R. v. Wedzin, 2012 NWTSC 22 S-1-CR-2012-000004

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

RICK PATRICK WEDZIN

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 12th day of March, A.D. 2012.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Johnson: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Bran: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 349, 348(1)(b) and 145(5.1) Criminal Code)

1	THE COURT:	Rick Patrick Wedzin has
2	pleaded guilty to	serious criminal offences
3	committed in his h	ome community of Behchoko last
4	fall, and it is to	day the Court's responsibility
5	to impose an approp	priate sentence for his

criminal behaviour.

Mr. Wedzin is 25 years old, and this is not the first time he has been in court because of his criminal conduct. He has a lengthy criminal record for a young man. Of significance, he has five convictions for mischief, a separate conviction for break and enter and commit, and another separate conviction for being unlawfully in a dwelling-house. He also has numerous convictions for offences against the administration of justice; that is, disobeying court orders and failing to comply with undertakings made to the Court. Mr. Wedzin has received custodial sentences, by my count, on four or five different occasions for periods of time ranging up to seven months.

In March 2011, Mr. Wedzin was convicted of the serious crime of sexual assault and, at that time, the Court sentenced him to seven months' imprisonment, to be followed by a period of probation of 18 months. The conditions of his probation included a condition that he keep the

peace and be of good behaviour through that

period of 18 months. Therefore, in September and

October of 2011, when he committed the offences

for which he is to be sentenced today, he was

free in the community of Behchoko, but he was

subject to the terms of the probation order of

March 2011.

The detailed circumstances of the crimes that he committed in September/October have been provided to the Court today on this sentencing hearing and these have been admitted by Mr. Wedzin. I will briefly summarize the circumstances.

Prior to September 9, 2011, the offender and his common-law spouse had been living in the home of his common-law's mother, Elizabeth Sanspariel. About a week prior to September 9th, they were advised by Elizabeth Sanspariel that they could no longer live there.

During the night of September 9th, one of the young girls in that residence, F.

12 years of age, awoke to find this offender in bed with her. He had apparently come in through a window to the upstairs bedroom. He was intoxicated. He was in bed with the

12-year-old and underneath the blanket. The young girl told the offender three times to go

away and he did so after the third time; that is, he left the bedroom, went downstairs and left the house. He did not have permission to be in that house on September 9th. The young girl was, understandably, quite afraid and upset about what transpired in the sanctity of her bedroom.

This offender was arrested and charged later that day and was released on September 10th upon signing an undertaking with conditions pending his appearance in court in answer to the charge. The conditions included no alcohol consumption, no contact with Elizabeth Sanspariel or her family, and no attendance at the Sanspariel residence.

On October 22, 2011, Elizabeth Sanspariel
was sleeping in that residence when she awoke at
2:30 a.m. to see Mr. Wedzin standing beside her
bed and holding her blanket off of her leg. When
Elizabeth Sanspariel confronted him, Mr. Wedzin
ran downstairs and left the residence.
Ms. Sanspariel called the police and Mr. Wedzin
was arrested, and he has been in custody since
that time.

Mr. Wedzin advises the Court today through his counsel that he was intoxicated at the time of the second incident as well. The prosecutor does not dispute this assertion.

In the context of determining an appropriate sentence, it is an aggravating feature that on September 9th and again on October 22, this offender was subject to the terms of a probation order issued just six months earlier. It is a further aggravating circumstance that after being released on September 10th, that mere weeks later, he committed a similar crime in re-attending at the Sanspariel residence while awaiting trial on the first offence.

This offender asked for trial by jury on these offences and requested a preliminary inquiry, which was held in December 2011. Last month he advised the Court through his counsel that he wished to attend in Supreme Court and re-elect mode of trial and enter pleas. Today he attends and has pleaded guilty to these crimes.

Although it cannot be characterized as an early guilty plea, his plea today and his acceptance of responsibility for what he has done - in particular, his acknowledgment of the trauma he caused to the Sanspariel children and to Elizabeth Sanspariel - this acts in mitigation of the sentence that would otherwise be imposed.

One of the main purposes of the sentencing process is to provide for a peaceful and safe community, and to achieve that purpose, it is

sometimes necessary to separate an offender from 1 2 the community or from society. In the circumstances of this case, I find that it is 3 necessary to sentence this offender to a 5 meaningful period of incarceration. The public, including the Sanspariel family, needs to be protected from Mr. Wedzin, intoxicated or sober, 7 and that is the Court's primary consideration in determining an appropriate sentence.

> The Crown is seeking a sentence of 12 months' imprisonment followed by a period of probation. With respect, I am not satisfied that anything will be accomplished by adding a period of probation to a custodial sentence in the case of this offender. Mr. Wedzin has been on probation on four earlier occasions, including one year ago for a period of 18 months, and there is no indication that probation had any effect on correcting Mr. Wedzin's criminal behaviour.

> Mr. Wedzin is 25 years old now and does not need his hand held by a probation officer. He knows, as he has told the Court in the presence of his mom and his grandmother, he knows that his alcohol addiction is at the root of his antisocial behaviour, and it is up to him, a grown, mature man, to address that addiction. tells the Court today, and again I repeat, in the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	presence of his mother and his grandmother, that
2	he wants to get treatment and he says that he
3	will get treatment.

When the prosecutor today states that he seeks on behalf of the public a global custodial sentence of 12 months, the prosecutor is being quite fair to Mr. Wedzin - perhaps more than fair - in all of the circumstances of this case that I have referred to. Mr. Wedzin, I hope that you appreciate that.

11 THE ACCUSED: Yeah, I do.

repetitive crimes.

12 THE COURT: These are serious and

sought by the public prosecutor.

My initial view upon hearing of the circumstances of these two incidents and the criminal record of this offender was that a substantial period of incarceration was called for, well in excess of 12 months; but upon consideration, in all of the circumstances, I will not impose a sentence in excess of what is

Please stand now, Mr. Wedzin. The sentence of the Court on Count 1, being unlawfully in a dwelling-house on September 9th, 2011, contrary to Section 349 of the Criminal Code, it is the sentence of this court that you be imprisoned for a period of five months. On Count 3, break and

1	enter and commit mischief on October 22, 2011,
2	contrary to Section 348(1)(b), the sentence is
3	six months' imprisonment, consecutive to Count 1.
4	On Count 5, breach of undertaking, October 22,
5	2011, contrary to Section 145(5.1), the sentence
6	is one month imprisonment, consecutive. That is
7	a total sentence of 12 months' imprisonment. I
8	am going to give you credit of four months for
9	your remand time in custody, so that the net
10	sentence from today is eight months'
11	imprisonment.
12	The warrant of committal that takes you back

The warrant of committal that takes you back to the Correctional Centre will include an order that you will have no contact with -- during your custodial sentence of eight months, no contact with Elizabeth Sanspariel, or F., or Isabelle Sanspariel, without the written consent of Elizabeth Sanspariel. This order is pursuant to Section 743.21 of the Criminal Code.

The clerk will endorse the Warrant of

Committal with the Court's finding that the

pre-trial custody is 143 days. The sentence that

would have been imposed is 12 months, global.

Credit of four months for pre-trial custody, and

that is a sentence of eight months' custody.

In the circumstances of Mr. Wedzin's

incarceration and his sporadic record of

1 employment, there will be no victim fine 2 surcharge in the circumstances.

Now, Mr. Wedzin before we close court, I 3 want to tell you that some people will consider that I have been too lenient with you in all of 5 6 these circumstances. This was serious stuff with 7 your background. You have had lots of chances. 8 But I am satisfied, Mr. Wedzin, from hearing you 9 today that you are sincere in saying the things 10 that you said to the Court about wanting to turn 11 your life around and wanting to deal with your 12 booze problem. You are still young. You have still got your whole future ahead of you. You 13 14 are a healthy-looking young man. You have got 15 opportunities down there in the Tlicho community 16 and you have everything you need to be a 17 productive citizen of the Tlicho community. This 18 is your chance, and do not be coming back to 19 court because you may not get the leniency again. 20 So do not disappoint your mother and your 21 grandmother. When you are in the jail for your 22 sentence and when you are released, just think 23 about what you said to the Court today. These 24 were your words --THE ACCUSED: Yeah.

25

26 THE COURT: -- not mine, not anybody

27 else's.

- 1 THE ACCUSED: I want you to take my word for
- 2 -- I want, I want to...
- 3 THE COURT: Well --
- 4 THE ACCUSED: Like before I didn't mean to
- 5 -- When I used to say stuff, I didn't do it; but
- 6 now I want to change that.
- 7 THE COURT: Well, that is good. You do it
- 8 for yourself, but do not disappoint your family
- 9 either.
- 10 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
- 11 THE COURT: You have given them enough
- 12 hardship. So I wish you luck. Have a seat.
- 13 Is there anything further, Counsel, on this
- 14 case?
- 15 MR. JOHNSON: I don't believe so, Your
- 16 Honour. Thank you.
- 17 MR. BRAN: Your Honour, my only -- my
- 18 only question is the calculation of the remand
- 19 credit. I was under the understanding it was
- 20 nearly five months of remand time that Mr. Wedzin
- 21 was in custody for.
- 22 THE COURT: Mr. Bran, I am rounding things
- off here. It is not mathematically one for one.
- It is four months. If four months is 120 days,
- 25 that is the credit he is getting on a 12-month
- 26 sentence. But I use the term "months" for
- 27 convenience sake. It is four months gross, eight

1		months net.					
2	MR.	BRAN:	Т	hank you,	Your Ho	nour.	
3	THE	COURT:	Т	he court	record w	ill show	it
4		was 143 days	by agre	ement, but	t it doe	es not	
5		always, as yo	ou know,	equate to	one fo	or one or	one
6		for one point	five.	That is t	the Cour	ct's	
7		decision.					
8	MR.	BRAN:	Т	hank you.			
9	THE	COURT:	W	ith that,	we will	close	
10		court.					
11						•	
12							
13							
14				ied Pursua Rules of		Rule 723	
15			or the	Rules OI	Court		
16							
17			Tono D	omonovi ob	CCD (A)		
18				omanowich, Reporter	, CSR(A)		
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							