CR 02495

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS.

FREDDY PUNCH

Reasons for Judgment and

Judgment by

The Honourable Justice de Weerdt

- U. Arvanetes, Ms., Appeared for the Crown
- S. Shabala, Esq., Appeared for the Defense
- P.E. Simonson, Mrs., Court Reporter

Fort Simpson, Northwest Territories February 14, A.D. 1995

(Charges under Section 271 of the Criminal Code)

THE COURT: Freddy Punch, now age 30 years, a single man, ordinarily resident in the small community of Trout Lake (population approximately 60) in the Northwest Territories, since birth, is before the Court this morning for the passing of sentence upon him for the offense of sexual assault.

The case is an unusual one in that the assault in question took place in 1987, that is to say, over seven years ago.

What is <u>not</u> unusual, however, is the fact that the accused claims to have little, if any, recollection of the events of the assault. He was, as so often happens, intoxicated at the time to a degree which left him with little memory of those events. And, as happens from time to time, it was therefore not until he heard the testimony of his victim at the preliminary inquiry, held some months ago in the Territorial Court, that he was confronted by the realization of what he so cruelly did to her seven long years ago.

This is by no means the only case of its kind in the Northwest Territories in which the accused has come to finally accept responsibility for his crime as a result of hearing the victim testify at a preliminary inquiry.

Those who, being unfamiliar with such

matters (not having attended regularly as counsel in criminal cases before the courts, and not having heard many such cases as a judge in the place where I sit today), and who now seek to abolish all preliminary inquiries, would do well to ask themselves if the victims of sexual assault will not be put to the anguish of having to give their evidence for the first time before a jury, no doubt with a large crowd of curious spectators in the public gallery, if Parliament should somehow be persuaded to abolish the present system of preliminary inquiries in serious criminal cases.

Be that as it may, it remains to note that the plea of "guilty" entered by Mr. Punch to count 2 in the indictment yesterday, while made only on the eve of his scheduled jury trial, would evidently not have been made at all were it not that he had earlier heard his guilt described under oath by his victim at the preliminary inquiry. Without that, it appears that we would today be commencing that trial before a jury, as scheduled, with the victim now being required to testify in the full glare of the publicity of a jury trial, if indeed she were fully able to do so, an ordeal from which she has been mercifully spared by having testified at the preliminary



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

inquiry and - let us not forget - by the "guilty" plea entered by Mr. Punch yesterday.

As counsel agree, correctly in my respectful opinion, the offence was nothing less than a major sexual assault, for which the courts in sentencing the offender begin with a starting point or base penalty of three years imprisonment in a penitentiary, adding to or subtracting from that base penalty in order to reflect the aggravating and mitigating circumstances of the situation. Parliament for that matter, has prescribed a maximum sentence of ten years imprisonment for the offence of sexual assault. That maximum is reserved by the Courts for the worst offence of its kind when committed by the worst kind of offender. Mr. Punch is clearly not such an offender. And while all such offences are rightfully looked upon as serious, this is, fortunately, not the most serious offence of its kind to have come before the Court. This is therefore, as counsel rightly agree, not a case for the maximum penalty.

That being so, the duty of a sentencing judge in such a case is to determine what penalty short of the maximum would be a just and fitting penalty in all the circumstances. It is as well to note that there is no minimum penalty for this

offence under our law. What I must do, therefore, is to bear in mind the recognized principles by which a sentencing judge must be guided. And then, in the light of those principles, I must do my best to craft a sentence which will give effect to those principles in a manner which properly reflects the circumstances of both the offence and the offender.

The first principle to be recognized is that the criminal law has as its object the protection of the public, to the extent that this can be accomplished with due respect for the values enshrined in our Canadian Constitution. In other words, the public is entitled to the law's protection in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

The sentence of the Court must therefore reflect this by upholding the law and by firmly and clearly denouncing those who transgress against it. We call this the principle of repudiation or denunciation. That principle is given effect by the Court's conviction of the offender, which becomes a matter of public record, and of course by the Court's sentence, provided that the sentence is such that it is seen to serve the end of denunciation of the offence.

A closely related principle is that of deterrence, which has a two-fold aspect. First, deterrence of the individual offender. Second, deterrence of others who may be tempted to do as he did. The public (and I say this on the basis of some experience) associates deterrence in this class of case with a lengthy term of imprisonment, as recognized by the starting point or base penalty which I have mentioned.

The date of the offence now before the Court and the information provided to me in these proceedings all point, however, to the absence of any repetition of this offence since 1987, or at the latest 1988. This is, thankfully, a strong indicator that there is no longer as great a need for specific or individual deterrence of this offender as there evidently was seven years ago.

Courts will also consider, in appropriate cases, the principle of incapacitation - the denial of liberty so as to directly prevent the offender from re-offending. A lesser form of incapacitation is accomplished, in cases of violent crime, by prohibiting an offender from possessing firearms for a period or from driving a motor vehicle for a period; and there are other forms of lesser deprivation of liberty intended to prevent or at least make more difficult any

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

repetition of the offence. Some forms of probation may have this effect.

Contrary to popular belief, prisons are not places where offenders become more penitent - as the name "penitentiary" somewhat misleadingly suggests. Those who have shown no penitence before going to prison rarely show any sign of it either in prison or on their eventual release. In this case, by his "guilty" plea, and by his statement yesterday to the Court, the offender has shown remorse for his crime. He has thus indicated an attitude of penitence and of acceptance of responsibility for his offence. This shows that he realizes that he must undergo punishment for that offence and that he recognizes this is necessary to assure the public that the offence is legally condemned and that justice has been done.

There is therefore, in this case, room for a realistic consideration of the offender's eventual rehabilitation and reform. That, after all, would be the public's best guarantee that he is no longer a danger to those like his victim, at the time of the offence, a 15-year-old girl on whom he sexually forced himself, he being then some eight years older than she was, so as to psychologically traumatize her severely with

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

effects which she still experiences. Both she and he are lifelong inhabitants of Trout Lake. If he is to be released back into that small community after serving his sentence, it will be essential that he shall by then have achieved full rehabilitation and reform or, if that is in any doubt, that his release shall be supervised so as to remove that doubt as far as that may be possible and necessary. The courts have been given certain powers for such purposes, through the use of supervised probation.

In cases of the kind before the Court today there is no form of restitution or compensation which the offender can provide to the victim, or which the Court can require him to provide so as to undo the harm done to her by him. And there are limits on what a Court can realistically accomplish by requiring the offender to undertake community service as a way of showing his remorse and of expiating the crime which he committed in 1987. Mr. Punch was not permitted to communicate with the victim from his arrest in 1993 up until now. He has indicated a wish to apologize personally to her. He will now be permitted to do so, in the interests of helping her also to come to terms with her trauma. And, if the imposition of some suitable terms of community service can

be incorporated into the sentence, that too may yet be seen to have its value in restoring peace to the community.

The Court has been asked by counsel for both the accused and the Crown to make no order under S.100 of the Criminal Code. Given all the circumstances, I make no such order. As a result, Mr. Punch will not be hindered in his pursuit of a living on the land, using firearms, upon his release from imprisonment. He will know now that if he should ever commit another crime of this kind, or any other crime of violence, his use of firearms can be stopped by the Courts, for a minimum of ten years and, if necessary, for life.

Counsel are agreed that the Court must, in all the circumstances, sentence Mr. Punch to a term of imprisonment for not less than 2 years less a day, which is just short of a penitentiary sentence, and for not more than 3 years in a penitentiary. I am in respectful agreement with this joint submission of counsel.

In coming to that conclusion, I want to make it very clear that the fact of his intoxication at the time of the offence is not a mitigating circumstance in the eyes of the Court. That fact may go some way towards explaining how the offence came to be committed. It is however no

excuse for what happened. If anything, the giving of an alcoholic drink to the victim, who was too young to legally consume or possess liquor, must be regarded as an aggravating feature of the offence. I note also the considerable difference in the ages of the offender and his victim, and her youthful years at the time. The offender's use of deception reflects some forethought on his part. That too is an aggravating feature, removing the element of impulsive spontaneity which might otherwise have been supposed.

The fact that the offender has been subject to restrictive conditions on his liberty since his arrest on February 22nd, 1993, almost two years ago, is to be noted. These conditions included a period of 3 months of banishment from Trout Lake, with a further period of months during which he was restricted within Trout Lake. In reckoning his sentence, this fact has to be given a mitigating effect.

Taking all the circumstances of the case into account, the sentence of the Court is as follows - would you please stand, Mr. Punch?

- You, Freddy Punch, are hereby sentenced to serve a term of imprisonment for two years less a day;
- 2. In addition, you shall be bound by a

10 probation order for a period of 12 months, from the time of your release on terms as follows: first, immediately on your release (a) from prison, you shall report to the senior probation officer in the place where you then are, and thereafter, you shall continue to report as required by your probation officer; 10 second, you shall immediately (b) 11 notify the probation officer of 12 any change in your place of 13 residence or your work or 14 15 employment; 16 (C) third, you shall perform 200 hours 17 of community service work as 18 directed by your probation 19 officer, and always subject to the 20 supervision and approval of your 21 probation officer. 22 Do you understand those conditions, Mr. 23 Punch?

MR. PUNCH: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you accept them?

MR. PUNCH: Yes.

24

25

26

27

THE COURT: Mr. Punch, you are now 30

years of age. You are before the Court as a first You should know that if you should re-offend, you would be facing a much more serious penalty than the Court has imposed today. If, on the other hand, you decide never to make such a serious mistake again in your life, you may in time be able to put this behind you and become a respected and useful member of your home community. The choice is yours. Let me say that you could help yourself by learning to avoid alcohol abuse. I am directing the Clerk to endorse the Warrant of Committal with the Court's recommendation that you be given alcohol counselling and treatment during the term of your imprisonment. You will do well to take that counselling and treatment so that you may avoid any repetition of the behavior that brought you before the Court today. Do you understand?

MR. PUNCH:

Yes.

THE COURT:

You may be seated. Is there

anything further from the crown side?

MS. ARVANETES:

No, sir.

THE COURT:

From the defence?

MR. SHABALA:

No, my Lord.

THE COURT:

My compliments to counsel.

These cases are always difficult. There is no perfect answer to them. I think you've done as

Gabe's

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

25

24

26

27

much as can be done.

I, PERRY SIMONSON, Court Reporter, hereby certify that I attended the above-mentioned Examination and took faithful and accurate shorthand notes, and the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my shorthand notes to the best of my skill and ability.

Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, this 20th day of February A.D. 1995.

Perry Simonson, C.S.R. (A)
Court Reporter.

Gabe's