R. v. Memogana, 2007 NWTSC 27

S-1-CR2006000029

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

## LESLIE MEMOGANA

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on March 9th A.D., 2007.

## APPEARANCES:

Ms. S. Tkatch: Counsel for the Crown

Ms. K. Payne: Counsel for the Accused

-----

Charge under s. 271 Criminal Code of Canada

Publication ban on the identity of the complainant pursuant to s. 486 of the Criminal Code

THE COURT: In this case the accused is charged with sexually assaulting the complainant on June 18th, 2005 at his residence in Inuvik.

The complainant testified that on that occasion, she went to the Mad Trapper bar in Inuvik around midnight to have a few beers. There she encountered the accused who was someone who she had been friends with for a couple of months, the two of them having worked at the same work site at one time.

At the Mad Trapper bar, the accused invited the complainant to go to his residence for more beer and some marijuana, and the complainant accepted. At his residence, the accused invited the complainant to sit with him in his bedroom while they drank a beer. The complainant says that she was reluctant to do so but she did.

When the complainant decided to leave, she says the accused would not let her leave, he prevented her from opening the bedroom door, and she says they struggled for some time by the door as she tried to leave and the accused kept the door closed and prevented her from leaving.

The complainant testified that the accused then managed to get her onto the bed and started taking her clothes off. She says that in resisting him and trying to get him off of her,

that she must have bit the accused's wrists because she says that the accused got angry at her, called her a "fucking bitch", and slapped and punched her on the face. She says that the accused then sexually assaulted her and in the course of the attack he bit her breasts and also bit her in the crotch area and that she screamed because of the pain. She says the accused had forcible sexual intercourse with her and that the assault lasted 15 to 20 minutes. During the course of the assault, she says she was screaming and crying, that she was trying to get him off of her, fighting him off and scratching him.

After the assault and after they were both dressed, she says she heard some people arriving at the accused's trailer and also that there was a knock on the bedroom door and the accused's roommate asked if things were okay. The complainant says that because of what happened and because of her condition, she did not want to speak to anyone there so she left, or "snuck out" as she said, by an outside door that was near the bedroom door. As she left, she noticed that among the people partying in the livingroom area was her cousin Loretta Elias.

The complainant says she went back to the place in Inuvik where she was staying at the

time, at the apartment of a new boyfriend. She says she arrived there at 1:30 or 2 in the morning, that she decided not to wake her boyfriend but she let him sleep until the morning. She consumed part of a mickey of alcohol and at 7 or 8 a.m. she told her boyfriend what happened and then reported it to the police.

In her cross-examination, the complainant did not resile from any of her testimony regarding the sexual assault itself.

In the context of all of the evidence, I find the complainant's testimony to be credible on the essential aspect of this case; that is, that she was subjected to forcible rough sexual activity by the accused.

In weighing the believability or reliability of her evidence, I have no concern about the fact that she did not cry out when she realized that a number of people arrived there for a party, nor that she did not say anything to her cousin Loretta. There is no normal expected behaviour or reaction of someone who has just been sexually assaulted or at least there is no evidence to indicate that at this trial. In my view, and given the circumstances of the event, the complainant gave a reasonable, understandable response when asked why she did not complain to

or engage in conversation with these people who arrived at the accused's trailer at 1 o'clock in the morning.

Also, in weighing the believability or the reliability of her testimony, I am not troubled by the fact that she did at times use different terminology or words in describing the extent or level of her friendship with the accused prior to this incident.

I turn to the evidence of the accused. In its entirety, I find the testimony of the accused to be problematic.

In his evidence-in-chief, he related a narrative of a completely different evening spent with this complainant. He spoke of drinking beer at Frosty's Pub in Inuvik and then when he was in the course of taking a cab home from Frosty's Pub, he encountered the complainant and says that either she invited herself into his cab or he invited her to join him in the cab. He says they went to his trailer and there they had a couple of beers and a couple of joints of marijuana and they had consensual sex. When asked if he bit the complainant during sex, he answered "I don't recall".

On cross-examination, the accused had considerable difficulty explaining or expanding

upon the narrative which he had given in his

testimony in-chief; his answers being "I don't

know", "I don't recall, "I don't think so" to

many questions which were quite straightforward.

When it was suggested to him that he may be confusing this evening following a visit to Frosty's Pub with another occasion when he met this complainant at Mad Trapper and when asked if it was possible he was confusing different occasions, his answer was "I don't know" and "I just don't recall".

When asked straightforward questions such as "did she try to push you off", "did she tell you to stop", "did she tell you no", "was she angry", "was she crying", his answer was either "I don't know" or "I don't remember" or "I don't think so".

Taking the evidence of the accused as a whole, my assessment is that he does not know what transpired between he and the complainant on June 18th, 2005 and that I cannot rely on any of his testimony at this trial. The quality of his evidence is not such as to be reliable. I do not find anything reliable in the evidence of the accused that raises any reasonable doubt about the commission by him of a sexual assault upon the complainant.

2.4

| 1  |     | On the complainant's evidence, I am               |
|----|-----|---|
| 2  |     | satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that a sexual |
| 3  |     | assault occurred as related by the complainant    |
| 4  |     | and accordingly I convict the accused of the      |
| 5  |     | charge in the Indictment.                         |
| 6  |     | Now, counsel, with respect to sentencing, I       |
| 7  |     | will hear from counsel but it would be my         |
| 8  |     | preference that we not at least conclude the      |
| 9  |     | sentencing hearing today but if we could find     |
| 10 |     | some time next week, the Court's Monday is        |
| 11 |     | already fully booked or overbooked.               |
| 12 | THE | ACCUSED: My God, it's I can't                     |
| 13 |     | believe this.                                     |
| 14 | THE | COURT: As I believe Tuesday is. What              |
| 15 |     | about Wednesday or Thursday of next week?         |
| 16 | MS. | TKATCH: I can speak to my schedule,               |
| 17 |     | Your Honour. I am tied up in a week-long          |
| 18 |     | preliminary inquiry downstairs that I can't pass  |
| 19 |     | on to somebody else. So my preference I guess in  |
| 20 |     | that respect would either to be subsequent to     |
| 21 |     | next week or if we could do submissions today and |
| 22 |     | I would be content to have another Crown receive  |
| 23 |     | the decision on that if you require time on that. |
| 24 |     | I can say that my submissions are going to be     |
| 25 |     | pretty short, there is not much to add with       |
| 26 |     | respect to the sentencing submissions on the      |
| 27 |     | Crown's side. I do appreciate that Ms. Payne has  |

more work to do. It is just that next week is 1 2 not good for me personally and I won't have a 3 whole lot of time to prepare another Crown to be in my stead. 5 THE COURT: Ms. Payne? 6 MS. PAYNE: Sir, I am available next week, 7 the following week as well. I'm sorry, the 19th 8 and 20th I will be out of town but for the 9 balance of the week I am in Yellowknife. 10 THE COURT: Okay, just before I turn back 11 to Ms. Tkatch, can you just confirm the next week, the 22nd in particular, the Thursday is; 12 13 the 22nd in particular? MS. PAYNE: 14 Yes, sir, I am in town. 15 THE COURT: Is that okay with you, Ms. Tkatch? 16 MS. TKATCH: 17 I am available. 18 THE COURT: All right then, we will set it for Thursday, March 22nd, at 10 a.m. for 19 20 sentencing Mr. Memogana. MS. TKATCH: 21 Thank you, sir. MS. PAYNE: Thank you, Your Honour. 22 Thank you, we will close 23 THE COURT: 24 Court.

26

25

| 1  | Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant |
|----|---|
| 2  | to Rules 723 and 724 of the<br>Supreme Court Rules,     |
| 3  | supreme court Rules,                                    |
| 4  |   |
| 5  |   |
| 6  |   |
| 7  | Lois Hewitt, CSR(A), RPR, CRR<br>Court Reporter         |
| 8  | Court Reporter  |
| 9  |   |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
| 26 |   |
| 27 |   |