, the defendant in this case, has been charged with the crime of misconduct involving a controlled substance in the second degree.

To prove that the defendant committed this crime, the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the following elements:

(1) the defendant knowingly possessed methamphetamine in an organic solution; and

(2) the defendant did so with the intent to extract from it methamphetamine, or its salts, isomers, or salts of isomers.

##

## USE NOTE

## The following term is defined in other instructions:

##  “intentionally” – 11.81.900(a)(1) (intent)

##  “knowingly” – 11.81.900(a)(2)

Based on AS 11.81.610, the mental state “knowingly” is included in this offense with regard to possession.

The statute provides an exception for individuals who are allowed access to controlled substances under AS 17.30. AS 11.70.020(a). If this exception applies, an additional element should be considered.

In certain cases it will be necessary to instruct the jury that the state must also prove the defendant’s culpable mental state regarding the controlled nature of the substance. It is not settled whether that mental state is “knowingly” or “recklessly.” *See* *Moreau v. State*, 588 P.2d 275, 285 (Alaska 1978) (“A defendant’s knowledge of the [controlled nature] of a substance can be shown by inferences that can be reasonably drawn from facts in evidence.”). *See also* Ninth Circuit Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction 9.15, Controlled Substance—Possession with Intent to Distribute. *But cf.* AS 11.81.610(b)(2) (“if a provision of law defining an offense does not prescribe a culpable mental state, the culpable mental state that must be proved with respect to a circumstance or a result is ‘recklessly.’”).