R. v. Allen, 2010 NWTSC 95

S-1-CR2010000057

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

## CHESTER JASON ALLEN

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on November 29th A.D., 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Lecorre: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. S. Shabala: Counsel for the Accused

-----

Charge under s. 267(b) Criminal Code of Canada

THE COURT: The offender, Chester Jason

Allen, is convicted of assault causing bodily

harm contrary to Section 267 of the Criminal

Code, and it is now the Court's responsibility

to impose an appropriate sentence.

The offence occurred at the North Slave

Correctional Centre on October 4th, 2009, more

than one year ago. The victim of the assault

was another inmate. There was an altercation

between the two and in the course of that

altercation, this offender struck the victim on

the face with a coffee mug which was filled with

boiling liquid.

The victim was taken to the local hospital to obtain treatment for second degree burns to his face and shoulder. He was in hospital for five days. He also received treatment from a local ophthalmologist for an injury to his right eye. He suffered vision problems in his right eye for several weeks subsequent to this assault. The victim has recovered from his injuries with the exception of minor but visible scarring on his face and upper body.

The offence of assault causing bodily harm carries a maximum sentence of ten years' imprisonment in penitentiary.

Mr. Allen's crime is very serious, and the

sentence imposed must reflect the level of seriousness of the crime and Mr. Allen's level of responsibility for that serious crime. This was the willful, intentional infliction of harm by striking the victim with hot boiling liquid and causing severe burns. Although I am told that the victim has recovered except for some remaining scars, it is obvious from looking at the photograph exhibits that the victim suffered a great deal at the time.

Specific and general deterrence and denunciation are important principles in the determination of an appropriate sentence for any violent behaviour and, in particular, when the violence occurs within a prison environment. If the Court's sentence was not seen as a deterrent, and denunciatory, there would be chaos in our prisons.

I am told that Mr. Allen is 33 years old and of Inuvialuit descent. He spent a great deal of his earlier life in foster care in the Inuvik region. He achieved a Grade 11 formal education and subsequently developed skills as a mechanic and has had regular employment in that field. I am told that he is also an accomplished artist and is able to sell his artwork commercially. Mr. Allen is married with

seven children however in recent times he is estranged from his spouse.

Mr. Allen has a lengthy criminal record and has been to jail many times, both as a young offender and as an adult. The types of offences comprising his criminal record are varied however I note that he does not have any prior convictions for assaultive violent behaviour.

In mitigation of sentence in this case is the fact that Mr. Allen waived a preliminary inquiry and offered a plea of guilty to an included offence, which plea was accepted by the prosecutor. In the context of the waiver of preliminary and a guilty plea, it is regrettable that it is only now, today, more than 13 months after the offence, that the formal conviction and sentencing disposition takes place.

Mr. Allen, today in open court, expressed his apologies to the victim of his crime and acknowledged his wrongdoing. I am satisfied that today Mr. Allen is genuinely remorseful. That is to his credit and it bodes well for the life that he has ahead of him after he is released.

Mr. Allen has been in custody awaiting disposition of this serious charge and accordingly I must deal with the fact of

pre-sentencing time on remand. I will briefly
recite the background details.

In August 2009, Mr. Allen was at large, here in Yellowknife, on a recognizance entered into by him, in July 2009 as a result of unrelated Criminal Code charges which arose in July 2009. There were several conditions to the recognizance document which allowed him to be at large on those July 2009 outstanding Criminal Code charges. In August 2009, he breached three of those conditions and was arrested and charged with three counts of breach of recognizance. He was detained in custody at the North Slave Correctional Centre.

On April 7th, 2010, he was sentenced in Territorial Court on the three convictions for breach of recognizance. The sentencing Judge imposed a total sentence of nine months imprisonment but gave credit for eight months time on remand, with a resulting net sentence of 30 days imprisonment imposed on April 7th, 2010. He served that sentence but, not surprisingly, was further detained to await his trial on the present charge; i.e., the assault on the other inmate in October of 2009.

26 But for this present charge, Mr. Allen
27 would have been released from jail in late April

2010. He thus has been in remand status on the present charge for the past seven months.

The fact that he was unable to obtain judicial interim release during these past seven months is, of course, primarily due to his lengthy list of convictions for disobeying court orders, including orders granting him bail. In these circumstances, although I will give credit for the seven months remand time, I am not satisfied that he ought to get more credit than on a one-for-one ratio.

Please stand, Mr. Allen.

Chester Jason Allen, for the crime that you have committed, assault causing bodily harm contrary to Section 267 of the Criminal Code, it is the sentence of this Court that you be imprisoned for a period of 18 months. I will give you credit of seven months for the remand time and therefore the net sentence is one of 11 months imprisonment.

In addition, I make an order under

Section 109 of the Criminal Code with respect to

prohibition of firearms for a period of ten

years. And finally, the DNA order sought by the

Crown prosecutor, under Section 487.012 of the

Criminal Code, will issue as well.

Mr. Allen, your lawyer indicated to me this

1 morning that you have told him that it is your 2 intention, when you do get your release, to lead a crime-free life from here on in. And I hope 4 that you hold true to that statement that you 5 made to your lawyer which he repeated in court here today. You are 33 years old now, and I am 6 sure you don't want to be spending any more time in jail. You have already spent too much time 8 9 there for a healthy young man. You want to get 10 back your relationship with your younger kids; 11 you can't do it from inside that jail. So I 12 wish you well. You can sit down now. 13 Anything further, counsel? 14 MR. LECORRE: 15 Just with respect to the 16 issue of the probation order, has Your Honour 17 considered that? THE COURT: 18 I have considered that, Mr. 19 Lecorre, and in my view the circumstances of 20 this crime, it was within the prison walls, the 21 altercation between he and the victim, it is not 22 a similar circumstance to them having an 23 altercation out in the wide world so I am 24 satisfied, from hearing Mr. Allen this morning,

25

26

27

he knows he has done wrong and he has apologised

to the victim, and so I am content to leave it

up to him to lead a crime-free life when he is

Τ	released.
2	MR. LECORRE: Thank you, Your Honour.
3	Nothing further from the Crown.
4	MR. SHABALA: Requesting the victim of
5	crime surcharge be waived, Your Honour.
6	THE COURT: Yes, in the circumstances,
7	there will be no victim fine surcharge, thank
8	you for reminding me.
9	We will close court.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
15	to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
16	Supreme Court Rules,
17	
18	
19	
20	Lois Hewitt, CSR(A), RPR, CRR Court Reporter
21	court veborger
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	