CR 03478

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

MICHAEL MANTLA

AUG 18 1998

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgement and Reasons for Sentence delivered by Justice J. Z. Vertes, in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 5th day of May, A.D. 1998.

APPEARANCES:

MR. B. ALLISON:

On behalf of the Crown

MS. J. MERCREDI:

On behalf of the Defence

Charges under ss. 145(1)(a) C.C., 264.1(1)(a) C.C.,
129(a) C.C., 271 C.C., 270(1)(a) C.C

Barr on Publication of Complainant / Witness Pursuant to Section 486 of the Criminal Code

THE COURT: The accused, Michael Mantla, was

charged with five offences. All of them relate to a

series of incidents occurring here in Yellowknife on

June 14th, 1997.

Count 1 is a charge of sexual assault. For the reasons that follow, I find the accused guilty of that charge.

Count 2 is a charge of uttering a death threat. I dismissed this charge at the end of the Crown's case due to a lack of evidence. So the accused is not guilty on Count 2.

Count 3 is a charge of resisting a police officer in the execution of his duty. For the reasons that follow, I find the accused not guilty on that charge.

Count 4 is a charge of assaulting a police officer. I find the accused guilty of that charge.

Finally, Count 5 is a charge of escaping lawful custody. I find the accused guilty of that charge.

The facts are as follows.

During the evening of June 13, 1997, the accused was in Yellowknife. He was over at the home of the complainant's sister. The sister, C , is 26 years old. The accused is 27 years old. They have known each other for seven or eight years and had been going together for one or two months. The complainant, who was 12 years old at the time, was there along with a friend of hers from school. The accused and C

(1

smoked some marihuana. The complainant had been			
drinking at another house that evening. After a while			
the accused left. Later on as he was returning he met			
the complainant and her friend outside. They told him			
that C did not want anyone to stay at her home but			
he could stay at "M 's place". M was a friend of			
C , M T , who had an apartment in the same			
complex. The two girls then went somewhere else. The			
accused, thinking that the "M " they were referring			
to was his cousin, M Z C , went to that			
apartment.			

The accused entered the apartment. He was met by

M 's brother, C T . They introduced

themselves. At some point, the complainant and her

girlfriend arrived. At one point C became

concerned that his girlfriend may have taken some pills

so he called an ambulance. When the ambulance arrived,

the accused started to become rude and disruptive.

C then asked the ambulance attendants to call the

police.

The police, two male officers and two female officers, arrived on the scene at approximately 1:20 a.m. on June 14th. They encountered the accused,

C 's girlfriend and a young woman, who I conclude was the complainant's girlfriend, in the living room.

That young woman was observed to be crying and directed the police officers to a back bedroom. Meanwhile, the

accused was swearing at the officers telling them to get out.

In the back bedroom the officers found the complainant asleep and naked. Constable Barrieau asked the accused if he knew who she was. The accused replied to the effect: "Leave her alone, Let her sleep it off, I just gave her the ride of her life." The accused admitted saying this.

The female officers tried to awaken the complainant. They had difficulty. Finally she awoke. She was described by one of the officers as being extremely intoxicated. She was having difficulty standing or speaking. The officer smelled the odour of alcohol on her. They wrapped a sheet around her. She was hysterical and tried to fight them. They had to handcuff her to control her.

The officers took the complainant straight to the hospital. Her mother was also brought to the hospital. Her mother described the complainant as being hysterical and obviously intoxicated. Tests taken at the hospital revealed semen on a vaginal swab. I was not told of any follow-up testing on this sample.

Back at the apartment C. T asked the officers to remove the accused. They tried and then a struggle ensued. Eventually the police handcuffed him and removed him to the police van. There the accused

was kicking at the vehicle and acting in such a manner that the police used pepper-spray to subdue him.

The accused was lodged into cells. He was given an opportunity to call a lawyer. He says he was unable get through to one but he never said this to the police.

Later that same day, Corporal Johnson took the accused out of his cell. He wanted to try to interview him. On their way to the interview room, the accused said he did not want to talk to him. As Corporal Johnson was returning the accused to his cell, the accused tackled him, threw him to the ground, and escaped through an exit. Corporal Johnson chased him for close to ten minutes and eventually caught up to him. It took three or four officers to subdue the accused on that occasion.

With respect to the charge of sexual assault, the accused admits that he had sex with the complainant. He says, however, that he thought she was older and that she was consenting to it.

The Criminal Code stipulates that consent is no defence to a charge of sexual assault if the complainant is under 14 years of age. It is also no defence to a charge of sexual assault that the accused believed the complainant was 14 years old or more unless the accused took all reasonable steps to ascertain the age of the complainant. The burden of

proof is, as always, on the Crown, but there is an evidentiary burden on the accused to show what steps, if any, he took to ascertain the correct age.

In this case the accused said that he thought the complainant was 15 or 16 years old. Yet he never asked her how old she was. He knew that she was C 's younger sister. C testified that just a week or so earlier she told the accused that her sister was just 12 years old. The accused denied having this conversation. I do not need to rely on it on this issue.

I observed the complainant. While she may try to act a little older than what she is, I do not think that anyone could mistake her as being older. It was therefore incumbent on the accused to take some steps to ascertain her age. He took none. In fact, he did not even talk with her.

I acknowledge that the accused's subjective belief is a factor to consider. But, having regard to the other evidence as to this man's lack of thought that night and his own evidence that he did not think much about what was happening, I reject his evidence of subjective belief. It is unreasonable and could not have been honestly held.

I also acknowledge that one of the officers and

C. T said that the complainant at first

looked to be about 15 years old. That evidence is a

1.0

1.1

factor to consider, but so are the highly-charged circumstances in which those observations were made.

While this is enough to dispose of the sexual assault charge, I want to say that even if I had a doubt as to the accused's belief as to the complainant's age, I have no doubt that the complainant was incapable of consenting due to her intoxication and that the accused failed to take reasonable steps to ascertain if the complainant was consenting.

The accused testified that while he was in the living room at M 's apartment, the complainant lay face down on the couch. She seemed to be napping. He said that the complainant got up and said she was going to sleep in the bedroom. He said he saw her stumble. Then he said that moments later when he came out of the bathroom, she put her arms around him and started kissing him. They then proceeded into the bedroom and had sex.

The complainant testified that all she could remember was being in M 's apartment and going to the bedroom to sleep. She said she had flashbacks of the accused having sex with her and of the accused grabbing her arm. She could not say, however, whether these things were true. When asked if she let him go to the bedroom with her, she emphatically said "not possible", "I wouldn't allow him to go with me".

The accused's evidence shifted from time to time.

He said he did not think she was drunk; then he said that he did not know that she was so drunk; then he said that he thought she was pretending to be drunk. Whatever it was, he should have been put on guard as to her capability of consenting as well as her age. But he took no steps. He just went ahead and had sex with her. His evidence, in my opinion, is unbelievable and I reject it. Hence I convict the accused on Count 1.

Defence counsel submitted that the accused's statement to the police at the apartment is indicative of an innocent mind, the fact that he had nothing to hide, and therefore can be used to support his state of mind as to the complainant's age and consent. Assuming that the statement can be used in that manner, I do not draw that inference. The accused did not know why the police were there. He was acting in a rude and aggressive manner nevertheless. It seems to me that the statement could be equally indicative of either his knowledge that she was "sleeping it off" because she was intoxicated or his conceit and bravado as to what a "man" he thought he was (much like the personal items belonging to the complainant that he stuffed into his pockets can be considered to be his "trophies" of that night's encounter).

On Count 3, there was conflicting evidence from the accused and Constable Barrieau as to how the struggle started and how it unfolded. In my opinion

the police officers were justified in removing the accused from the apartment and taking all the steps they did to subdue him. Nevertheless, it seems to me that when the police have to use physical force on someone then one can expect some degree of force in return. It seems to me that the accused's actions in struggling while restrained are more in the nature of a natural reaction, something that comes, unfortunately, with the job description of being a police officer. The accused's actions in the van, while possibly constituting malicious damage of property, come after he was restrained so it cannot be said to be resistance to prevent detention. I have a doubt as to the accused's intention. Hence I find the accused not guilty of Count 3 and dismiss that charge.

With respect to Counts 4 and 5, all of the elements of an assault and an escape are satisfied by the evidence. There is no evidence of any reasonable excuse on the part of the accused, not self-defence, not necessity, not diminished mental capacity. He admitted to assaulting the police officer. He admitted to escaping custody. Hence I convict the accused on these two counts.

(SENTENCING SUBMISSIONS MADE BY COUNSEL)

25 THE COURT: Probably the most difficult task a
26 judge has to perform is trying to determine in each
27 case an appropriate sentence on someone who has been

convicted of a crime. If we have offenders who have long criminal histories and who we can truly call criminals, then that task is very easy, or at least easier. It is, however, most difficult when we see an offender who, by all accounts, can lead a worthwhile and productive life, can be a valuable member of his community and can be a very supportive person to his family, and then who for some reason, whether some emotional problem, mental problem, drug or alcohol problem, who for some reason, in one night through some foolish, thoughtless and selfish act forever changes the course not only of his own life, but the lives of those he says he loves, the lives of his own family, his own child, and the lives of the victims of his crime.

In this case, Mr. Mantla was convicted by me of three criminal offences. The facts and circumstances of those offences I have already covered in my judgment in entering the convictions. I do not need to repeat them.

The most serious offence of course is that of sexual assault. Crown counsel has suggested that I should consider a range of imprisonment of three to five years. As he describes it, the sexual assault was an act of full intercourse with a child of 12, who at the time was under the influence of alcohol.

This was not a case like some others that we hear

where we have two relatively young people who are in love with each other and become passionate and end up making love and the girl just happens to be under the age of consent. Here the accused was 14 or 15 years older than the complainant. He knew her to be the younger sister of a friend of his. He could and should, and I'm convinced he did, see that she was under the influence of alcohol, and I'm convinced he took advantage of her for his own selfish purpose.

It is a very serious offence. It is an offence that calls for denunciation and deterrence. It is the type of offence where most people who commit these offences are sent to penitentiaries. Therefore I have to keep in mind that similar offences should draw similar sentences.

It does not matter, in my mind, how the complainant may have been acting when she was under the influence of alcohol. There is no excuse for an older man to take advantage of a young girl like that, none whatsoever. So I have no alternative but to consider a penitentiary sentence.

Now, what I cannot understand is how this accused could do such a thing. I am convinced it was out of character for him. I see his education and employment background is quite good. He has held responsible positions. He was, I notice, a platoon and instruction leader for the cadets. I have a letter from the Chief

of the Dogrib Rae Band in which the accused is described as an active member of the band who has always been ready to lend assistance to his elderly father and other community residents who may be in need. The Chief describes him as one who has always put his family needs first ahead of his own. Of course the Chief says that he cannot comment on the circumstances surrounding this trial. However, the Chief says that he can vouch for the accused's positive involvement in and around their community and he certainly will be missed. So it is inexplicable to me how someone can be held in such good regard and then go out and in one night commit this crime and act in such a bizarre and aggressive and violent manner, as I heard him acting on this night in question.

I heard that some of his emotional difficulties started in 1996 when he lost his job and he started having difficulties with his common-law partner. I heard how he was drinking and apparently doing a lot of drugs. Perhaps those are all factors that went into this. But the sad part about it, that one night will now change his life. It will affect the lives of his partner and his daughter, and as we've heard, it has already affected the lives of his victim and her family.

I heard from the victim's mother how the victim became depressed, suicidal, had to drop out of school.

These are all things that the accused will have to live with.

The difficulties his incarceration will cause for his family, for his father, for his daughter, are all things the accused will have to live with. My only hope is that the good background of the accused will be something that the accused will be able to build on, and when he comes out of jail that he will be a better person and a responsible person, the type of person that the Chief and others apparently think he can be.

He is still young; he's only 27 years old. There is plenty of time ahead for him to prove that he can be a worthwhile member of the community, a good father to his children.

Stand up, Mr. Mantla.

Mr. Mantla, your lawyer did and said everything possible on your behalf in this case. I hope that over the next little while you'll think about what you can do to plan for your future and the future of your family, how you can improve your education, your situation. Use the time ahead not to sit and sulk and complain about your problems, but to try and deal with whatever those problems are. You are a grown man now, you have family responsibilities and only you can take control of your life so that none of this ever happens again.

On Count 1, I sentence you to serve a term of

imprisonment of three years.

I should say, counsel, that I have taken into account the background of this man. I recognize that, while he has a minor criminal record, he has never been incarcerated previously, so I take that into account. I take into account the two months in pre-trial custody that he spent after his arrest.

With respect to Count 4, I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of six months. That term will be consecutive to the three-year term on Count 1.

On Count 5, I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of six months. That will be concurrent to the sentence on Count 4, but of course Counts 4 and 5 will be consecutive to Count 1.

Mr. Mantla, it is not up to me to decide where you serve your sentence. Based on everything that I have heard, I am going to have the warrant endorsed with my recommendation to the correctional officials and the parole authorities that they give early consideration to what will best serve your needs; an early assessment of whatever counselling programs and education programs that you may be best able to profit from during the time of your incarceration; and, more importantly, where that may best be achieved, whether it's at the correctional centre here in Yellowknife or some other facility. Based on that early assessment they will make a decision as to where it would be best for you to

1	serve your time, taking into consideration as well your
2	family connections and your background and your
3	connection to this area.
4	Now, the correctional authorities will receive a
5	transcript of my remarks, they'll receive copies of the
6	exhibits that were submitted on the sentencing - I
7	think that's an automatic procedure - so they will know
8	my wishes in this regard.
9	You may have a seat.
10	Counsel, I am not going to make a Section 100
11	order. I fail to see the purpose of one under these
12	circumstances.
13	There will be no victim of crime fine surcharge.
14	I'm going to direct that Exhibits 3, 4, 5 and 6
15	that were filed during the trial be returned by the
16	clerk to the custody of the police, perhaps through the
17	offices of the Crown Attorney. Mr. Allison, you could
18	take those exhibits and give them to the police and
19	they should hold onto them until the end of the appeal
20	period, after which they can be destroyed or returned
21	to their rightful owner if the owner may wish.
22	Is there anything else we need to cover, counsel?
23	MR. ALLISON: No, My Lord.
24	THE COURT: Miss Mercredi?
25	MS. MERCREDI: Nothing.
26	THE COURT: Thank you for your services,
27	Mr. Rabesca.

1	
2	
3	Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28,
4	1987.
5	awright
6	Annette Wright Court Reporter
7	Court Reporter
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	