CR 03022

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUE

FRANK DAVID GRUBEN

MAY 28 199

Transcript of Submissions on Sentence and Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Mr. Justice E.P. MacCallum, sitting at Tuktoyaktuk, in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday, November 30, A.D. 1995

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. A.R. Regel:

For the Crown

Mr. S. Melnick:

For the Defence

(Charges under Section 266 and Section 267(1)(a) of the Criminal Code)

1 MR. REGEL: Moving on then to the submissions I
2 have on the sentence.

My friend and I are in agreement here with a joint submission that we're presenting to the Court, and it's a joint submission in the range of five years.

With respect to the circumstances that mitigate the offence, the accused did plead guilty. He indicated very early on that that was his intention and he waived the preliminary inquiry for the purpose of pleading guilty. The Crown, in discussing with the Defence the joint submission, has taken that into account as well as the fact that he has spent just over three months on remand as well.

On the aggravating side of things, you have a prior record with a number of related convictions. As I calculate it, there are at least 17 offences involving personal violence, 11 offences with weapons. Seven of those had knives and three were spousals. One of those three spousals was on the same victim.

The accused was on parole at the time of this offence for assaulting this victim. That one, as you note from the Summary of Prior Circumstances, involved a knife and the removal of her clothes as well. So I would suggest, if you conclude that the clothes were ripped off her on this occasion, that would be a significantly aggravating feature.

As well, I'd ask you to consider that this is

another spousal assault. There are many of them before 1 the courts. There is not merely violence, but it's 2 accompanied by threats in addition to the violence, and 3 I suggest it creates an atmosphere of oppression and domination which very clearly is part of a pattern, 5 and, in addition to that, there is the use of a knife 6 and some physical abuse resulting that are well 7 documented in the medical report. 8 As well, if you conclude that the clothes were 9 removed, I suggest you could conclude there were sexual 10 overtones. However, it's clearly not a sexual assault; 11 it's not what the Crown is alleging. But the overtones 12 are something you could take into account. 13 Finally, there is no indication of provocation in 14 this report of any of the circumstances here, and I 15 suggest that should be considered. 16 Subject to any questions Your Lordship has, those 17 are the submissions I intended to make. 18 Thanks. THE COURT: 19 First of all, My Lord, I believe the 20 MR. MELNICK: Crown made reference to the aggravating circumstance 21 that Mr. Gruben was on parole at the time. 22 understanding is that he was not. He was released 23 earlier on parole and, basically, ended up doing his 24 time before these assaults occurred in August. I 25 believe he was released in June, if I'm not mistaken. 26 I believe the Crown --

27

Do you concede that, Mr. Regel? 1 THE COURT: No, I don't, My Lord. But I'll be 2 MR. REGEL: looking into it. 3 Well, I see that the last --THE COURT: I'll look into that and I'll advise the MR. REGEL: 5 Court of my decision shortly, My Lord. 6 All right. THE COURT: 7 As to the actual evidence that was MR. MELNICK: 8 called today regarding the issue of clothes, my friend 9 has indicated the complainant has nothing to gain from 10 lying. From the agreed facts that have been presented 11 before the Court and the pleas of guilty from 12 Mr. Gruben, he has absolutely nothing at all to gain 13 from lying. It's a situation that, really, I would 14 suggest has not much bearing one way or another on the 15 overall situation that occurred. 16 My friend also indicated there were sexual 17 overtones to that. I dispute that fact. It is simply 18 an assault that was there. He's admitted to choking 19 He's admitted to a number of situations which are 20 contained in the statement of facts -- or the Agreed 21 Statement of Facts. He simply does not want to admit 22 the facts that, in his opinion, in his mind, did not 23 occur. He indicates he was drinking during that period 24 of time, that he was not exceptionally drunk at that 25 period of time, and that his recollection of events is 26 that that did not happen. I will leave that to the 27

1	Court to come to whatever conclusion on the normal					
2	issues the Court determines in the finding of					
3	credibility and the finding of fact.					
4	The photos that were taken there was a comment					
5	again by the Crown with regard to the marks on the neck					
6	and normally blood doesn't come right from them.					
7	Again, in the Agreed Statement of Facts, there is no					
8	indication that she bled at a later date, and we're not					
9	prepared to admit that she did. The medical report					
10	there describes those marks on the neck. I seem to					
11	have misplaced my copy, Your Honour.					
12	THE COURT: Yes, I have it before me. Thank you.					
13	Two small bruises were noted to the right side of her					
14	neck. A small abrasion approximately one-half by					
15	one-half centimetre was apparent to the centre front of					
16	her neck and another small abrasion to the left front					
17	of the neck. This one less than half a centimetre.					
18	MR. MELNICK: My submission is the report, with					
19	respect, shows there were very small abrasions. The					
20	photographs themselves it's very hard to tell					
21	whether the marks are scratches from being choked.					
22	Mr. Gruben, in the Statement of Facts indicates he had					
23	no intention of cutting her at the time did not					
24	intend to cut her at the time. That's not a defence to					
25	the charge of an assault with a weapon, Your Honour.					
26	It is with regard to what injuries occurred as a result					
27	of the assault. So in that respect he does not believe					

that the marks on the neck were as a result of the knife. With the series of assaults that occurred over a few number -- a couple of days there, it's possible they could have come from any situation. Perhaps even the choking on the last day, on the 20th. It was more to the expression of the scratches or abrasions or that.

So our submission is simply that the Court again can look at the medical evidence, the Court can refer to the photographs, and come to the conclusion which the Court feels most appropriate based on the submissions of both the Defence and Crown and the Agreed Statement of Facts.

14 THE COURT: You are, however, a party to a joint
15 submission suggesting five years more or less?
16 MR. MELNICK: Yes, and I will address that in

particular, My Lord.

The record is quite lengthy. By my calculations, I count 19 appearances actually before the Court over a 30-year period. Some 13 assaults. A total of approximately -- a total of 29 charges, sir. Jail time was imposed. On a quick calculation, it seems to be roughly about 15 years or so over a 30-year period. So approximately half the period of time. The last sentence that was imposed was three years and that was for assault with a weapon, and at the same point in time, for assault causing bodily harm, 15 months jail

1 concurrent.

The range Crown has indicated of five years, I would ask the Court to consider going on the low end of that. It is a five-year range that is being submitted to the Court. It does seem to be appropriate given the record, given the charges that are before the Court.

There are some mitigating factors. Crown has referred to a few of those. In particular, the early guilty plea and the early acknowledgment to the Crown that it would be a guilty plea. In this particular area, in this particular jurisdiction, an early guilty plea usually carries with it quite a mitigating factor for the courts to consider. It has saved the complainant and Court undue time and expense, and the complainant undue embarrassment at having to testify. Also, from the accused's point of view, it has saved him a situation, too, because we have been able to come to an Agreed Statement of Facts which he acknowledges actually happened.

The incidents, the majority or of all of them, occur while he's under the influence of alcohol. He has indicated that he didn't appear -- feel that he was that drunk on the last occasion. However, he was drinking homebrew. It's difficult to judge the amount that he was drinking at that point in time.

Mr. Gruben is 52 years of age. He was born on the 11th of May, 1943. He has a Grade 8 education. He has

taken, in addition to that, some upgrading courses by correspondence and bookkeeping courses.

Even for the amount of time that he's spent in incarceration, he does have a work history. He's worked pretty steady, actually, for the amount of time he's been able to. 1971, he said, he first started with Esso on and off on a seasonal basis. To approximately 1987 that continued. He then worked at M & J Water for a while, swamping, 1990, approximately, to '95, on and off again. He's held various other labour jobs around, and also worked for Gruben's Transport. It seems that when he is able, when he is not drinking, he is a respected citizen, which is unusual given the record and the charges that he has on his record and charges that he has today. I will speak more about that in a moment, My Lord.

As far as Mr. Gruben's background, when he was six years old -- six years of age, he tells me, he was put into a residential school and taken out of this particular community. He was also taken from his family. He went to school in Aklavik. He stayed there until he was about 13 years of age. In fact, what that had done from him is take him completely out of his family. When he finally returned to this community, he knew where his mother and father were, but didn't have the ability to bond to them, as most people do, for being away that number of years at a very early, young

1 age.

His family actually made Tuk their permanent residence in 1956. His father, prior to that, was a trapper in Sachs Harbour. By the time Frank was brought home, Tuk was now his permanent residence.

During that six- or seven-year period -- it wasn't just on a seasonal basis that he was away. He was away for the full year, for a full six or seven years, during that period of time. In addition to that, he spent two years in Tuk partly living with his mother and father. He has five brothers and five sisters. He is the fourth oldest. Some of his brothers and sisters were in school in Aklavik with him. His sister spent a lot of time in the hospital, and so did his brother who's four years older and finish his schooling earlier, so that he didn't really have the ability to bond with him that much either.

After returning back from Aklavik, he went back to school again in 1958 and that was a school in Yellowknife. I believe it's called Akaitcho Hall.

That was for a year, from 1958 to '59. In 1959 to '60, he went to live in Inuvik and worked for the DEW Line there. By this point in time, he was about 19 years of age.

He began drinking at a relatively early age as a teenager and drank steadily until his last release this year. He indicates to me that at this point in time,

actually, as of his last release, he was getting sick of the alcohol. But it was a very difficult relationship he had with Miss Chicksi. It caused them a lot of difficulties and he returned to alcohol, unfortunately, and finds himself before the Court again for a similar type of offence.

He himself considers himself to be, basically, a lone wolf because of his lost childhood years.

However, he did manage to learn hunting and trapping skills and his traditional lifestyle from his mother and his father.

His mother is still alive. I understand she resides here in Tuk and is a non-drinker now. He describes his family life as not an abusive situation.

He says he learned to fight and become the aggressor, as he sees it, anyway, in his earlier school years. What he indicates to me is that, literally, in order to be able to get along, basically survival of the fittest in his early school years in Aklavik. He says, as far as he can see, anyway, that's where his aggressive behaviour developed at a very early age, and he's never been able to, to this day, be fully able to control it.

He ran away from that school on several occasions and was eventually brought back to the school again by the R.C.M.P. At one point he attempted to -- he disliked it so much, he attempted to walk to

Tuktoyaktuk from Aklavik in the wintertime. He was
about 11 or 12 years of age at that time.

He indicates that there was some abuse by some of the teachers, but nothing to any great extent. They were corrected because of -- when they used their own native language. They had difficulty in school in that respect. They were corrected by the teachers for using their own language.

He feels now that it would be beneficial to speak to a psychiatrist or psychologist. He says that when he is sober, he's a good citizen. I have letters from several people in the community that seem to indicate that, and I'll present those to the Court shortly. I have shown them to Mr. Regel and he has agreed they can be brought before the Court.

He himself really doesn't understand why he acts the way he does when he consumes alcohol. He indicates that he doesn't want to be involved with alcohol anymore, but it's very difficult for him at this point. He also indicates that he's spoken to a lot of young people, to some young offenders who have been around, that he's run into when he's been in the community here. He would at times take them out to his camp on the land, try to talk to them about the evils of alcohol, and give them his firsthand knowledge. Seems when he's sober, and sober for a while, he can understand it. But that still makes it a weakness. He

still has that weakness for it, and when he does drink he becomes depressed. He does feel that he's helped some people. In particular, there are some young individuals he's talked to about furthering their education. I believe one is -- I'll find it in my notes in a moment, My Lord.

He has, in addition, taken programs while he's been incarcerated. Most recently, the Life Skills Program in 1993.

He's not bitter. He takes full responsibility for his actions. He's apologized, apparently, to Rosa, and he has clearly, by his ability to come to the Agreed Statement of Facts here and his early pleas, has really accepted full responsibility and shows a true and genuine sign of remorse.

He did most recently request to see a psychiatrist while he was at remand in the Yellowknife Correctional Centre. He did see him on one occasion, but has not been able to see him since. He does acknowledge that it has taken virtually his whole life to realize that alcohol is a problem and, generally, his life has been wasted away. But he does see that there is still some positive life experiences for him and he feels he can still benefit the community and society when he's released, at the very least by helping others to avoid a life like his; he knows it firsthand. He doesn't actually at this point in time feel that he is actually

institutionalized. Says he's not. Says that when he's out, he obtains steady employment, and he has a lot of skills to offer in that respect. When I spoke to him about that, he said, "I didn't care about life anymore when I came out. I wouldn't just do nothing." Yet it seems that he does tend to gain employment. By the Statement of Facts, he was employed at the time. He doesn't feel that he has a criminal mind in the sense that -- sometimes, however, he has difficulty with aggression. That does seem to be his main, severe problem; that is when he's consumed alcohol. He likes to help people, he says, but he says he hasn't been able to help himself. It's only now that he's beginning to realize this.

I know the Court has heard that type of plea on many occasions. But in our conversations with Mr. Gruben, he seems to be sincere in his efforts.

Coming to an Agreed Statement of Facts and acknowledgment of his guilt here, he seems to be very sincere. When he says that it's only now he's realized it, I have no doubt (sic) to disbelieve that in fact it has taken this long to come to realize what has happened with his life. He has lost it with his children. He hasn't had the time to spend with them. I think that plays heavily on his mind and his conscience.

So in respect to the range that's been submitted to

1	the Court, for the reasons that I've set out, I've				
2	asked the Court to at least be on the low scale of that				
3	range.				
4	THE COURT: Well, what was suggested was five				
5	years. How can I be on the low range of five				
6	MR. REGEL: I believe what was suggested, My Lord,				
7	is the range of five years. Whether it's exactly five				
8	or four				
9	MR. MELNICK: There are a series of letters, My				
10	Lord.				
11	THE COURT: The letters can be marked collectively				
12	as the next exhibit.				
13	EXHIBIT NUMBER 5 - LETTERS OF CHARACTER				
14	REFERENCE WRITTEN ON BEHALF OF FRANK GRUBEN				
15	MR. MELNICK: Letters are, basically, from				
16	THE CLERK: Exhibit 5, sir.				
17	THE COURT: Five.				
18	MR. MELNICK: acquaintances within the community,				
19	My Lord. They indicate that at times he's a good				
20	person, and I ask the Court to take that into				
21	consideration, when he's not involved with alcohol. I				
22	believe the letters are				
23	THE COURT: There are two letters from Shirley				
24	Steen.				
25	MR. MELNICK: Yes, My Lord. It took me a moment to				
26	realize				
27	THE COURT: Is that the same person?				

1	MR. MELNICK: Same person. The letter appears to be					
2	written on behalf of two individuals. Actually, on her					
3	own personal behalf. You'll find the first line in the					
4	letter relates to where she works for a particular					
5	organization, and the letter is signed with that in					
6	mind. The second letter is a personal letter.					
7	THE COURT: Okay. Do you have anything to add?					
8	MR. REGEL: Just two points, My Lord. One, I did					
9	review my file. There is reference to parole and					
10	whatnot, but nothing from the Parole Board indicating					
11	that he was on parole. Accordingly, I'd ask you to					
12	proceed on the assumption that he was not on parole at					
13	the time; that his sentence had expired.					
- 14	THE COURT: Thanks.					
15	MR. REGEL: The second thing was, just to concur,					
16	the joint submission is that the sentence be in the					
17	range of five years. My friend asked that it be a					
18	little lower, but, at the same time, you could go a					
19	little higher if you wished.					
20	THE COURT: Does your client have anything to say					
21	before I pass sentence on him?					
22	MR. MELNICK: No, My Lord.					
23	THE COURT: Would you stand up, sir.					
24	Mr. Gruben has entered pleas of guilty to two					
25	charges of assault under Section 266 of the Code and					
26	one charge of assault using a weapon, namely a knife,					
27	pursuant to Section 267(1)(a) of the Code.					

The Agreed Statement of Facts indicates that on the 5th of August, 1995 - this relating to count number 1 - the accused assaulted Rosa Chicksi by pulling her arm and clothing, and her hair, tearing her shirt open, and later that evening, by kicking her while she lay on the floor.

On the 18th of August, 1995 and shortly before midnight, she went for a walk and met the accused later, returning home with him. He held a pocketknife to her throat. She thought the knife cut her throat. There seems to be some doubt about that, although she did have marks on her throat. At any rate, he clearly threatened to cut her when he was holding the knife to her throat. He hit her in the face and head a number of times. This incident continued off and on, so the statement says, until they reached their home at Reindeer Point, at which time he fell asleep.

Finally, on the 20th of August, 1995 - this relating to count number 3 - he and a friend were drinking at her home. She asked them to leave -- or told them to leave, whereupon he choked her and continued drinking in the kitchen. There is a disputed allegation by her that in the course of the assault he tore her pants off, ripping them in the process. He denies this. Or to use his words, he says he "disputes that." He didn't tear her clothes, he says, "to my recollection." But he admits that he was drinking at

the time and that she was not. I prefer her evidence on the point, and although it doesn't make any real difference with respect to the sentence I'm about to impose, I accept the fact that he ripped her clothing on that occasion.

Defence has proposed -- or at least the Crown has proposed a global sentence in the range of five years, and the Defence agrees that that would be appropriate, although the Defence would like to see something less than five years and has made lengthy submissions in support of that request. The paramount factor in this case given the accused's very long and violent record is protection of the public and particularly anybody, any female, with whom he might live.

Spousal assault is a terrible problem in society, not only here but everywhere, and there's a very strong element of general deterrence to be considered in cases like this. Individual deterrence is obviously very important as well given the accused's record and given the circumstances of this case, which is only a repeat, sad to say, of earlier assaults upon the same victim.

His rehabilitation, of course, is a factor to be considered, although it is much less important here than are the factors of protection of the public and deterrence.

This man is 52 years of age, and his record has been described by counsel as very long, very old - or

at least very long - and continuing and violent in nature. Mr. Gruben appears to be a tragic victim of alcohol abuse, but, to his credit, he does not blame alcohol alone for his troubles. He takes full responsibility for the assaults for which I am about to sentence him. And truth to say, he cannot lay the blame at the door of alcohol entirely. Many people drink too much, but not many people are as violent as you are, Mr. Gruben, even when they're drunk.

In mitigation, of course, it must be noted that you have served three months of pre-trial custody and that you waived the preliminary, thus sparing the victim the pain of testifying, and that you had made it known early on that you were going to plead guilty. All these things stand in your favour, and were it not for them, I can assure you that given your record and the history of violence towards this complainant that the sentence would exceed five years.

The Crown has pointed out that you have 17 prior violent offences on your record, 11 of them involving weapons, and 7 of those weapons were knives. Numbered amongst the assaults are three spousal assaults.

All of the material has been marked as exhibits in this trial and I need saying nothing further about it.

I take note of the letters of recommendation provided to me by some of your friends, and there does indeed seem to be hope that you can live a useful life

and that you are, in fact, not a bad man when you're 1 not under the influence of alcohol. Let us hope that 2 somehow, somewhere, you can beat that addiction and 3 that when you finally are released from prison, you will continue to -- at least you will start life anew as a useful citizen. 6 The sentence I impose upon you is a global one of 7 five years, and it will be structured as follows. 8 On count number 2, assault with a weapon, I sentence 9 you to five years in prison. On counts number 1 and 3. 10 I sentence you to one year each to be served 11 concurrently with the longer sentence imposed on count 12 13 number 2. There have been weapons prohibitions under Section 14 100 in the past, and I'm sure that one is needed now. 15 It's probably a life prohibition. Is that right, 16 Crown? 17 I didn't serve the notice in that MR. REGEL: 18 regard, My Lord. You do have some discretion as to 19 whether you wish to impose life or ten years from the 20 date released from custody, if I'm not mistaken. 21 will just double-check that. 22 Yes, the way it's worded -- you'll note Section 100 23 says the order commences the day on which it is made 24 and expires not earlier than, in the case of a first 25

other case, life.

26

27

conviction for such an offence, ten years, and in any

1	Now, again, there are notice provisions if the
2	Crown intends to increase the minimum sentence beyond
3	that which would ordinarily be imposed, and we have not
4	served a notice in this case. So the Court has the
5	discretion. But you're not bound to impose life
6	THE COURT: Well, it doesn't say it seems to be
7	mandatory under Section 100(1). "Make an order
8	prohibiting the offender from possessing any
9	firearm" et cetera. In the case of a first
10	conviction, ten years, and in any other case, life,
11	after the time. The Court "shall."
12	MR. REGEL: In that regard, My Lord, I would
13	suggest there is a parallel to be drawn between this
14	and the impaired driving sections. With the impaired
15	driving sections, you'll recall there's increased
16	penalties for a second or subsequent offence. But
17	under and if I can just have a second here, I'll
18	give you a section number. If I could just have a
19	minute, My Lord, I'll find the section that applies.
20	It's Section 665, My Lord. It's just the way
21	subsection (1) is generally read is that the Court
22	would have the discretion to impose the greater
23	punishment, but the imposition of it is not mandatory.
24	THE COURT: Well, except that 665 says, "Where an
25	accused or a defendant is convicted of an offence for
26	which a greater punishment may be imposed by reason of
27	previous convictions" That's not the way Section

```
It says "shall."
          100 reads.
1
                           I know, My Lord, that that section is
2
     MR. REGEL:
          also the section that's used to require an increase on
3
          the drinking and driving, and if we draw a parallel to
          those ones, 253 -- the penalty section, I believe, is
5
          255.
                           Well, Section 255 says the accused is
     THE COURT:
7
                      Doesn't say anything about "shall" -- about
           the judge "shall" make a prohibition for a certain
9
           period of time.
10
                           Here's another reference to a case, My
      MR. REGEL:
11
           Lord, under Section 100. In particular, page 145 of my
12
           1996 copy of the Martin's Code. The case of Jobb is
13
           referred to where the Court notes "Where the Crown
14
           seeks the longer prohibition for a subsequent
15
           conviction as provided for in paragraph (b), it must
16
           give notice as required by Section 655."
17
                            Speaking of what?
      THE COURT:
18
                            In other words, the way I'd suggest --
      MR. REGEL:
19
                            Are they speaking about the Section 100
20
      THE COURT:
           prohibition? Yes?
21
                            That's my understanding.
22
       MR. REGEL:
                            Where is that reference?
23
       THE COURT:
                            That's about halfway down the page of
       MR. REGEL:
24
                       I don't know if the edition you're working
            page 145.
25
            on has the same page numbering system for each
 26
            section.
 27
```

```
THE COURT: Oh, I see. I don't know what they're
1
         talking about; paragraph (b).
2
    MR. REGEL: I believe what they're referring to, My
3
         Lord, is --
                        13(b) . Glad to some at it inches the
    THE COURT:
5
    MR. REGEL: I thought it was Section 100(1)(b),
6
         but... I note, under the annotations -- pardon me.
7
         does fall under the annotations to subsection (1).
8
     THE COURT: Well, all right. I see the authority
9
         and you're correct, it does seem to apply to that.
10
     MR. REGEL: I do believe, My Lord, just as I'm
11
          thinking, there was a case in the Northwest Territories
12
          Court of Appeal on a similar issue recently, involving
13
          a firearms issue, where Judge Halifax -- and I'm not
14
          sure of the name of the case, but Judge Halifax
15
          considered he was bound to impose life. I think it was
16
          Judge Halifax. But, anyway, one of our Territorial
17
          Court judges was of that view, and the Court of Appeal
18
          set aside the life order.
19
      THE COURT: The I see.
 20
      MR. MELNICK: The only other comment I was going to
 21
          make, My Lord, is that there are the provisions,
 22
           dealing with the order, that it is not mandatory to be
 23
           made if the Court comes to the conclusion that it is
 24
           required for other reasons under Section (1.1).
 25
              When Mr. Gruben is released, if he is able to
 26
           rehabilitate himself with his hunting and trapping
 27
```

1	skills, he may be of some benefit to the community at a					
2	future point in time. So if the Court would be looking					
3	at it from that point of view, a period of ten years					
4	may be appropriate.					
5	THE COURT: I'd be glad to look at it from that					
6	point of view if Mr. Gruben was facing the Court for					
7	the first time on a violent offence. But he has a					
8	record which clearly demonstrates that he's a danger to					
9	the public, and that includes weapons offences in the					
10	past. It seems to me, on a plain reading of Section					
11	100, that I'm obligated to impose a lifetime					
12	prohibition. But there appears to be authority to the					
13	contrary, and perhaps even more significantly, the					
14	Crown is not asking me to impose a lifetime					
15	prohibition, not having given notice of its intention					
16	to seek such an order.					
17	Therefore, pursuant to Section 100 of the Criminal					
18	Code, sir, I make an order prohibiting you from					
19	possessing any firearm or any ammunition or explosive					
20	substance for a period of ten years after your release					
21	from imprisonment.					
22	You may sit down. Anything further, Counsel?					
23	MR. REGEL: Victim of crime surcharge is waived, My					
24	Lord?					
25	THE COURT: Yes.					
26	THE CLERK: Sir, for the firearms prohibition,					
27	would that be surrendering forthwith?					

1	THE COURT:	Yes.	
2	You	are to surrender any firearms or ammuniti	.on
3	that you	u now have in your in possession forthwith	١.
4	(PROCEEDINGS	CONCLUDED)	
5			•
6		Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction dated December 28, 1987.	#20
7		CA	
8		Jane Romanowich	-
9		Court Reporter	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			