IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

## JANICE HARRIET MANTLA

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by the Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on January 12th, A.D. 2007.

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. J. MacFarlane: Counsel for the Crown

Ms. M.L. Nightingale: Counsel for the Accused

(Charge under s. 380(1) Criminal Code)

THE COURT: The offender before the Court to be sentenced is Janice Mantla, a 37-year-old Dene woman from Behchoko. Her crime is fraud contrary to section 380 of the Criminal Code for which there is a maximum penalty of 14 years in jail.

In brief, she was employed in a position where the community trusted her to handle public funds intended for people on social assistance, and she unlawfully diverted many thousands of dollars of those funds to herself and her family.

Ms. Mantla was one of the persons employed in an office in her home community of Behchoko where community members in need would go and make application for public funds to assist them with their daily or weekly basic living requirements; i.e., social assistance or income support. It is, of course, a merit based system, and Ms. Mantla was one of the community persons trusted with the responsibility of administering this system intended for those in actual need.

As Behchoko is still a relatively small community, characterized in part by a handful of fairly large extended families and where everybody pretty well knows everybody else, there would naturally be a lot of stress, a lot of pressure on anyone working in that office with

2.4

respect to individual applications for social
assistance or income support. Indeed, Ms. Mantla
tells the Court through her lawyer that she was,
during the time she worked in that office,
subjected to pressure with respect to individual
applications for social assistance from relatives
and friends of applicants and political or
community leaders.

It was within this environment, I am told, that Ms. Mantla gave in to the temptation to divert public funds entrusted to her to the use of her own immediate family by unlawfully arranging to have cheques issued that were payable to her common-law husband and deposited into the family bank account for reasons that were stated to be for the benefit of other social assistance recipients, but which reasons were false or fictitious.

A later audit showed that Ms. Mantla did this on 35 or more separate occasions in the time period 1997 to 2002. The total amount of money defrauded from the Territorial Government in this manner by these many transactions was approximately \$22,300.

During the time that these fraudulent transactions occurred, Ms. Mantla was, as stated, gainfully employed earning a salary of

2.4

approximately \$40,000. Her husband was also employed most of the time. The point being that they were able to support their family without committing these frauds on the public social assistance system.

I am told that Ms. Mantla consciously ceased committing these frauds in 2002 following a period of self-reflection while attending a healing conference or session outside of her home community. She knew then that what she had been doing was wrong.

The fraudulent transactions were apparently discovered by her employer in 2004, for in May, 2004 she was suspended from her employment pending an investigation, and then in August, 2004 she was dismissed from that employment.

Ms. Mantla has had this matter hanging over her head since that time, and she and her family have suffered stress and anxiety during that extended period. No doubt, in the small community of Behchoko she and her family have been the subject of much negative gossip and derision. She has had difficulty obtaining replacement employment.

The audit conducted by the Territorial Government was concluded in August, 2004 and then the matter was turned over to the RCMP for

possible criminal charges. As we have seen in other fraud cases that have come before this Court, unfortunately, due to limited resources and the prevalence of much violent crime and other crime in this jurisdiction, the RCMP are unable to put any priority to an investigation of this sort - i.e., so-called white collar crime - with the result that the RCMP investigation in this case was not concluded until the summer of 2006.

Criminal charges were laid against Janice
Mantla in July, 2006. She waived her Preliminary
Inquiry in Territorial Court in October, 2006,
and when she was, by consent, committed to stand
trial in this Court, she indicated it was her
intention to plead guilty. I take it there were
then some discussions between counsel as to the
precise charge to place before this Court for
disposition, but, in all of the circumstances, I
am satisfied that Ms. Mantla has entered a plea
of guilty at the earliest reasonable opportunity.

Subsequent to the time in 2004 that

Ms. Mantla was suspended from her employment in
the income support office she was able to obtain
casual short-term employment from time to time.

Once the Territorial Government, by its audit,
determined the amount of money that Ms. Mantla

2.4

1	had fraudulently taken from the Territorial
2	Government they garnisheed her final paycheque,
3	some of her casual paycheques and also an income
4	tax refund in 2005. In this way, they recovered
5	a total sum of \$9,648.

In addition, Ms. Mantla on her own made seven payments by way of restitution in the period March, 2005 to March 2006. These voluntary payments totalled \$1,300, and I note that they were made prior to the date that criminal charges were laid against her.

In all, she has already made restitution in the amount of \$10,948.45, leaving the amount outstanding and owing to the Territorial Government in the amount of \$11,378.91.

As part of the sentence imposed on Janice
Mantla, an order will issue pursuant to section
738 of the Criminal Code requiring Janice Mantla
to make restitution to the Government of the
Northwest Territories in the amount of
\$11,378.91.

Counsel have kindly put before the Court for its assistance copies of earlier sentencing decisions of this Court in similar cases. It has always been the practice of this Court in cases of crimes of fraud or theft committed by persons employed in a position of trust to impose a jail

term, absent exceptional circumstances, on account of the important sentencing principle of deterrence. Since the advent of the so-called conditional sentence regime enacted by Parliament about 10 years ago, it is not unusual for the Court, in appropriate cases and in appropriate circumstances, to order that the offender serve the sentence of imprisonment not in a formal physical correctional facility, but in the offender's home community.

Janice Mantla's crime is a serious one involving a breach of trust placed in her by her community. It is an aggravating circumstance that this crime is comprised of dozens of fraudulent transactions over a period of years.

I am told that this offender, Janice Mantla, is a person of otherwise good character with no previous criminal record. There are a number of written character references presented to the Court on her behalf, and she has also presented to the Court a written letter of apology.

Janice Mantla comes from a good family and her parents are respected Elders in Behchoko.

She is known to be a person who looks after her family and provides good care for her three children and is a person who has done a lot of volunteer work in the community, particularly

2.4

with the youth centre. It is to Janice Mantla's credit that community people like Father Pochat and Madeline Rabesca speak well of her.

Ms. Mantla has in the past year enrolled in a teacher training education program and is apparently doing well in that program and is striving to achieve her goal of becoming a full-fledged teacher in her home community.

This offender's early guilty plea, her remorse and acceptance of full responsibility for her wrongdoing, her apology to her family and extended family, to the community and to the Court, her voluntary payments and restitution, these are all circumstances which act in mitigation of sentence.

Crown counsel and defence counsel are in agreement that a sentence of imprisonment is required in this case. They are also in agreement that allowing Ms. Mantla to serve her sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community and that such a disposition would be consistent with the purposes and principles of sentencing and previous decisions of this Court.

Accordingly, I will impose a 12-month conditional sentence with a list of conditions that I will detail and also the section 738

1	restitution	order	that	Т	have	mentioned.

Please stand, Ms. Mantla. Janice Mantla, for the crime that you have committed, the crime of fraud contrary to section 380 of the Criminal Code, I impose a term of imprisonment of 12 months. Pursuant to section 742.1 of the Criminal Code, I order that you serve your sentence in the community of Behchoko subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That you keep the peace and be of good behaviour.
- 2) That you appear before this Court when required to do so.
- 3) That you report to a supervisor within two working days and thereafter as required by the supervisor.
- 4) That you remain within the jurisdiction of this Court unless written permission to leave the jurisdiction is obtained from the Court or the supervisor.
- 5) That you notify the Court or the supervisor in advance of any change of name or address and promptly notify the Court or the supervisor of any change of employment or occupation.
- 26 6) That you perform 120 hours of community 27 service over the first six months of your

1	sentence with a minimum of 10 hours in each month
2	as directed by your supervisor.
3	7) That you remain within your residence in
4	Behchoko at all times throughout the duration of
5	your sentence. The only absences or exceptions
6	to be the following:
7	(a) while attending at or travelling to and
8	from your place of employment;
9	(b) while attending at or travelling to and
10	from any place where you are receiving a formal
11	education or training program authorized by your
12	supervisor;
13	(c) for purposes of medical treatment or
14	care for yourself or members of your immediate
15	family;
16	(d) to attend regular Sunday church services
17	in your community;
18	(e) for purposes of performing community
19	service as ordered by the Court;
20	(f) for attending counselling sessions as
21	authorized by your supervisor;
22	(g) for travelling to and from your child's
23	daycare facility as authorized by your
24	supervisor;
25	(h) for attending meetings with your
26	supervisor; and
27	(i) for one continuous five-hour period each

week to attend to grocery shopping or other
household chores.

2.4

- 8) Make a minimum payment of \$400 per month towards satisfaction of the restitution order.
- 9) That you provide in writing to this
  Court at the end of three months, six months,
  nine months and 12 months of your sentence
  confirmation signed by your supervisor that you
  have complied with the conditions of your
  conditional sentence.
  - 10) Cooperate with your supervisor and the RCMP regarding compliance with this order and answer your telephone at home and attend in person at the door of your residence as required.

You may take a seat, Ms. Mantla.

Ms. Mantla, after court is adjourned you will have to stay here until the Clerk has had an opportunity to prepare the formal court order and to give you a copy of that order and to explain it to you with the assistance of your lawyer, Ms. Nightingale.

Ms. Mantla, I want you to know that during the term of your sentence the supervisor can ask the Court to make changes to these conditions, and, also, the Crown prosecutor and yourself can request the Court to make changes, and if there is good reason, the Court will consider making

- 1 changes.
- I also want you to know that if the Court
- 3 receives a report from the supervisor indicating
- 4 that you have breached any conditions, you will
- 5 be required to come to court and we will hear
- from you, and the Court will consider at that
- 7 time whether this conditional sentence should be
- 8 terminated, and, if so, you will be required to
- 9 serve the rest of your 12-month sentence in jail.
- Now, Ms. Mantla, I hope that you understand
- 11 what I have said to you, and if you have any
- 12 questions, you should ask your lawyer to explain
- these things to you again in some more detail. I
- 14 wish you good luck.
- 15 Anything further in this case, counsel?
- 16 MR. MacFARLANE: Your Honour, I'm not sure if
- it's Your Honour's practice to indicate to whom
- 18 the minimum monthly payment should be paid, to
- 19 the Clerk of the Court for the benefit of the
- 20 GNWT, if that should be a part of the order?
- 21 THE COURT: She can arrange that with the
- 22 supervisor. The payments can go directly to the
- government, presumably.
- 24 MR. MacFARLANE: Very well. Thank you, sir.
- 25 THE COURT: But it is a condition of her
- 26 sentence that she make during the first 12 months
- 27 those regular contributions towards the larger

1		sum. Anything further	er, Ms. Nightingale?
2	MS.	NIGHTINGALE: No	o. Thank you very much.
3	THE	COURT CLERK: A	ny surcharge?
4	THE	COURT: T	he victim fine surcharge will
5		be set at \$100. Any	thing further, Madam Clerk?
6	THE	COURT CLERK: No	0.
7	THE	COURT: T	hank you. Close court.
8			
9			
10			
11			ertified to be a true and ccurate transcript pursuant
12		t	o Rules 723 and 724 of the upreme Court Rules.
13			apreme court nures.
14			
15			ill MacDonald, CSR(A), RPR
16			ourt Reporter
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			