R. v. Football, 2006 NWTSC 69 S-1-CR-2006000020

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

## GARY FOOTBALL

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by the Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, sitting at Behchoko, in the Northwest Territories, on December 4th, A.D. 2006.

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

## APPEARANCES:

Ms. M. McGuire: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Brydon: Counsel for the Accused

(Charge under s. 268 Criminal Code)

1 The offender before the Court THE COURT: 2 is Gary Football, a 28-year-old Dene man who has pleaded guilty to a serious crime of violence 3 against his common-law spouse over a two-day period in August, 2005. During the two days, the offender administered a severe beating upon his 6 wife causing serious injuries that required her to be medivaced to an Edmonton hospital for 9 treatment. During the two-day period when this appalling behaviour occurred the couple's two 10 young children, ages two and four, were present 11 12 in the home.

Details of the injuries sustained by the victim are contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts, Exhibit S-1. When one looks at the photographs of the victim's visible injuries, it is difficult to understand how any human being could do this to another human being, let alone one's wife. Among the victim's many injuries were a fractured jaw, a brain injury and multiple bruises on her face and all over her body. The extensive beating to the victim's facial area caused loss of vision and extreme swelling, such that the victim was unrecognizable to her own sister and to a police officer who knew her.

Mr. Football is convicted of aggravated assault contrary to section 268 of the Criminal

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Code, a crime which carries a maximum sentence of 14 years' imprisonment in a federal penitentiary.

It is now my serious responsibility to impose an appropriate sentence.

I am told that at the time of this offence
Mr. Football and the victim had been in a
common-law relationship for approximately ten
years and had two young children. At the time of
the offence Mr. Football was employed with a
local construction company.

Mr. Football has a criminal record and, most notably, his criminal history includes previous crimes of violence against this same victim. In 1997 he was convicted of assaulting the victim and received a suspended sentence and was placed on probation for one year. In 1999 he assaulted his wife on two separate occasions and, again, received a suspended sentence and was placed on probation. In 2001 he, again, was convicted of assaulting his wife and received a sentence of six months' imprisonment.

Mr. Football has been in custody awaiting his trial since he was arrested on these present matters in August, 2005. This is a period of approximately 16 months, and he will receive credit for this time in custody awaiting trial in accordance with the long-standing practice of

2.4

1 this Court and binding case law.

2.4

It is regrettable that it is only now that this matter is being disposed of in a final way.

As Mr. Football's counsel phrased it,

Mr. Football has taken some time to make his journey from an initial reactive denial to an acknowledgement of responsibility and wrongdoing.

Mr. Football elected trial by Judge and jury and requested a Preliminary Hearing where, I am advised, everything was in issue and the victim was required to testify. In March, 2006 he was committed for trial by jury in this court and his jury trial was scheduled for a two-week period here in Behchoko commencing today, December 4th, 2006. However, in September, with the assistance of his counsel, there was a negotiated resolution of the criminal charges and Mr. Football signed an Agreed Statement of Facts admitting to the commission of the aggravated assault and accepting responsibility for what he has done.

Although Crown counsel fairly acknowledges that in these circumstances Mr. Football's guilty plea is not a last minute guilty plea, it also cannot be characterized as an early guilty plea or one made at the first opportunity.

The Courts have attempted in its sentencing decisions in this jurisdiction, in the last two

decades in particular, to send a message that
domestic violence, or violence against women
generally, will not be tolerated and that
meaningful, severe penalties, i.e., significant
jail time, will be imposed on offenders who
assault their spouse.

Case law has for a long time stated that denunciation and deterrence are the paramount sentencing principles in cases of serious domestic violence. Several years ago Parliament enacted a specific provision in the Criminal Code directing that the Court in sentencing an offender for a crime such as aggravated assault -- directing that the Court consider any violence against a spouse to be an aggravating circumstance in the determination of an appropriate sentence. In that enactment, Parliament clearly stated that the sentence should be increased on account of that circumstance alone.

I am told that the victim of this crime was advised of her right to place a victim impact statement before this Court at the time of sentencing. However, she has declined to do so.

There are many aggravating features to

Mr. Football's crime and precious little that can
be said in mitigation. He has, indeed, pleaded

2.4

2.6

guilty to the charge. However, as I have mentioned, it is not an early guilty plea and cannot have the same mitigating effect as an early guilty plea. Also, today he presents in court in his home community as genuinely remorseful for what he has done and he publicly apologizes to the victim and her family.

The aggravating circumstances include his previous record of criminal violent behaviour towards his spouse resulting in three appearances before the Court in the last nine years, and on each occasion he was treated with some leniency. It is also an aggravating feature of the predicate offence that it was not a situation of one spontaneous blow, but, rather, a continuing, ongoing sequence of assaultive behaviour over a two-day period.

It is an aggravating circumstance also that Mr. Football's two young children were present in the home throughout this two-day ordeal suffered by their mother. One can only cringe at the thought of what lasting psychological impact that could have for those children.

From the description of the victim's injuries in the Agreed Statement of Facts and from the photos I infer that at least some of Mr. Football's assaultive behaviour can also be

2.4

characterized as gratuitous violence upon his spouse. As his counsel noted, this is not normal human behaviour, and Mr. Football, a mature man of 28 years of age, ought to know now that he has some sort of illness, that he ought to access professional help while he is serving his period of incarceration and also following his release.

This was a serious criminal offence.

Mr. Football's criminal behaviour was egregious and there has to be serious consequences for him.

Taking into consideration the submissions of counsel and the aggravating and mitigating factors that I have mentioned and all of the other circumstances and the principles of sentencing, in particular denunciation, deterrence and proportionality, in my view the appropriate sentence in this case is six years' imprisonment. I give credit of two and a half years to Mr. Football for the time he has spent in custody awaiting disposition of his case.

Please stand, Mr. Football. Gary Football, for the crime that you have committed, aggravated assault contrary to section 268 of the Criminal Code as set out in count 2, it is the sentence of this Court that you be imprisoned for a period of three and a half years.

I will have the Clerk endorse the warrant of

2.4

1		committal that take	es you to jail with this
2		Court's recommendat	tion that you be permitted to
3		serve your sentence	e at an institution in the
4		Northwest Territor:	ies.
5		I grant the ma	andatory DNA order sought by
6		the Crown. I grant	t the mandatory section 109
7		firearms prohibition	on order for a period of ten
8		years. I decline	to grant a section 113 order
9		softening the impac	ct of the section 109 order,
10		given the lack of a	an evidentiary foundation for
11		such an order and	given that the Crown opposes
12		it. In the circums	stances, there will be no
13		victim fine surchar	rge. You may be seated.
14		Counsel, is there anything further with	
15		respect to this cas	se?
16	MS.	McGUIRE:	No. Thank you, Your Honour.
17	MR.	BRYDON:	Nothing further.
18	THE	COURT:	Thank you, then. We will
19		close court.	
20			
21			
22			Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
23			to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules.
24			Dupieme Coult Rules.
25			
26			Jill MacDonald, CSR(A), RPR
27			Court Reporter