S-1-CR2011000130

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

PAUL PAYOU

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, at Fort Simpson in the Northwest Territories, on April 5th A.D., 2012.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. D. Vaillancourt: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd: 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 offender before the
2		Court is a 60-year-old aboriginal man from
3		Fort Liard, Northwest Territories. Yesterday
4		he was convicted by a jury of his peers of a
5		serious crime of sexually assaulting an
6		intoxicated unconscious woman. Today it is my
7		responsibility to impose a fit sentence.
8		The circumstances of the offence are as
9		follows:
10		On February 6th, 2011, the victim, a
11		32-year-old aboriginal woman, living in her
12		home community of Fort Liard, was drinking
13		alcohol with friends and family at two
14		different residences in Fort Liard and, by
15		early evening, was becoming intoxicated. She
16		then went to the community health centre with
17		her friend C. as C. required medical
18		attention. The offender, who is C.'s
19		father, drove them to the health centre in his
20		vehicle. The offender waited in his vehicle
21		outside the health centre. There was alcohol
22		in his vehicle.
23		During the time while C. was waiting
24		for or receiving medical attention, the victim
25		had several more drinks of alcohol at or in
26		the offender's vehicle. When the victim
27		decided to leave the health centre to go home,

1 she asked the offender to drive her home.

There was no more alcohol in the offender's vehicle and so the offender offered to take the victim to his home where she would have more to drink and then he would drive her

6 home.

At the offender's home, he made her a mixed vodka drink and then he gave her three shooters of straight vodka. This would have been nine or 10 o'clock in the evening.

After drinking the shooters, the victim remembers nothing until she woke up the next morning. She was laying on a bed in the offender's livingroom, her pants were lowered, and the offender was sitting beside her. The victim said "what the hell's going on?" to which the offender responded "nothing, you just passed out, that's all".

The victim pulled up her pants and went to the bathroom. She noticed blood on her pants, and testified that she was on her monthly period at that time. She also noticed hickeys on her neck and breast. The offender drove the victim to her home. After speaking with family members at her home, she called the police. She was later taken to the health centre where a sexual assault kit was

completed. While the victim remembers nothing
of what happened to her during the night, she
learned from the police as a result of
forensic analysis that the offender had had
sex with her that night.

The victim knew the offender as she says that he was friends with her own father and also because she had babysat the offender's children in the past.

The 60-year-old offender testified at his trial that in February 2011, he and this younger woman, the victim, were "very much in love with each other". And that they had consensual sex that night. By their verdict, it is obvious that the jury did not believe his evidence. By their verdict, the jury found that the victim was not capable of consenting to sexual activity because of her gross intoxication. Having heard the trial evidence, I am satisfied that this offender intentionally supplied excessive amounts of alcohol to an already intoxicated woman so that he could have sex with her.

The personal circumstances of this offender are as follows:

He is 60 years of age. He grew up in Fort
Nelson, British Columbia, in a large family

after his parents had relocated there from
northern Alberta. His parents, now deceased,
at some point had lost their treaty status
with the result that Mr. Payou and his
siblings did not regain treaty status and are
considered nonstatus aboriginal.

At a young age, this offender and his siblings were taken away from the parents into foster care. This offender spent much of his youth, until age 15, in many foster homes away from his family in Fort Nelson, and he lost the aboriginal language that he had learned from his parents, and he did not receive the parental care and guidance usually associated with a traditional family unit.

After age 15, he apparently got in with a bad crowd and had a troubled life thereafter, often in conflict with the law and indeed he has an extensive criminal record between 1968 and 1987, primarily for property offences and drinking and driving offences.

He gave up drinking alcohol in 1987 and he says that he has not had a drink since that time.

25 In 1988, Mr. Payou commenced a
26 relationship with a woman in Fort Liard,
27 Northwest Territories and they had three

- 1 children. That relationship lasted until the 2 year 2000.
- 3 Mr. Payou did not have much formal
- 4 schooling beyond Grade 8; however, to his
- 5 credit, he has upgraded himself by taking
- 6 trades training when he could and he
- 7 eventually took courses which resulted in him
- 8 getting his Grade 12 GED diploma. I am told
- 9 that Mr. Payou has always had steady
- 10 employment and in recent years has worked for
- 11 the municipal government in Fort Liard
- 12 providing water and sewer services to the
- 13 community.
- In November of 2009, in Fort Liard, Mr.
- 15 Payou sexually assaulted a young girl. That
- 16 case came into this court in April 2011 when
- 17 he was convicted of sexual assault and
- 18 sentenced to three years imprisonment. He is
- 19 presently serving that sentence in Bowden
- 20 Institute in the province of Alberta.
- 21 That is a summary of this offender's
- 22 personal circumstances.
- I turn now, briefly, to the victim in the
- 24 present case.
- The victim in this case was quite
- 26 emotionally upset and distraught when
- 27 testifying at this trial, and understandably

1 so. She filed a brief victim impact statement with the Court and I will read it into the 3 record. Madam Clerk, I am going to ask you to mark this document as Exhibit S-2 in these 5 proceedings. The victim states as follows, and I quote: 8 I feel so stupid for taking shots with him, the accused. I am so 10 11 embarrassed for drinking with him. 12 Nothing like this has ever happened to me before. I now keep 13 my thoughts to myself. I am too 14 embarrassed about this. I feel 15 16 everyone knows about this. My 17 family has to put up with my bad moods. I felt safe with him, the 18 accused, because we, friends and 19 20 family, drank his booze before. He always had booze in his truck 21 22 and his home. But he never drank 23 with us. Since he did not drink, I felt safe. I never thought he 24 25 would hurt me. I want this to be 26 over so I can go home to my 27 family. I want no contact with

1 him.

One of the principles of sentencing which
guides a sentencing Judge is sometimes
referred to as parity. This principle is
described in the Criminal Code in these words:
"a sentence should be similar to sentences
imposed on similar offenders for similar
offences committed in similar circumstances".

When I have regard to those latter words,

"similar offences committed in similar

circumstances", I am mindful of the prevalence

of this very type of offence in this

jurisdiction. And by "this type of offence",

I am referring to the sexual assault of a

woman who is unconscious or passed out because

of alcohol consumption.

Regrettably, we have had many many many similar cases come before the courts of this jurisdiction for years, and it continues to be a serious social problem in this jurisdiction today. The Judges of this Court and of the Court of Appeal have commented on this situation over and over. One recent case where this was highlighted was the decision of this Court in R. v. Keith Roy Michel where a young aboriginal offender was sentenced for a similar offence which he committed in the

aboriginal community of Lutsel K'e.

The prevalence of this type of offence in the communities of this jurisdiction is simply appalling. Because of that situation, in my view the sentencing objectives of denunciation and deterrence require a fit and appropriate sentence with those particular objectives in mind.

The starting point, when considering a fit sentence for an offence of this nature, is three years imprisonment in a federal penitentiary. During the consideration of a fit sentence in each individual case, that starting point can then be adjusted to reflect the presence or absence of any aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

In the determination of a fit sentence in this case, I have considered the fundamental purpose and the objectives of sentencing as set forth by Parliament in the Criminal Code.

I acknowledge the fundamental sentencing principle of proportionality, that is, that a sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

In this case this offender's degree of responsibility is high. Himself a nondrinker,

he deliberately plied an intoxicated woman with more booze so that he could have sexual gratification. His behaviour was egregious. He displayed an appalling lack of regard for the personal and bodily integrity of another human being.

1

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

I have also considered other sentencing principles set forth in Section 718.2 of the Criminal Code. As Mr. Payou is an aboriginal offender, I have had particular regard to paragraph (e) of Section 718.2.

As required by the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada in Gladue and Ipeelee, as sentencing Judge I take judicial notice of the history of colonialism in this country, the historical displacement of some aboriginal peoples in Canada, the sad legacy of the residential school system in Canada. These are matters that have led to, and continue to lead to, lower educational attainment by aboriginal peoples generally, higher rates of unemployment, higher rates of substance abuse and social problems among aboriginal people generally, and also higher levels of incarceration of aboriginal people in Canada as a whole. I take this context and these historical circumstances into account when I

consider what sanctions are appropriate and 1 reasonable when imposing a fit sentence for 3 this aboriginal offender in this case. In addition, in this case defence counsel has provided to the Court some case-specific 5 or individual information about this aboriginal offender's background, information that I have referred to earlier. It shows 8 that his parents lost their children as a result of the then state policies on 10 11 apprehension of children from aboriginal families and aboriginal communities and, as a 12 13 result, his parents were prevented from providing the usual parental care, love and 14 15 quidance that is associated with a traditional family unit. This led to a dysfunctional 16 17 lifestyle by a young Paul Payou which continued into his adult years. He did 18 19 however, as I have said, eventually grow out 20 of the dysfunctional lifestyle and he did 21 improve himself and was, for years, a 22 productive member of society. Those, then, are some of the unique 23 24 circumstances of this aboriginal offender 25 which I take into account or into 26 consideration when I have regard to the 27 direction of Parliament in paragraph (e) of

1 Section 718.2.

However, at the end of the day, I regret
in all of the circumstances of this case that
I am unable in this case to impose a sanction
short of incarceration. I am unable to
conclude that the unique circumstances of
aboriginal offenders generally, or the
case-specific information about this
aboriginal offender, is of such a mitigating
nature as to impose a sanction short of
incarceration.

This was a very serious crime of violence. Mr. Payou's conduct vis- α -vis this young aboriginal woman was despicable. His moral blameworthiness is high. His unique systemic or background circumstances as an aboriginal offender before this Court cannot and does not diminish his moral culpability for this serious crime of violence which is so prevalent in this jurisdiction.

After much consideration, I have determined that the principles of sentencing, including proportionality and including the Gladue principles contemplated by paragraph (e) of Section 718.2, lead me to impose a fit sentence for this aboriginal offender, Paul Payou, that is similar to the sentences that

have been imposed upon similar aboriginal
offenders in this jurisdiction who have
committed a similar offence in similar
circumstances.

5 There are aggravating features to this 6 crime.

Mr. Payou's criminal record is an aggravating feature although I take note that most of it is dated and unrelated. It is an aggravating factor in the determination of sentence that the offender was, on February 7, 2011, on bail awaiting his trial a few months later on a sexual assault charge in which the complainant was a young girl in Fort Liard.

I find that there are no mitigating circumstances in this case. I detect no remorse on the offender's part for what he did in committing this offence in February 2011.

There is another sentencing principle that

I must consider and that is sometimes referred

to as the totality principle. The law

requires that when the Court imposes a

sentence that is consecutive to another

sentence, the Court must be careful not to

impose a combined sentence that is unduly long

or unduly harsh.

In my view, a consecutive sentence is

1 appropriate in this case. Also, in my view, a fit sentence for the present offence is one of 3 four years imprisonment. The principle of totality requires that I take a "hard look" at the combined sentence which would now mean a 5 further six years in penitentiary for this 60-year-old aboriginal offender, that is, the two years remaining on the sentence that he is 8 now serving plus the four years consecutive which would be imposed. I find that that 10 11 combined sentence is harsh, perhaps unduly 12 harsh, and as a result I will reduce somewhat 13 the consecutive sentence that I impose today. I will just state for the record that I am 14 advised by counsel that this offender has no 15 pre-trial custody for which I must consider 16 17 any credit in the determination of sentence. Please stand now, Mr. Payou. 18 19 Paul Payou for the crime that you have 20 committed, the sexual assault on Donna Klondike contrary to Section 271 of the 21 Criminal Code, it is the sentence of this 22 Court that you be imprisoned for a term of 23 24 imprisonment of three years consecutive to any 25 other sentence presently being served. In addition, I grant the mandatory

26

27

firearms prohibition order under Section 109

1		of the Criminal Code for a period of ten years
2		consecutive to the existing firearms
3		prohibition order.
4		Next, I grant the mandatory order under
5		Section 487.051 of the Criminal Code requiring
6		you to provide a DNA sample.
7		Also, an order will issue under Section
8		490.012 requiring that you comply with the
9		provisions of the Sex Offender Information
10		Registration Act for life.
11		In the circumstances of the lengthy term
12		of incarceration to be served by Mr. Payou,
13		there will be no victim of crime surcharge.
14		Take a seat, sir.
15		Counsel, is there anything further on this
16		case?
17	MS.	VAILLANCOURT: Nothing from the Crown, Your
18		Honour.
19	MR.	BOYD: Nothing from the defence.
20	THE	COURT: Fine, we will close court.
21		*EXHIBIT S-2: Victim Impact Statement
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

Τ	accurate transcript pursuant
2	to Rules 723 and 724 of the
3	Supreme Court Rules,
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	Lois Hewitt,
9	Court Reporter
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	