## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V-

ERIC PEARSON



Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, sitting in Fort Simpson, in the Northwest Territories, on the 14th day of June, A.D. 2000.

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. J. O'Halloran:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. A. von Kursell:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Mr. Pearson has been convicted now of the offence of aggravated assault in disfiguring Charles Walker.

The essence of the offence is that Mr. Pearson bit off a good-sized chunk of Mr. Walker's ear. The description that was given by Mr. Gill, who found the piece of ear, was I believe that it was approximately an inch and a half by a quarter inch in size, and certainly from the photograph that was entered as an exhibit, that would appear to be about right.

The result of the bite was that Mr. Walker was disfigured; in other words, he has a very visible abnormality, shall we say, to his ear, but it also caused physical pain to him and, as he's indicated in the victim impact statement, has caused him substantial embarrassment because of the appearance of the ear.

It has also, I note, caused him concern, which I think is quite understandable, in that the danger, the potential danger or the potential consequences of a human bite are well known.

The offence, I'm satisfied, occurred when Mr.

Pearson was angry. He was in the midst of a scuffle with Mr. Walker. I found that Mr. Pearson used excessive force in what he did. In thinking about the facts of the case to some extent, I suppose I would compare it to a bar room brawl. There were

verbal insults, verbal exchanges between these two men, they escalated to physical violence and, as unfortunately all too often happens, somebody goes overboard.

I've been told that Mr. Pearson is 29 years old and he's been working in the logging industry for approximately nine years. From all reports, he's done very well for himself despite a difficult and unsettled childhood. The letter from his employer indicates that he's a hard-working employee, a good employee. He also comes before the Court without any previous criminal record which is to his credit.

The fact that Mr. Pearson exercised his right to a trial is not to be held against him. He simply doesn't get the benefit or mitigation of a guilty plea. I suppose that it's unfortunate in some ways for both Mr. Walker and Mr. Pearson that this matter wasn't dealt with at an earlier date, it's been over a year since the offence happened, I'm not going to draw any particular conclusions in that regard, but it just seems to me to be the type of offence that should probably have been dealt with earlier and I think I'll just leave it at that.

This is a serious offence, the consequences have been serious for Mr. Walker. I am satisfied that Mr. Pearson has expressed remorse.

Mr. Walker testified that Mr. Pearson apologized

to him and Crown counsel also confirmed that Mr. Pearson paid Mr. Walker \$500 towards his lost wages.

Aggravated assault is an offence for which the maximum sentence that the Court can impose, in other words in any case of aggravated assault, is 14 years in jail which is an indication of how seriously Parliament considers it.

At the same time, it has to be acknowledged that aggravated assault covers a very wide range of criminal activity and I think that counsel have essentially and correctly acknowledged this in their submissions; in other words, that it's difficult to compare one case to another.

In this case, I take into account that the offence occurred, as I said, in the course of an altercation between these two men; one of whom, Mr. Walker, was drunk; and the other, Mr. Pearson, I find was upset and angry. Mr. Pearson knew that Mr. Walker was drunk. Mr. Pearson was not drunk and was in a better position to resolve their differences or to stop things or to avoid things escalating without becoming physical.

I am satisfied, however, that the biting occurred in the heat of the moment, the heat of the struggle, and that it was not premeditated beyond the act itself.

As I've indicated, it was, however, a dangerous

act and I don't think there can be any question of that. It was dangerous and it resulted in serious consequences.

Nothing in the evidence suggests that Mr.

Pearson is likely to commit this type of offence
again or that he is otherwise a danger to society.

However, the case clearly calls for a sentence that
will demonstrate that this type of behavior is not
acceptable and that it will bring significant
consequences.

In all the circumstances, I think that a term of incarceration is called for, although in my view something less than what the Crown has submitted will suffice. Mr. Pearson's employment appears to be somewhat flexible and seasonal, and in all the circumstances I'm not going to make the sentence intermittent.

Would you stand please, Mr. Pearson. I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of two months. I also make a restitution order and, counsel, what I'm going to do is make the restitution order under Section 738(1)(b) of the Criminal Code so that there will be not a probation order, this will simply be an order for restitution and I take it I should deduct the \$500 from the 2000, is that -- that's what I understood.

MR. O'HALLORAN: The 2,240.

```
1
       THE COURT:
                           Well, there has already been an order
            for 240, so I take it that order stands. That's what
 2
 3
            you told me, I didn't see -- you can sit down, Mr.
            Pearson.
 4
       MR. O'HALLORAN:
                           I understand the order was made, but
 6
            it hasn't been fulfilled. I'm suggesting that you
            make it as part of the restitution order, the
            gentlemen won't be required to pay it twice
 8
 9
            obviously, but if you put the order then he should
10
           have to pay it.
11
       THE COURT:
                           Do you have any comments, Mr. von
12
            Kursell?
13
      MR. VON KURSELL: This court can adopt, I assume, just
14
           given its paramountcy, the order of the inferior
15
           court, adopt and endorse, it can all be put into one.
16
           These orders can be accumulated, and the difficulty
17
           with the last order with relation -- was to provide
18
           some assistance to Mr. Pearson as to through whom or
19
           how restitution is to be made. That would be
20
           satisfactory in my submission.
21
      THE COURT:
                          All right. Then if it's $2,240, is
           the $500 to come off of that?
22
23
      MR. O'HALLORAN: I would suggest that would be
24
           appropriate, yes.
25
      THE COURT:
                          All right, that would be 1740 then?
26
      MR. O'HALLORAN:
                          Yes, Madam.
27
      THE COURT:
                          All right, there will be a restitution
```

```
1
            order in the amount of $1,740. That is -- I suppose
 2
            it should be paid to the clerk of the court for
 3
            furtherance to Mr. Walker?
 4
       MR. VON KURSELL:
                            If it please the Court.
       THE COURT:
 5
                            Would you concur with that, Mr.
 6
            O'Halloran?
 7
       MR. O'HALLORAN:
                            Yes.
 8
       THE COURT:
                            All right, it will be paid that way
 9
            then.
                  The victim of crime surcharge will be waived
10
            in the circumstances. The section of the Criminal
11
            Code requires that a firearm prohibition order be
12
            made, and since I have not heard any reason why it
13
            should not be made I will, therefore, make an order
14
            under Section 109 of the Criminal Code that Mr.
15
            Pearson is prohibited from possessing firearms,
16
            ammunition, explosive substances or anything else
17
            referred to in Section 109 for a period of time that
18
            starts today and expires ten years from his release
19
            from imprisonment.
20
                 Now, is there anything that I've overlooked or
21
            should be addressed?
22
       MR. VON KURSELL:
                           Would Your Ladyship consider an
23
            endorsement on the Warrant of Committal for the time
24
            to be served at the South Slave Correctional Center?
25
            It would be more proximate to his family.
26
       THE COURT:
                           Well that's, of course, completely up
27
            to the correctional authorities, but I have no
```

1	difficulty. I'll direct the clerk to endorse the
2	warrant to recommend that Mr. Pearson serve his time
3	at the South Slave Correctional Center.
4	MR. VON KURSELL: Thank you, My Lady.
5	THE COURT: Is there anything further then,
6	counsel?
7	MR. VON KURSELL: No, My Lady.
8	MR. O'HALLORAN: No, thank you.
9	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Pearson, I certainly
10	hope you learn from this because, from all accounts,
11	it's really you have a lot of potential, I guess
12	is what it sounds like to me, and to essentially do
13	some damage to your own life by engaging in this type
14	of behavior really doesn't make very much sense. So
15	I certainly hope that we won't see you before the
16	Court again. I take it that completes everything we
17	need to deal with at this assize?
18	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes, it does.
19	MR. VON KURSELL: Yes, My Lady.
20	THE COURT: All right. I wish to thank everyone
21	involved in the court proceedings and we will close
22	court.
23	
2 4	Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987.
25	
26	Madka Disas
27	Sandra Burns R.P.R, C.R.R. Court Reporter