R. v. Matthews 2013 NWTSC 66

S-1-CR-2012-00071

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

CECIL SYLVESTER MATTHEWS

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice S. H. Smallwood, in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 16th day of August, 2013.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. K. Onyskevitch: Counsel on behalf of the Crown

Mr. P. Falvo: Agent for Counsel C. Wawzonek on

behalf of the Accused

Charges under ss. 334(a) C.C.

THE COURT: Sylvester Matthews has entered
a guilty plea on two counts on an Indictment of
theft over \$5,000, contrary to section 334(a) of
the Criminal Code. The victims are the Gwichya
Gwich'in Band and the Charter Community of
Tsiigehtchic.

The facts are as detailed in the agreed statement of facts, Exhibit S1, which were filed yesterday. I will just briefly summarize them.

Mr. Matthews was employed as a finance manager for both the Charter Community of Tsiigehtchic and the Gwichya Gwich'in Band. He was employed for both organizations between July 15th, 2007, and February 5th, 2010, when he was terminated for cause.

As part of his employment, Mr. Matthews was provided with credit cards for both the community and band. The credit cards were intended to be used to make reservations for hotels and to pay for goods and services ordered by the community or band.

As a result of irregularities being noticed starting in December 2009, accountants were hired to assess the expenses which had been charged to the credit cards. The assessment revealed that Mr. Matthews had used the credit cards many times for personal expenses mainly while on vacation.

1	There were cash advances as well as charges at
2	hotels, dental offices, restaurants, bars, liquor
3	stores, clothing, music and grocery stores.
4	These charges came from locations in the
5	Northwest Territories, Alberta, and Ontario. The
6	total which was charged to the Charter Community
7	of Tsiigehtchic credit card was \$10,930.71; the
8	total which had been charged to the Gwichya
9	Gwich'in Band credit card was \$29,752.02. The
10	total loss to both the community and the band is
11	\$40,682.73.
12	In January 2010, Ms. Lennie, who was the
13	senior administrative officer for the community,
14	confronted Mr. Matthews and he admitted incurring

In January 2010, Ms. Lennie, who was the senior administrative officer for the community, confronted Mr. Matthews and he admitted incurring the expenses and wrote two cheques to cover some of the expenses. Neither cheque cleared as Mr. Matthew's account did not have sufficient funds to cover either cheque, and this had occurred because Mr. Matthews had been terminated from his employment and apparently no longer had an income which could cover the cheques.

In terms of Mr. Matthews' personal circumstances. He is 66 years old. He is originally from Guyana but has lived in Canada since 1969. He has lived in communities throughout the north, both in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, since 1990. He has

worked in several communities often in a
financial position. He is an accountant by
training but has not completed the final steps to
become a certified general accountant.

He is now single but was married; his wife passed away in 2010. The death of his wife occurred around the time that these offences were occurring, but counsel for Mr. Matthews says that that is not the reason that these offences occurred.

Mr. Matthews currently lives in Tulita and works casually for several companies there. He is apparently well-regarded by his employers and in the community as evidenced by the three letters of support which were written for him and filed on these proceedings.

Mr. Matthews' explanation for why these offences occurred, offered through his counsel, really does not provide an explanation other than Mr. Matthews saw an opportunity and took it.

While Mr. Matthews has had some difficulties with alcohol, counsel advises that they are not offered as an excuse for his actions.

It seems, based on what his counsel advised me, that Mr. Matthews used the credit card initially for some personal travel on the mistaken belief that this was permissible and

then he later realized that it was not. However, this conflicts with appendices A and B of the agreed statement of facts where the initial personal expenses charged to the credit card seems to be for dental expenses, which is then followed by restaurant, liquor, and food charges.

The appendices also demonstrate a steady stream of spending for personal items. It seems likely that Mr. Matthews made an initial charge or charges to the credit card and then when this conduct did not raise any questions or red flag, he continued and began using the credit cards more and more frequently. As counsel for Mr. Matthews acknowledged, it really was an offence of opportunity.

There appears to have been little to no effort to conceal these transactions or to deceive anyone about the charges he was making. That is to Mr. Matthews' credit. However, given his position as the finance manager for both the community and the band, it may be that he simply thought that these transactions would go unnoticed.

On sentence, the Crown is seeking a sentence of 15 to 18 months' imprisonment and orders of restitution in favour of the community and the band. The Crown is opposed to a conditional

sentence order on the basis that in the circumstances, that the sentencing principles of general deterrence and denunciation cannot be met by a conditional sentence.

Counsel for Mr. Matthews is seeking a conditional sentence on the basis that all of the factors that are required for a conditional sentence are present and that this case is similar to many of the other cases that have come before this court and have resulted in conditional sentences being imposed.

I have read all the cases provided by both Crown and defence and I do not intend to review them in this decision but I thank counsel for providing them. They were helpful to review the principles that courts have considered in similar cases and for showing examples of when a conditional sentence has been imposed and when imprisonment has been imposed. All cases of course must be dealt with on their own facts in dealing with the individual offender.

There are mitigating factors. Mr. Matthews has entered a guilty plea. He waived his preliminary inquiry and has taken efforts to plead guilty in this court. It has taken some time for this matter to come to today's point and from a review of the record on file, it is not

clear why. In any event, a trial in this court
was not set, a trial date was not set, and so
this is not a situation where witnesses have been
inconvenienced or have had to testify. While
this was not an early guilty plea or one that was
entered at the earliest opportunity, Mr. Matthews
does deserve credit for his guilty plea.

Mr. Matthews has not paid back any of the money. He had attempted to pay back some of the money in January 2010 but the cheques that he provided did not have sufficient funds to clear the bank. Counsel for Mr. Matthews advises that she has a cheque for \$5,000 which has been advanced by Mr. Matthews's employer M.Y.B. Construction to go towards restitution. Apparently this cheque is an advance for Mr. Matthews for future income that he is expected to earn with his employment with the company. While this is a testament to how highly regarded Mr. Matthews is by Bob McPherson, the president of M.Y.B. Construction, this is not money that Mr. Matthews has personally provided for restitution. So while he has pledged his willingness to pay back the money, his efforts to date have really had little impact.

I acknowledge that Mr. Matthews did lose his job as a result of these offences and he has been

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

surviving on his CPP pension and a variety of part-time and casual jobs which counsel advises me do not quite equal the income that he was receiving with both the band and the community, so I acknowledge that his ability to repay restitution may have been limited in the circumstances.

Mr. Matthews does have a prior criminal record. He has ten convictions for forgery from 2002 as well as a fail to attend court. For the forgery convictions, he received nine months concurrent on each count and was ordered to pay restitution of \$25,546.71. He also has a conviction for theft under \$5,000 from 2005 where he received \$100 fine. There are two other unrelated convictions on his criminal record.

Mr. Matthews' record is particularly of concern in that he has 11 prior property offences. The theft under conviction on its own is of little concern. The convictions for ten counts of forgery are of greater concern.

Counsel for Mr. Matthews argues that they are dated and that they would have been related in that they resulted in one nine-month sentence which was concurrent on each count. They are somewhat dated and they are likely related because of the sentence that was imposed, but

they also demonstrate that the forgery that Mr.

Matthews participated in, much like the case
before me today, was not a one-time incident.

There were ten counts of forgery. The amount of
restitution that he was required to pay at that
time, over \$25,000, also tells me that, like
today, the amounts that were involved were not
insignificant.

In this case the amount is over \$40,000 and this offence occurred over a period of time.

While there are two counts before the court that Mr. Matthews has pled guilty to, in looking at the agreed statement of facts it is apparent that the credit cards were used by Mr. Matthews multiple times over a lengthy period.

Offences where an individual steals from their employer are referred to as breach of trust offences because they involve an employee who has been trusted by their employer to treat the money and/or goods that they are responsible for in an appropriate manner and not to take them or use them for their own benefit. In small communities like Tsiigehtchic, communities and bands rely on persons like Mr. Matthews to look after their finances, and the position that Mr. Matthews was in, finance manager, tells me that he was the person who should have been on the lookout for

theft and fraud. The band and community were relying on him to ensure that this did not happen, and instead he is the person who abuses their trust and charges thousands of dollars in personal expenses on their credit cards.

There has been a victim impact statement which has been filed by Ms. Lennie, who is the former senior administrative officer, and I do want to quote from that because I think what she says demonstrates the impact that it has had upon the community and the band. She says:

As a small community of 200 people, we sometimes rely on the expertise of people outside our community to fill senior management positions. We trust all our employees to represent our organization and community with the utmost respect and honesty.

It is apparent from the victim impact
statement that the community relied upon, and
trusted, Mr. Matthews. As the victim impact
statement also details, these thefts have had an
impact on both organizations as they are located
in a small community and have a limited budget.
Resources that are scarce are intended for the
use of the community and they need to budget to
ensure that the needs of the community are met,
and the impact of Mr. Matthews' actions must have

affected their ability to do so. Violations of
that trust, the trust that is placed in
individuals like Mr. Matthews, are taken
seriously by the courts.

In sentencing individuals guilty of thefts in these circumstances as the cases demonstrate, deterrence is one of the primary considerations. Rehabilitation is as well a focus that cannot be lost sight of. Many of the individuals who come before the court are first time offenders and are otherwise of good character and the actions that they have undertaken have been characterized often as really out of character.

Deterrence means that other individuals, when hearing of this, would be deterred from committing this type of offence and that Mr.

Matthews himself is specifically deterred.

A focus as well has to be denunciation, to express society's condemnation of this type of conduct.

In looking at the requirements of section 742.1, which are the requirements for the imposition of a conditional sentence, the section, as it was prior to November 2012, had four elements which the court must be satisfied before imposing a conditional sentence:

The first is the person is convicted of an

offence prosecuted by way of indictment for which
there is a maximum term of imprisonment that is
ten years or more not punishable by a minimum
sentence.

Secondly, that the court will impose a sentence of less than two years.

In the circumstances, I am satisfied that these two conditions have been met. This is not a situation where the court would seek or the Crown is asking for a sentence of more than two years.

A third prerequisite is that service of the sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community.

And the fourth is that it has to be consistent with the fundamental purposes and principles of sentencing set out in the Criminal Code.

In considering these last two factors, and particularly the fourth factor, there are several areas of concern and one is Mr. Matthews' prior criminal record. He has committed several offences of forging documents which resulted in the loss to the victim of \$25,000, and that is of concern. The offences before the court today began in June 2008, so he has participated in the same type of criminal activity a little over six

years later. That is also of concern. The forgery convictions were also Mr. Matthews' first convictions and he received nine months' incarceration. Presumably a conditional sentence was available to him then and he did not receive it.

In any event, in the end what I think significant about that prior conviction is that the previous sentence of imprisonment has not served to deter Mr. Matthews. From 2008 to 2010, he took over \$40,000 from his employers. He did not get the message the court was sending him in 2002 and that is of great concern.

A conditional sentence has to be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing. Breach of trust thefts, as the cases show, require the sentencing principles of deterrence and denunciation to be paramount, and conditional sentences can still be imposed, can still meet the sentencing objectives which have been established in many cases where deterrence is one of the primary objectives.

Given Mr. Matthews' position as a finance manager, he would have been in a position to deal with funds. While he took no steps to conceal his activities, because of his position, the band and the community were vulnerable to his actions.

1	As I stated earlier, they trusted him to
2	safe-keep the finances, not abuse them.
3	These offences also occurred persistently
4	and repeatedly over a fairly lengthy period of
5	time. This was not a one time occurrence, and
6	tens of thousands of dollars were taken. I am
7	not certain that the band or community will ever
8	fully recover the funds taken by Mr. Matthews,
9	and it appears that Mr. Matthews only stopped
10	because he was caught and terminated from his
11	position. Overall, I am not satisfied that the
12	circumstances of this case are such that
13	deterrence can be met with a conditional sentence
14	order.
15	As stated in the case of R. v. Harding, 2006
16	SKCA 118, the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal stated
17	at paragraph 25:
18	mb and man be administrated as a maked
19	There may be circumstances, as noted in R. v. Proulx, where the need for
20	deterrence and denunciation is so pressing that a period of
21	incarceration is necessary to the ends of deterring similar conduct in
22	the future and of expressing society's condemnation of the
23	offender's conduct.
24	I agree with that comment and view the
25	circumstances in this case as calling out for
26	denunciation and deterrence. I cannot see that a
27	conditional sentence would meet those objectives

1		in this case. In	the circumstances, I am
2		satisfied that the	sentencing principles require
3		that a sentence of	imprisonment be imposed.
4		Mr. Matthews,	can you stand up, please.
5		For the charge	e of theft over, Count 1 on the
6		Indictment, theft	from the Gwichya Gwich'in Band,
7		I impose a sentence	e of 12 months' imprisonment.
8		For the charge	e of theft over from the
9		Charter Community	of Tsiigehtchic, Count 2 on the
10		Indictment, I impos	se a sentence of imprisonment
11		for 12 months which	h will be served concurrently.
12		There will be	a restitution order for the
13		benefit of the Char	rter Community of Tsiigehtchic
14		in the amount of \$3	10,930.71 and a separate
15		restitution order	to the benefit of the Gwichya
16		Gwich'in Band for	the amount of \$29,752.02.
17		The victims of	f crime surcharge will be
18		waived as a result	of hardship.
19		You may sit do	own, Mr. Matthews.
20		Counsel, is the	here anything else that we need
21		to address on this	file?
22	MR.	ONYSKEVITCH:	Nothing from the Crown, Your
23		Honour. Thank you	
24	THE	COURT:	Mr. Falvo.
25	MR.	FALVO:	No, Your Honour. Thank you.
26	THE	COURT:	Then we will close court.
27			

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