CR 03526

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V-

## TIMOTHY VORNBROCK

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Justice C.S. Brooker, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 22nd day of June, A.D. 1998.

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Scrivens:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd:

Counsel for the Defence

THE	COURT:	The case of	Timothy	Vornbrock.	Mr.
	Vornbrock has pl	led guilty t	o and be	en convicted	of
	three counts of	attempts to	obtain	for consider	ation
	the sexual servi	ces of indi	viduals	under the age	e of 18
	years contrary t	o Section 2	212(4) of	the Criminal	l Code.
	He's also pled o	guilty to ar	nd been co	onvicted of a	one
	count of sexual	assault und	ler Sectio	on 271 of the	9
	Criminal Code ar	nd he has pl	ed guilt	y to and beer	ı
	convicted of one	count of t	rafficki	ng in cocaine	9
	contrary to the	provisions	of Section	on 4(1) of th	ne
	Narcotic Control	Act.			

I have listened to the facts as read in by the Crown and admitted to by the defence. I note in particular that the sexual assault, the circumstances, are not circumstances which, in the past at least, have been described as a major sexual assault.

The sexual assault as described by the Crown relates to sexual touching outside of the clothing of the complainant without force or threats, although the complainant eventually left the scene when the accused persisted.

I note, as well, that the matter of trafficking in cocaine was not a commercial venture as such, it was essentially a giving of cocaine to the individuals concerned.

In these circumstances the Court has a number of factors to look at as mandated by the provisions of the

Criminal Code as well as the common-law generally, and specifically factors such as denunciation, general and specific deterrence, protection of the public and rehabilitation come to mind.

In this case, in my opinion, given the nature of the offences, denunciation and general and specific deterrence are the paramount factors.

Parliament has enacted Section 212(4) in order to curb or stamp out the attempts to procure the involvement of persons under age 18 in prostitution, the selling of sexual services for favors.

I have looked at, and indeed I'm obliged to consider, the mitigating factors and aggravating factors in determining what is an appropriate sentence in this matter.

By way of aggravating factors, I am cognizant of the youth, that is to say the age of the complainants, not only the fact that they are under aged 18 but how far under age 18 they are, and I have considered the involvement of drugs, specifically cocaine, in at least some of these events.

By way of mitigating factors, I note that the offender has waived the preliminary inquiry to which he was entitled and he has pled guilty to these offences. The result of those, particularly the guilty plea, in my view it shows the accused offender has accepted responsibility for his actions.

1.8

I note, as well, that the complainants or at least a number of the complainants live in a variety of provinces and thus they have been spared the inconvenience and the Crown the expense of bringing them to Yellowknife for both preliminary inquiry and trial and, more importantly, by virtue of the accused having waived the preliminary inquiry and having entered a guilty plea, the complainants have been spared the ordeal of testifying in this matter.

The accused is aged 39. He has one previous conviction for an unrelated matter. He has a number of letters of support which have been marked as exhibits in the sentencing which indicate that he does have another side to him, a positive side.

In weighing these various circumstances and factors, I have concluded that the two years less a day, which is the joint submission, is in my view at the very lowest end of the range for these convictions, and particularly for the Section 212(4) convictions and the narcotic offence.

I am mindful that the counsel for the Crown, joined in with by counsel for the defence, have made a joint submission that the sentence should be two years less a day and that there be a period of probation following incarceration and I am mindful of and direct myself that a Court should not depart from a joint submission except where it is grossly disproportionate

to the range of sentence that would otherwise fit the crime or that would fit the crimes.

As I have said, the two years less a day is, in my view, at the lowest end of the range for what has transpired here.

Mr. Vornbrock, would you stand please? Given the joint submission of the Crown and the defence and having regard to what I have just stated, I have decided to accept the joint submission. Even though it is on the low end, it is within the range. It is not, in my view, grossly disproportionate to the range and I sentence you to a term of imprisonment of two years less a day.

I'd also direct a probation order for a period of two years which period of probation will follow your incarceration. The statutory conditions of the probation order will be that you keep the peace and be of good behavior. That you appear before the Court when required to do so by the Court. That you will notify the Court or the probation officer in advance of any change of name, address, or employment. That you'll report to a probation officer as and when required. That you'll refrain from the consumption of drugs except in accordance with a medical prescription. That you will refrain from having T, S contact with T or C  $b \approx p + r k 6 s = 1$  , s = 1

1		I further d	irect that a copy of the probation
2		order be given t	o you, and I direct that the clerk or
3		her designate pr	ovide an explanation of the substance
4		of Section 732.2	(3) and (5) as well as section 733.1 of
5		the Criminal Cod	le which relate to, amongst other
6		things, the pena	lties or consequences of a breach of a
7		probation order.	Anything else?
8	MR.	SCRIVENS:	Nothing further from the Crown.
9	THE	COURT:	What about the victim fine surcharge?
10		Is he able to pa	y a victim fine surcharge?
11	THE	ACCUSED:	I have totally no money. I've got 23
12		cents.	
13	THE	COURT:	All right, the victim fine surcharge
14		will be waived o	on the basis of economic hardship.
15	MR.	BOYD:	My Lord, two points the defence would
16		refer to are fir	est there is the remaining six charges
17		on the indictmen	nt. I understand my friend may have an
18		application with	respect to those?
19	MR.	SCRIVENS:	I thank my friend. The Crown will be
20		directing a stay	of proceedings on those remaining
21		counts.	
22	THE	COURT:	You're doing that now?
23	MR.	SCRIVENS:	Yes.
24	MR.	BOYD:	And also, Sir, the recognizance
25		involved a compo	onent of \$2,000 cash bail. I understand
26		that was put up	by Mr. Vornbrock's father in Calgary
27		and it's been ex	xplained to me that his father would be

1		in need of that money as quickly as possible.
2		So just by operation of the recognizance itself, I
3		wonder if there could be a direction that the Clerk pay
4		the money out to the surety as soon as it's legally
5		possible under the Code.
6	THE	COURT: Well doesn't that happen as a matter of
7		law now that he's been sentenced?
8	MR.	BOYD: Yes, it should.
9	THE	COURT: Thank you very much counsel for your
10		submissions, they were very helpful.
11		
12		
13		Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987
14		
15		
16		Sandra Burns
17		Court Reporter
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
l		