AMENDED ORIGINAL

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

TEDDY RONALD ELIAS

- v -

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

ORIGINAL amended as of October 11, 2018, to: Cover page $Elias\ v\ R$, 2018 NWTCA 6

Transcript of the Reasons for Decision held before The Honourable Justice K.M. Shaner, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 25th day of September, 2018.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. R. Clements: Counsel for the Appellant

Mr. J. Major-Hansford: Counsel for the Respondent

(Application for leave to appeal and release pending appeal pursuant to ss. 675(1) (b) and 679 of the Criminal Code)

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

TEDDY RONALD ELIAS

- v -

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Transcript of the Reasons for Decision delivered by The Honourable Justice K.M. Shaner, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 25th day of September, 2018.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. R. Clements: Counsel for the Appellant

Mr. J. Major-Hansford: Counsel for the Respondent

(Application for leave to appeal and release pending appeal pursuant to ss. 675(1) (b) and 679 of the Criminal Code)

THE COURT: This is R. v. Teddy Ronald

Elias. It is Mr. Elias's appeal. And this is a

leave application to appeal from sentence, which

is also a prerequisite to an application for bail

pending appeal, something which the applicant has

also brought.

The appeal is premised on the following: The appellant pled guilty to and was convicted of sexual assault and gross indecency. He received a custodial sentence of 12 months and six months respectively to be served concurrently. The appellant has, as of now, served approximately half of that custodial sentence. I should add that the custodial portion of the sentence is to be followed by a period of probation. The events leading to the convictions occurred at a time when a conditional sentence was available as a sentencing option, and the Crown concedes this point. Trial counsel, who did not act as the appellant's counsel in this application, was unaware of this and, consequently, he did not raise a possibility of a conditional sentence with the sentencing judge.

The appellant is an indigenous offender, thus engaging Section 718.2(e) of the Criminal Code. Moreover, the appellant has

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

significant *Gladue* and *Ipeelee* factors in his background. These things, along with a number of other factors, including, but not limited to, his subsequent productive life, his age, his self-reporting in the investigation, his guilty plea, and his remorse made a conditional sentence one of the possible outcomes at the sentencing hearing.

Crown counsel fairly conceded in this case that the threshold for leave to appeal sentence is a low one which has been met in this case, and accordingly, such leave should be granted. I agree. Having now considered the application for leave to appeal from sentence, and noting the Crown's concession, I have concluded that it must be granted.

The sentencing judge found that the sexual assaults were serious. This is borne out in his comment that a penitentiary length sentence, that is at least two years, was an appropriate starting point for determining what sentence should ultimately be imposed. The circumstances are set out in the transcript of the proceedings and need not be repeated in detail.

In summary, however, the offender sexually assaulted one of the victims,

who was a young adolescent at the time, by performing oral sex on him on two separate occasions. At another time the appellant attempted to have anal sex with that victim. The victim refused and the appellant put his penis between the victim's legs and ejaculated. The gross indecency conviction involved another child victim who was six or seven at the time. The appellant in that case masturbated in front of the child while that child was using the toilet. The appellant was an adult when these events occurred.

Sexual assaults, particularly those against children, are treated with the utmost seriousness in the Northwest Territories, and they typically attract incarceration. This recognizes the harm to victims who are vulnerable to adults and often depend on adults for their safety and security. Deterrence and denunciation are thus primary sentencing objectives. At the same time, a sentencing Court is required by Section 718.2(e) to consider all reasonable sanctions besides jail when sentencing an indigenous offender, and must take into account the Gladue factors to inform moral blameworthiness when determining what is a fit, just, and proportionate sentence. This has been

2.7

an important part of Canadian law for many years
now. The findings of the Truth and
Reconciliation Commission of Canada highlight the
importance of taking this aspect of sentencing
very seriously and giving it meaning.

It is true that the concept of a conditional sentence could have been put to the sentencing judge and that he would nevertheless have imposed a period of incarceration. also be that the Court of Appeal will decide that this sentence is fit, proper, and proportionate and ought not to be disturbed. That is, however, the very uncertainty that must be decided on What I have to decide is whether there appeal. is some merit to the appeal that falls somewhere between mere possibility and likelihood, and I am satisfied that the circumstances here, where the sentencing judge had before him an indigenous offender and was not provided with the full range of sentencing possibilities, meets this standard.

So that leads to the question of whether the appellant should be granted bail pending the appeal, and many of the comments I have just made respecting the leave application apply in this context as well.

The Crown concedes, again, that the requirements in Section 679.4(a) and (b)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

are satisfied. That is, firstly, that the appeal has sufficient merit that in the circumstances it would cause unnecessary hardship to require the appellant to continue to serve the sentence pending the appeal.

Second, there are no concerns about whether the appellant will turn himself into custody in the event that the appeal is unsuccessful.

The Crown has concerns about the public interest, however. Public interest, as was argued, engages the dichotomy between reviewability and enforceability. And in my view in this case, the equities favour reviewability. I could go on at length, but I think it suffices to say this: those who come before our Courts certainly do not have the right to a specific result or outcome, and indeed the result or outcome is often not what an appellant or an offender has hoped for. However, everyone in Canada who is charged with and/or convicted of an offense must be confident - and has the right to be confident - that they will be judged and, if convicted, sentenced in accordance with the law. That is particularly important when freedom is at stake. We all have an interest ensuring this is so. If the appellant in this case is forced to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	remain incarcerated, perhaps unnecessarily,
2	while, the question before the appeal court is
3	determined, his confidence and the public
4	confidence in the justice system will be
5	compromised.
6	To summarize, leave to appeal
7	is granted and bail bending appeal is granted.
8	
9	
10	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
11	
12	
13	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
14	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
15	transcript of the proceedings produced and
16	transcribed from audio recording to
17	the best of my skill and ability.
18	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
19	Alberta, this 2nd day of October, 2018.
20	
21	
22	
23	\bigcap , \bigwedge \bigwedge
	a. Willard
25	
26	Allison Willard
27	Court Reporter