IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

MICHAEL DRYNECK

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice J.Z. Vertes, in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 29th day of July, 2008.

APPEARANCES:

Counsel on behalf of the Crown Ms. S. Aitken:

Mr. T. Boyd: Counsel on behalf of the Accused

Charge under s. 266 C.C.

1	THE	COURT:	In this case, Michael Dryneck
2		has entered a plea	of guilty to a charge of
3		common assault. It	t is not often that this court
4		is called upon to d	deal with such charges, but the
5		facts reveal a very	serious case of assault in
6		this instance.	
7		The triatim tree	the aggreed's semmon-law

The victim was the accused's common-law spouse. They had been living in a relationship for the past ten years and they have two children, ages 5 and 8.

On the night of July 23rd, 2007, at their home in Wekweti, Northwest Territories, the accused and his spouse were engaged in what I may describe as intimate lovemaking. However, he began to hurt his spouse. She tried to make him stop. He then became angry and started talking about some things from her past. He started hitting her and punching her about the face. The victim managed to escape the house and seek assistance at the local nursing station. There is no police detachment in Wekweti, so the next day the victim had to leave the community and seek shelter elsewhere.

The accused was arrested in October of 2007 for his actions and eventually a jury trial was scheduled to be held in the community of Behchoko. Just days before that trial was set to

begin, the accused entered a guilty plea for the charge that we are dealing with today.

2.4

Crown counsel has pointed out a number of aggravating circumstances to take into account in this case. First and foremost, there is the fact that this offence involves the abuse of the offender's spouse, an act of violence recognized by the Parliament of Canada as a most serious aggravating factor since it has been specifically designated as such in the Criminal Code.

There is no excuse for this behaviour. I heard the accused talk about his past, his difficult upbringing, and I am sure that is the root of many of his difficulties, and indeed it may be the cause of what he describes as "the anger inside me". But that is no excuse to react violently to one's loved one and the mother of one's children. It is a gross abuse of trust and it is, unfortunately, a very recurring act in our communities.

Compounding that aggravating fact is the fact that the victim was nine weeks pregnant at the time. It appears obvious to me that the accused did not give a thought to that fact as he engaged in his violent attack on his spouse. The injuries were significant, as revealed by the photographs that were submitted.

Also aggravating is the fact that the accused has a criminal record. He has 33 convictions between 1989 and 2006. Of those 33 convictions, nine offences are for crimes of violence and five of those involve the same victim, starting in 2000. He was on probation at the time of this offence, with a condition that he have no contact with the victim, although Crown counsel acknowledges that the two of them were living together with the consent of the victim and regardless of the no-contact clause. But this repetitive behaviour reveals to me that the accused did not learn from his past conduct. He was charged, tried and punished for his past attacks on the victim, and yet that did no good. Maybe now at his age and with growing self-awareness he will come to the realization that only he can make the changes in his life that are necessary, both for himself and for his family. Of course there is the strong mitigating factor of a guilty plea. Crown counsel, while recognizing that the guilty plea did not come at an early stage of these proceedings, acknowledges

a trial. So I give credit to the accused for

the fact that it has meant that the victim need

not go through the ordeal of having to testify at

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

1 that.

2.4

The accused is 37 years old. He grew up in a large family in the North Slave region. In the past he has been working for Renewable Resources as a firefighter and has also obtained employment as a labourer with one of the logistical companies working at a diamond mine.

I am told by his counsel that on the day of this offence he had consumed quite a bit of alcohol. That of course may partly explain his conduct, but it is no excuse.

Crown counsel has suggested a sentence of two years less a day, with credit for time spent on remand, and a further three-year probationary term specifically providing for a no-contact provision. In this case, I am assisted by the fact that defence counsel has indicated that the defence joins in that sentencing proposal.

In my opinion, the sentence for this offence, considering the accused's background and all of the aggravating factors that I have identified, could very well be significantly higher than that proposed in the joint submission. I recognize, however, that the joint submission is one that has been put forward by experienced counsel, and considering the fact that there has been a guilty plea, I am satisfied

that it meets the principles and objectives of sentencing.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

I must of course consider the circumstances of the accused as an aboriginal offender. I recognize that there are widespread systemic factors of a general nature affecting all aboriginal Canadians that place them at a disadvantage. I heard the accused speak about some factors that are specific to his upbringing - the abuse he suffered from the hands of his father apparently and other members of his family. Again, I say that those factors, while they may be very much part of the cause for his anger and for his lack of self-control, cannot explain away the repetitive nature of his conduct, his violent and abusive conduct toward his spouse. In these circumstances I have no alternative but to impose a sentence that would be imposed on anyone else who has exhibited such a history of violence.

With respect to the credit for remand time, the accused has apparently spent six months in remand attributable to this offence. The Supreme Court of Canada has recognized that credit must be given for remand time in the absence of a significant reason not to do so. While there is no formula, the usual rule of thumb is to credit

remand time at a ratio of two-to-one, in the absence of evidence of circumstances that may warrant a deviation. I heard no evidence of any circumstances that would warrant a deviation from the usual calculation of credit for remand time.

Stand up, Mr. Dryneck.

Mr. Dryneck, having listened to you, it seems to me that you are starting to become aware of your difficulties. I only hope that at your age you are able to start to take control of your emotions and to deal with them and to try and put your life together so that you can be the man and father that you tell me you hope to be.

I agree with Crown and defence that an appropriate sentence would be one of two years less one day. Taking into account remand time, which I credit at two-for-one which would amount to 12 months, I sentence the accused to a term of imprisonment of 12 months.

In addition, there will be a period of probation for a further term of three years. The terms of that probation will be that you are to keep the peace and be of good behaviour; you are to report to the court as and when required to do so; you are to report to a probation officer upon your release from imprisonment and continue to report as and when directed by a probation

1 officer; you are to participate in any treatment 2 or counselling programs that may be recommended 3 by your probation officer. Do you agree with that, sir? 5 THE ACCUSED: Yes, sir. THE COURT: And you are to have no contact 7 directly or indirectly with Therese Boline during 8 the period of your probation order. Do you understand that? 9 THE ACCUSED: Yeah, I can respect that. 10 11 THE COURT: Very well. Your counsel will 12 explain to you the significance of the probation 13 order and the fact that if you breach any term of 14 that order you can be charged with that and 15 brought back in court and sentenced for that. Do you understand? 16 17 THE ACCUSED: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: In addition, as requested by Crown counsel, there will be an order requiring 19 20 the accused to provide a sample for DNA analysis 21 for submission to the DNA databank, pursuant to 22 section 487.051 of the Criminal Code. 23 Finally, I make an order under the discretionary provisions of section 110 of the 2.4 25 Criminal Code prohibiting the accused from having in his possession any firearms, ammunition or 26 other devices mentioned in section 110 for a 27

1		period of no less than ten years from the date
2		his release from his sentence of imprisonment.
3		Is there anything else we need to address,
4		counsel? Ms. Aitken?
5	MS.	AITKEN: Just in relation to the
6		victims of crime surcharge, sir.
7	THE	COURT: Under the circumstances, the
8		victims of crime surcharge fine surcharge is
9		waived.
10	MR.	BOYD: Nothing from defence. Thank
11		you, Your Honour.
12	THE	COURT: Thank you, counsel, for your
13		submissions. We will close court.
14		
15		
16		Certified to be a true and
17		accurate transcript pursuant to Rule 723 and 724 of the
18		Supreme Court Rules of Court
19		
20		Annette Wright, RPR, CSR(A)
21		Court Reporter
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		