R. v. Lafferty, 1999 NWTSC 14

CR 03703

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -



LOUIS LLOYD LAFFERTY

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice V. A. Schuler, sitting in Hay River, in the Northwest Territories, on the 18th day of November, A.D., 1999.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Scrivens:

Mr. A. von Kursell:

Counsel for the Crown

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Before I sentence you, 1 Mr. Lafferty, is there anything that you would like to say? If so, please stand up. No. THE ACCUSED: Louis Lloyd Lafferty has pleaded THE COURT: quilty to a charge of sexual assault. Briefly stated 6 the facts that were put before me and have been 7 admitted by Mr. Lafferty are that in August of 1998, in the early morning hours after a drinking party, 9 Mr. Lafferty entered the residence where the party had 10 been and sexually assaulted the victim who had been 11 passed out or sleeping with her husband. 12 The sexual assault took place while the husband 13 was in the bathroom. He returned to find the accused 14 having sexual intercourse with his wife, and the 15 circumstances were described to me as involving brief 16 penetration. 17 I have in earlier cases, such as the Martin case 18 that was cited by counsel, rejected the notion that 19 there is any significant distinction between a sexual 20 assault on a sleeping victim and a sexual assault on a 21 victim who is awake and aware of what is happening. 22 I note that in the N. P. case, also cited by 23 counsel, Mr. Justice Richard considered the fact that 24 the victim was passed out and alone, and therefore in 25 what he described as a particularly vulnerable state, 26

27

as an aggravating factor.

In this case I would characterize the sexual assault as a serious and contemptuous intrusion of the victim's personal and physical integrity and privacy. There is no evidence before me of whether the victim has suffered any lasting effects of the assault, although common sense dictates that it must have been extremely upsetting for her to learn what had happened.

I am told that Mr. Lafferty is 37 years old and the father of three young children. He was born and raised and lives in Fort Resolution with his family. He has been steadily employed there and has supported his family.

There is a substantial criminal record which goes back 20 years. It includes convictions for indecent assault on a female in 1979, assault causing bodily harm in 1982, assault causing bodily harm in 1990, and sexual assault in 1991. For this last conviction he received a jail term of three years.

Crown counsel presented a transcript of the sentencing judgement in that case from which it can be seen that the facts were almost identical to this one. The victim in that case was passed out at a drinking party and then awoke to find Mr. Lafferty having sex with her. There are some minor differences in the facts, but in my view they do not detract at all from the conclusion that these were almost identical

offences.

I have to bear in mind that Mr. Lafferty was sentenced for the conviction in 1991. The sentence that I will impose will not be aimed at punishing him again for that earlier offence. I also take into account that his conviction for that offence was eight years ago, although he has unrelated and less serious convictions in the meantime.

so it cannot be said that there is a complete gap in the record, because Mr. Lafferty has continued to come into conflict with the law. The fact that Mr. Lafferty has previously been convicted of, as I have said almost an identical offence, and clearly did not learn from the sentence imposed is significant. It along with the entire record indicates, in my view, that Mr. Lafferty is a threat to the personal safety of others.

There is no evidence before me as to the extent of Mr. Lafferty's intoxication on this occasion. I conclude that he had been drinking, he was at the drinking party. Clearly from the record drinking is a problem in his case; however, whether he was intoxicated or not, clearly as I have said, he is a threat to the safety of others.

This type of sexual assault, by which I mean a sexual assault on a sleeping victim or a victim who is passed out, is not at all uncommon in our society, and

the sentence that I impose must aim at denouncing this type of behavior showing that society, the people in the Northwest Territories, do not accept this type of behavior, and also at discouraging others from committing this type of offence. But in this case it must also deter Mr. Lafferty from repeating this behavior, and as I have indicated, the last sentence of three years did not do that, and in my view therefore something more is required.

In mitigation there is the guilty plea. I do accept that it indicates that Mr. Lafferty is taking responsibility for what he did. It did save the victim from having to testify at trial, although I would simply temper that by noting that it did not save her the stress of expecting to have to testify at trial.

Both counsel acknowledge that a jail term is appropriate in this case. It has not been suggested to me that there is any other suitable option. I am aware that as happens in many of these cases, Mr. Lafferty's family will no doubt suffer by his being incarcerated, especially in light of the difficulties that have come about with the infant.

Mr. Lafferty is the one who will have to bear the responsibility and blame for that. I can only suggest, Mr. Lafferty, that in the future when you are drinking, or even when you are not drinking, and you are about to do something that is likely to result in

your being incarcerated, that you think of your family; not just the effect on them in terms of your being removed from the family, but also think what kind of example you are setting for your children by engaging in this kind of behavior. I am sure you do not want your children to grow up doing the same kind of thing and spending big chunks of their lives in jail.

My task is to do what is required for the protection of the public and the safety of society. I have looked at the cases that were cited by defence counsel, all of the sentences in those cases of course have to be viewed as resulting from a blend of the particular circumstances of those cases and those individuals, and as Mr. von Kursell acknowledged, there is no case on all fours with this one.

I have referred to the factors that in my view are important in this case. Stand up please,
Mr. Lafferty. Having taken into account all of the circumstances, I sentence you to a term of incarceration of four years. There will be no victim of crime surcharge.

I have not heard any submissions on the question of a firearm prohibition order. I do not know counsel whether you want to make submissions.

25 MR. VON KURSELL: I defer to my friend, My Lady.

26 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this:

27 Essentially it follows, and unless Mr. Lafferty falls

```
within the categories that provide that there not be
  1
            such an order, there would in fact be an order.
  2
        MR. SCRIVENS:
                                 That is correct.
       MR. VON KURSELL:
                                 Yes, My Lady. Mr. Lafferty, I
           understand, when he's in his off season does hunt
  5
           regularly with his wife and by himself, and that's
 6
           stemming from his involvement during the six years he
           spent in the bush. This is a means by which he
           augments the family's sustenance when he not employed
 9
10
           in his off seasons.
       THE COURT:
11
                                 You can have a seat,
           Mr. Lafferty. Does the Crown have anything?
12
13
       MR. SCRIVENS:
                                 I have no comment and no position
14
           with respect to it. Section 113 governs this now, and
           it provides an option for delegation of the
15
           responsibility in a sense to the chief firearms officer
16
           to decide under what terms, if any, it's appropriate
17
           for an individual to have access to firearms who is
18
           subject to a prohibition order.
19
20
       MR. VON KURSELL:
                                And we seek that relief, My Lady.
21
       THE COURT:
                                All right.
                                            The order I will make
22
           then is that there will be a firearm prohibition order
23
           that commences today in the usual terms and expires ten
           years from Mr. Lafferty's release from imprisonment.
24
           That order is subject to Section 113 of the Criminal
25
26
           Code.
                  In other words, the application referred to
          under Section 113 may be made by Mr. Lafferty, and I
27
```

1	make that order in consideration of what has been
2	indicated to me about his personal circumstances and in
3	consideration of the fact that there was no firearm
4	involved in the commission of the offence.
5	Now is there anything further, counsel, that I
6	should deal with?
7	MR. VON KURSELL: My Lady, I'm unsure, there wasn't
8	an indication as to location of the sentence. Am I to
9	understand that in the absence that it falls to the
10	federal system?
11	THE COURT: Yes. Actually, Mr. von Kursell, I
12	have no difficulty with that. All I can do of course
13	is make a recommendation, I cannot order where he
14	serves his sentence. But I will ask the clerk or
15	direct the clerk to endorse the warrant to recommend
16	that he be permitted to serve his time in the Northwest
17	Territories, and just for the record the reason why I
18	do that in this case is because of the family
19	situation.
20	MR. VON KURSELL: Thank you, My Lady.
21	MR. SCRIVENS: Nothing further.
22	THE COURT: All right, thank you.
23	
24	Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987
25	
26	fill Touche
27	Joel Bowker Court Reporter