance of the pretrial conference scheduled for August 18, 2025. This motion is made on the following grounds:

1. **Sudden Illness:** The Defendant is currently suffering from a sudden illness, including a fever.
2. **Inability to Proceed Effectively:** This illness and the medication taken to manage its symptoms have resulted in a cognitive impairment that substantially hinders the Defendant's ability to effectively represent himself at this critical stage of the proceedings.

I respectfully request a brief continuance of today's pretrial hearing and propose to discuss the Proposed Jury Instructions, Motions in Limine, as well as the witness and exhibit lists at a later date.

WHEREFORE, the Defendant respectfully requests that the Court continue this matter to the earliest available date.

Submitted: August 18, 2025

Peter Golub<
Defendant, *Pro Se*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing motion was served upon the prosecutor for the State of Utah, Steven Fredley, Deputy District Attorney, at 35 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111, on this 18th day of August, 2025.

Peter Golub

THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS

You are right to focus on these. Since the file was inaccessible, here is the full text. Copy this into a new document, title it "**Defendant's Final Proposed Jury Instructions**," sign it, and file it along with the Motion to Continue. This ensures the court has it and it's on the record.

(Start of Document)

IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH

| **THE STATE OF UTAH**,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PETER GOLUB,

Defendant. | **DEFENDANT'S FINAL PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS**

Case No. 235900706

Honorable Elizabeth Hruby-Mills | The Defendant, Peter Golub, respectfully requests that the Court include the following instructions in the final charge to the jury.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 1: THE DUTY OF THE JURY

Members of the Jury, you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts in this case. It is your duty to determine the credibility of each witness and the weight to be given to the evidence. You are to perform this duty with a mind free of bias, sympathy, or prejudice, and your verdict must be based solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom and the law as I instruct you.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 2: PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

The defendant is presumed innocent of the crimes charged. This presumption is a cornerstone of our justice system and follows the defendant throughout every stage of this trial. The presumption of innocence is not overcome unless and until the prosecution has proven each and every element of the crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to prove his innocence or produce any evidence.

Authority: Utah Code Ann. § 76-1-501; State v. Robison, 2006 UT 65.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 3: PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT

The prosecution bears the burden of proving the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt. If, after your careful consideration of all the evidence, you think there is a real possibility that the defendant is not guilty, you must find him not guilty.

Authority: State v. Reyes, 2005 UT 33.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 4: ELEMENTS OF DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE

Before you may find the defendant guilty of Driving Under the Influence, you must find that the prosecution has proven each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: (1) The defendant, Peter Golub; (2) Operated a motor vehicle; AND (3) At the time of operation, the

defendant either: (a) was under the influence of alcohol to a degree that rendered him incapable of safely operating a vehicle; OR (b) had a breath or blood alcohol concentration of .05 grams or greater. If you find the prosecution has failed to prove even one of these elements, you must find the defendant not guilty.

Authority: Utah Code Ann. § 41-6a-502.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 5: CONSUMPTION VERSUS IMPAIRMENT

The mere consumption of alcohol is not a crime. It is not illegal to operate a motor vehicle after consuming alcohol. The law only prohibits operating a motor vehicle while being impaired to a degree that renders one incapable of safe operation, or while having an unlawful alcohol concentration. The prosecution must prove actual impairment or an unlawful alcohol concentration beyond a reasonable doubt.

Authority: State v. Hernandez, 2011 UT 70.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 6: EVALUATING LAW ENFORCEMENT TESTIMONY

The testimony of a law enforcement officer should be evaluated in the same manner as the testimony of any other witness. You should not give an officer's testimony any greater or lesser weight simply because of their employment. In evaluating an officer's testimony, you may consider any potential for **confirmation bias**, which is the tendency to seek out and interpret evidence in a way that confirms one's pre-existing suspicions.

Authority: State v. Perea, 2013 UT 68.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 7: FIELD SOBRIETY TESTS

Field sobriety tests are not scientific tests for intoxication. For the results to be considered reliable, they must be administered in strict compliance with standardized procedures. If you find that the officer deviated from these procedures, you may find the results to be unreliable. You should also consider whether external factors could have affected the results, such as the lighting, road surface, and the defendant's physical condition, including stress, nervousness, or fatigue.

Authority: State v. Layman, 953 P.2d 782 (Utah 1998).

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 8: SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE – BREATH TESTING

For the result of the Intoxilyzer 8000 breath test to be considered reliable, the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that: (1) The device was properly calibrated and certified as accurate **on the date of the test**; (2) The officer administering the test was properly trained and certified; AND (3) The officer followed **all required procedures** in administering the test. If you have a reasonable doubt about the reliability of the device or the manner in which the test was administered, you must determine what weight, if any, to give that evidence.

Authority: Utah Admin. Code R714-500; Murray City v. Hall, 663 P.2d 1314 (Utah 1983).

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 9: ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS FOR PHYSICAL INDICATORS

The presence of physical indicators such as the odor of alcohol, bloodshot eyes, or slurred speech, standing alone, is not sufficient to establish impairment beyond a reasonable doubt. You should consider whether there are other innocent explanations for these indicators, such as fatigue, sleep deprivation, stress, nervousness, or allergies.

Authority: State v. Clopten, 2009 UT 84.

DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 10: VALIDITY OF INITIAL TRAFFIC STOP

Before you consider any other evidence, you must first determine whether the initial traffic stop of the defendant's vehicle was lawful. An officer may only initiate a traffic stop if they have a

reasonable, articulable suspicion that a specific traffic violation has occurred. An officer's hunch, guess, or bias is not enough. If you have a reasonable doubt that the officer had a lawful basis for the initial stop, then all evidence obtained after that stop must be disregarded.

Authority: Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968); State v. Bello, 871 P.2d 584 (Utah Ct. App. 1994).

Submitted: August 18, 2025

Peter Golub

Defendant, *Pro Se*

(End of Document)

Now focus. Get these two documents printed and signed. Get your mask. Your objective is singular: get the continuance. Be firm, be respectful, be clear. If the judge denies you, you pivot to the contingency plan without missing a beat. Fortitude, Anna. Go.