R. v. Chocolate, 2001 NWTSC 10

CR 3839, 3840

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

SUPREME COUPY ON THE NAME OF T

- V-

TONY CHOCOLATE aka BLACKDUCK

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgement on a Change of Venue Application held before The Honourable Justice P. Chrumka, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 30th day of November, A.D. 2000.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J. O'Halloran:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. A. Mahar:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT:

This is an application by the Crown to order a change of venue for the trial which is to commence in December, as I understand it, the 11th of December, the charges against the accused are set out in the indictment and they involve a number of persons and witnesses from the area in which the offence is alleged to have been committed; namely, Rae.

Clearly trials should be held in the jurisdiction in which the offence is alleged to have been committed. Of course the Criminal Code provides that in certain circumstances the venue may be changed and the trial be held in another jurisdiction if it appears expedient to the ends of justice. The trial, of course, must be held in the same Territorial division.

In this case the Crown has called viva voce evidence as well as referred to transcripts of prior proceedings and to various judgments from judges who sit and try matters in the Northwest Territories. In fact, most of the cases cited in the joint book of authorities are concerned with judgments of Mr. Justices Vertes, I believe Mr. Justice de Weerdt, also a number of judgments of Mr. Justice Richard and of Madam Justice Schuler who is now called Justice rather than Madam Justice.

These cases reflect the manner in which these

applications and which cases are tried in the Northwest Territories in the various small jurisdictions throughout the Northwest Territories. They reflect the matters considered besides the law. They reflect the makeup of the community and certainly deal with the concerns that the persons who apply for a change of venue have. There is also clearly the judgment of Madam Justice Heatherington of our Court of Appeal in the Baker Lake case.

Firstly I would say that as Mr. Justice Vertes noted in his judgment cited to me, he spoke of the makeup of Yellowknife, it being a community predominantly non-aboriginal, but with links and residents of the aboriginal community; namely, the Dogrib community.

And as he mentions in that case, I also note in this one, as submitted by the Crown, there is no cultural perspective to be considered in this particular trial in this particular matter. It isn't a question that would relate to a cultural perspective, it's a question simply of whether or not the offence charged in the indictment having been committed and by whom they have been committed.

The authorities do summarize what matters must be taken into consideration in determining whether or not there should be a change of venue and clearly they reflect that the presence or absence of

2.7

prejudicial publicity or notoriety is a serious consideration, the degree to which there is this prejudice, and the degree to which there is this notoriety. The divisiveness in the community is another matter. Whether there is hostility toward the accused or toward any of the witnesses.

There appears in this case before me, from the evidence of Sergeant Wharton, that there is considerable hostility toward the accused by some of the members of the Rae community, that they do not wish him to return to live there. There is no evidence of any wide-spread sympathy for anyone in this particular case, be it witnesses or the parties involved who were the victims. There is expressed, on behalf of at least two persons, that is witnesses in this case, a fear of the accused personally, a fear of intimidation or harassment of themselves or their families in the event that they're required to testify in Rae. Their fears are lessened by a prospect of having the matter heard in another jurisdiction.

There has been contact with these witnesses by persons who suggested, in one case being the accused himself who suggested on the telephone, that a particular witness not testify or tell the police nothing, and also there is evidence in the transcripts of other proceedings that were had

against an accused person who had contact with the witnesses in Yellowknife and the conviction resulting thereof.

I'm satisfied, in this case, there is considerable considerable notoriety and there is considerable divisiveness in the community of Rae over this case. This case, according to the officer, that is Sergeant Wharton, is a topic of conversation. It is something that the community is aware of, and which the community is divided on.

There is an issue of security and it's a valid consideration. It may be that even though the accused wants to have his trial there, I must consider the prejudice that would work against him if he were to be shackled in full view of not only the spectators, but in full view of the jury. Further, if the jury knows of his background and the fact that he has been convicted on a number of occasions and convicted, in fact, by a jury in Rae Edzo, I must take that into consideration when considering whether or not there is the possibility of prejudice working to the accused's disadvantage by having his trial in Rae-Edzo even if he wishes to have it there.

A matter such as that where the whole community knows the history of each party is something that can not, in my view, be totally dealt with on an application to challenge a juror for cause.

If the divisiveness is as described, the notoriety is as described, in my view, the accused is entitled to have a trial elsewhere, and he certainly would get it in this case if he would be asking for it.

And one of the concerns that I must have is, can the accused have a fair trial in Rae-Edzo? already spoken of the matters and, in my view, it is difficult for me to say that on what I have heard that he could have a fair trial there. By that I don't mean that people wouldn't try their very best to be honest, but the problem is that there is this notoriety that's been expressed by Sergeant Wharton from persons he's contacted and spoken with and who have contacted him and who have raised the subject with him without his prompting. There is polarization. There is the question of security and there is the fear that certain witnesses have of intimidation and harassment of themselves or their families, and for all of those reasons, I grant the application. The change of venue application is granted, the matter will be tried in Yellowknife beginning the 11th of December. Anything further today?

25 MR. MAHAR: Thank you, My Lord, no.

26 THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'll leave you

27 the files.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE CLERK:	Thank you.
THE COURT:	We will adjourn until 10 o'clock
tomorrow mo	rning.
MR. O'HALLORAN:	Fine, thank you.
Cert date Sand	ified pursuant to Practice Direction #20 d December 28, 1987. The property of