R. v. Ross, 2001 NWTSC 42 S-1-CR2001/001

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Appellant

- and -

## DONALD CHRISTOPHER ROSS

Respondent

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Judgment delivered by The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, at Inuvik, in the Northwest Territories, on May 15th, A.D. 2001.

## APPEARANCES:

R. Gorin, Esq.,

J. O'Halloran, Esq., Counsel for the Appellant Counsel for the Respondent THE COURT:

All right. I will give my decision now in the matter of the Crown appeal of the sentence in the Donald Ross case. There is no doubt at all that the circumstances of the offences to which Mr. Ross pled guilty were very serious and the situation in which he placed all those persons involved a very dangerous one.

The Crown submits that the conditional sentence followed by probation imposed by the sentencing Judge in this case is unfit because of those circumstances and because it fails to serve the principles of denunciation and general deterrence.

The Supreme Court of Canada has, I think, made it clear in the case of <a href="Proulx">Proulx</a>, found at (2000), 140 C.C.C. (3d), page 449, that:

"A conditional sentence can provide significant denunciation and deterrence if sufficiently punitive conditions are imposed and the conditional sentence term is lengthier than would have been imposed as a jail sentence. This is so even where aggravating factors relating to the offence increase the need for denunciation and deterrence."

At the sentencing hearing in this case the Crown

sought a relatively short six to eight-month jail sentence, having elected to proceed by summary conviction. The sentencing Judge chose instead to impose a conditional sentence of 20 months followed by three years' probation. He acknowledged that it was a very difficult case and that the incident was a dangerous one.

A sentencing Judge need not refer to every fact or every consideration, and I do not think that there can be any doubt that he was aware that there was a domestic violence aspect to Mr. Ross's actions.

In imposing the conditional sentence, the sentencing Judge expressed the view that the risk of reoffending with the conditional sentence order was less than it would be under the jail sentence asked for by the Crown.

In my view, the sentencing Judge considered all the relevant factors and carefully crafted a sentence which he felt, based on the material before him, would best protect the public and serve the other principles of sentencing.

Certainly, the sentence he imposed is more onerous, involving, as it does, over four years of supervision over Mr. Ross than eight months in jail, which he would most likely have served less than the full amount of with the usual remission. The length of the conditional sentence order combined with the

probation in this case, in my view, does have a denunciatory and deterrent aspect to it.

I conclude that the sentence in all the circumstances and considering the standard of review and the deference to be given to the sentencing Judge was not demonstrably unfit, save in one respect, and that is the question of house arrest. In my view, house arrest does serve a denunciatory and deterrent purpose and should have been imposed in this case rather than simply a curfew.

As counsel have acknowledged, the 20-month conditional sentence cannot stand, because the maximum on each of the three counts was six months. So I, therefore, vary the conditional sentence to 18 months, being six on each count consecutive.

I also vary the conditional sentence to provide that during the balance of the conditional sentence term Mr. Ross shall remain in his home except for the following purposes: Seeking and engaging in employment, attending Alcoholics Anonymous meetings, taking counselling and any other programs recommended by his supervisor, obtaining medical attention, doing the community service work ordered and meeting with his supervisor.

So the appeal is allowed to that extent, and obviously the curfew condition would, then, be struck and it will be replaced by this house arrest

condition. 1 Now, counsel, I think what you should do is take out an order, a formal order, then, reflecting this and 3 that can then be appended to the conditional sentence order that was made originally. Is there anything further that I should deal with or that I have overlooked? 7 MR. GORIN: Nothing from the Defence. 9 MR. O'HALLORAN: I will have to get, then, from the Clerk, I take it, later on those conditions again 10 specifically and then I will have the order drafted for 11 12 My Friend to examine? 13 THE COURT: Yes, I think that is the way you should do it. The alternative would be to simply have 14 the Clerk endorse the original order, but since this is 15 an appeal, rather than a variation by the Court that 16 made the order, I'm not sure that that is the right way 17 18 to go about doing it. 19 MR. O'HALLORAN: Right. 20 THE COURT: All right. If there is nothing further, then, thank you for your submissions, 21 counsel. Good luck, Mr. Ross, with the sentence that 22 23 you are on. We will close court. (AT WHICH TIME THE ORAL REASONS FOR JUDGMENT CONCLUDED) 24 25 26 27

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