CR 03586

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

#### PAKAK SIGURDSON

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice C.F. Tallis, at Rankin Inlet in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday, January 14th A.D., 1999.

#### APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Scrivens:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd:

Counsel for the Accused

Charges under s. 252, s. 249(3) Criminal Code of Canada

FILED

JAN 20 1999



1 THE COURT: In this particular case, you have
2 been found guilty by a jury of the offence of failing
3 to remain at the scene of an accident contrary to
4 Section 252 of the Criminal Code.

As your counsel has pointed out, this offence carries with it a possibility of a term of imprisonment for five years. Parliament has said that this is a serious offence but fortunately for you, Parliament has imposed no minimum sentence. Mr. Boyd has quite correctly pointed that out to me, and Mr. Scrivens acknowledges that he has correctly stated the law in that connection.

The jury have also found you guilty of the offence of dangerous driving causing bodily harm.

Mr. Boyd has again correctly pointed out that that offence carries with it a maximum term of ten years but no minimum is imposed. I do however point out that Parliament has said when you drive in a dangerous manner and when that dangerous driving causes bodily harm to another person, in this case Stacy Anawak, the sentence that is open to the Court to impose is greater than if you were just convicted of dangerous driving.

A conviction for dangerous driving alone carries with it a lesser sentence in that the maximum is five years. You can see that when you injure somebody, Parliament has said that it is so serious that the maximum may be ten years.

I have already mentioned to you that as the sentencing Judge, I am obliged to respect the verdict rendered by the jury on each count. I have no difficulty in doing so because, as I mentioned earlier, compelling evidence was presented to the jury to support the verdict that they reached on each count.

You are a young man and, as Mr. Boyd has pointed out, you are capable of acting in an impetuous manner but I want to tell you, as I indicated earlier, that there is no place in this community, or any other community for that matter, for any type of retaliation against members of the jury. If you have learned your lesson from this experience, you will not do anything like that but more important you will make it clear to your friends and relatives that they are to have no part in anything of that nature. The consequences of that type of conduct are very serious to say the least, and I just mention that to you and also state it for the benefit of others in the community.

I want to turn directly to the circumstances of this case.

Stacy Anawak's Victim Impact Statement has been read into the record here. Deep down, I am sure that you couldn't help but feel for her in that statement. When she gave her evidence in front of the jury, I did not detect any sense of personal vindictiveness towards you. She wants you to understand the terrible thing

2.0

that you did to her and the terrible hurt that you inflicted on her, particularly by leaving her there after you had struck her. I am not going to belabor that but I do say to you that it is something that I hope that you have reflected on in the months that have gone by and I hope that you will think about it in the future.

I have been persuaded by counsel that any term that I should impose on each of these counts should be concurrent. Your conduct essentially arises out of the same occurrence or transaction and that has motivated me to approach it in that fashion.

In trying to impose a fair and just sentence in a case of this nature, I want to tell you at the outset that it gives me no pleasure to sentence a young man or a young woman to a term of imprisonment. I know that that view is shared by both Mr. Boyd and Mr. Scrivens. But we have a responsibility not only to you but to the society in which you live.

I have taken into account that you were 18 years of age at the time of this offence. You have been visited with your share of misfortune but as you get older, you will find that most people have to bear their share of misfortune in life.

I hope that you continue with your education because it seems to me that you have promise in this area if you apply yourself diligently. Your attendance

record is not as good as it should be but as Mr. Boyd has explained, people sometimes let social activity interfere with their academic studies.

One of the areas that does concern me is your excessive use of liquor. From the information conveyed to me during the course of the testimony, I draw the inference that you do tend to get involved in drinking and your conduct after this incident where you, by your own admission, resume drinking after an hour or so, at a friend's place that you visited, indicates that it is relatively easy for you to become preoccupied in a drinking party with your friends. Your mother has indicated, that as a recovering alcoholic, she does her best to give you some guidance and direction. I hope that you listen to her and some of your elders.

When sentencing you, I do not look upon punishment as any goal to be achieved. So I have dismissed any notion of punishment for punishment's sake from my mind. I do however have to respect what both counsel have referred to and that is deterrence.

In crimes of this nature, the factor of deterrence must be given adequate consideration by the sentencing Judge. If the sentence that I impose adequately emphasizes community disapproval of your conduct by branding it as reprehensible, one can hope that it will have a moral and educative effect on the attitude of the public. Not only do we hope that you will refrain

1.0

from repeating conduct of this nature, but perhaps other members of the public will appreciate the seriousness of such conduct. Counsel have referred to this and during the course of their submissions, you heard the discussion that took place.

When I use the term "deterrence", you will understand, I believe from what Mr. Boyd has already said, that not only must the Court aim to deter you from this type of conduct, which is specific deterrence, but the Court must also aim to deter other people from doing the same thing.

It is generally accepted that society must be protected from this type of conduct and Stacy Anawak's statement indicates her concern, not only for herself. On the last page of her statement, she says this:

"I want him to understand that a person should never refuse to help someone they have hurt. Never should they run away and just leave them lying there wounded."

This, I think, reflects the view of right-minded thinking people in society. A community will have very little public confidence in any system if this type of conduct is accepted.

After weighing and reviewing all of the circumstances that were placed in evidence and after hearing the submissions of counsel, I have concluded that the sentence to be imposed is a term of one year imprisonment on each count with the same to run

concurrent. In other words, the total or global sentence on the two counts is a term of imprisonment for one year.

I realize that in imposing that sentence I have erred on the side of leniency but I do so for these reasons:

First of all, you are a young man, 19 years of age, who is striving to attain his high school matriculation. This sentence should not interfere too much with your education and I hope that you will continue, during your period of custody, with your studies. I feel confident that it can be arranged but you will have to take the initiative and ask for it.

I have also taken into account the fact that you have no previous record that was presented to me this morning. Crown counsel went out of his way to mention that in making his submissions and is to be commended for putting it forward in a positive way.

You also appear to have a reasonable work record for a young person and you, I think, have hopes of improving your lot by taking further training after high school.

I have tried to balance these matters so as not to crush your future hopes but at the same time to send a message to the community that this behaviour is not acceptable and you cannot avoid the consequences of it.

As a young person, you will have ample time in the future to atone for the wrong that you have done, and I frankly hope that you will bring yourself to see what you have done as being a terrible thing for Stacy. I sense that she's a big enough person to appreciate a written apology. But that is something up to you. As I told you before, she didn't strike me as a vindictive young woman although she clearly is very troubled by what happened.

With respect to the driving prohibition, I agree that there must be a driving prohibition for a two-year period. In fairness to you and Mr. Scrivens and your counsel, Mr. Boyd, this seems to be a generally accepted range and I agree with them.

So in addition to the sentence of one year concurrent on each count, I impose a driving prohibition for a term of two years.

You must understand that any violation of that driving prohibition can only get you into further trouble and you will have to respect that order or suffer the consequences.

I believe that concludes matters unless there is anything that counsel feels that I have omitted.

MR. BOYD:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.7

Nothing from defence, My Lord.

25 MR. SCRIVENS:

No, My Lord.

26 THE COURT:

You can have a seat.

Mr. Boyd and Mr. Scrivens, before we close this

1	sittings of the court, I want to express my
2	appreciation to you, as the presiding Judge, for the
3	professional way in which you conducted these
4	proceedings. That really sums up a great deal in a few
5	words but I think that people in the community of
6	Rankin Inlet are entitled to know that you both
7	fulfilled your respective roles with dignity and, from
8	the Court's perspective, your obligations were
9	discharged in a very responsible way. Thank you.
10	(AT WHICH TIME THE ORAL REASONS FOR SENTENCE CONCLUDED)
11	
12	Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987.
13	Direction #20 dated becomber 28, 1987.
14	
15	
16	Lois Hewitt,
17	Court Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	