IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

DARREN LEE KENNY

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice V. A. Schuler, sitting in Fort Smith, in the Northwest Territories, on the 30th day of June, A.D., 2010.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Lecorre: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Bran: Counsel for the Defence

Charge under s. 271 Criminal Code of Canada Publication Ban pursuant to Section 486.4 of the Criminal Code

Darren Lee Kenny has been

convicted of sexual assault after a trial, and it

is now my duty to sentence him for that offence.

The circumstances of the offence were reviewed in

my judgement yesterday, so I will not go into a

great deal of detail again.

The victim and Mr. Kenny had been seeing each other for a period of approximately two weeks prior to the events in question. She considered him to be her boyfriend and he appears to have considered her as his girlfriend. On the night in question, after a few minutes of consensual kissing, Mr. Kenny ignored the 17-year-old victim's attempts to physically resist him and her verbal protests and ground his groin into her bum, then turned her over and had intercourse with her, again despite her resistance, and then moved her on top of him and continued to grind or press against her until she was able to get off him. She had not had sex before and she told him that while this was happening. She was very upset and crying after these events.

Mr. Kenny's actions amount to a serious sexual assault, a serious breach of the victim's sexual privacy and integrity. The victim made it clear to Mr. Kenny that she did not want to do

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

anything more after the kissing, that she wanted
to go to sleep, but he ignored that and went
ahead for his own sexual gratification.

Mr. Kenny was 26 years old at the time. Although
there is a nine-year age difference between him
and the victim, both were students at the college
here in Fort Smith at the relevant time.

The victim has been traumatized by the incident. In her victim impact statements she refers to being afraid to stay alone, to not feeling safe, to feeling dirty and being distrustful of men, and concerned about how she may react in future intimate relationships. She was very emotional while testifying.

The psychological effects she describes are, sadly, consistent with what the Court has heard from other victims of sexual assault, and those effects may be long lasting. Nothing the Court can do can resolve the difficulties that the victim is facing, but perhaps with the trial having been held, that is one less obstacle for her to deal with or one less obstacle standing in the way of her efforts to cope with the effects of this incident.

Mr. Kenny, now aged 28, is an aboriginal man born in Inuvik and raised in Deline where he has spent most of his life. At the time of the

offence he had obtained a grade 12 education and was enrolled in a teacher education program at the college. He has a two-year-old child who lives with his mother in Edmonton, and his current partner is expecting their child at the end of July. Mr. Kenny's last full-time work was in 2009 with a mining company engaged in exploration work near Deline.

Mr. Kenny does have a lengthy record, beginning with findings of guilt in Youth Court in 1998 and 1999, and then continuing as an adult with convictions from 2001 to 2009. He indicates that the record is alcohol related, that he has been an abuser of alcohol, especially in regard to the convictions in 2003 for break and enter, which involved looking for alcohol and which resulted in a total 16-month jail sentence. I do note that there is no evidence that he was under the influence of alcohol at the time of the offence for which I am sentencing him.

Mr. Kenny's record is mainly for property offences and offences such as breach of probation involving non-compliance with court orders. I infer from the sentences imposed on Mr. Kenny that certainly in the last five years the offences were relatively minor in nature. It is noteworthy that Mr. Kenny has no prior

convictions for offences of violence and no
prior convictions for sexual offences.

The maximum punishment for sexual assault under Section 271 of the Criminal Code is ten years imprisonment. There is no minimum punishment. In the Northwest Territories a serious sexual assault conviction, where the offender does not have a prior related record, generally results in a sentence in the area of three years, but that may be increased or decreased depending on the circumstances of the offence and the offender.

Sentencing is, however, a very individualized process, which is precisely why it is one of the most difficult aspects of a judge's work. No two offences and no two offenders are ever exactly the same. In determining what the sentence should be in this case I have to take into account mitigating and aggravating factors. The fact that Mr. Kenny exercised his right to a trial is not an aggravating factor, it just means that he does not get the mitigating effect of a guilty plea.

In this case, despite the fact that

Mr. Kenny did not plead guilty, during sentencing
submissions, when asked if he wished to say
anything, he did say he wanted to apologize to

the victim and he said that it should never have happened. I take that as an acknowledgment of the harm he has caused to the victim and I do give it some mitigating effect, although obviously much less than had there been a guilty plea and had the victim not had to testify. There are no aggravating factors outside the circumstances of the offence itself.

Crown Counsel seeks a sentence of three and a half to four years in jail. Defence counsel seeks a sentence of two years less a day. Both recognize that some credit should be given for remand time as against the suggested sentences, and I will refer to the issue of remand time further on.

Counsel have also referred to all of the relevant principles of sentencing. The sentence I impose must aim at denouncing Mr. Kenny's behavior in sending the message that it is not an acceptable way to behave, and that it will result in serious consequences for the offender. The sentence should also deter, in other words, discourage other young men who might be inclined to act the same way. In other words, it should send the message to them that no means no, stop means stop, and if they do not listen they will have to face the consequences.

Although Mr. Kenny does not have a prior record for sexual assault or offences related to that, because he does have a prior criminal record, the sentence should aim at deterring him from committing any further crimes. At the same time, Mr. Kenny's rehabilitation cannot be ignored and should be encouraged. Despite his past trouble and offences, he did obtain a grade 12 education, he did try to further his education by enrolling in the teacher training program, and he was able to get the job with the mining company, which I expect is considered a good job to have by people in a small community like Deline. I infer that Mr. Kenny would like to be, and that he can be, a productive member of society, and in my view he should not be discouraged from that. The sentence I impose must also be proportionate to the gravity of the crime and

The sentence I impose must also be proportionate to the gravity of the crime and the blameworthiness of the offender. This was, as I have said, a serious sexual assault and Mr. Kenny is fully responsible for what happened. His actions were not predatory, but he did take advantage of his much younger girlfriend. In many ways this is a very sad case. Had Mr. Kenny stopped when the victim told him to, obviously no one knows, but it is possible that the

1

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

relationship might have continued and developed.

Maybe it would not have, maybe it would have ended. But instead Mr. Kenny is here convicted of a serious criminal offence. The complainant is suffering, she is traumatized, and all of this is because of Mr. Kenny's selfishness and his disregard of the victim's wishes and feelings.

Pursuant to Section 718.2(e) of the Criminal Code I do bear in mind that Mr. Kenny is aboriginal, although there is no evidence before me that systemic factors played a role in his having committed this offence. It was not suggested by counsel that any sanction other than imprisonment would be reasonable in the circumstances, nor do I think it would be considering the nature and seriousness of the offence and the prevalence of sexual assault in the Northwest Territories.

I also have to consider that Mr. Kenny has spent some time in pre-trial custody or what is often called remand. The law is clear that the extent to which I may credit that time towards the sentence I impose today is in my discretion. There is no submission before me that the new legislation governing credit for remand time has any applicability to this case in which the offence pre-dates that legislation.

The law before that legislation is reflected in the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of R. v. Wust where the Court said that a two-for-one credit, although not mandatory, is appropriate to reflect the harshness of pre-trial custody. Pre-trial custody is considered harsh because it does not attract remission, as does time after sentencing, and also because the conditions of pre-trial custody may not offer the programs or may be more difficult than the conditions that apply after an offender is sentenced.

I do not think that lack of priority in programs, which is what defence counsel described, can be put on the same level as lack of any access to programs. Without evidence of any specific conditions that could be considered harsh in Mr. Kenny's pre-trial custody, it seems to me that the main difference between pre-trial and post-sentence custody is the lack of remission.

Mr. Kenny's pre-trial custody consists of approximately eight months, being the time from his arrest on October 9, 2008, until he was released on bail on November 26, 2008, and then from the time of his rearrest on December 9, 2009, after he was erroneously released from

custody and then failed to appear at his earlier
trial date. He has been in custody since then,
in other words December 9, 2009, until the
present.

At least part of the reason Mr. Kenny has been in custody, has been kept in custody, is because of his failure to appear at the November of 2009 trial that was scheduled. Counsel advises that he has not been charged with failing to appear. So if I take the fact that he did fail to appear into account now in relation to the remand time he will not be in a situation where he may also be penalized for the same thing by being sentenced on a charge of failing to appear, but at the same time I think I need to be cautious since I do not know if there is a reason why he was not charged with failing to appear. Counsel, both of whom are relatively new to this case, have not been able to provide me with that information. Ultimately, in all of the circumstances, I take the view that a two-for-one credit for the pre-trial custody is not appropriate. I will, however, credit the time on approximately a 1.5 basis.

There are certain ancillary orders that I will deal with now. First, a DNA order is mandatory in these circumstances under Section

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 487.051 of the Criminal Code. So I make that
2 order for the taking of a sample to obtain
3 Mr. Kenny's DNA.

An order for compliance with the Sex

Offender Information Registration Act is required under Section 490.012 of the Criminal Code unless

Mr. Kenny establishes, under subsection (4), that its impact would be grossly disproportionate, which he has not sought to establish. So I order that he do comply with the registration and reporting requirements under that Act for a period of 20 years.

Finally, under Section 109(1)(a) of the Criminal Code, since sexual assault is inherently a violent offence, I make a firearm prohibition order in the usual terms. That order begins today and will expire ten years after Mr. Kenny's release from imprisonment. Stand please, Mr. Kenny.

Having considered all of the circumstances, including that this is the first time that

Mr. Kenny is convicted of an offence involving violence or force against another person, I have decided that a proper and adequate sentence in this case is three years in jail. After crediting the remand time the sentence that I impose today is two years less a day. You may

sit down, Mr. Kenny. In the circumstances the victim surcharge is waived.

I have considered the request that Crown

Counsel relayed from the victim that the warrant

be endorsed with the recommendation that

Mr. Kenny not serve his time at the correctional

centre in Hay River because that is where she

resides. I have considered that quite carefully

and I understand obviously why she makes that

request.

However, the reality in the Northwest

Territories is that there are only two

correctional facilities for adult males, and a

number of considerations go into the decision as

to which facility any individual inmate is placed

in. That, I believe, is a matter best left to

the correctional authorities. I do not feel that

I have enough information, information that they

would have, that would allow me to make a

recommendation.

The correctional authorities are certainly used to dealing with instances where, because of where an inmate is serving his sentence or her sentence, there may be the potential for contact with a victim or other witnesses in a case, and I think they are best equipped to make the decisions and put into place any conditions that

	need to be put into	place to deal with those
	issues.	
	So for those i	reasons I decline to make
	the recommendation.	. I would encourage victim
	services and Crown	Counsel to help the victim
	make inquiries as to whether she may present her	
	concerns directly to the correctional authorities	
	and tell them how she feels and see whether they	
	will take that into account when they are making	
	a placement, but I will not go so far as to	
	actually making the recommendation as to where	
	he serves his time.	
	Is there anything further, counsel?	
MR.	LECORRE:	No, Your Honour.
THE	COURT:	Is there someone here to take
	Mr. Kenny back into custody?	
THE	SHERIFF:	I believe there is.
MR.	LECORRE:	Yes, there is, Your Honour.
THE	COURT:	All right.
THE	CLERK:	Probation?
THE	COURT:	Pardon me?
THE	CLERK:	Will there be any terms of
	probation?	
THE	COURT:	No, there is no probation
	order. We will close court.	
	THE MR. THE THE THE	issues. So for those is the recommendation services and Crown make inquiries as to concerns directly to and tell them how so will take that into a placement, but I actually making the he serves his time. Is there anyth MR. LECORRE: THE COURT: Mr. Kenny back into THE SHERIFF: MR. LECORRE: THE COURT: THE CLERK: THE COURT: THE CLERK: THE COURT: THE CLERK: THE COURT: THE CLERK: THE COURT:

1	
2	Certified correct to the best
3	of my skill and ability.
4	
5	Joel Bowker
6	Court Reporter
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	