**CRIMINAL POSSESSION OF A WEAPON**

 **IN THE FOURTH DEGREE**

 **(Possession of Armor Piercing Ammunition)**

 **Penal Law 265.01(8)**

**(Committed on or after Nov. 1, 1988)**

The (*specify*) count is Criminal Possession of a Weapon in the Fourth Degree.

Under our law, a person is guilty of Criminal Possession of a Weapon in the Fourth Degree when that person knowingly[[1]](#footnote-1) possesses any armor piercing ammunition with intent to use the same unlawfully against another.

The following terms used in that definition have a special meaning:

ARMOR PIERCING AMMUNITION means any ammunition capable of being used in pistols or revolvers containing a projectile or projectile core for use in such ammunition, that is constructed entirely, excluding the presence of traces of other substances, from one or a combination of any of the following: tungsten alloys, steel, iron, brass, bronze, beryllium, copper, or uranium.[[2]](#footnote-2)

POSSESS means to have physical possession or otherwise to exercise dominion or control over tangible property.[[3]](#footnote-3)

A person KNOWINGLY possesses armor piercing ammunition when that person is aware that he or she is in possession of such armor piercing ammunition.[[4]](#footnote-4)

INTENT means conscious objective or purpose.[[5]](#footnote-5) Thus, a person acts with intent to use armor piercing ammunition unlawfully against another when his or her conscious objective or purpose is to use it unlawfully against another.[[6]](#footnote-6)

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, each of the following three elements:

1. That on or about (date), in the county of (county), the defendant, (defendant's name), possessed armor piercing ammunition;

2. That the defendant did so knowingly; and

3. That the defendant did so with the intent to use the armor piercing ammunition unlawfully against another.

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. The word "knowingly" has been added to this definition to comport with statutory law (*see* Penal Law § § 15.00(2) and 15.05 [2]) and with case law. *People v Persce,* 204 NY 397, 402 (1912) ("the possession [of a slungshot] which is meant is a knowing and voluntary one"); *People v Saunders,* 85 NY2d 339, 341-42 (1995) ("’Possession,’ as part of the forbidden act, includes the Penal Law definitional component of ‘[v]oluntary act,’ which incorporates the attribute of awareness of the possession or control . . . . Thus, the corpus delicti of weapons possession . . . is the voluntary, aware act of the possession of a weapon"); *People v Ford,* 66 NY2d 428, 440 (1985) (the offense of possession of a loaded firearm requires that the possession be knowing). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *See* Penal Law 265.00(18). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *See* Penal Law 10.00(8). Where constructive possession is alleged, or where the People rely on a statutory presumption of possession, insert the appropriate instruction from the "Additional Charges" section at the end of this chapter. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *See* Penal Law 15.05(2). *Cf. People v Parrilla*, 27 N.Y.3d 400, 405 (2016) (when possession of a gravity knife was a crime, defendants were required to know that “they possessed a knife” but the People were not required “to prove that defendants knew that the knife in their possession met the statutory definition of a gravity knife”); *People v Hernandez*, 180 AD3d 1234, 1237 (3d Dept 2020) (“Contrary to defendant's contention, the court was not required to instruct the jury that the People were required to show that defendant was aware of the legal definition of a blackjack. The characteristics of the blackjack at issue—a lead core, surrounded by leather, which is flexible and used as a weapon—make ‘the inherently dangerous nature of the prohibited object be readily apparent, so as to put [defendant] on clear notice that the object is potentially subject to government regulation or prohibition’ . . . . Accordingly, the People did not have to prove that defendant was aware of the statutory definition of a blackjack”); *People v Steinmetz*, 177 AD3d 1292, 1293 (4th Dept 2019) ("The People were not required to establish that defendant knew the rifles met the statutory criteria of an assault weapon but, rather, only that he knowingly possessed the rifles"); *People v Abdullah*, 206 AD3d 1340, 1344 (3d Dept 2022) (knowing possession of a slungshot is required but a defendant need not know the dictionary definition of slungshot). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *See* Penal Law 15.05(1). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If the People rely on the statutory presumption of intent, insert the appropriate instruction from the "Additional Charges" section at the end of this chapter. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)