R. v. Sunrise, 2006 NWTSC 47

S-1-CR2006000025

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

## BARRY SUNRISE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, at Hay River in the Northwest

\_\_\_\_\_

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. Gaunt: Counsel for the Crown

Ms. P. Taylor: Counsel for the Accused

-----

Territories, on September 19th A.D., 2006.

Charged under s. 348(1)(b), s. 271, s. 348(1)(b) Criminal Code

BAN ON PUBLICATION OF COMPLAINANT/WITNESS PURSUANT TO SECTION 486 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

THE COURT: The offender Barry Sunrise has pleaded guilty to the offence of breaking and entering a dwelling house on the Katlodeeche Reserve and committing therein the indictable offence of theft. In addition, he has been found guilty, following a trial, of the offence of break and entering a different dwelling house on the Katlodeeche Reserve and committing therein the indictable offence of sexual assault. These two offences occurred on the same date, February 11th of 2006, and indeed within the space of an hour or so.

The circumstances, briefly, are that this offender, while intoxicated, entered the home of his former common-law spouse on the Katlodeeche Reserve and sexually assaulted her in the livingroom of her house where she was passed out from intoxication. The sexual assault ended when the victim's 27-year-old son came home and caught the offender in the act.

This is an offence that is all too common in this jurisdiction and the sentence imposed must take into consideration the important principles of deterrence and denunciation. In my respectful view, the sentences being proposed by each of defence counsel and Crown counsel fall far short of giving effect to these two principles in the

circumstances of this case.

2.4

In an effort to prevent the offender from leaving the residence before the police arrived, the victim's son picked up one of the offender's shoes and threw it outside the residence.

Nonetheless, the offender fled a short while later. These events all occurred at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the morning. The offender broke and entered into another home on the reserve by breaking a kitchen window and entering that house while the two occupants there were sleeping.

After he left, it was discovered that he had stolen a shoe. As stated, the offender pleaded guilty to this second break and enter.

The offender Barry Sunrise is not a stranger to the courtroom. He has a lengthy criminal record. He has in excess of 30 convictions under the Criminal Code for various types of offences. He has three prior convictions for break and enter. He has six prior convictions for assault and three of those are noted as being spousal assaults in 1994, 1996, and 1999. Indeed the 1999 spousal assault, I am told, was committed against the same victim as his current offence.

He also has a prior conviction for sexual assault and that was as recent as 2002 when he received a sentence of 12 months. My reading of

the reasons for sentence of June 2002 indicate to me that Mr. Sunrise received a lenient or a minimal sentence at that time. The circumstances of his 2002 sexual assault conviction are strikingly similar to those of his present offence.

Mr. Sunrise's prior criminal record is clearly an aggravating circumstance.

His plea of guilty to the second break and enter upon his arraignment yesterday is a mitigating circumstance. He cannot receive any similar mitigation in sentence for the first break and enter. Indeed, he does not appear to accept the verdict of guilty in that matter.

The law requires that the sentence that the Court imposes for these offences must be proportionate to the gravity or seriousness of the crime committed and the offender's degree of responsibility for those crimes. The sentences proposed by each of defence counsel and Crown counsel, again in my respectful view, hardly reflect that proportionality.

One of the objectives of the sentence to be imposed is to promote a sense of responsibility in Mr. Sunrise for what he has done. Although Mr. Sunrise appears in court today and accepts responsibility for one of the crimes by his

2.4

guilty plea, I note that at the time of the offences he took the opposite view. When confronted in the act of sexually assaulting an unconscious woman, his immediate response was that she was consenting. When confronted in the act of breaking a window and entering a house at 4 a.m., his immediate response was that he had seen someone else do it.

Mr. Sunrise was arrested on February 12th and has now been in custody over seven months awaiting his trial on these charges. His trial was scheduled to occur in July, over two months ago, but at the last minute he and his previous counsel had a falling-out and so his trial had to be rescheduled for this week. For this pre-trial custody, he is entitled to be given credit towards his sentence in accordance with the practice of the Court and binding case law.

In all of the circumstances, in particular the gravity of the main offence, the lengthy record of prior criminal behaviour, in my view an appropriate sentence is three years' imprisonment on the first offence and one year consecutive on the second offence. For reasons that I have stated, I give Mr. Sunrise credit of one year for pre-trial custody and that one year will be deducted from the sentence that would otherwise

2.4

- 1 be imposed.
- 2 Please stand, Mr. Sunrise.
- 3 Barry Sunrise, on Count number 1, the crime
- 4 of break and enter and commit sexual assault, it
- 5 is the sentence of this Court that you be
- 6 imprisoned for a period of two years.
- 7 On Count number 3, for the crime of break,
- 8 enter and commit theft, the sentence of this
- 9 Court is that you be imprisoned for a period of
- one year consecutive to the sentence on Count 1.
- 11 There will be a Section 109 firearms
- 12 prohibition order for a period of ten years.
- 13 Also, I grant the order sought by the Crown
- 14 under Section 490.011 requiring you to comply
- 15 with the provisions of the Sex Offender
- 16 Information Registration Act for life.
- In the circumstances, there will be no
- 18 Victim of Fine surcharge.
- 19 You may be seated, sir.
- 20 Anything else on this case, counsel?
- 21 MR. GAUNT: Not from the Crown, Your
- Honour.
- 23 MS. TAYLOR: I just wanted to make sure
- that I understood the sentence, Your Honour. The
- one year for pre-trial custody, is that to be
- 26 deducted from the total of three years that you
- 27 have imposed or is that already taken into

1		account?	
2	THE	COURT:	It has already been deducted
3		from the four y	rears that would otherwise be
4		imposed.	
5	MS.	TAYLOR:	Thank you.
6	THE	COURT:	Close Court.
7			
8			
9			
10			Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
11			to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
12			54F155 66415 H4165,
13			
14			
15			
16			Lois Hewitt, CSR(A), RPR, CRR Court Reporter
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			