R. v. Elias, 2012 NWTSC 13

S-1-CR2011000113

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

KRISTOPHER JOHN ELIAS

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice w. M. Darichuk, at Deline in the Northwest Territories, on February 3rd A.D., 2012.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. A. Paquin: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Bran: Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 271 Criminal Code of Canada

An order has been made banning publication of the identity of the Complainant/Witness pursuant to Section 486.4 of the Criminal Code of Canada

1	THE	COURT: The accused has been found
2		guilty of a sexual assault. The victim was 22
3		years of age while the accused is 27 years of
4		age.
5		He has an extensive criminal record.
6		The observations of Mr. Justice Vertes in
7		R. v. Kodzin, [2011] N.W.T.J. No. 8, appear to
8		be apt. At paragraph 18 he observes,
9		Sentencing in every criminal case
10		is a difficult process. It
11		requires the balancing of
12		different objectives. If I look
13		at this case strictly with the
14		offender in mind, I might be far
15		more lenient. He made a terrible
16		mistake. He made a terrible
17		decision when he got drunk. He
18		made a terrible mistake when he
19		violated someone else. It was not
20		just a mistake, it was a crime,
21		and he is responsible for the harm
22		he has caused. So I cannot just
23		think about what would be best for
24		this offender and his family. I
25		have to think as well about
26		vindicating the victim, about
27		upholding the law so other women

1	are not victimised and about
2	sending a message to everyone that
3	this type of behaviour is morally
4	wrong and young men who take
5	advantage of vulnerable women will
6	be punished for it.
7	As I indicated, part of these observations
8	are apt in this decision. One other important
9	observation that he makes appears in paragraph
10	10,
11	The crime demands no different a
12	sentence than if it were committed
13	by a non-aboriginal offender in
14	the same circumstances. Serious
15	sexual assaults on women,
16	especially aboriginal women, are a
17	clear and pressing problem in this
18	jurisdiction.
19	The first issue for determination before
20	proceeding with the sentencing is whether or
21	not this is a major sexual assault. For that
22	answer, I need go no further than the decision
23	of the Alberta Court of Appeal in R. v. Arcand
24	2010 ABCA 363. At paragraph 171, this is what
25	the Alberta Court of Appeal said:
26	A sexual assault is a major sexual
27	assault when the sexual assault is

of such a nature or character that a reasonable person could foresee that it is likely to cause serious psychological or emotional harm whether or not physical injury occurs. As I look at those words, I recall the evidence of Kayleen Kenny who noted that the

evidence of Kayleen Kenny who noted that the victim was crying hysterically and she looked scared; she never saw that look before. That is enough but I do note as well the comments of the learned counsel that she subsequently left this jurisdiction. So I am of the opinion, firstly, that the sexual assault before the Court is encompassed in that definition. It is a major sexual assault.

The significance is that according to the decision of R. v. Sandercock 22 C.C.C. (3d)

79, the starting-point is three years' imprisonment. The learned Crown attorney submits that a sentence of three and a half to four years would be appropriate. That's a period of 42 to 48 months. Considering the relevancy of the factors that I must duly weigh, that recommendation by her is neither unrealistic nor unreasonable.

Accordingly, there is an order of the

1	Court that pursuant to section 490.012 of the
2	Code, an order is granted that the accused
3	comply with the Sex Offender Registration Act.
4	That order will begin today and last for 20
5	years.
6	As sexual assault is a primary designated
7	offence, an order is granted authorizing the
8	taking of bodily substances that are
9	reasonably required for the taking of a DNA
10	analysis pursuant to section 487.051.
11	The mandatory firearms prohibition order
12	under section 109 of the Code is granted for
13	ten years from today's date.
14	The victim surcharge is waived.
15	Bearing in mind that Mr. Elias has already
16	served five and a half months, the sentence of
17	the Court is three years.
18	The Court stands closed.
19	
20	Certified to be a true and
21	accurate transcript pursuant to Rules 723 and 724 of the
22	Supreme Court Rules,
23	
24	
25	
26	Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter
27	Source Reported