R. v. Betsidea, 2001 NWTSC 53 S-1-CR-2001000016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

JACK MORRIS BETSIDEA



Transcript of Ruling on Voir Dire by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, with a jury, at Deline, in the Northwest Territories, on June 26th, A.D. 2001.

APPEARANCES:

A. Slatkoff, Esq.,

Counsel for the Crown

R. Gorin, Esq.,

Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 271 of the Criminal Code of Canada

THE COURT:

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1€

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

On this application the Crown seeks some special procedures for the Complainant's trial testimony. The Crown asks that the public be excluded from the courtroom during the Complainant's testimony and also that the Complainant be allowed to testify behind a screen so that she does not see the accused.

This request goes against the general rule that trials are to be held in open court. The law, however, does provide for exceptions when necessary. The burden is on the Crown to satisfy the Court of the necessity of these procedures for one of the reasons mentioned in section 486.

In this case, the Complainant, now 15 years of age, alleges that the 21-year-old accused had forcible intercourse with her in August, 2000 here in their home community of Deline, a small isolated community of 800people. On the voir dire the Complainant testified that she left the community shortly after the incident because she did not want to be anywhere near the accused or this small community after what had happened to her.

She has been living in Edmonton the last nine months and there has received professional counselling about this incident on a weekly basis. Her counselling sessions have also dealt with her ongoing depression and suicidal thoughts. In the last nine months the Complainant has only returned to Deline for the

Preliminary and for this trial.

On the one hand, this young Complainant says she doesn't want people in the community to know about the very personal thing that happened to her, yet she also acknowledges that everyone in this small community probably knows about it. In listening to such emotional concerns, particularly from a young witness, it is not surprising to note some irrationality.

The Complainant says that in recent days and weeks as the trial date approached she became nervous and scared and depressed and at times reluctant to return to this community to testify in court. This, of course, is not unusual in cases of this nature. She says that it will be difficult for her if the public is present, that she will be unable to say anything about what happened to her with the public present because of the personal, intimate nature of what happened to her.

The Complainant's mother testified on the voir dire, stating that her daughter's normal demeanour and comportment changed as a result of this incident last August. She says before the incident her daughter was an outgoing, happy young girl and since the incident has been a different person, moody, depressed and a stay at home type.

Both Complainant and mother appear to have been under the genuine impression that the Complainant would be able to testify with the section 486 screen and with

Ç

1 €

1 8

2:

the public excluded, as that is what happened at the Preliminary Inquiry in January. Although the procedure at Preliminary is certainly not binding here at trial, the Complainant's state of mind in preparation for her trial testimony is a factor for consideration, given her stated reluctance and the usual stresses and strains on young witnesses in this kind of case.

Taking into consideration this girl's age, the circumstances and nature of her allegations against the accused and the testimony on the voir dire, I am satisfied that it is necessary to make accommodations to alleviate the stress and nervousness and reluctance of this Complainant to testify before the general public, and with a view of the accused person, and to provide her some reassurance so as to enable her to give her full and candid testimony to the jury.

In my view, these steps are necessary for the proper administration of justice, in particular for the trier of fact to hear this girl's full account of what happened between she and the accused last August. I am satisfied that her ability to give that full account will be thwarted if the public is not excluded and the screen not utilized.

In granting this application, I do so fully satisfied that there will be minimal consequences for the accused himself or for the general public. Use of the section 486 screen will not inhibit defence

]

1 €

3[

7 C

2€

counsel's right of cross-examination in the usual fashion, nor will it inhibit the accused's view of the Complainant during her testimony.

As for the general public, it is my experience in presiding at dozens of similar jury trials in Deline and other small communities that there are usually either no members of the general public in attendance or only a few people at most. There is no reason to anticipate that this case will be any different.

Of course, the Court's exclusion order will only apply during the Complainant's testimony. The courtroom will be open to the general public during the rest of the trial.

Sc I hereby make an order pursuant to section 486(1) that the public be excluded during the Complainant's testimony, and I will ask the Sheriff to ensure that that order is complied with. I further order that the Complainant testify behind a screen pursuant to section 486(2.1) to allow the Complainant not to see the accused while she is testifying.

Now, counsel, I intend to advise the jury during my opening instructions of these special accommodations that I am allowing in this case. The jury will also be specifically instructed that since these procedures have nothing to do with the guilt or innocence of the accused that they should not draw any inference from the use of these procedures, and, in particular, no

 ϵ

1 €

3 [

7 C

2€

adverse inference should be drawn against the accused man because of these procedures. So unless there is anything further, I propose to bring the jury in, give them their opening instructions. We will then take a brief adjournment before the Crown opens to set up the screen. So could ϵ we have the jury in, Mr. Sheriff. Certified pursuant to Rule 723 of the Supreme Court Rules. Court Reporter 1€