CR 03745

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

vs. -



ART THOR SIMILA GONZALES

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on Friday, June 4th A.D., 1999.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. L. Charbonneau:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. R. Gorin:

Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 268 Criminal Code of Canada

THE COURT:

I will now deliver judgment in the sentencing of Art Thor Simila Gonzales who has pleaded guilty to and been convicted of a charge of aggravated assault by wounding Dave Timothy Forbes.

It is often said that sentencing is perhaps the most difficult task that faces a Judge. Each case is different, each offender is different, and the law permits a wide range of sentences for most offences. The task for any Judge on a sentencing is to weigh all the factors that must be taken into account and come up with an appropriate sentence.

I will summarize the facts that are set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts by saying that on February 7 of this year at about 2 o'clock in the morning, the accused Art Gonzales, his younger brother Archie, and two friends drove to the apartment building where the accused lived to pick up another friend. They had all been drinking at a bar. Archie went into the building while the others waited in the vehicle.

Mr. Zaragoza, who was driving the vehicle, started revving the engine and while he was doing that, the victim, Dave Forbes, and another individual, Corey Stead, made the gesture that is usually described as "giving the finger" to the people in the vehicle.

Mr. Zaragoza got out of the vehicle with a crowbar and tapped it on the roof. He then put the crowbar under his jacket and went to the door of the building

1.8

where there was an altercation between him and Mr. Stead in which Mr. Stead knocked him to the ground and then both Mr. Stead and Mr. Forbes assaulted Mr. Zaragoza.

Inside the vehicle, the accused got out his swiss army knife and showed it to the friend still in there with him. He put the knife into his pocket and the two of them got out of the vehicle and went to help Mr. Zaragoza.

The accused and Mr. Forbes started fighting and the accused ended up on the ground. He saw that Mr. Zaragoza was bleeding from the face. The accused got out the knife and opened the blade. He got up and waved it at Mr. Forbes to keep him away. In doing so, he hit Forbes on the arm with the knife and stabbed him in the chest apparently twice from the description of the injuries to the chest.

While this was happening, Archie Gonzales, the brother, came out of the building with the friend he had gone to get. Mr. Forbes, who had just been stabbed in the chest, turned away from the accused and was heading towards Archie. At that point, the accused stabbed him in the back.

When the police arrived on the scene, which I take it was shortly after this, having received a complaint that there was fighting, it was noted that the knife was sticking out of Mr. Forbes' back and the blade was

1.8

completely embedded in the back.

Mr. Forbes was taken to the hospital where he was in intensive care for four days and then remained in the hospital for another four days.

He had two stab wounds to the side of his chest and one to his lower back near his spine, as well as a slash wound to his forearm which punctured a vein and required stitches. The wounds to the side of the chest resulted in a punctured lung, punctured diaphragm, and puncture to the top of his liver. A tube had to be surgically inserted to drain blood from between his lungs and the wall of his chest.

Crown counsel advised that Mr. Forbes still has scars on his skin from the injuries and that this event has continued to have an impact on him and his parents. He has not provided a Victim Impact Statement which of course he is not obliged to do.

Counsel for Mr. Gonzales stated that the accused was not drunk when this event happened but was feeling the effects of the alcohol he had consumed.

Mr. Gonzales is said to have been afraid for himself and his friend Zaragoza and also afraid that Mr. Forbes was going to attack his brother Archie when Mr. Forbes went toward Archie just before Mr. Gonzales stabbed him in the back.

Mr. Gonzales was arrested on the date in question and held in custody for nine days before he was

released on conditions. For most of that time, he has been subject to a condition that he not leave his residence.

As to Mr. Gonzales' personal circumstances, he is 22 years old. He has a high school education and has completed a restaurant management course. He came to Canada from the Philippines in 1997 with his family. He has no criminal record.

Seventeen letters were submitted on his behalf at the sentencing hearing. It appears from those letters that Mr. Gonzales comes from a family that is well respected, especially in the Philippine community in Yellowknife.

Mr. Gonzales has taken part in community and cultural events, in particular, chorographing and taking part in dance performances. He was described by the manager at the cafe he worked at for three years as an "exemplary employee".

Many of the letters express shock that
Mr. Gonzales could have done what he has now pleaded
guilty to and they speak of his good character and say
that he is quiet and well mannered. I accept that this
incident is out of character for him.

Mr. Gonzales' family is also supportive of him.

When asked in court whether he wished to say anything, Mr. Gonzales apologized to the victim and stated that he is deeply sorry.

He waived the preliminary hearing and, as I have said, he has pleaded guilty. That means that he is taking responsibility for what he did and I take that into account.

During counsel's submissions yesterday, there was some discussion as to whether this incident was a consensual fight or a confrontation, and they had different views on how it should be characterized. Having reflected upon that, I don't think anything turns on it. I have to sentence Mr. Gonzales on the facts that were placed before me.

It is clear that it was Mr. Zaragoza who first introduced a potential weapon, the crowbar, into what at that point seems to have been nothing more than crude gesturing by Mr. Forbes and his friend. It was then Mr. Gonzales who introduced the knife into the mix when he went to help Mr. Zaragoza.

Notwithstanding that Mr. Gonzales initially had the knife with him to use in his work, which I accept, I infer from the fact that he showed it to his friend in the vehicle that he must have had at least some thought about using it in the fight.

It's not clear to me exactly how the fight between Mr. Gonzales and Mr. Forbes started. Other than the reference in the Agreed Statement of Facts to Mr. Gonzales being on the ground at one point and the fact that his counsel stated that he is a slighter man

than Mr. Forbes physically, there is no evidence that he was being badly beaten or that he sustained any injuries. He pulled out the knife however and he used it, not just once but three or four times.

This is not a case of self-defence. Mr. Gonzales was not being attacked or assaulted when he first decided to get involved in the fighting. He had other options. He could have gone for the police.

His brother was not being attacked when Mr. Gonzales stabbed Mr. Forbes in the back. I do accept that Mr. Gonzales was afraid for his brother and himself but he badly overreacted to those fears.

The street fighting, or brawling, that was going on in this case unfortunately happens all too often. When someone decides to get involved and introduces a weapon into the scene, especially when there is liquor involved, matters are bound to escalate with serious and sometimes fatal consequences.

The crime for which Mr. Gonzales has been convicted is a very serious offence. The Criminal Code provides that a person convicted of the offence of aggravated assault can receive up to 14 years in jail.

In my view, there is no question that for an offence involving the use of a knife and serious injury, a jail sentence is usually considered appropriate, in particular, to show how the community condemns this type of conduct and to deter others, as

well as the accused, from committing this type of crime.

The Crown has submitted a sentence of two years less a day to be served in jail is appropriate.

Ms. Charbonneau has indicated that the Crown would be seeking a lengthier term if it were not for the guilty plea and the fact that the victim has not had to testify.

Defence counsel, Mr. Gorin, has submitted that the Court should consider a suspended sentence with probation or, if a jail sentence is deemed appropriate, then one that can be served in the community subject to conditions rather than in jail. That is what is called a conditional sentence.

First, in my view, a suspended sentence would not be appropriate in this case.

The <u>Chivers</u> case decided by Mr. Justice de Weerdt in this court in 1988, and relied on by Mr. Gorin, was a case with radically different facts from this one, and a suspended sentence is not usually imposed in cases of violence.

I do think a sentence of less than two years is justified in this case. That means that I can consider whether it should be a conditional sentence.

The law does not restrict conditional sentences to non-violent offences. Many cases have been submitted to me by counsel where courts across this country have

imposed conditional sentences for a variety of offences including those involving violence.

I have reviewed the cases submitted. Each case is different and turns very much on its own facts.

The use of conditional sentences has been much debated and different courts have expressed different views. It is hoped that the Supreme Court of Canada will provide some guidelines when it hands down a judgment in the cases now pending before it.

Until then, in the Northwest Territories, the Brady case from the Alberta Court of Appeal, whose members make up the majority of the Northwest Territories Court of Appeal, must be considered the most persuasive.

In <u>Brady</u>, the majority of the Court concluded that a conditional sentence would not ordinarily be available for those offences where the paramount consideration is denunciation and deterrence. I do not understand that to be restricted to offences such as sexual assault and spousal assault where the Court has specifically said that the considerations that I have just mentioned will be paramount. In my view, it applies to all cases where denunciation and deterrence are the primary concerns.

In <u>Brady</u>, the Court also stated the view that a sentence served in jail is likely to be more of a deterrent than one served in the community even when

one considers that offenders are paroled before the end of their sentences in jail, something that the Court has no control of in most cases. I think that is a realistic view. When I say the Court has no control over in most cases, I am simply referring to certain provisions that in certain cases that permit the Court to delay consideration of parole.

As pointed out by Mr. Gorin, the Criminal Code does require that all available sanctions other than imprisonment that are reasonable in the circumstances must be considered for all offenders.

In the recent case of <u>Gladue</u>, the Supreme Court of Canada said that those words do not alter the fundamental duty of a sentencing Judge to impose a sentence that is fit for the offence and the offender.

Sentencing has to contribute to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful, and safe society. The fundamental principle of sentencing is that the sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the sentence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

I have already said that this was a very serious offence. Mr. Gonzales' responsibility for it is clear notwithstanding that others were fighting too.

I have given this case a great deal of thought since yesterday's hearing. While I have no doubt that Mr. Gonzales, with his past good character, his lack of

a criminal record, and his remorse, is the type of person for whom a conditional sentence should be considered, I am troubled by the facts of the case, the way and the number of times the knife was used. To permit a conditional sentence, I would have to be satisfied that the safety of the community would not be endangered and that requirement has caused me some hesitation for the reasons that I have just mentioned.

On the whole, there is nothing really unusual about the circumstances of this case. Above all, however, I am not persuaded that a conditional sentence would be proportional to the gravity of the offence or that it would be effective to discourage others who would take up weapons.

This case does remind me somewhat of a case that I dealt with early last year, The Queen and Andrew

Michael Diveky CR 03521. There are differences between the two cases but the essential facts are similar - groups of young men out on the street here in Yellowknife start off with words and then fists and then someone brings a weapon into the fight.

In Mr. Diveky's case it was a two-by-four and two people were injured. I sentenced him to a year in jail which was in addition to some remand time that he had already served.

The sentence I impose must take into account the guilty plea, the remorse shown by Mr. Gonzales, and his

personal circumstances and I do take all of those things into account.

Stand up please, Mr. Gonzales.

Mr. Gonzales, I have no doubt that this terrible incident has been very upsetting for Mr. Forbes and his family and also for you and your family. The responsibility for that is yours. It's not this Court's task to forgive those who commit crimes. My task is simply to decide what the appropriate sentence is. It's really only good luck that the injuries that you inflicted with the knife were not even more serious or lasting. I sincerely hope and I expect that you will be able to turn things around and live up to the good character that so many people spoke about in the letters that were filed.

First of all, the knife that was used will be destroyed by the RCMP at the expiry of the appeal period if there is no appeal.

There will be a firearm prohibition order in the usual terms pursuant to Section 100 of the Criminal Code beginning today and expiring ten years from your release from imprisonment. As I haven't heard anything about any firearms, I will make the order that any such items that would be covered by the order be surrendered forthwith.

There will be no Victim of Crimes surcharge in the circumstances, and the sentence that I impose on you is

1	20 months in jail.	
2	You may sit down.	
3	Is there anything further, counsel?	
4	MS. CHARBONNEAU:	Not from the Crown, My Lady.
5	MR. GORIN:	No, My Lady.
6	THE COURT:	Thank you very much. We will close
7	court.	
8	(ADJOURNMENT)	
9	(AT WHICH TIME THE O	RAL REASONS FOR SENTENCE CONCLUDED)
10		Certified pursuant to Rule 723 of the Supreme Court Rules.
11		or the papreme court hares.
12		
13		
14		V he will
15		Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		