R. v. Laliberte, 2013 NWTSC 70 S-1-CR-2012-000087

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

JAKE LALIBERTE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Fort Simpson, in the Northwest Territories, on the 24th day of September, A.D., 2013.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. A. Godfrey: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. S. Petitpas: Counsel for the Defence

Charge under s. 151 Criminal Code of Canada PUBLICATION BAN UNDER SECTION 486.4 CRIMINAL CODE

Official Court Reporters

THE COURT: This afternoon it is my
responsibility to impose a sentence on Jake

Laliberte for the serious offence that he has
pleaded guilty to, the offence of having touched
for a sexual purpose a person under the age of 16
years old contrary to Section 151 of the Criminal
Code.

This offence can cover a broad range of

This offence can cover a broad range of conduct, anything from simply touching someone over their clothes, all the way to more serious interferences with a person. In this case what was involved was an act of full intercourse with the victim. She was too young to be in law capable of consenting to sexual activity, and she was also highly intoxicated and, as the accused acknowledges, incapable of consenting for that reason even if she had been over the age of 16.

This offence can be punished by a maximum of ten years in jail and a minimum of one year in jail, which shows how seriously the law treats it. The case law and the decisions of this Court in this jurisdiction is to the same effect.

In this jurisdiction, where unfortunately the sexual assault of an intoxicated person is a very prevalent crime, it is treated seriously by the Courts even when the victim is an adult.

2.6

Obviously if the victim is not an adult it makes it all the more serious.

Sadly, the circumstances that I heard about earlier today are very common in this jurisdiction. I would say that almost every week the Courts deal with similar offences committed in circumstances where persons are under the influence of alcohol often times, and commit very serious violations upon others who are also under the influence of alcohol.

There is a long list of decisions from this Court and the Territorial Court dealing with just that type of scenario. People in these circumstances are sentenced for having sexually assaulted members of their own families, good friends, relatives, sometimes acquaintances, or other times, like here, people who simply happen to be in their home at the time.

It is very difficult to understand why these crimes are so prevalent here and why, despite their devastating impact, they continue to take place. These crimes have devastating impacts on the people who are assaulted, they have devastating impacts on people such as the accused here, who are young and will have to be sent away for a long time to jail because of what he has done, and obviously there is a devastating

impact on the families of everyone involved.

1

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

2 The Courts do not have the answer to the question of why these things keep happening, and 3 the solution to these problems is not something that can come from the Courts. It is something that will have to come from the communities themselves, and hopefully one of the things that maybe could come out of a case like this 8 9 one, one of the more positive things, is to raise 10 awareness and be a motivation for people to take action to try to address some of the underlying 11 issues that lead to these things. Because it 12 is always sad and disturbing to deal with these 13 14 types of crimes, but it is especially sad and 15 disturbing to hear about these types of crimes 16 committed against a young person.

The victim impact statement that was filed in this case illustrates in very simple terms the type of harm that these crimes can cause. Things that this particular victim refers to, the hurt that she feels, her loss of trust in others, the feeling that this hurt will never go away, I am sad to say, are the types of comments that victims often make in cases like this one. The Court can only hope that in time and with some help this young woman will be able to recover from these events.

I also hope, as I have referred to already, that this type of case, and this one in particular, will continue to cause things to be talked about in the community. The abuse of alcohol, the scars from the past, unhealthy relationships, are all things that are very difficult to talk about, but unless and until members of the community come together to grapple with these kinds of issues things will not change. They certainly cannot be changed by outsiders.

All that being said, in the meantime the Court does have the duty and the unfortunate task of dealing with the results of what has happened and decide what a fit sentence is every time a crime like this takes place, and it is not a happy task. There is nothing happy about sending a young man like this one, who obviously has valuable skills and can be a productive member of this community, to jail, especially knowing some of the hurdles that he has had to overcome to get to where he is today.

But in the face of such a serious crime
it is the only response that the Court can
have, and in this case the Crown and defence
acknowledge this because the submission that
they have presented jointly is for a significant

term of imprisonment to be imposed. I will say

at the outset that I have decided to accept their

recommendation and their joint submission as to

what the sentence should be, at least as far as

what the jail term should be.

But I do want to explain a little bit more why such a significant jail term has to be imposed. The law is well established in this jurisdiction that when dealing with serious sexual offences, and this is a serious sexual offence, the most significant sentencing principles are deterrence and denunciation.

Deterrence means discouraging this accused and other persons from committing this type of offence. Denunciation means sending out the message that this type of conduct is wrong and unacceptable in this community.

The prevalence of this type of crime adds to the need for deterrence and denunciation.

This is especially so when, as here, the offence is not at the more minor end of the scale of seriousness. This was not a minor interference with the victim, it was a serious violation of her personal and sexual integrity.

As was mentioned earlier this afternoon during submissions, in this jurisdiction the starting point on sentencing for serious sexual

assaults, such as an act of full intercourse

without a person's consent or when the person

is not capable in law of consent, is three years

imprisonment. When that assault is committed on

a child by a person who is in a position of trust

or authority the starting point is actually four

years.

Here we have a non-adult victim, but the accused I recognize was not in a parental role or in a position of authority towards her.

So the appropriate starting point to use is somewhere between three and four years.

There are aggravating factors in this case.

The first is the victim's age. The Criminal

Code makes that an aggravating factor as a matter

of law now, but it has long been treated as an

aggravating factor in any event by this Court

when the victim of a crime like this is a young

person. This too fits somewhere on a scale.

This victim was not a very young child, but

the fact remains that she was a teenager,

whereas the accused was an adult man.

All adults have a duty to protect and assist younger people, and even when a young person behaves in a way where perhaps they are not taking the best care of themselves or are not making the best choices to look after

themselves, there is an underlying duty in all
adults to assist them, and certainly there is
a duty not to take advantage of them. So her
age is an aggravating factor here, especially
considering that the accused was about 11 years
older than her.

It is also aggravating, in my view, that the victim was in an even more vulnerable position because of her state of intoxication. The accused was intoxicated as well, I recognize that, but still he took advantage of someone who was evidently not in any position to make proper decisions or take steps to protect herself.

There are mitigating factors as well.

The most significant one is the guilty plea.

I recognize, based on the facts that were admitted, that there appears to have been a strong case against Mr. Laliberte. There was DNA confirming that sexual activity took place; the victim's age, making her consent not possible in law; evidence of her intoxication; and apparently people who saw at least some of what happened.

But still, a guilty plea is always a significant mitigating factor. It provides a certainty of outcome for victims. It tells the community that the accused is willing to

take responsibility for his wrongdoing, and
hopefully that can avoid or reduce the amount
of blame that can be shifted onto the victim,
because unfortunately in every community, it
seems, there always are some people who, in
a situation like this, prefer to focus on the
victim's conduct instead of focussing on the
conduct of the person who has committed the
crime.

It takes courage to acknowledge our own wrongdoings, and it is beneficial to victims, in the Court's experience, to know that the accused does admit responsibility. That is why the guilty plea has such great value, and I think that value perhaps is even greater in a smaller community. And, of course, the guilty plea is an indication of true remorse. Giving up the right to have a trial is not a small thing.

This guilty plea was not an early guilty plea, it came just as we were about to begin jury selection. But I also know that this trial was to take place on matters involving two complainants, and the Crown is not proceeding with respect to the second one. That puts

Mr. Laliberte's guilty plea into context too.

It is somewhat similar to when a person pleads

guilty at the 11th hour, but to a charge that
is less serious than what they were to be tried
on. When the Crown is willing to change the
jeopardy that a person faces, that goes some
way to temper the lateness of the guilty plea.

I was advised that this victim did not have to testify at the preliminary hearing. This guilty plea this week has avoided the need for her to testify in front of 12 members of this community, and after seeing sexual assault victims testify very frequently I know that sparing someone from having to do that is sparing them a lot.

For all of those reasons I am of the view that this guilty plea should be given considerable weight and that Mr. Laliberte is entitled to significant credit for it even though it came late in the process.

He has a criminal record, but it is minor and marginally relevant. He has never been sentenced to jail before. It is to his credit that by and large he has not been in trouble with the law even though, as his counsel said, he has had some struggles with alcohol and drugs for several years, going back to when he was himself a teenager.

27 I have heard that he has never taken any

counselling to help him deal with those issues, and I do hope he will during the course of his sentence. Many people drink, but do not engage in this kind of conduct while intoxicated. If alcohol has contributed to this type of behavior once it could easily have the same effect in the future. In that sense, I certainly agree with what Mr. Laliberte's sister writes in her letter, which was made an exhibit, where she says that she hopes that these events will help teach everyone involved the effect of the excessive use of alcohol and what it can do to people.

I also take into account the fact that Mr. Laliberte has obviously done a lot to acquire training and skills, and he was a valued employee to the people he has worked for as of late. That is also clear from the materials that were filed at the sentencing hearing.

I take into account as well that this particular event happened shortly after he experienced the loss of his aunt. That is something that is not an excuse, but perhaps the beginnings of an explanation for how much out of control his drinking had been in the days that preceded these events. But that does not remove his responsibility for his actions.

I have already mentioned the letter 1 2 prepared by his sister, and I have taken into account other things that she wrote in that 3 4 letter, about what she knows of his character and what she writes about him more generally. I do not doubt that she knows him to be a good person, a helpful person, and that she finds it difficult to believe he would have harmed 8 anyone or behaved in this way. The letter is 9 dated September 20th, which is last Friday, and 10 it is clear, especially from the last paragraph 11 in the letter, that at the time it was written 12 the author still thought this matter would go 13 14 to trial. 15

Now that Mr. Laliberte has admitted his wrongdoing hopefully everyone, including his family and loved ones, can come to terms with what he has done and move on on that basis.

In sentencing hearings the Court often hears that the person who committed the offence is not a bad person, and it is important to make that distinction between what a person did and who a person is. I do not doubt, from everything I have heard, that Mr. Laliberte has a lot of skills and that a lot of good things can be said about him, but unfortunately that night last year he did a very bad and hurtful thing.

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

2526

I have taken into account the fact that 1 2 he is an aboriginal offender, the struggles that he faced in his family situation when 3 4 he was growing up, which included the abuse of alcohol by both of his parents and the violence that his biological father used towards his mother and towards him. The Criminal Code and the binding jurisprudence 8 9 require that I take those factors into account 10 in determining what a fit sentence is. It is not a factor that can overtake all the others, 11 but it is something that must be taken into 12 13 account.

I have reviewed the two cases filed by the Crown. Both involve adult victims, and that is an important distinguishing factor between those cases and this one. But those cases do confirm what I have been talking about as far as the prevalence of sexual assaults generally in this jurisdiction.

The joint submission that I have been presented with is that I impose a sentence of two and a half years imprisonment, and as I have already said I have concluded that it should be followed. The law is well established that when the Court is presented with a joint submission that position must be given serious

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2526

consideration by the Court, and it should be
followed unless the Court concludes that it is
clearly unreasonable. Here I think that the
position presented is not outside the range
of what is reasonable. I think it is at the
low end of the range, but in my view it is
within that range and that is why I have
decided to accept it.

9 I do, however, want to make it clear to 10 Mr. Laliberte and to everyone else that given the age of the victim here he could very easily 11 have been sentenced to a much longer jail term. 12 Certainly after trial he could have been looking 13 14 at a sentence as high as four years or close to it. I mean what I said when I talked about the 15 16 mitigating effect of a guilty plea, and here of 17 course, as I have said, while I think the joint submission is perhaps at the more lenient end 18 of the spectrum I do think it is reasonable, 19 20 particularly in light of all of the circumstances. Stand up please, sir. 21

For the offence that you have pleaded guilty to, sir, I am going to go along with the joint submission that was presented, and I have concluded that a sentence of two and a half years is appropriate. For the time that you have spent on remand, about 67 days that

22

23

24

2526

```
I have heard, I will give you credit roughly on
1
2
            a one-to-one ratio. So there will be a further
            jail term of two years and four months. I am
3
 4
            giving you two months credit for the remand
            time. You can sit down.
                Mr. Petitpas, before I forget, you did
            not ask that I include any recommendation on
            the Warrant of Committal with respect to where
8
            the sentence should be served, but I have also
9
            heard that your client's ties are primarily
10
            Northern at this point. Did you want to make
11
12
            submissions on that?
       MR. PETITPAS:
                              Yes, Your Honour. I omitted
13
14
            to make those submissions previously, but the
15
            defence will be seeking a judicial recommendation
16
            that he be able to serve his time here in the
           Northwest Territories, and more specifically
17
            at the South Mackenzie Correctional Centre.
18
19
        THE COURT:
                               I will do part of what you
20
            asked. This decision is not up to me. I cannot
21
            order where you will serve your sentence, sir,
22
            but I know you have strong support here, and
23
            because this is a sentence in the penitentiary
24
            range I am going to direct the clerk to put an
25
            endorsement, a note on the Warrant of Committal
2.6
            with my very strong recommendation that you be
27
            permitted to serve your sentence in the North.
```

| 1 | | I am not going | g to go as far as saying |
|----|-----|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2 | | which institution k | pecause I think that the |
| 3 | | availability of cer | rtain programs and some of |
| 4 | | the things that mig | ght be actually helpful to |
| 5 | | you may vary from p | place to place, and I think |
| 6 | | the Correction peop | ole are the people who are |
| 7 | | in the best position | on to make that decision. |
| 8 | | Of course, I am sur | re as part of their processes, |
| 9 | | they will find out | from you what your preference |
| 10 | | would be and where | your supports are. But |
| 11 | | certainly, Mr. Cler | rk, I want there to be a |
| 12 | | strong recommendati | on endorsed on the Warrant |
| 13 | | of Committal that N | Mr. Laliberte be permitted |
| 14 | | to serve his senter | nce here in the Northwest |
| 15 | | Territories. | |
| 16 | | As far as the | ancillary orders, many of |
| 17 | | the ones that have | been sought are mandatory |
| 18 | | for a case like thi | is. There will be a DNA order |
| 19 | | because this is a p | primary designated offence. |
| 20 | | There will be a fir | rearms prohibition order |
| 21 | | pursuant to Section | n 109 of the Criminal Code, |
| 22 | | which will be in fo | orce for 10 years following |
| 23 | | your release. I wi | ll direct that any firearms |
| 24 | | be surrendered fort | thwith. Is that a problem, |
| 25 | | Mr. Petitpas? | |
| 26 | MR. | PETITPAS: | Mr. Laliberte has no firearms. |
| 27 | THE | COURT: | There will also be another |

order that is mandatory on this type of case,

and that is that you comply with the requirements

of the Sexual Offender Information Registry

Act for a period of 20 years. The clerk

will explain to you what that means.

I have considered the request for an order under Section 161 of the Criminal Code.

That type of order prevents persons from attending areas where young persons are likely to be present, such as swimming pools, parks, schools. The order can also include things like prohibiting someone from doing volunteer work in areas where they may come into contact with children.

I realize this was originally part of the joint submission. I have reviewed the provision, and considering the circumstances of this offence, the fact that there is no indication in the facts that there was any planning or deliberate effort by Mr. Laliberte to lure young people to his home and take advantage of them, considering the fact that he has nothing on his criminal record that is relevant to the abuse of young persons, and just considering the overall picture that is painted by the evidence, the facts and the other materials filed, I do not see the need

to restrict his movements in the way that 1 2 they would be through a Section 161 order. This does not strike me as an event that 3 discloses predatory tendencies or a significant 4 concern that in general in his day-to-day life that Mr. Laliberte is a threat to children. In my estimation that is more the intended scope of Section 161 of the Criminal Code. For those 8 9 reasons I am not going to make that order. 10 I will, however, make an order that you pay a victim of crime surcharge. That money 11 goes into a general fund that is used to assist 12 victims of crime. So given that you have been 13 14 employed recently and regularly in the past 15 several months it is appropriate that this order be made. The Criminal Code provides 16 that the amount is \$100. Would 30 days be 17 sufficient time to pay? 18 19 MR. PETITPAS: Your Honour, I believe 20 he can pay it immediately. 21 THE COURT: So I will say seven days, 22 and that is for the victim of crime surcharge. 23 There will be an order that any exhibits 24 that were seized in this investigation be returned to their lawful owners if that is 2.5 2.6 appropriate. If not, they can be destroyed, but that of course should only be at the 27

| 1 | | expiration o | of the appeal period. | |
|----|-----|--|--|--|
| 2 | | I think | I have addressed the various | |
| 3 | | things you h | have raised. Is there anything | |
| 4 | | I have overl | ooked, Mr. Godfrey, from the | |
| 5 | | Crown's pers | spective? | |
| 6 | MR. | GODFREY: | I don't believe so, Your | |
| 7 | | Honour. | | |
| 8 | THE | COURT: | Is there anything I have | |
| 9 | | overlooked f | From the defence perspective? | |
| 10 | MR. | PETITPAS: | No, Your Honour. | |
| 11 | THE | COURT: | I want to thank counsel for | |
| 12 | | their work i | n dealing with this matter generally | |
| 13 | | and specific | cally in arriving at a resolution and | |
| 14 | | for your submissions on this matter. We will | | |
| 15 | | close court. | | |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | | | Certified to be a true and accurate transcript, pursuant | |
| 19 | | | to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules. | |
| 20 | | | Supreme Court Nates. | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | Joel Bowker Court Reporter | |
| 23 | | | Coult Reporter | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |