R. v. Magrum, 2007 NWTSC 26 S-1-CR-2006-000078

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

CHRISTINA JOANNE MAGRUM

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Hay River, in the Northwest Territories, on the 30th day of March, A.D., 2007.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. S. Hinkley: Counsel for the Crown

Counsel for the Defence Mr. M. Hansen:

L	THE	COURT: C.	nristina Magrum nas pleaded
2		guilty to a charge of	f assault with a weapon and
3		to a charge of utter	ing death threats. These
1		charges arise from se	omething that happened during
5		the late evening on a	April 21st, 2006, almost a
5		year ago, on the Hay	River Dene Reserve.

The Crown prosecutor has read in the facts set out in Exhibit 1 this morning. I will refer to those facts again because it is important for the purposes of the record.

The facts in support of the assault with a weapon charge essentially are that on the night this happened, the accused, her common-law at the time, who is the victim of the assault, and another person were drinking heavily, and the accused became upset, accusing a 12-year-old of sleeping with her common-law. She got mad and she went after the 12-year-old, she shoved a coffee table and broke a glass countertop.

Another adult that was there, who was one of the victims on the threat charge, took her outside to try to calm her down, but when they came back in the house an argument erupted between the accused and her common-law, and that argument escalated to a physical confrontation, and in that confrontation Ms. Magrum stabbed the victim with a steak knife.

Fortunately, although he had to be sent to Yellowknife, it turned out his injuries were not life-threatening, and the medical attention he received, it sounds like, amounted to receiving stitches and nothing more extensive than that.

On the utter threats charge, the facts happened right after the stabbing. The victim left the house, but there were still other people in the house in the upstairs bedroom. The two named victims on the threat charge, as well as other people, including four young children, three of these children are the accused's children and one other is, as I understand, closely related to her through her relationship with Mr. Norn.

The accused by that point appeared to be completely out of control. She said she would kill all of them one by one. The people in the bedroom closed the door and held it shut. She attacked the door with a metal broom-handle and caused damage to the door. She continued to yell at them through the door.

Fortunately the police had been called.

They went to the house and they arrested her, and while she was being arrested two of the adults left or ran out of the bedroom, and three of the children were found under the bed and were

2.1

l distressed.

Today it is my very difficult responsibility to decide what sentence Ms. Magrum should receive for these crimes. The Crown says that a jail term is required because of the aggravating factors that are present in these offences. The Crown is asking that I impose a sentence in the range of 12 to 14 months.

Defence counsel agrees that a jail term is required. My understanding from his submissions is that Ms. Magrum realizes that a jail term is required, but is asking that I consider a shorter jail term, something in the range of six to nine months.

The offences committed by Ms. Magrum, as I am sure she realizes now, are very serious. In many ways she is lucky. Many of the homicide cases that come before the Courts in the NWT are cases that arise out of stabbings. In other words, some of the times the result of this is that someone is dead. A harsh reality is that Mr. Norn could have been fatally injured that night, and if that had happened I would not have heard submissions today about how many months the sentence should be, I would have heard submissions about how many years the sentence should be. The other harsh reality is that no

one knows what would have happened if the police had not been able to intervene. No one knows.

The principles of sentence that any judge
must apply in any case are in the Criminal Code,
and I am not going to read the sections out in
detail today, but I have considered these
principles.

Two important sentencing principles that the prosecutor has referred to are denunciation and deterrence. Denunciation has to do with reinforcing society's views that certain conduct is not acceptable. Violence, and especially violence when weapons are used, must be denounced.

Deterrence has to do with discouraging people from committing crimes, people in general and the person who is charged before the Court. Sentences that the Court imposes should at least try to discourage other people from committing crimes.

Rehabilitation is another very important principle. Recognizing that if the people who come before the Courts are able to get help and are able to deal with their issues, everyone, all of us, are better off, because a person who is rehabilitated, instead of harming the community, can contribute to the community.

In a sense, I suppose, considering rehabilitation is about not giving up on people, and often sentencing boils down to just that, balancing the need to hold people accountable for what they have done and send the important messages that need to be sent to the community about what happens when people commit crimes like this, and balancing that with not giving up on people, and that is what I have to do this afternoon.

I have read the pre-sentence report. It is part of the record, it has been made as exhibit number 3, and in many many ways it speaks for itself. It sets out the many challenges that Ms. Magrum has faced in her life, it explains some of the difficult things she has had to deal with. It cannot excuse her behavior, and I think she understands that, but it is very helpful for the Court to know some of these things to get a fuller picture of what has brought her to this day.

Ms. Magrum admitted to the author of the pre-sentence report that she consumed alcohol on two occasions since her separation, which means that this was a breach of her undertaking which, as I said this morning, is obviously not a good thing. But the fact that she admitted to

something that she may have never otherwise been caught for may in fact be a good sign that she is prepared to own up to what she does, to be honest and to face consequences.

The defence in this case is not asking me to consider a conditional sentence, and that is a very realistic position on the part of the defence, because with those circumstances, the facts, the aggravating factors and all of the circumstances before me, that simply would not have been an option for the Court.

As for mitigating factors in this case, the main one is the guilty plea. Ms. Magrum was charged in April, right after this happened. She had a few court appearances, she made a judge and jury election, she set a prelim date, but at that time she was facing an aggravated assault charge, along with other ones. In fact, she waived her preliminary and consented to a committal on the charges that are before me today. No witnesses ever had to be called on these matters. I accept what her lawyer has said this morning, that she intended to plead guilty early on, and even though this is not in the traditional sense an early guilty plea, I have given Ms. Magrum full credit for it.

On the side of the aggravating factors,

there is a record, a criminal record before me,
which I think, as the Crown has fairly stated, is
not related and is somewhat dated. I do not
place any particular significance on this record,
except perhaps to note that the fact that
Ms. Magrum was convicted for trafficking in
narcotics is further evidence of her involvement
or past involvement with drugs and some of the
destructive impact that it has had on her life.

As far as other aggravating factors, as the Crown has said, the fact that the victim of the assault with a weapon was her common-law is an aggravating factor. It is specifically set out in the Criminal Code now, but it is also a long-standing principle that when a person harms someone that they are in a relationship with it is a breach of trust and it is an aggravating factor.

The presence of children, when the second offence was committed, and the first one for that matter, is very very aggravating. That image of small children hiding under a bed in terror and fear of their own mother is heartbreaking, and I know that it is heartbreaking for Ms. Magrum too.

I said before that taking rehabilitation into account is partly about not giving up on a person who has committed crimes. More important

than anything, in my view, is that Ms. Magrum not give up on herself.

The Court has limited means available to it in cases like this, like in all cases. The sentencing tools are there, but there are not many of them, and it is the Court's sincere hope that Ms. Magrum will not give up on herself.

It is not my role to preach to you, Ms. Magrum, I do not think I would be very good at it in any event, but I do want you to know that I accept and believe that you have been through some very difficult things in your life. It may feel like a life-time of hardships that you have had, even though you are still quite young, but what happens after today is really up to you, and on that you have some control. You may have had very little control over some of the things that happened a long time ago, but after today you do, and I hope that after you are finished serving your sentence you will be able, with the help of others, to focus on the good things in your life and look ahead and not back. Please stand.

Ms. Magrum, on the charge of assault with a weapon I am going to sentence you to a term of imprisonment of ten months, and on the charge of uttering threats I am going to sentence you to a

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

term of imprisonment of six months, but I am
going to make that concurrent, so it is going to
be a global sentence of ten months. You can sit
down.

That, Ms. Magrum, is a little bit more time than what your lawyer asked for, and it is a little bit less time than what the Crown asked for. If there is one thing that I say today that I would like you to remember, it is that I consider this to be a very very lenient and low sentence when I look at what happened and the facts of this case. The Crown could have asked for a longer sentence even on a guilty plea, and in simple terms I have exercised as much restraint as I feel I can, given the facts of this case.

I am also going to put you on probation after you are released from your sentence, it will be for 12 months. The only two conditions that I will put on the order, other than the ones that are automatic and will be explained to you, is that you report to a probation officer within 48 hours of your release and then that you report as directed. That is reporting to the probation officer. The second condition is that you not have contact with Jeff Norn except through a third party for the purposes of dealing with

2.1

1 matters having to do with your children.

whatever reason, depending on what happens with your children, there is a point where that condition needs to be varied or modified, you can do that, you can apply to have it amended,

Mr. Hansen can explain all of that to you. That condition I am putting in for Mr. Norn's protection given what has happened, but also because based on everything I have heard it appears that it is also in your best interests to move away from that particular situation.

I am not going to have conditions requiring you to take treatment or take counselling as directed. Obviously I am hoping that you will be able to access some counselling and some treatment. It should be mostly at your own initiative. That does not mean that the probation officer will not make suggestions, but I am leaving this as a fairly wide-open probation order, the purpose being to support your efforts, and to put some onus on you to take the steps that you need to get your life back on track.

The last thing I will say is I know and I understand from what your lawyer has said that your trust has been broken many times in your life, but part of what this probation order is

- about is the Court's belief that there are people
- out there that sincerely do want to help you and
- 3 support your efforts, and I hope that you can
- 4 make the most of that.
- 5 Finally, it is mandatory in a case like this
- that I make a firearms prohibition order pursuant
- 7 to Section 109 of the Criminal Code. It will be
- 8 for a minimum period of ten years, Mr. Hinkley?
- 9 MR. HINKLEY: Yes, Your Honour.
- 10 THE COURT: Ten years from your date of
- 11 release. Similarly, I have heard no submissions
- suggesting that there should not be a DNA order,
- so I will make such an order as well.
- 14 Mr. Hinkley, I am going to ask that you prepare
- 15 an order for my review in a timely fashion as
- soon as you are able to have one.
- 17 MR. HINKLEY: Your Honour, if I might, I
- 18 believe the court clerk would already have an
- 19 order prepared for you.
- 20 THE COURT: That is a timely fashion.
- 21 MR. HINKLEY: Thank you, Your Honour.
- 22 THE COURT: I cannot fault you for not
- 23 being timely this time. Under the circumstances,
- 24 because I have imposed a jail term and because of
- the overall personal circumstances of Ms. Magrum,
- I am not going to impose a victim of crime
- 27 surcharge due to hardship. Is there anything

1		that I have overlo	oked, counsel?
2	MR.	HINKLEY:	No, thank you, Your Honour.
3	THE	COURT:	Mr. Hansen?
4	MR.	HANSEN:	Nothing I can think of.
5	THE	COURT:	All right. Well, counsel,
6		thank you for your	submissions. Ms. Magrum, I
7		wish you luck. We	will close court.
8		-	
9			
10			ertified to be a true and ccurate transcript, pursuant
11		t	o Rules 723 and 724 of the upreme Court Rules.
12		5	apreme court naies.
13			
14			oel Bowker, CSR(A) ourt Reporter
15		C	ours Reporter
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			