R. v. Norn, 2007 NWTSC 45

S-1-CR2007000037

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

BRENT RICHARD NORN

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, at Hay River in the Northwest Territories, on June 18th A.D., 2007.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Himmelman: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. B. Norn: Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 255(2) Criminal Code of Canada

1 THE COURT: I am ready to deliver my
2 sentence, Mr. Norn. I wish I could look at you
3 the whole time that I am speaking but I have to
4 look at my notes. But I have given this a lot of
5 thought since we adjourned this morning so I hope
6 that what I am about to say will make sense to

you.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Mr. Norn has pleaded guilty to a charge of impaired driving causing bodily harm. On October 15th, 2006, after a drinking party, Mr. Norn made a very very bad choice. That choice would have been a criminal offence even if Mr. Norn had made it home without incident. But unfortunately that choice did have terrible consequences and this afternoon it is my difficult responsibility to decide what sentence should be imposed on Mr. Norn as a result of this event. Nothing that I can do this afternoon can undo the harm that was done. All that I can do is impose a sentence that will adequately reflect the seriousness of what happened and try to uphold the sentencing principles and objectives that are set out in the Criminal Code.

The facts were referred to in some detail this morning when the Agreed Statement of Facts was filed and I will not repeat them all but I do want to summarize them.

Mr. Norn and Mr. Elleze were at the same 1 2 drinking party in the early morning hours on 3 October 15th, 2006. Mr. Elleze left on foot and a short time later Mr. Norn decided to leave too. People tried to prevent him from driving because 5 he was intoxicated but he did not listen to those people and he did leave in a truck. He drove some distance and according to a witness he was "travelling pretty fast" on a poorly-lit road 9 10 where the speed limit is 30 kilometers per hour. He hit Mr. Elleze and he did not stop. 11 12 Mr. Elleze was later found in the ditch and in 13 the statement that Mr. Norn later provided to the 14 police, he admitted that he hit something on the 15 road, he didn't stop because he was scared, and then he drove home and told his common-law spouse 16 "I hit something, I hit somebody". 17 18 About three hours after the incident, Mr. Norn submitted to a breathalyzer test. One 19 20 sample of breath provided a reading of 230 21 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood 22 and the other one provided a reading of 210 23 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of 24 blood, and that is close to three times the level that constitutes a criminal offence. Mr. Elleze, 25 26 through luck only in my view, was found in the 27 ditch shortly after he was hit and he suffered

very serious injuries and at this point I will refer to paragraph 19 of the Agreed Statement of Facts which says that the injuries included a lacerated liver, a contusion of the kidney, a basal skull fracture, bleeding in the thorax, a collapsed lung, multiple rib fractures, and two fractured femur bones. He was resuscitated, he was sent to Alberta, he has been undergoing treatment for several months, and the Agreed Statement of of Facts says that he is now a paraplegic and is expected to require the assistance of a wheelchair for the rest of his life.

As Crown counsel has mentioned during his submissions, the Criminal Code sets out the objectives and fundamental purpose of sentencing.

And I just want to refer again to those objectives which are referred to, among other places, in Section 718 of the Criminal Code.

The objectives of sentencing include to denounce unlawful conduct, to deter the offender and other persons from committing offences, to separate offenders from society when necessary, to assist in rehabilitating offenders, to provide reparations for harm done to victims or to the community, and to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders an acknowledgement of

1 the harm done to victims and to the community.

There are other principles in the Criminal

Code as well.

A sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the person who committed the offence. Sentences should be similar to sentences imposed for similar offenders committing similiar offences. All available sanctions have to be considered; that is, all sanctions other than imprisonment with particular attention to circumstances of aboriginal offenders. And an offender should not be deprived of liberty if less restrictive sanctions are appropriate.

In this case the Crown argues that a significant jail term must be imposed and defence counsel essentially concedes as well that a significant jail term has to be imposed and that is, in my view, a very realistic position on the part of defence counsel.

The primary, and by this I mean the most important, sentencing objectives in this case are denunciation and deterrence. That is not to say that Mr. Norn's rehabilitation and his personal circumstances are not important, because they are. But the Court's main concern has to be that

this sentence discourage others from making this bad destructive choice to drive when they are impaired, to discourage Mr. Norn himself from ever making that choice again, and to express society's condemnation of this behaviour. In other words, to demonstrate that society does not accept this kind of behaviour.

One wonders what it will take to stop people from drinking and driving. For years there have been ads on television, on the radio, articles in newspapers, that talk about the tragic things that happen as a result of drinking and driving. There are campaigns, there are marches, there are people who give public talks, people who go to the schools, Judges who impose sentences and talk, much in the way that I am doing now, about the devastating impacts of drinking and driving, the ruined lives and the scars that it leaves that can never completely heal. And yet the carnage on the roads continues. People do get behind the wheel of a car or a truck and they kill or hurt other people very badly when they are drunk and they are driving. Sometimes they hurt little children. Sometimes they hurt little children's mothers or fathers or both. Sometimes they kill entire families. Sometimes, as in this case, they hurt a life-long friend. When it

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

happens, everyone is sorry. Everyone sees the waste and after the fact everyone can see how preventable it was. And yet, probably every day, somewhere people continue to make the bad choice and the carnage continues. The Court has the responsibility, then, to continue to try to deter and denounce this conduct and unfortunately, again, this is what I have to do today.

I have heard about Mr. Norn's personal circumstances a little bit this morning. I have heard that he has a stable relationship, two children, and a steady work history. Unlike many people who come before the Court, he has some support. He has a lot to live for, a lot to look forward to, even today as he faces a lengthy jail term. His lawyer has said that Mr. Norn wants this to be a turning point, to change his life for the better, and I sincerely hope that that will be the case. Obviously he has some skills and he has some positive things in his life and if he can stay focused on those during his sentence and after, then maybe he can turn his life around and be, from now on, a productive member of society.

Mr. Elleze has prepared a Victim Impact
Statement. It was prepared last March, and it
has been made an exhibit in these proceedings.

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Mr. Elleze has extended Mr. Norn an immense gift.

He says that he forgives him. Despite the pain that he experiences in his legs, despite all the efforts towards rehabilitating his body, despite the terrible consequences for him and the uncertainty about his own future, he has forgiven him. It is an awesome gift and I hope that

Mr. Norn realizes and will prove worthy of this forgiveness.

Every sentence must take into account legal principles and the circumstances of the offence and the circumstances of the offender.

There are mitigating factors in this case.

First, there is the guilty plea which the Crown fairly treats as an early guilty plea. I accept what has been said that Mr. Norn wanted to plead guilty from the very beginning in these proceedings. I completely accept that. It is consistent with his behaviour when the police spoke to him that very night. It is consistent with his warned statement when he admitted what he did. The police had a fairly strong case early on identifying the vehicle but it was not Mr. Norn's vehicle and he could have tried to blame someone else or deflect the attention from himself. He did not do that and I accept that. Therefore, his guilty plea entitles him to the

1 maximum credit that he could get for it.

I also accept without hesitation that he is truly remorseful about what happened and that the letter that was filed this morning is a sincere expression of how he feels about what he did to his friend and also the impact that this will have on his own family.

There are also aggravating factors, and I $\label{eq:condition} \mbox{refer to them in no particular order.}$

The first is the fact that, on the evidence that I have, Mr. Norn was highly intoxicated which is evidenced by the readings from the breathalyzer tests. The Criminal Code says specifically that at those levels this is an aggravating factor but even if the Criminal Code did not say that, these are very high readings and I would consider them aggravating even if the Code didn't specifically compel me to do so.

The second aggravating factor of course is the significant harm done to the victim. In my opinion these were dreadful injuries. Of course they could have been worse. We can always think of a worse scenario but they were significant life-threatening and ultimately life-altering injuries.

26 The third aggravating factor that I see in 27 this case could be grouped or referred to generally as a high level of blameworthiness.

What I mean by that is in some ways the fact that

Mr. Norn was driving fast, the fact that he left

even when people tried to stop him, are things

that make this more serious. But the aspect of

this that is even more significant, I think, is

the fact that he did not stop after the accident.

This is something that I think is important for

Mr. Norn to realize. The harsh reality is that

Mr. Elleze ended up in the ditch and if there had

been no one come along shortly thereafter, he

could have easily died in that ditch. That is

one of the things that can happen when people do

not stop after an accident.

The fourth aggravating factor of course is the criminal record. It's not a long record but it is relatively recent. Mr. Norn received a fine for a drinking and driving conviction.

Because the sentence imposed was a fine, and no one has made specific submissions on this but I can infer that this was probably a relatively routine case with no accident, no one getting hurt, I expect that probably the Judge who sentenced Mr. Norn that day may have talked about some of the consequences that can arise when people drink and drive. So in that sense that prior record is aggravating. I am also concerned

about the more recent conviction that Mr. Norn
has for failing to comply with the release
condition of not drinking while he was awaiting
disposition on this very serious matter.

Mr. Norn recognizes that he has a problem with
alcohol and recognizes that that problem played a
part in this tragic event which obviously it did.

It is disturbing that he would continue to drink
even in the face of this tragedy and hopefully
his resolve now will remain strong even after he
gets out of jail and he can continue on a more
healthy path for the rest of his life.

The cases that were filed by the Crown are helpful in establishing the range of sentences that are imposed in cases like this and some portions of these cases were referred to by Crown counsel this morning.

I noted in particular that many of these cases refer to R. v. Horen 58 C.C.C. (3d) 418.

That's a case from the Alberta Court of Appeal which, among other things, talks about the fact that consequences are relevant in sentencing for these kinds of cases, that deterrence is served by warning drivers that they are taking an unacceptable chance when they drink and drive and that the risk they take, among others, is if they injure someone or kill someone that the penalty

1	will be increased. So the cases are helpful to		
2	set out these principles, they are helpful to set		
3	out the range, but they do more than that. They		
4	illustrate graphically the carnage that I talked		
5	about earlier in my comments this afternoon. The		
6	prosecutor referred to the facts in some of these		
7	cases, and I will not belabour them, but I just		
8	want to refer to them briefly in part for		
9	Mr. Norn's benefit.		
10	Martens, 13-year-old girl walking her		
11	bicycle across the street, struck by a drunk		
12	driver, very serious injuries, now in a		
13	wheelchair.		
14	Bockman, a young man on a motorcycle struck		
15	by a drunk driver, motorcycle and young man catch		
16	on fire, people have to put them out, serious		
17	burns, amputated fingers. Another wrecked life.		
18	Stewart, father and son injured by a drunk		
19	driver. Family is completely devastated.		
20	McLean, 77-year-old man walking his dog a		
21	block form his house, otherwise healthy, serious		
22	injuries. We do not know but probably at 77		
23	years old that old man probably had a harder time		
24	recovering.		
25	So this happens. It happens a lot		
26	everywhere and now it has happened to Mr. Elleze		

and Mr. Norn is responsible for it. He is sorry,

> A sentence should never be longer than what is needed to achieve the purpose and goals of sentencing and I do take into account what I have heard about Mr. Norn and I would think that if he truly wants to deal with his drinking problem and other issues in his life and if he can help maybe explain to others the damage that can come from drinking and driving, maybe something good can come out of this awful event. I believe, as I have said already a few times, that Mr. Norn is sorry for what he did. Mr. Elleze has shown his character by forgiving Mr. Norn and one way perhaps that Mr. Norn can show his character is to continue to take responsibility for what has happened and deal with these issues and complete this sentence and essentially do what you have said earlier this afternoon that you want to do which is to move on with your life in a positive way. Your wife is here supporting you and that says a lot about her character. And, as I said before, many people stand in this courtroom to be sentenced completely alone with absolutely no one who takes the time to support them. So even though I am sure this is a hard day, in some ways

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 you should count your blessings.

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Given the seriousness of this incident, this crime, I could impose the sentence of three years that the Crown is asking. It certainly is in the range. Given what I have heard about you, given your guilty plea for which I do give you the maximum credit that I can, I have decided that I do not need to impose the maximum sentence. By this I mean the sentence that the Crown is asking, I will exercise some restraint, but I am unable to impose a sentence as low as what your lawyer is asking simply because of the seriousness of the consequences of your actions. And I think a sentence higher than two years is required to send the message that needs to sent and hopefully will one day get through and put an end to these kinds of offences that cause so much harm to so many people.

So stand up please, Mr. Norn.

For this offence, Mr. Norn, I am going to sentence you to 30 months imprisonment. I am also going to impose a driving prohibition. The maximum is ten years in addition to the jail term so what I am going to do is I am going to, given your work history will have more of an impact on you, I am going to make it a seven and a half year driving prohibition but starting today which

2 you are in jail and depending on how much time 3

means of course that some of it will pass while

- you actually spend in jail it will probably work
- into, I don't want to guess how much time you are
- going to spend in jail but it will be a
- significant driving prohibition but it is
- required under the circumstances.
- 8 Please sit down.

- I am also going to make a DNA order, this is 9
- 10 a secondary designated order. The Crown has
- asked for the order, defence has not argued 11
- 12 against it, and given Mr. Norn's attempt to, well
- 13 the fact that he fled the scene, in my view it is
- 14 in the best interests of the administration of
- 15 justice to make such an order.
- Having regard to the length of jail term 16
- that I have imposed and Mr. Norn's family 17
- 18 circumstances, I will not make the order for
- 19 payment of a Victims of Crime surcharge.
- Is there anything else required, counsel? 20
- 21 MR. HIMMELMAN: Nothing further from the
- 22 Crown, Your Honour.
- 23 THE COURT: Mr. Hansen, from you?
- MR. HANSEN: No, ma'am. 24
- THE COURT: Then I want to thank both 25
- 26 counsel for your very helpful submissions.
- 27 Mr. Norn, I wish you the best of luck when you

1		have completed your	r sentence.
2	THE	ACCUSED:	Thank you.
3	THE	COURT:	We will close court.
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
9			to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
10			Supreme Court Naies,
11			
12			
13			
14			Lois Hewitt, CSR(A), RPR, CRR Court Reporter
15			Could Reported
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			