CR 03288

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

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

MICHAEL GABRIEL JONES

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by Justice J.E. Richard, at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 17th day of March, A.D. 1997.

1991

APPEARANCES:

MR. A. REGEL

MR. J. BRYDON:

On behalf of the Crown

On behalf of the Defence

THE COURT: This offender, Michael Gabriel

Jones has pleaded guilty to two counts of breaking and
entering into the residence of his estranged spouse in

May and June last year here in Yellowknife. Each of
these crimes is an offence contrary to Section

348(1)(b) of the Criminal Code and carries a maximum
penalty of life imprisonment. Mr. Jones has been in
custody since late August of last year awaiting trial
on these and other matters.

The crimes committed by Mr. Jones are very serious and are a departure from the usual B&E which comes before the courts in this jurisdiction; that is, because those crimes of B&E arose out of a spousal relationship that went seriously wrong.

The chronology leading to these crimes commence with the final breakdown of the matrimonial relationship in the spring of 1996. From all accounts, it was a bitter ending to that relationship. It is clear that in the ensuing days and weeks this offender was suffering from severe emotional problems.

In April 1996, the offender, Mr. Jones, agreed to move out of the matrimonial home within the month. On May 11th, his spouse, the victim of these crimes, told him to leave the home. On May 13th, the offender, in fact, moved out. The victim then started taking steps to move out herself and to sell the house, she being the legal owner of the house.

At around the time the offender moved out, the victim went to the police and made complaint about a number of things that had occurred during the relationship. As a result, Mr. Jones was arrested and charged and then released on May 29th, 1996. One of the conditions of his release, which is contained in an undertaking which he signed before the officer in charge, was that he keep the peace and be of good behaviour. Another condition was that he was to abstain from any communication or contact with his estranged spouse and to stay away from her residence.

On June 1st, 1996, the victim returned to her residence after an absence of a few days and found that her residence had been trashed. Mr. Jones now admits that it was he who broke into her house by breaking a window at the rear of the house and that it was he who trashed the house. The damage he caused is in the thousands of dollars and is described in an agreed statement of facts in the following terms:

Holes and gouges were made in the drywall in various rooms. Wallpaper and paint was ripped off the walls. Curtains were bleached and sliced. wood trim in some rooms was chipped or hacked. Bleach was poured on the carpet in various rooms. Dressers, chesterfields, the headboard, night table, hutch, mirrors, ironing board, pictures, ornaments and china dishes were smashed. The victim's clothes remaining in the house were stained, bleached and cut up, or ripped. cords to the vacuum cleaner and power nozzle were cut. Dirt from plants was strewn about the house. The house was

252627

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

generally messed up. Messages were written on broken mirrors and the window with caulking.

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

On June 2nd, 1996, a police officer questioned Mr. Jones about the break-in at the victim's residence. At the time, Mr. Jones denied being at the residence and denied any knowledge of the break-in. Two days later, June 4th, Mr. Jones again attended at the victim's residence, again broke into her house in her absence, again caused damage to the house. time he was caught at the scene by the police. main damage done at the time of the second B&E was the opening of paint cans and the spilling of large amounts of paint on the carpet in the living room, family room and two bedrooms. Mr. Jones was arrested at the scene on June 4th but, surprisingly, was released again on June 7th following a bail hearing. The police allege that Mr. Jones committed other crimes in late August and for that reason he was re-arrested and he has been detained in custody since then.

Those are the circumstances of the two break and enters and of his remand into custody. It is said for Mr. Jones that when he committed these crimes he was acting out of revenge, out of anger or rage, and that he was in the throes of severe emotional depression bordering on suicidal tendencies.

In the context of this sentencing process,

however, I view the most significant feature of his behaviour is its result; that is, that he terrorized this woman, a woman he purports to love. He had to know the effect that these rampages would have on her. Quite apart from all of the damage to the household, to cut up someone's personal clothing and leave it for that person to see can only be viewed as a calculated infliction of emotional trauma. It is also indicative of a serious emotional illness, in my respectful opinion, as a lay person.

I am told that the victim, though she has relocated to another jurisdiction, still lives in constant fear, continues to endure real emotional trauma. She says that these incidents have ruined her life. She has yet been unable to sell her house here in Yellowknife and she has suffered financially because of the damage to the house and to her other personal belongings. It is not difficult to see that it will be some time, if ever, that this woman will recover from the emotional trauma inflicted by Mr. Jones' conduct.

As for Michael Gabriel Jones, the offender who is before the court to be sentenced, he, too, clearly suffers from emotional problems. He is a 35-year-old man originally from northern Saskatchewan. He has a Grade 12 education plus additional trades training and business courses. Throughout his adult life, I am told that he has suffered from alcoholism.

Mr. Jones has only one previous criminal conviction in his past and although it is dated, it is not entirely insignificant. In 1984, he was convicted of making threatening phone calls to an ex-girlfriend.

It is clear to the court that Mr. Jones has still a great deal of work to do in dealing with his emotional problems. He did not handle the breakup of his relationship with Miss Stewart in a mature way.

From his words to the court on this sentencing hearing, I am satisfied that he cares very much about the two-year-old daughter that he has from his relationship with Miss Stewart and that he very much wants to see his daughter and participate in her up-bringing in the future. However, that will hardly ever come to pass until he conquers the emotional problems that he is plagued with at this time.

It is to Mr. Jones' credit that in pleading guilty to these break and enters he has taken full responsibility for what he did and he has said publicly that he is truly sorry for his behaviour. He also said that he wants to put these events behind him, to get on with his life, to look forward in a positive way to his future and to spending time in the future with his daughter. I can only wish the best for Mr. Jones in his desire to improve his emotional health and to have a productive and positive life in the future.

My unfortunate task today, however, is to impose

an appropriate sentence for these crimes he has committed.

The circumstances of these crimes are very, very serious, and Mr. Jones must accept that the punishment or the sentence must fit the crime. For the time being, the public, including, Miss Stewart, needs to be protected from Mr. Jones and that is the court's primary consideration in determining the appropriate sentence. Mr. Jones needs some substantial time isolated from the general public to obtain help and to work on his recovery from his emotional problems.

In determining an appropriate term of imprisonment, I am giving some credit to Mr. Jones for his guilty pleas in mitigation of that sentence as he has taken the first step to recovery by acknowledging responsibility for his own conduct, as a mature man.

Upon reflection, I find that I am unable, however, to give any meaningful credit to Mr. Jones for the months that he has spent in remand awaiting disposition of these two charges and other pending charges. First of all, because there were other charges outstanding, it cannot be said that he has been sitting in remand simply because of these two break and enters.

Secondly, and more importantly, Mr. Jones' liberty was restricted awaiting trial or other disposition of these charges through his own flagrant violation of the terms of his bail. The officer in charge of the Yellowknife

police detachment put that specific restriction on him about not visiting his spouse's residence for very good reason. Mr. Jones agreed to that clear condition in order to obtain his freedom on bail. His deliberate breach of that condition within days is the main reason he lost his liberty awaiting trial. In these circumstances, it would not be appropriate to give credit towards the eventual sentence, otherwise the imposition of bail conditions would be futile.

Aggravating features of the circumstances here are the fact that Mr. Jones was on the particular undertaking that he was at the time of the commission of these crimes and also, of course, the repetitive nature of the second offence after being questioned by the police with respect to the first offence.

In all of the circumstances and for these reasons I have mentioned, I am of the view that a meaningful and consecutive sentence is required for each of these crimes.

Would you please stand now, Mr. Jones.

Michael Gabriel Jones, for the crime that you have committed in Count 2, the break and enter between May 25th and June 1st, 1996, it is the sentence of this court that you serve a term of imprisonment of 12 months. On Count 3, for a break and enter committed on June 4th, 1996, it is the sentence of this court that you serve a term of imprisonment of 15 months

1	gongogutive to the gentance g
İ	consecutive to the sentence on Count 2. In the
2	circumstances, there will be no victim fine surcharge.
3	You may sit down now, sir.
4	
5	
6	
7	Certified pursuant to Practice
8	Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987.
9	
10	Annette Wright
11	Annette Wright // Court Reporter
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	