R. v. Apsimik, 2011 NWTSC 04 S-1-CR-2010-000039

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

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

TERENCE ANTHONY APSIMIK

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Judge J. E. Richard, in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 9th day of February, 2011

APPEARANCES:

Mr. A. Godfrey: Counsel on behalf of the Crown

Mr. J. Bran: Counsel on behalf of the Accused

Charge under s. 266 C.C.

1 THE COURT: This 23-year-old offender,

Terence Apsimik, has been convicted by a jury of assault, contrary to section 266 of the Criminal

4 Code. This offence carries a maximum sentence of

5 five years imprisonment.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Late in the evening of October 20th, 2009, the offender was likely in an intoxicated state, although there is no precise evidence on that point. He had been drinking alcohol and consuming marihuana with a 17-year-old friend throughout the day in the offender's apartment. The two of them took a taxi cab from the offender's apartment to the downtown area of Yellowknife. The taxi driver was directed to go to a parking area near Somba K'e Park. The 17-year-old friend was sitting behind the driver, and this offender was sitting in the right rear seat. The 17-year-old put a knife to the throat of the driver and demanded money. The driver struggled to get the knife away from his throat and managed to do so, and in the process sustaining cuts to both his hands. The 17-year-old got out of the car. This offender then punched the taxi driver in the face from his position in the right rear seat. This offender then got out of the car and both he and the

17-year-old fled. The taxi driver called the

RCMP and they arrived on the scene within minutes. The RCMP apprehended the two amateur criminals not far from the scene within minutes.

No money had been taken from the victim.

The victim suffered cuts to both hands and also minor swelling or puffiness to his lips or face from the one punch administered by this offender. He received minor medical treatment from ambulance personnel called to the scene and at the Stanton Hospital.

During his testimony at trial, the victim stated that as a result of this incident he was not able to work for a while, not because of physical injuries but rather for emotional reasons or traumatic stress. He states that he no longer works the late night shift and also said that he is more careful about which addresses he goes to in connection with his profession as a taxi driver in our city.

Following their arrest on October 20th, both this offender and the 17-year-old were charged with robbery. The 17-year-old appeared in Youth Court, pleaded guilty to robbery, and received a sentence of 12 months custody.

This offender, Terence Apsimik, was charged with robbery, elected trial by Supreme Court judge and jury, and requested a preliminary

inquiry in Territorial Court. The preliminary was held in February 2010 and he was committed to stand trial before a jury in this court. Having elected trial by jury, he then joined the long queue of accused persons wishing a jury trial. His jury trial was scheduled for this week, that is February of 2011, 16 months after the offence date.

Though charged with robbery, the jury properly found him not guilty of that offence but guilty of the included offence of assault. There was no evidence on which the jury could necessarily infer that at the time this offender administered the punch to the victim that he himself intended to steal from the taxi driver or that he intended to assist the 17-year-old to steal from the taxi driver.

My impression of the nature of this assault comes from the evidence of the victim, who I must say did not embellish his evidence and gave his evidence in a very fair and dispassionate manner in describing the circumstances of the assaults. The victim gave very credible evidence and it should come as no surprise to the offender that the jury accepted the victim's evidence about the assault. In any event, it is my impression that when administering the punch, this offender did

so in the heat of the moment, perhaps in a state of panic, perhaps in an effort to extricate himself from the situation, or perhaps it was simply gratuitous violence. Although the criminal conduct of these two immature young men could be described as amateurish, their respective crimes were nonetheless serious crimes of violence. Mr. Apsimik's crime in assaulting a vulnerable and terrified victim in the circumstances I have described is very serious, and the sentence must reflect the gravity of his crime and must be proportionate to the level of his responsibility.

The main purpose of the sentencing process is to promote respect for the law and to maintain a safe and peaceful community. This kind of attack on a vulnerable taxi driver has to be denounced as unlawful conduct that is not acceptable to the members of our community. The sentence that is imposed must act as a deterrent to this offender and others, drunk or sober, from engaging in this kind of unlawful conduct. As has been stated in previous decisions of this court and other courts, taxi drivers are in a vulnerable position. They are people who provide a service to the public in circumstances that put them at risk. So the sentence imposed must

recognize that and must have as its objectives,
to repeat, deterrence of others from engaging in
this kind of unlawful conduct, and denunciation
of this unlawful conduct.

This offender, Terence Apsimik, is now 23 years old. I am told he has a grade 10 education plus additional upgrading. I am told he is presently employed, having obtained full-time employment just a few weeks ago. Mr. Apsimik has been in a common-law relationship for two years and the couple are expecting their first child in April of this year.

This is not the first time that Mr. Apsimik has been before the court for a crime of violence. His criminal record includes three separate assault convictions. For his first assault conviction in 2007, he received a suspended sentence and was placed on probation for 12 months. He was later in 2008 convicted of two other assaults and for those received custodial sentences of one month and two months respectively. When he appeared in court in May 2008 and was sentenced on those two assaults and other matters, he received a total sentence of six months imprisonment, followed by 12 months probation. Thus, it would appear that he would have barely completed his probation period when

1 he committed his most recent crime of violence in 2 October 2009.

Counsel are agreed that a custodial sentence is necessary in this case. However, the offender requests that he be allowed to serve his sentence in the community as a conditional sentence pursuant to the provisions of section 742.1 of the Criminal Code. I have considered this request and have determined that a conditional sentence is simply not on, in all of the circumstances of this offence and this offender. One of the factors in that determination is the offender's repeated pattern of crimes of violence in our community. I find that a conditional sentence in this case would fail to promote in Terence Apsimik a sense of responsibility for what he has done. Mr. Apsimik submits to the court through his counsel that he has in the past 16 months while awaiting trial matured a lot or grown up. Part of growing up or maturing is taking responsibility for one's conduct. To impose a conditional sentence in the circumstances of this offence and this offender would be inconsistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing, in particular, promoting respect for the law, denunciation, deterrence, proportionality, and

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 1 parity.
- There are no mitigating circumstances to
- 3 take into consideration in the determination of
- 4 an appropriate sentence in this case.
- 5 The offender's criminal record is an
- 6 aggravating circumstance, as is the fact that the
- 7 victim of his violent crime was a vulnerable taxi
- 8 driver who had just been violently assaulted by
- 9 the offender's friend.
- The prosecutor suggests that a period of
- 11 probation be added to any custodial term. I
- decline to impose a probation term. Probation
- has not worked for this offender and I see no
- 14 reason to add another file to the case load of
- the office of Probation Services.
- 16 Please stand, Mr. Apsimik.
- 17 Terence Apsimik, for the crime that you have
- 18 committed, assault contrary to section 266 of the
- 19 Criminal Code, it is the sentence of the court
- 20 that you be imprisoned for a period of six
- 21 months.
- In the circumstances, there will be no
- victim fine surcharge.
- You can be seated.
- Is there anything further in this case,
- 26 counsel?
- 27 MR. GODFREY: None from the Crown, Your

1		Honour.
2	MR.	BRAN: Your Honour, nothing in regard
3		to the sentence but a very brief comment on the
4		comments earlier today. I'd like to thank the
5		court for that positive feedback and I certainly,
6		upon reflection, agree with all of your comments
7		and thank you for pointing those out. It can
8		only make my practice in the court better in the
9		future. So thank you for those comments.
10	THE	COURT: Thank you. We will close
11		court.
12		
13		
14		Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
15		to Rule 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules of Court.
16		-
17		
18		Annette Wright, RPR Court Reporter
19		-
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		