R. v. Clillie, 2013 NWTSC 21

S-1-CR2012000083

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

JUSTIN CLILLIE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable

Justice L. A. Charbonneau, at Yellowknife in the Northwest

Territories, on March 27th A.D., 2013.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. J. Bond: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd: Counsel for the Accused

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: Ea	rlier today Justin Clillie
2		pleaded guilty to a	charge of sexual assault
3		and I must now decid	le what a fit sentence is
4		for that crime. In	this case, as with any
5		sentencing, the Cour	t has to take into account
6		the circumstances of	the offence that was
7		committed, the circu	mstances of the offender
8		who committed it, an	d the principles of
9		sentencing that are	set out in the Criminal
10		Code.	
11		The circumstance	es of the offence are
12		outlined in the agre	ed statement of facts that
13		was filed at the sen	tencing hearing.
14		The complainant	E.H. was at a friend's
15		house in Wrigley on	the night in question.
16		People were consumir	ng alcohol in the house and
17		Mr. Clillie joined t	them. When Mr. Clillie
18		found himself alone	in the livingroom with the
19		complainant, he push	ned himself on her and
20		tried to kiss her.	She told him to leave her
21		alone. Another man	who was in the house,
22		Mr. Boniface, who wa	s the boyfriend of E.H.'s
23		friend, came downsta	irs to check on what was
24		going on. Mr. Clill	ie told him to go back
25		upstairs. The compl	ainant tried to follow
26		Mr. Boniface but aga	in Mr. Clillie pushed her
27		and this time he tri	ed to kiss her. She got

1 away and went up the stairs. She went to the 2 bedroom where her friend and Mr. Boniface 3 were. She later left to go to the bathroom, which was down the hall. When she came out of 5 the bathroom, Mr. Clillie grabbed her from 6 behind, pulled her into an empty bedroom, put 7 the bed against the door, and then pinned her on the bed. He started grabbing at her breasts 8 and crotch over her clothes. She was trying 10 to get away. He tried to put his hand down 11 her pants but was not successful. She was, during this time, screaming for help. 12 13 Mr. Boniface came to try to help but he was not able to open the door because the bed was 14 blocking it. He called the police. Two 15 officers responded to the call and they were 16 able to get the door open. When they did so, 17 they found Mr. Clillie holding the complainant 18 19 onto the bed. 20 Defence counsel had made the submission 21 that I should accept or interpret these facts 22 as being that from Mr. Clillie's distorted point of view that night, the bed was placed 23 24 against the door to ensure that they could 25 have privacy. 26 I have great difficulty accepting this

27

interpretation of events.

1 The bed had the effect of preventing 2 access to the room where Mr. Clillie had 3 forcibly brought the complainant after twice before that having tried to kiss her against 5 her will. The bed was enough to prevent 6 Mr. Boniface from opening the door and she was 7 screaming on the other side of it. The fact that two police officers were later able to 8 open the door does not change the fact that 10 the bed was blocking the door. On the whole 11 of the circumstances, I find the only reasonable interpretation of the facts is that 12 13 Mr. Clillie was determined to do what he had set out to do. He knew Mr. Boniface was 14 nearby and he was trying to prevent anyone 15 from getting in to intervene again because he 16 17 had already been interrupted downstairs in the livingroom one of the times he had tried to 18 19 kiss the complainant. This case, in my view, is very different 20 21 in nature from what is sometimes referred to as a "groping" case. This is not an 22 intoxicated person "groping" a clothed woman. 23 24 This is an intoxicated man determined to force 25 his will on a woman and completely ignore her 26 views of the matter and to use force to 27 confine her and subdue her to his will. I do

not think it takes a lot of imagination to
figure out what would have happened if there
had not been the intervention first from Mr.

Boniface, and then from the police.

Mr. Clillie showed complete disregard for the complainant and complete contempt for her personal integrity. He ignored her physical resistance to him and her screams for help. In my view, this is a very serious incident.

That said, I think the Crown prosecutor is correct in pointing out that Mr. Clillie must be sentenced for what he actually did, not for what could have happened if he had not been stopped. The complainant is lucky obviously that he was stopped. But so is he. If he had not been stopped, and if things had progressed in the direction that they appeared to be heading, he could be looking today at a sentence of several more years in jail and a long long time before he could hope to see his daughter again.

The principles of sentencing that I have to apply are set out in the Criminal Code and I am not going to quote them today. But I have reviewed them and I have considered them.

The paramount sentencing objectives in this case are deterrence and denunciation.

1 This is because sexual assault is a very prevalent crime in this jurisdiction and the 3 need to reinforce the message that this type of conduct, that shows disregard and contempt for women's personal and sexual integrity, is 5 unacceptable. That need is very much at the 6 7 forefront of the Court's mind when imposing sentences for crimes of this nature. People 8 have to understand that they have to take 'no' 10 for an answer. It is as simple as that. 11 The fundamental sentencing principle under our law is proportionality. A sentence must 12 13 be proportionate to the seriousness of the offence and the level of blameworthiness of 14 the offender. 15 Other important sentencing principles in 16 17 this case are parity and also restraint. 18 Restraint takes on a particular importance 19 when dealing with aboriginal offenders by 20 virtue of Section 718.2(e) of the Criminal 21 Code as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada in the cases of R. v. Gladue [1999] 22 1 SCR 688 and R. v. Ipeelee 2012 SCC 13. 23 24 Just last week, on March 20th, 2013, in my

Official Court Reporters

25

26

27

sentencing decision in R. v. Green I reviewed

the main features of those two Supreme Court

of Canada cases and the responsibilities that

they place on a sentencing Judge. For the
purpose of this case, I adopt the comments
that I made in that case and I have applied
the same principles here.

I have taken judicial notice of the matters that the Supreme Court of Canada has said sentencing courts must take judicial notice of.

I have also taken into consideration the factors specific to Mr. Clillie about his background and upbringing, which are part of the constellation of factors that must be examined in assessing his level of blameworthiness for this crime.

And given that here the issue really is whether time served would be a fit sentence, or whether an additional jail term needs to be imposed today, I have specifically turned my mind to the question of which sanctions might be most appropriate to his case given his aboriginal background and some of the struggles that he has faced, and which sanctions are more likely to achieve the objectives of sentencing. More specifically, as I have said, I have reflected about whether a further term of incarceration would be the best way to further the objectives of

sentencing, or whether something else would.

I have heard about Mr. Clillie's personal circumstances from his counsel and also from him directly when he spoke to the Court earlier today.

He is an aboriginal man and grew up mostly in Wrigley. He was raised by his mother as a single parent. Mr. Clillie advised that his mother did go to residential school and that she has and continues to struggle with alcohol. Mr. Clillie says he was sexually abused when he was very young and again as a teenager when he lived in a group home in Fort Simpson. He said he was also physically abused in that home.

Mr. Clillie has come to recognize that he should not consume alcohol.

I have heard that after he served his last jail term, for a time he was able to maintain employment and a sober lifestyle and that during that period of time he was not involved in a single incident involving the police.

That suggests that if Mr. Clillie stays away from alcohol, he does not constitute a threat to public safety. It suggests that he could be productive and turn his life around if he chooses to and if he stays away from alcohol.

There is also compelling evidence that when he does consume alcohol, he very much represents a threat to public safety.

Mr. Clillie is now 32 years old. He has a long criminal record that starts in 2001 and continues with a steady pattern of convictions until 2009 at which point he received a significant jail term for a sexual assault charge. He received a jail term of 18 months followed by probation but that was after receiving credit for about eight months of pre-trial custody. So, in effect, this means that the sentence that was deemed fit for that offence was well into the penitentiary range. From this I infer that it was a serious sexual assault.

As I have already said, I consider that what happened on the date of this incident was a serious assault. Mr. Clillie showed persistence in its commission and he used his own physical strength to overpower his victim. He ignored her words and her actions and proceeded with complete disregard for her as a person.

I have heard that Mr. Clillie has a daughter and that he loves her very much and that his focus at this point, and his primary

1.3

1 concern, is to be released from prison as soon 2 as possible so that he can try to get her back 3 in his care and look after her. I have no doubt that Mr. Clillie loves his daughter. 5 And I am sure he would not want her to be 6 treated, when she grows up, in the way that he 7 treated the complainant in this case. This is 8 what people have to remember - this complainant, and complainants in all sexual 10 assault cases that come before this Court, and 11 courts in general, are someone's daughter or someone's sister, someone's wife or someone's 12 1.3 mother. 14 Apart from the seriousness of the offence itself, the main aggravating factor in this 15 case is the criminal record, especially 16 because it includes several entries for crimes 17 18 of violence, but more particularly because of 19 the entry from 2009 for the very same offence 20 that brings Mr. Clillie before the Court 21 today. 22

As I said during submissions this morning, a person should not be punished over and over again for the convictions that appear on his or her criminal record but the record does raise concerns from the point of view of specific deterrence and concerns also about

23

24

25

26

1 the protection of the public.

2 That said, there are mitigating factors as 3 well. Mr. Clillie has pleaded guilty.

In assessing the weight to be given to that plea, I have considered that it was not an early guilty plea. There was a preliminary hearing and a date had been set for a jury trial, although the subpoenas had not yet been served or even issued. But the fact is that this case was hanging over the complainant's head for quite some time.

I have also considered that Mr. Clillie was virtually caught in the act by the two police officers. There was also an independent witness to at least part of his actions. So this is one of those cases where, it appears, he was inescapably caught. But at the same time, I heard that the complainant's version of events at the preliminary hearing was different than what had been alleged in her statement to the police in some respect, so that could have presented a problem for the Crown at trial.

In addition, what the guilty plea has done, quite apart from any challenges the Crown might have had with its case, is that it has spared the complainant from having to come

to court to have to testify about this and it
has provided her with certainty of outcome.

This Court sees complainants testify in these
types of cases on a regular basis and knows
that it is usually a very difficult and
painful experience for them. So sparing
someone from that, I have always said, is a
very significant thing.

In addition, the guilty plea has saved the resources and time required for a trial in a jurisdiction where, more and more, trial time is precious, especially on circuit, given the number of pending cases that we have. So while Mr. Clillie is not entitled to the same mitigating effect for his plea as he might have if he had entered his plea at the very first opportunity, I have concluded that he still deserves considerable credit for it.

He is also entitled to credit for the year he spent on remand. In this case, I have discretion to give up to one and half credit for that time but I do not have a lot of information that would justify me doing so. I know that he has had access to certain programs while he was in custody and I have not heard any specific submissions about his case manager, or some other official from the

jail, conveying that he would have earned
remission had he been a serving prisoner. So
I think that the information that I have
before me today falls short of what would be
required to establish that the circumstances
justify enhanced credit for the remand time in
his individual case.

I have considered the cases that were submitted. As Crown counsel pointed out, no two cases are alike and none of the ones submitted are on all fours with this one. It is true that certain facts in some of those cases, like the removal of the clothing or more intrusive violations of the complainant, make in that respect some of those cases more serious. But here the level of force that was used and Mr. Clillie's persistence in his actions despite the complainant's protests and her attempts to resist are features of his crime that are more serious and are not present in some of these cases referred to.

As I noted in my exchange with counsel this morning, at first blush, especially in light of the criminal record and the sentence that was imposed in 2009 for a sexual assault, and some of the aggravating features of this offence, I had concerns about the Crown's

position. The additional submissions that
were provided to me were helpful in
understanding how the Crown came to its

position. And now of course I also have the
benefit of defence counsel's submissions, as

well as information that Mr. Clillie himself
has provided, so I have a much fuller picture
of the situation than I did when I raised my
concern with Crown counsel.

I think on the whole the Court would be perfectly justified, on a offence like this one, in imposing a sentence at the high end of the territorial range given the facts and the criminal record. But I have considered carefully the submissions of counsel, what I heard from Mr. Clillie himself, and I have reminded myself that rehabilitation should never be overlooked even when it is not the paramount factor. And I have also, as is my duty, given due consideration to the fact that Mr. Clillie is an aboriginal offender. I have concluded, after giving the matter some thought, that this is a case where it is possible perhaps to approach the sentencing in a manner different than what I might otherwise do, with the view of crafting a sanction that addresses, at least to an extent, some measure

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- of restorative and rehabilitative objectives
 in the hopes of course that Mr. Clillie will
 change his ways and will rehabilitate himself.
 Because ultimately that is the best way to
 protect the public.
 - Mr. Clillie has said that he thought probation would be helpful for him.

At first blush, again his past record
might not suggest so, because there are a lot
of convictions for breaches on his record.

But he said that on his last sentence he found
being on probation quite useful. He has also
said that he is prepared to abide by a
no-drinking condition because he recognizes
that this is essential for him to be and
remain a productive member of his community.

I asked him specifically about this issue of the no-drinking condition because the objective in putting a condition like that in a probation order is not to set him up for a breach and cause him more problems. It is to assist him in his own efforts at maintaining the course he says he wants to be on.

So I will make probation part of this sentence, even though someone looking at the criminal record may think that it is not the greatest of ideas. I am going to make

probation a part of the sentence as an indication of the Court's hope that it will be helpful and will be used in the way that it can be and assist Mr. Clillie in his rehabilitation.

I am going to make it a long probation order with meaningful conditions, and I am going to include a no-drinking condition. It may be a hard condition for Mr. Clillie to comply with. And it is because it will be a burdensome probation order that I feel I can reduce what would have otherwise been the custodial portion of his sentence.

Having taken all of this into account, and in all honesty, with some hesitation, but hoping that it is the right decision on this case, I have decided not to impose a further jail term on Mr. Clillie today.

I want to make it clear, though, that this decision that I have come to is tied in with the very specific features of this case and the specific circumstances of Mr. Clillie as have been presented to me. This decision should not be considered as a precedent showing the usual range of sentence that would normally be imposed with these kinds of facts and this kind of criminal record. As I have

- 1 already said, I think it was obvious this
- 2 morning I certainly do not think that the
- 3 range that the Crown was seeking here is
- 4 excessive. If anything, I think it is quite
- 5 lenient. And the fact that I am about to show
- 6 even more leniency does not detract from how I
- 7 view the seriousness of this type of conduct.
- 8 Stand up please, Mr. Clillie.
- 9 Mr. Clillie, you have heard what I have
- 10 said. For the offence that you have
- 11 committed, I have decided that a fit sentence
- 12 would be a sentence of one year, which is
- incredibly lenient given the facts. I will
- give you a year credit for the time that you
- spent on remand, one day for each day spent on
- 16 remand.
- 17 THE ACCUSED: Yes, ma'am.
- 18 THE COURT: So that means that there
- 19 will not be any further jail term today except
- one day which will be considered served by you
- 21 having been here today.
- You may sit down.
- I am going to place you on probation for
- 24 three years. It's a long time. You will have
- 25 the usual conditions, the mandatory conditions
- 26 that the clerk will explain to you the main
- one is to keep the peace and be of good

- 1 behavior. I am sure that you know what that
- 2 means it has been explained to you many
- 3 times.
- 4 THE ACCUSED: Yes, ma'am.
- 5 THE COURT: I will add a condition that
- 6 you take counselling as directed by your
- 7 probation officer. That you abstain
- 8 absolutely from the possession or consumption
- 9 of alcohol for the full three years. And that
- 10 you perform 240 hours of community service
- work during the first 18 months of your
- 12 probation. I don't know what that will be, it
- will be for the probation officer to decide.
- I am sure, whether you are living in Wrigley
- or elsewhere, that there are a lot of things
- that can be done by a healthy strong young man
- such as yourself to assist the community and
- other members of the community. So I am
- 19 leaving it very general, 240 hours to be
- 20 completed within the first year and a half of
- 21 your probation.
- 22 THE ACCUSED: Yes, ma'am.
- 23 THE COURT: The details can be worked
- 24 out with your probation officer.
- 25 You must understand that if you reach a
- 26 point where you do not think you can comply
- 27 with the no-alcohol condition, it is your

1 responsibility to make a request to this Court 2 to have it changed. I know that surmounting 3 addiction is a difficult thing but because of what you have told me today, I am putting this 5 condition in and it is going to be an offence 6 if you breach this. And with your record, 7 unfortunately, it is almost quaranteed that 8 you would get sent back to jail if you 9 breached this term. So if you reach a point 10 where you do not think that you can continue 11 to follow it, you should apply to the Court and explain the situation and see if the Court 12 13 will amend it, changing that condition; do you 14 understand? THE ACCUSED: Yes, ma'am. 15 THE COURT: Because as I said, this 16 no-alcohol condition is not designed to cause 17 18 you more problems, it is the opposite, it is 19 to help you, based on what you have said, to 20 try to stay the course and do what you seem to 21 be able to do for quite some time after you 22 were released last time. I have heard what your lawyer explained, 23 24 what your focus is, what you want to do with 25 your life, what you want to do with your

26

27

daughter. And I have already said this, I

encourage you to think very much about your

- 1 daughter, think about how you would like her
- 2 to be treated by men when she is older and
- 3 from this day on you treat women the way you
- 4 would like them to treat your daughter. And
- 5 that will probably keep you out of this kind
- 6 of trouble.
- 7 THE ACCUSED: Yes, ma'am.
- 8 THE COURT: There will be a firearms
- 9 prohibition order under Section 109 of the
- 10 Criminal Code as it is mandatory in a case
- 11 like this.
- 12 There will also be a DNA order. It is
- 13 also mandatory in a case like this.
- 14 There will be an order that Mr. Clillie
- 15 comply with the Sex Offender Information
- 16 Registration Act. The order will be for life
- for the reasons outlined by counsel. Under
- 18 the Criminal Code, that is a requirement.
- 19 I am not going to impose a victim of crime
- 20 surcharge in this case because Mr. Clillie has
- 21 been on remand for the last year. I expect
- 22 that he will need some time to get his life on
- 23 track again and get employment so I think it
- 24 would result in hardship if I imposed a victim
- of crime surcharge.
- There will be an order for the return of
- 27 any exhibits seized to their rightful owners,

- 1 if that's appropriate. Otherwise they can be
- 2 destroyed but only at the expiration of the
- 3 appeal period.
- 4 Is there anything that I have overlooked?
- 5 MS. BOND: The only other thing, Your
- 6 Honour, was the issue of the 113 exemption on
- 7 the firearms order. I am not sure whether you
- 8 turned your mind to it.
- 9 THE COURT: Thank you for reminding me.
- 10 I did. I think that I am going to leave that
- 11 to Mr. Clillie to apply himself to the
- 12 competent authority if and when there are
- specific parameters for him to do so. This
- 14 means, Mr. Clillie, that even though I have
- made a firearms prohibition, Mr. Boyd can
- explain this to you, there is a mechanism
- 17 where you can ask for that to be lifted for
- very specific purposes, basically going out on
- 19 the land hunting and trapping. So it is not
- 20 that you have the right to have a firearm all
- 21 the time but you can ask for permission to
- 22 have one for very specific purposes. But I
- 23 would rather leave that decision up to the
- 24 person who would be getting an application
- from you and details of what it is that you
- 26 want to do instead of a general thing.
- 27 THE ACCUSED: Yes, ma'am.

1	THE	COURT:	Anything further from
2		defence?	
3	MR.	BOYD:	No, thank you, Your Honour.
4	THE	COURT:	All right.
5	THE	CLERK:	The firearm prohibition is
6		for ten years?	
7	THE	COURT:	Yes, commencing today
8		because there is	no jail term.
9		This has been	quite a long day but I want
10		to thank you both	for your submissions,
11		counsel. Sentence	ing is always a difficult
12		task and it is ce	rtainly less difficult when
13		the Court has the	benefit of thorough
14		submissions so I	thank you both.
15		I wish you lu	ck with the next chapter of
16		your life, Mr. Cl	illie.
17	THE	ACCUSED:	Thank you, ma'am.
18	THE	COURT:	And I hope that we won't see
19		you back here eve	r again.
20	THE	ACCUSED:	Yes.
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

1		
2		Certified to be a true and
3		accurate transcript pursuant to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		