S-1-CR-2002/011

R. v. Yukon, 2002 NWTSC 35

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V-

FRANCIS YUKON

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 22nd day of April, A.D. 2002.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. S. Bond:

Counsel for the Crown

Ms. M. Engley:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Well, I think that the joint position that's been put forward is a reasonable one in the circumstances.

This is a robbery because of the violence associated with the theft, and although it's probably not among the most serious of robberies from the Agreed Statement of Facts, it looks as though Mr. Yukon -- maybe "lured" is too strong a word, but he got Mr. Kimiksana to come into the washroom with him and then he grabbed him and punched him in the face and took the money that he had previously, I take it, thought that Mr. Kimiksana might have because he had asked the young woman who was there if she knew whether he had any money. So there wasn't a lot of planning put into this, but there seems to have been at least a little bit of planning in the sense that Mr. Yukon obviously thought this was a way he could get some money.

That being the case, I take into account the guilty plea. It did not come at an early date, but it still has saved the time and trouble of a trial and it means that Mr. Yukon is giving up his right to a trial. And I also take into account what Ms. Bond has said that the Crown's case may not have been the strongest because of the problems with some of the witnesses.

The main thing in looking at this, Mr. Yukon, is

your record and I think you better sit down and give some pretty serious thought to it because what I see on here is since 1993 you were convicted that year of break, enter, and commit assault along with other charges. In 1995 you were again convicted of assault, this time causing bodily harm and you got 60 days intermittent on that one having received jail time on the other one as well, your earlier one; and then in 1999 assault causing bodily harm again, three months; and later in 1999, assault, four months; and then in the year 2000 a couple of weapons offences, six months; June 2001, another weapons offence, four months. And the weapons offences, although I don't have the circumstances, I would conclude from the charges that there was at least a threat of violence with those offences.

So the record is one of violence and the jail time seems to be inching up there and Mr. Yukon, if you're not -- if you don't change your ways, you're just going to end up getting longer and longer periods of time in jail and at some point you may be heading for the penitentiary, so I would suggest you give it some pretty serious thought and make sure that that doesn't happen because you're the only one who can stop it from happening.

If you've got a drinking problem, then don't drink, it's that simple. I don't mean it's an easy

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

thing to do, but that's the decision you have to make, otherwise you will just end up in jail over and over again.

In all the circumstances I do accept the joint submission and what I will do is -- stand up please, Mr. Yukon. I'm going to impose one day in jail on the basis that essentially the sentence is one of time served plus the one day in jail which will be served by his attendance here in court.

The victim of crime surcharge will be waived.

There will be a firearm prohibition order which will commence today and will expire ten years from today in the usual terms. I take it, because of the earlier order, there is no need to specify a time within which any weapons have to be surrendered?

MS. ENGLEY: No, there isn't.

THE COURT:

All right. Now, with respect to the DNA order, it is the type of order that is intrusive, but looking at the record which consists of offences of violence over and over again, in the circumstances I think it would be in the best interests of the administration of justice to make the order so I will make a DNA order in the usual terms. I don't know if you have a draft order, Ms. Bond, with you?

MS. BOND:

I don't have a properly-drafted order so I'll have to get one and file it with the Court.

1.8

I should be able to do that this afternoon.

```
All right, that's fine. What it will
      THE COURT:
1
           provide then is that -- I take it it can be done --
2
           well, he won't be in custody so --
3
                           No, that's why my order that I have
4
      MS. BOND:
           drafted currently isn't accurate. What I would
5
           propose, Your Honour, is that it simply be that the
6
           sample be taken as soon as practicable, and Mr. Yukon
7
           will actually have to be summonsed by the police to
8
           attend and have the sample taken and we can do that.
                           All right. Well then you can word the
      THE COURT:
10
            order that way, and Mr. Yukon then when you receive
11
           the summons saying you have to go and give a sample
12
            of your DNA, you have to do that. That's part of
13
            this sentence; do you understand that?
14
                           Yeah.
      THE ACCUSED:
15
                           All right. All right, you can have a
      THE COURT:
16
            seat then. Is there anything further?
17
                           Nothing further, Your Honour.
      MS. BOND:
18
                           Nothing further, thank you.
19
      MS. ENGLEY:
                           All right. Thank you, counsel, and
2.0
      THE COURT:
            we'll close court.
21
22
23
                   Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20
                   dated December 28, 1987.
24
25
                   Sandra Burns R.P.R, C.R.R.
26
                   Court Reporter
27
```