R. v. Mullins, 2007 NWTSC 74

S-1-CR2007000028

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

PHILLIP EDWARD MULLINS

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice J.Z. Vertes, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on September 18th A.D., 2007.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. S. Tkatch: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Brydon: Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 465(1)(c) Criminal Code of Canada Charge under s. 5(1) Controlled Drugs and Substances Act

THE COURT: Phillip Edward Mullins has

entered guilty pleas to two charges: one of

conspiracy to traffic in cocaine; the other of

trafficking in marijuana.

The charges arose from an extensive undercover police operation in 2005. The accused was part of an ongoing commercial drug supply network involving a number of other individuals and centered around an establishment in Yellowknife known as "The Right Spot" bar. The details of the activity and the undercover operation are set out in an agreed statement of facts. The accused was not the major player in this drug trafficking ring but he was a key component of it. He acted as a middleman between the supplier of the cocaine and the eventual seller and, with respect to the marijuana charge, he participated in the actual sale to other dealers.

This accused is one of a number of people already sentenced for their part in this criminal enterprise. They have all received significant sentences. As many of those cases highlighted, crack cocaine in particular has become a blight on this community. And these people played a significant part in the spread of this blight, a part played out because of their own greed and

1 lack of concern for others.

2.4

The accused is 29 years old. He has a history of odd jobs. He is not originally from this community. He also has a criminal record. In the past nine years, he has been convicted of eight offences, six of them for possession of drugs. In 2000 he was convicted, in Edmonton, of trafficking and sentenced to 12 months in jail.

None of this seemed to have had an effect on him.

I take into account as a mitigating factor the accused's guilty plea. While it does not come at an early stage, it is still worthy of credit since it saves the administration of justice a considerable amount of time and expense in processing him through a trial.

The Crown has recommended a sentence of five to six years. Crown counsel has however left to my discretion the amount of time to be credited toward time spent in pre-sentence custody. That issue requires some explanation.

The accused was originally arrested on October 13th, 2005. In January 2006, he was granted bail. At that time his counsel, not his counsel here today but his counsel at that time, made a strong argument in favour of bail so that the accused could receive treatment for what was termed his drug addiction problems. Arrangements

were made at a residential treatment program in Edmonton. The accused was eventually released to that treatment program when a bed became available in April of 2006. In July, he breached the terms of his bail conditions. The treatment centre was going to reject him from the program. He then took off. He was subsequently rearrested in September of 2006. When he was, he was found with a quantity of crack cocaine and marijuana on him.

The total pre-sentence custody amounts to 574 days, or the equivalent of approximately 19 months.

Case law has long recognized that, as a rule of thumb, pre-sentence custody should be credited at a rate of two-for-one because people serving in pre-sentence custody, awaiting trial, are not eligible for statutory remission, nor in most cases are they eligible to participate in the various programs provided to sentence-serving inmates. But that rule of thumb is just as I described it - a rule of thumb. It is a discretionary exercise, one that has to take into account all of the relevant factors.

The accused's counsel has argued that the usual approach should be applied in this case. With respect, I do not agree.

The reason this accused spent the last 12 months in custody is because of his own deliberate violation of his bail conditions. that circumstance, I fail to see why he should be credited at two-for-one for this time period. I do recognize that he should be given some credit, but I am not prepared to credit him for the full two-for-one for the period of time since his rearrest. He made a choice. He knew what the risks were when he took off. No one can say what would have happened if he had been either rejected from the program or if, in the first place, he had followed the rules of the program. He has not been charged for that breach. No sentence has been imposed on him for that breach so it is not a question of double punishment.

I will give him credit for these 12 months but not at the full two-for-one. In the exercise of my discretion, I will credit the accused with the equivalent of 30 months, two and a half years, for the 19 months of pre-sentence custody.

In my opinion, the only mitigating factor present here is the guilty plea. This accused, someone who has been punished previously for similar crimes, played an extensive role in a long-running criminal operation. He was not the mastermind but his role was significant

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

- 1 nevertheless.
- 2 The principles of sentencing, as applied to
- 3 this case, call for a sentence that emphasizes
- 4 deterrence and denunciation.
- I have concluded that an appropriate
- 6 sentence would be on Count 3, the conspiracy
- 7 charge, three years imprisonment; on Count 4, the
- 8 trafficking charge, two years to be served
- 9 consecutively. That is a total of five years
- 10 imprisonment. From that, I deduct the 30 months
- 11 credit that I have already indicated I would for
- 12 pre-sentence custody. The net sentence that I
- impose is therefore one of two and a half years,
- or 30 months imprisonment.
- In addition there will be the usual order,
- 16 pursuant to Section 109 of the Criminal Code,
- 17 prohibiting the accused from having in his
- 18 possession or control any firearms for a period
- of no less than ten years.
- Is there anything else that is required, Ms.
- 21 Tkatch?
- 22 MS. TKATCH: No, Your Honour.
- 23 MR. BRYDON: Victims of Crime surcharge to
- 24 be waived?
- 25 THE COURT: The Victim of Crime fine
- 26 surcharge is waived, yes, under the
- 27 circumstances.

1	THE CLERK: The	firearm prohibition is te	
2	years from release, si	r?	
3	THE COURT: In	the usual terms of the	
4	order, Madam Clerk.	order, Madam Clerk.	
5	Thank you, counse	l, we will close court.	
6			
7			
8			
9		tified to be a true and urate transcript pursuant	
10	to 1	to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,	
11	Sup.	bupreme court naics,	
12			
13			
14			
15		s Hewitt, CSR(A), RPR, CRR rt Reporter	
16	Cou.	court Reporter	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			