ylw

R. v. Ipeelee, 2001 NWTSC 33

CR 03837

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

### HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

· vs. -



### MANASIE IPEELEE

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on March 16 A.D., 2001.

## APPEARANCES:

Ms. B. Schmaltz:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd:

Counsel for the Accused



THE COURT: The offender Manasie Ipeelee was convicted in September 2000 of a serious sexual assault causing bodily harm to the victim. The subject offence was committed only a few months after Mr. Ipeelee was released from penitentiary where he had served a full penitentiary term for

another violent sexual assault.

Following his most recent conviction, the Crown sought and obtained an order of the Court directing a psychiatric assessment of the offender for purposes of a possible application to have the offender declared to be either a dangerous offender or a long-term offender under the provisions of Part 24 of the Criminal Code.

Dr. Dickey's report was filed with the Court on December 1st, 2000, and now the Crown has advanced its application to have the offender declared to be a long-term offender under Section 753.1 of the Criminal Code.

I shall review aspects of Mr. Ipeelee's history of criminal behaviour in the context of the Crown submission that the evidence shows a certain pattern of repetitive behaviour as contemplated by Section 753.1(2)(b) of the Criminal Code.

The Crown seeks a finding of long-term offender and if that is granted, seeks a sentence of ten years' imprisonment for the predicate offence

followed by another ten years of supervision in the community.

The offender is an Inuk who was born and raised in Iqaluit, Nunavut. He is now 29 years of age. His mother died when he was only five years old and he was raised by his maternal grandparents. He has had a dysfunctional lifestyle since his early teens. He dropped out of school in Grade 7 or 8.

In the past ten to 12 years, he has been in and out of Youth Court, Adult Court, young offenders' facilities and adult correctional facilities and penitentiary.

Despite his age, he has no employment history.

By his own admission, he has been a chronic abuser of drugs, particularly alcohol, throughout his youth and adult life.

Although his first language is Inuktitut, he is now capable of functioning in the English language.

He had approximately three dozen convictions as a young offender. Most of those convictions were for property offences such as break and enter and theft and joyriding with snowmobiles. His youth record however does display a disregard for the property rights of other people, and the breaches of probation and escape custody convictions display a lack of respect for court orders and for authority generally.

Those types of offences; that is, property offences, breach of court orders, and escape custody, continued into his adult years. However, he also started venturing into crimes of violence, and I now refer to those crimes in particular.

In December 1992, the offender pleaded guilty to assault causing bodily harm. At the time of the incident, the offender was intoxicated. He and a friend beat up a man who was refusing them entrance to his home. During the fight, the offender hit the victim over the head with an ashtray and also with a chair causing injury to the victim. For this particular crime, the offender received a sentence of 21 days imprisonment.

In December 1993, the offender again pleaded guilty to assault causing bodily harm. This incident occurred outside a bar in Iqaluit. The offender was intoxicated. His victim was extremely intoxicated. During the fight, the offender was seen to kick the victim in the face at least ten times and to continue kicking the victim in the face and punching him in the mouth when the victim was unconscious and not resisting. The victim sustained injuries and was hospitalized. Mr. Ipeelee received a sentence of five months imprisonment. At the time of this offence, he was on a period of probation.

In November 1994, Mr. Ipeelee pleaded guilty to

aggravated assault. This crime also arose from an altercation outside the same bar in Iqaluit between an intoxicated Manasie Ipeelee and an intoxicated victim. Again, Mr. Ipeelee administered many blows and kicks to a helpless victim and with full force stomped on the victim's face. The victim's face was swollen beyond recognition, and he suffered a broken jaw and had to be sent to Montreal for treatment.

Mr. Ipeelee received a sentence of 14 months imprisonment. At the time of committing this serious assault, he was on a period of probation.

Mr. Ipeelee obtained early release from his 14 month sentence in the fall of 1995. Approximately three weeks later, while still technically serving his sentence, he committed a serious crime of sexual assault. The female victim had been drinking in her apartment in Iqaluit with Mr. Ipeelee and others and passed out from intoxication. Mr. Ipeelee and another man were seen carrying her into her bedroom. Mr. Ipeelee was later seen having sex with the unconscious victim in her bed. For this crime, Mr. Ipeelee received a sentence of 24 months imprisonment in April 1996. He also received other consecutive sentences for other matters for a total sentence in excess of 33 months.

He served every day of that sentence as the Corrections Canada officials deemed him to be a high

risk to reoffend if he was given early release.

I have reviewed the contents of the many progress summaries, program assessments, and performance reports on the Corrections Canada files between 1996 and 1999 that have been filed as exhibits on this hearing.

Those reports describe various programs and courses that were accessed by Mr. Ipeelee during his incarceration and some that were refused by him.

It appears that there were periods of time when Mr. Ipeelee was in denial with respect to his sexual assault conviction and other periods when he was able to gain insight into his dysfunctional life and antisocial behaviour.

Throughout his incarceration, he seemed to acknowledge that he was an alcoholic and also that he was unable to control his violent behaviour when he drank alcohol.

One of the many professionals or counsellors who dealt with him prior to his release in February 1999 stated simply, in layman's terms, that Mr. Ipeelee was a low risk to reoffend if he stayed clean and sober but if he reverted back to substance abuse, he was a high risk to reoffend.

Mr. Ipeelee decided to relocate to Yellowknife upon serving his sentence rather than to return to his home community of Iqaluit.

Just prior to his release on February 5th,
1999, the area director of Corrections Services of
Canada wrote to the RCMP in Yellowknife to advise of
this offender's pending arrival in Yellowknife. In
that letter, it was stated,

"While incarcerated, this offender has made limited progress in programming and has not addressed his sexual behaviour in any way. His criminal history indicates that alcohol is regularly involved in his offences. He is considered a high risk to reoffend since he has not completed sex offender programming."

Evidence before me indicates that Mr. Ipeelee was drinking within one half hour of arriving in Yellowknife. He was arrested for public intoxication on the evening of the very day that he arrived in Yellowknife following his release from penitentiary, and again 24 hours later. In the next six months, he was arrested at least nine more times for public intoxication.

On August 21st, 1999, he committed the predicate offence of sexual assault causing bodily harm which led to his conviction and to the present Crown application.

Although for a few months after he came to Yellowknife he lived in an apartment, by August 21st he was homeless and living on the street.

On the evening in question, he was again

intoxicated. He went into an abandoned van located behind the homeless shelter, a van that was apparently regularly used by the homeless. In that van, the victim was sleeping.

Mr. Ipeelee's victim this time was a 50-year-old woman who, by her own description, was a homeless person or street person.

She testified that she had been drinking with friends on the day in question and by the early evening, she was more tired than intoxicated. She went to sleep on a mattress in that van. She awoke to find Manasie Ipeelee taking her pants off. She struggled with him, a fight ensued. He was punching her on the face. She tried to get away from him but he pulled her back onto the mattress. She cried out for help but he told her to shut up or he would kill her. He then raped her.

The victim was able to escape after Mr. Ipeelee fell asleep. The police were called and the victim was taken to the hospital to be treated for her injuries.

She had lacerations to her forehead and lip, which required sutures, and abrasions to her arms and legs.

Mr. Ipeelee was arrested at the scene and has been in custody since that time, a period of 19 months.

This summary of Mr. Ipeelee's crimes of violence shows a consistent pattern of Mr. Ipeelee administering gratuitous violence against vulnerable, helpless people while he is in a state of intoxication.

It is clear that society must be protected from him, that it is absolutely necessary to take steps to control his behaviour. This means, at a minimum, keeping him in a controlled environment such as a correctional facility for a substantial period of years where he can possibly receive treatment and presumably where he has no access to alcohol.

Dr. Robert Dickey is a forensic psychiatrist from Toronto, Ontario who gave opinion evidence at this hearing. Dr. Dickey has a great deal of experience working with high-risk offenders in the federal penitentiary system, in risk assessment testing, and in diagnosing mental disorders. Dr. Dickey has given expert testimony in this jurisdiction and other jurisdictions on dangerous offender and long-term offender applications.

Dr. Dickey made a psychiatric assessment of Manasie Ipeelee and his written assessment report is filed as Exhibit S-3 on this hearing. He supplemented that written report with viva voce testimony.

It is Dr. Dickey's opinion that Mr. Ipeelee

does not suffer from any major mental illness. His intelligence level is average to above average.

Dr. Dickey is of the view, however, that
Mr. Ipeelee does suffer from both an antisocial
personality disorder and an alcohol abuse disorder.
His alcohol abuse disorder is quite severe in Dr.
Dickey's view.

Dr. Dickey does not diagnose Mr. Ipeelee has having any specific sexual disorder.

Dr. Dickey scored Mr. Ipeelee on a number of risk measures. One of those is the Psychopathy Checklist Revised, PCL-R.

This instrument is a kind of codification of the experts' knowledge or understanding of psychopathy. It has been accepted by professional psychiatrists in North America as being valid and reliable in assessing the criminality of individuals and specifically their willingness to be exploitative interpersonally and the extent of their internal controls.

Use of this PCL-R checklist is simply an attempt to define how closely an individual resembles the ideal psychopath.

The perfect psychopath would score 40 out of 40 but an individual would usually be diagnosed as psychopath with a score of 30 or more.

Manasie Ipeelee's score on this instrument is

22.1. This places him just below the average score for federal penitentiary inmates. Dr. Dickey does not diagnose Manasie Ipeelee as a psychopath.

Dr. Dickey also employed a number of actuarial tools in measuring Mr. Ipeelee's risk of reoffending. In particular, he utilized actuarial instruments known as Risk Assessment Guide, the Sex Offender Risk Assessment Guide, and the Static 99.

These instruments indicated to Dr. Dickey that Mr. Ipeelee represents a high moderate to high risk for violent reoffence and a high moderate risk for sexual reoffence.

Quite apart from these actuarial results, it is Dr. Dickey's opinion that, without intervention with respect to Mr. Ipeelee's alcohol consumption, his risk of committing further violent offences is high and his risk of committing further sexual offences is at least moderate.

Dr. Dickey makes this independent diagnosis based on his own review of the file materials and on his extensive interviews with Manasie Ipeelee. As the good doctor indicated, these statistical models, or actuarial tools, do not and should not replace using one's simple common sense.

I find merit in that statement and for my part,

I am in general agreement with the doctor's opinions
with respect to the probability of Manasie Ipeelee

reoffending in the foreseeable future.

Dr. Dickey is of the view that there is a reasonable possibility of eventual control or reduction of the risk of Mr. Ipeelee's reoffending in the community following a lengthy period of incarceration if there is comprehensive supervision in the community. And by that, he means if there are the resources in the community for proper supervision of Mr. Ipeelee. For example, he suggests that any breaches in his alcohol abstention condition would have to be seriously and immediately dealt with as this is the major risk factor for serious violent or sexual reoffending by Manasie Ipeelee.

Dr. Dickey says that Manasie Ipeelee needs to be highly supervised with respect to consuming alcohol.

In addition to Dr. Dickey's report and testimony, I have had the benefit of the trial testimony, Mr. Ipeelee's testimony on this hearing, and the many documents from the Corrections Services Canada files referred to earlier.

Taking into consideration all of that evidence, I am convinced that there is a substantial risk that Manasie Ipeelee will reoffend. Indeed, if he has access to alcohol, it is as certain as night follows day.

For the protection of the public, it is necessary to separate him from society for a lengthy period of time. After that, I am satisfied that his risk of reoffending when in the community can be controlled with appropriate conditions of long-term supervision.

The evidence before me, in particular the circumstances of the five specific crimes of violence that I have referred to, shows a pattern of repetitive behaviour by Mr. Ipeelee indicating a likelihood that he will cause injury or harm to other members of the community in the future.

As to the predicate offence, it almost goes without saying that any fit and appropriate sentence for that crime would be well in excess of two years' imprisonment.

With these findings, I am of the view that the criteria or prerequisites under subsection (1) of Section 753.1 of the *Criminal Code* are present in this case. And for purposes of those statutory provisions, I find Manasie Ipeelee to be a "long-term offender".

I exercise my judicial discretion in that regard after taking into consideration Mr. Ipeelee's personal circumstances, the circumstances of his criminal offences, and the principles of sentencing enumerated in the *Criminal Code*.

As I understand counsel's submissions,

Mr. Ipeelee does not take issue with the proposition
that he requires long-term supervision in the
community following the serving of his sentence for
the predicate offence. The thrust of his counsel's
submissions is directed to the duration of the
determinate sentence to be imposed for the predicate
offence under Section 753.1(3)(a).

I accordingly turn now to the issue of the appropriate duration of the period of incarceration for the predicate offence.

In the determination of this part of the Court's disposition, the Court is again bound by the purpose, objectives, and principles of sentencing that are set forth in the *Criminal Code* and in precedent case law.

As Mr. Ipeelee's predicate offence is sadly of a kind that is all too prevalent in this jurisdiction, denunciation and deterrence are particularly important principles.

Mr. Ipeelee's sentence for the sexual assault of August 1999 must be proportionate to the gravity of that crime and to Mr. Ipeelee's degree of responsibility for it. In this regard, his intoxication at the time is no excuse. This is a man who was consistently told during his 33 months of federal incarceration and who consistently himself

acknowledged that his drinking of alcohol would lead to the commission of an offence and yet he was into the booze within one half hour of getting off the plane, and he continued to drink regularly until he committed this offence six months later.

I have already referred to the fundamental need to provide protection for the public from violent behaviour.

It is an aggravating circumstance here that in committing this offence, Mr. Ipeelee took advantage of a sleeping, vulnerable victim.

Although his victim did not wish to present a formal Victim Impact Statement to the Court on this sentencing hearing, I am advised through Crown counsel that the victim has yet to put this horrible ordeal behind her and still suffers serious emotional trauma whenever she is reminded of it.

Mr. Ipeelee's criminal record is also an aggravating feature, in particular, the succession of violent crime since 1992.

I specifically take note of the fact that Mr. Ipeelee has been in remand custody for 19 months already and must be given substantial credit for that time.

Mr. Ipeelee is an aboriginal offender however he had only limited exposure to the lifestyle of the Inuit in his formative years living with his

grandparents. When Mr. Ipeelee testified at this hearing, he did say that he wants to eventually reconnect with family members and with his culture. He is also aware of a new program and new facility for Inuit offenders in Gravenhurst, Ontario, and he is seeking to have access to that program. I also made particular note of that part of his evidence where he was attempting to correct an erroneous impression, he says, in the file documentation that he was abused in any way by his grandparents. He says that he was not, that his grandparents did try to teach him between right and wrong, and that it was he and he alone who was responsible for getting into trouble as a young person.

I will mention one further consideration that, in my view, comes into play in the sentencing process and that is that a period of incarceration for an offender should be no longer than is necessary in order to give effect to the purpose and objectives of the sentencing process.

Please stand now, Mr. Ipeelee.

Manasie Ipeelee, for the crime of sexual assault causing bodily harm committed by you on August 21st, 1999, it is the sentence of the Court, firstly, that you be imprisoned for a period of six years.

I further order that you be supervised in the

1 community for a period of ten years after you have finished serving your term of imprisonment in 2 accordance with Section 753.2 of the Criminal Code 3 and with the Corrections and Conditional Release 4 Act. I make the usual firearms prohibition order 6 under Section 109 of the Criminal Code. Any such item in your possession at this time shall be 8 9 surrendered to a police officer forthwith. The DNA order requested by the Crown will 10 issue. 11 There will be no Victim Fine surcharge in the 12 circumstances. 13 And pursuant to Section 760 of the Criminal 14 Code, I order that a transcript of the hearing and 15 the trial and copies of all exhibits be forwarded to 16 the Correctional Service of Canada for its 17 information. 18 You may sit down. 19 THE CLERK: The firearms prohibition is ten 20 21 years, Your Honour? THE COURT: 22 Yes. I want to thank counsel for their assistance in 23 this case. 24 25 MS. SCHMALTZ: Sir, just to correct the record actually, I had said this morning that the 26 27 DNA order was mandatory.

```
1
                 Being that the offence was committed before the
 2
            legislation came into effect, it is not a mandatory
 3
            order. The Crown is still requesting it though.
        THE COURT:
                                It is a different section of the
            Code.
 5
 6
        MS. SCHMALTZ:
                                Yes.
 7
        THE COURT:
                                Is there any submissions on that
 8
            point?
 9
        MR. BOYD:
                                 No, sir, I am aware of the
10
            privacy and other issues that can be raised.
11
            don't think on the fact base here that it would be a
12
            point to raising those.
13
        THE COURT:
                                No, I am satisfied that there is
14
            merit in the DNA sample order going. It is just that
15
            it is, you're right, a different section of the
            Code.
16
17
       MS. SCHMALTZ:
                                I did have a draft order
18
            prepared, unfortunately I neglected to bring it with
19
                I will forward it to Mr. Boyd for his approval
20
            and then send it to the Court.
                                Fine, thank you. We will close
21
       THE COURT:
22
            court.
23
        (AT WHICH TIME THE ORAL REASONS FOR SENTENCE CONCLUDED)
24
25
26
27
```

1	Certified pursuant to Rule 723
2	Certified pursuant to Rule 723 of the Supreme Court Rules.
3	
4	
5	
6	Lewil
7	Leis Hewitt, Court Reporter
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
1	