S-1-CR2002/010

R. v. Larabie, 2002 NWTSC 28

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V-

HENRY MICHAEL LARABIE



Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 14th day of March, A.D. 2002.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. N. Sinclair:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. S. Duke:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Mr. Henry Michael Larabie has pleaded guilty today to the offence of possession for the purposes of trafficking, specifically cocaine, and I won't go into a lot of detail about the facts but, briefly stated, the police received information that Mr. Larabie was selling cocaine from his room at the Gold Range. They went to the room on September 8th, 2001 with a search warrant, and found various paraphernalia relating to cocaine including bags that were cut in such a way as is used for selling cocaine on the street at the gram level. They also found, and seized, a total of 8 grams of cocaine wrapped in individual grams in that type of plastic bag.

Also found was a portable police scanner and it was inside that, as I understand it, that the cocaine was found inside the battery compartment.

A quantity of money was found on Mr. Larabie and two cell phones were found and seized from the apartment. During the arrest and search the cell phones were ringing frequently and individuals were called asking for a "movie," which I understand from counsel is the street term used for a gram of coke. As well, people were coming to the door looking for Mr. Larabie.

Mr. Larabie is 29 years old. His background, which has been put before me, is unremarkable. He has, in the past, done labour work on a fairly

sporadic basis. He does come with a criminal record which is quite lengthy going back to 1991. It involves a number of different offences including several offences of assault which are not related obviously to the offence I am sentencing him for, but it's, I suppose, somewhat interesting to note that in the early years he seems to have accumulated several convictions for assault and then in 1999, although there are still after that convictions for assault, he commenced being convicted of offences which are directly related to the offence before the Court today.

In 1999, possession of a scheduled substance for the purpose of trafficking, for which he received three months incarceration.

In the year 2000, trafficking in a scheduled substance for which he received one month consecutive to two months imposed on other charges, and then there was four months consecutive imposed for another count of trafficking in a scheduled substance.

And then, as noted by counsel, in February 2002, he received 12 months in jail for possession of a controlled substance. And, as counsel pointed out, prior to the February 2002 conviction, the other drug offences related to marijuana. I suppose that the conclusion I would have to draw from that is that Mr. Larabie graduated, if that's the appropriate term,

from dealing in marijuana to dealing in cocaine so that certainly, in terms of his drug record, there has been an increase in the seriousness of the drugs that he's dealing with.

The evidence indicates, and both counsel as I understand it agree with characterizing it this way, that Mr. Larabie was engaged as a street-level There is some indication, obviously, that dealer. this was a fairly well-organized business that he was running. There is the police scanner, the cell phones. I think that, and I believe it's mentioned in one of the cases that Mr. Sinclair referred to that I noted as I was looking through them, I'm not sure that the relatively small quantity of drugs found is really reflective of what was going on, and actually it's the Chung case in which I note that Chief Justice Fraser of the Alberta Court of Appeal, who is also the Chief Justice of the Northwest Territories Court of Appeal says that,

The system...

In that case,

...minimizes the accused's risk by permitting him to plead that he should be sentenced on the small quantity of drugs with which he is found.

24

25

26

27

1

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So I think the way to look at this case is that yes there was a small quantity of drugs found, but obviously the operation that he was running was

something quite beyond that.

I do take into account the guilty plea that Mr. Larabie has entered today. It did not come at the earliest opportunity, but he still will be given credit for it. Notwithstanding that there was a preliminary inquiry, I still give considerable weight to the guilty plea and I say that because this — in this type of case, I would assume that the witnesses were basically or were probably solely police officers, and it's not like, for example, a sexual assault case where the main witness who testifies often is considerably upset and suffers trauma just by having to come to court and testify, so I do take that into account that it's not the same type of case.

With respect to the sentencing in February, as I understand it the facts of that offence also occurred in February of 2002, so several months after the offence for which I am now sentencing Mr. Larabie, several months after he had been arrested, and I bear in mind that because the February 2002 offence happened afterwards, it is not something that should be taken into account in terms of aggravating the offence that's before me now. And I say that, as well, because as I understand it from counsel's submissions, it was at that time taken into account that Mr. Larabie was on release for this offence.

But what it does indicate to me obviously is that having been arrested for the offences before the Court now, Mr. Larabie obviously didn't get the message when he committed the further offence in February of 2002.

His counsel says that he now realizes that he's looking at a lengthy period of incarceration. He says that he -- this is something he has to think about, and I hope he does because obviously what he's looking at otherwise is spending the rest of his life in jail, and I say that because if he doesn't stop committing offences, eventually that's where he's going to be spending all his time. But I guess I see this as a situation where obviously Mr. Larabie hasn't gotten the message now. He didn't get it on arrest. I don't know whether he's perhaps starting to realize that he should be getting a message here, but I think that's all I can say about that.

In these cases it's common on sentencing to repeat essentially the same things, that the main principles in a case like this are the principles of denunciation and deterrence; in other words, somehow the message has to get through to other people that this type of offence will be seriously dealt with and also the sentence that's imposed has to show that society, the community, rejects this type of behavior. It does absolutely nothing but cause pain

in the community and in what he said, Mr. Larabie said that he was doing this essentially to support his own habit, I don't know whether that's true or not, there wasn't anything said about it prior to his speaking, but even if it is true, then he certainly knows the pain that cocaine causes. So he knows that first-hand and he knows what devastation he's contributing to in this community by dealing this to other people.

Stand up please, Mr. Larabie. Having considered all the circumstances, what I'm going to do is impose a sentence of two years incarceration. It will be consecutive to the 12 months that you're presently serving. There will also be a firearm prohibition order pursuant to Section 109 of the Criminal Code in the usual terms. It will commence today and it will expire ten years from your release from imprisonment, and there will be an order forfeiting the -- was it just the drugs seized that you were asking for the order?

MR. SINCLAIR: There was also the cash which was seized in the amounts of \$685.

THE COURT: All right. Then there will be an order for forfeiture of the drugs and the cash seized. You may sit down Mr. Larabie.

The victim of crime surcharge will be waived in the circumstances. Is there anything further that I

```
need to deal with, counsel?
1
2
      MR. DUKE:
                           No, Your Honour.
      MR. SINCLAIR:
                          No, Your Honour.
3
      THE COURT:
                          All right, thank you.
4
      MR. SINCLAIR: Thank you.
6
                   Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20
7
                   dated December 28, 1987.
8
9
10
                   Sandra Burns R.P.R, C.R.R.
                   Court Reporter
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```