R. v. Martino, 2013 NWTSC 53

S-1-CR2013000044

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

DUSTIN MARTINO

Territories, on June 28th A.D., 2013.

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable

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

APPEARANCES:

Mr. A. Godfrey: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. S. Petitpas: Counsel for the Accused

Official Court Reporters

1 THE COURT: Earlier this week, 2 Mr. Martino pleaded guilty to a charge of break and enter and commit robbery. I heard 4 sentencing submissions from Crown and defence. 5 I have now had the opportunity to consider those submissions and the authorities that 6 were filed. Counsel have presented a joint submission 8 9 on this matter. That joint submission is that 10 a sentence of imprisonment of two years less a day be imposed, to be followed by a period of 11 probation. Counsel have left the duration of 12 the probation and the specific conditions in 13 the Court's discretion although they have each 14 15 made representations about what types of conditions might be useful. 16 17 It is well established in law that a joint submission must be given very careful 18 19 consideration by a sentencing Judge. Unless that joint submission is clearly unreasonable, 20 21 it should be followed. Sentencing Judges 22 always retain the ultimate discretion to 23 decide what is a fit sentence for any given 24 crime. But where a joint submission is 25 presented and that joint submission is not an

26

27

unfit sentence having regard to all the

circumstances, a sentencing Judge should

1 follow it.

In this case, and for the reasons that follow, I have decided to accept the joint submission that was presented.

The circumstances of this offence were read into the record earlier this week at the sentencing hearing but I will refer to them again to put my decision in context.

On January 9th, 2013, the accused and two other individuals were drinking at a residence in Hay River. At some point after midnight they went to a nearby residence to buy a bottle of liquor. They then returned from where they had come from to drink the liquor.

There was then a discussion about going back to the same house to steal more liquor. Apparently this was the idea of one of the other individuals who was there. Mr. Martino tried to dissuade him from this plan but eventually went along with it.

The two of them returned to the residence. They armed themselves with a piece of wood and a black airgun that looked like a real handgun. The other man kicked in the door to the residence. Mr. Martino stood at the door and pointed the airgun at two people who were sitting in the livingroom of the residence

1 watching television. The other man went to 2 the bedroom where the owner of the residence 3 was sleeping. He took a black suitcase from that bedroom and then he and Mr. Martino left. 5 As it turned out, that suitcase was full of clothes. Mr. Martino threw the airgun in the 6 7 garbage. The matter was reported to the police and 8 Mr. Martino was cooperative from the start. He gave a full confession about his 10 involvement in this incident. He also 11 testified at the trial of the other individual 12 13 charged with this offence. I heard that that matter is still pending in the Territorial 14 Court of the Northwest Territories because 15 there was insufficient time to complete it on 16 the date that the trial started but 17 Mr. Martino has testified at that trial. 18 19 Mr. Martino is 27 years old. He was born 20 in Edmonton. I heard from his counsel that 21 his parents separated when he was young. His 22 father lives in Edmonton and his mother lives in Oshawa, Ontario, and he has spent some time 23 24 in both places as he grew up. 25 I heard that he had a difficult 26 upbringing, frequently being exposed to family

27

violence in his mother's home between his

1 mother and her common-law partner. I also
2 heard that he was in and out of foster homes
3 and group homes during his teenage years.

Mr. Martino had not been living in Hay

River for very long when this happened. He has two children who live with their mother in Oshawa and he had been in a relationship for some time with a woman who lives in Hay River and who has two children of her own. Mr. Martino himself was living in Alberta, as I understand, when this relationship started, but he moved to Hay River in November 2012; and there, he worked for a plumbing and heating company and he was still employed in that company when this incident happened. Before that, he appears to have been fairly steadily employed at various jobs in the various places where he has lived. I heard that his plans, when he finishes serving whatever sentence is imposed on him today, is to continue living in Hay River and continue

Mr. Martino has a criminal record which includes some convictions that are related to the one that I must sentence him for today.

There are convictions for property offences and several convictions for breaching various

with that relationship.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

types of court orders. The last entry on his
record is from September 2006. He has been
sentenced to jail terms in the past but never
to very long jail terms.

He was arrested on this matter on January 9th, 2013, and he has been in custody since.

Crown and defence agree that under the relevant provisions of the Criminal Code, and given the reasons given by the Court at the time his detention was ordered, it is only open to me to give him credit for the time that he has spent on remand on a one for one ratio, that is, one day of credit for each day spent in pre-trial custody.

This offence, objectively speaking, is a serious one. Breaking and entering a person's dwelling house is always a serious matter.

Doing so to commit robbery, which in itself is also a very serious offence, makes it all the more significant. This offence is punishable by a maximum of life imprisonment, which shows how serious Parliament considers it to be.

This also recognizes the sanctity of everyone's home - the fact that it is the place where every person should feel the safest; violating that is treated by the law as a very serious crime.

Various Courts have recognized the
seriousness of this type of conduct and, in
particular, in relation to breaking and
entering into dwelling houses and committing
serious crimes in there, it has given rise to
the judicially-created concept of "home
invasion robbery".

Home invasion robbery is not a separate offence that exists as such in the Criminal Code. It is simply the way that the Courts have used to identify that specific category of break and enter in a dwelling house which calls for very severe penalties. Appellate Courts in different jurisdictions have identified starting points and ranges of sentences to guide the exercise of sentencing Judges' discretion when dealing with offences like this. These starting points reflect the very serious hallmarks of these types of crimes.

But even when a case does not involve all of those hallmarks, the fact remains that to break into a person's home for the purposes of committing an offence, and actually committing a serious offence in that dwelling house, can always be expected to be treated very seriously by the Courts.

In this case the house that was broken

into was one where illegal activities, namely

bootlegging, were taking place. But that does

not take away the seriousness of the offence.

Obviously bootleggers break the law and

can themselves face consequences for that. In

can themselves face consequences for that. In some communities bootlegging causes a lot of harm actually and in those rare occasions where bootleggers are prosecuted and convicted, Courts tend to treat those offences quite seriously. But that fact is not something that should ever be understood to give anyone license to turn around and commit crimes against the people who engage in those activities or break into the premises where those activities take place. The fact that a person engages in the illegal activity does not give other people the right to break the law themselves. That is not how a civilized society operates.

21 There are several aggravating factors in 22 this case.

The first is a statutorily aggravating factor. By this, I mean the Criminal Code specifically says it is an aggravating factor; that is, the fact that Mr. Martino knew that there were people in the house and used

threats of violence to effect his purpose,

along with his co-accused. Section 348.1 of

the Criminal Code says that in itself is an

aggravating factor. And I have to say that

even if the Criminal Code did not say so, I

expect it would be in any event considered an

aggravating factor.

The second aggravating factor is the use of the airgun. It looked like a handgun and the victims probably thought it was a handgun. It is not difficult to imagine how frightening it would be to be sitting in a house, have the door kicked in, two men barge in and one pointing what looks like a firearm at you. The introduction of a weapon in this kind of this situation not only adds to the impact on the victims but it always creates a very real risk of escalation of the seriousness of the matter and of the violence. People thinking this is a real firearm might react in all sorts of ways trying to defend themselves. And it goes without saying that much more serious consequences can flow from that.

The third aggravating factor was the planning element in this. I accept this was not a long, thought-out plan. I accept it was not Mr. Martino's plan. And I accept that he

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

was in an intoxicated state when he made the
sad decision to agree to join in in that plan.

But still, it was not a completely spontaneous
act either. It involved some discussion,
making a decision, the individuals arming
themselves with weapons, and ultimately
carrying out their plan.

The fourth aggravating factor is the criminal record because it does include convictions for property and weapons offences which are not unrelated to this one. But, I agree with Mr. Martino's counsel that the record does not disclose a persistent pattern for the type of conduct (he displayed in this incident). I also recognize that there is a gap in the criminal record and that the types of offences that appear on it and the sentences that were imposed do not suggest that these offences were at the higher end of the spectrum of seriousness. In fact, the offence that I am sentencing Mr. Martino for today is by far the most serious one that will appear on his criminal record. And hopefully, it will be the last.

As far as mitigating factors, the main one is that Mr. Martino has pleaded guilty. He has also waived his preliminary hearing so

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

none of the witnesses involved in this had to testify to prove the charge against him.

1.3

This willingness to take responsibility
manifested itself early on in the process.
When this matter was investigated, he gave a
statement to the police and he admitted his
involvement. At his first appearance, I
heard, he conveyed an intention to plead
guilty to this. And he cooperated with the
authorities further in testifying in the trial
of his co-accused - something that not
everyone is prepared to do.

Through counsel, he has expressed remorse and I accept that he is remorseful. I also agree that, based on everything that I have heard, his guilty plea should be given the maximum mitigating impact that it can have.

There are other things that were mentioned by his counsel which, in my view, are more reflective of the absence of what would otherwise be an aggravating factor. For example, if he had been the leader or instigator of this, that would be aggravating. If his criminal record was more significant, it would be aggravating. If the matter had been planned a long time in advance with a lot of sober thought, that would also make it more

1 serious.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Some cases were submitted by the Crown,
and I have reviewed them all.

I think the main principles that emerge from those cases are, first, that for this type of offence, the sentencing principles that are the most important are deterrence and denunciation. Second, when a home is broken into and an offence is committed in that home, particularly where it involves violence or threats of violence, a significant jail term must be imposed to address those sentencing principles. Third, if the hallmarks of what has been termed "home invasion robberies" (in cases such as R. v. Matwiy [1996] A.J. 134, (Alta CA), R. v. Reader [2008] M.J. No. 120 (Man CA), or R. v. Bernier [2003] B.C.J. No. 466 (BCCA)) are present, significant starting points are engaged to address the fundamental sentencing principle of proportionality.

Matwiy talks about a starting point of eight years; Leader talks about a starting point of seven to ten years. It appears that the starting point adopted by the British Columbia Court of Appeal is slightly lower than that but still, it also signals the requirement for a very significant jail term

1 to be imposed. This is also reflected in 2 cases from this jurisdiction as demonstrated 3 in the case of R. v. Kakfwi and Lennie 2006 NWTSC 8 quoted by Crown counsel during his submissions. In that case this Court referred 5 6 to Matwiy, as well as to other another case 7 from this jurisdiction, R. v. Payne 2005 NWTSC 42, and quoted the starting points with 8 approval, saying that but for the guilty pleas this is the range of sentence these offenders 10 11 could have expected to receive. The same can be said for this case. 12 1.3 Kakfwi and Lennie involved two people

Kakfwi and Lennie involved two people
breaking into a residence for the purpose of
stealing alcohol - much like this case. In
that case, one of the men held a knife to the
occupant's throat. Here, we have an airgun
pointed at people, admittedly creating less of
an actual risk of injury but likely every bit
as terrifying for those who the gun was
pointed at. Mr. Kakfwi had a significant
criminal record and he received a three year
sentence, even though he pleaded guilty.
Mr. Lennie was much younger and his personal
circumstances were more favourable. He

Given all of this, the suggested sentence

received a sentence of two years.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

of two years less a day, I think, can be characterized as quite lenient. It is at the very low end of what people can expect to be sentenced for when they commit these types of of crimes, even when they plead guilty. But I cannot say, based on the cases that have been submitted, that the sentence is outside the range of what can be considered and that is why I have decided to follow it.

The criminal record and the numerous breach convictions that appear on it made me reluctant at first to have this sentence include a term of probation. But I recognize that the gap in the criminal record may be an indication that Mr. Martino has decided to change his ways and may be more responsive now to being on probation than he has been in the past as far as following court orders.

Alcohol was a factor in the commission of this offence and whether Mr. Martino considers himself to have an actual alcohol problem or not, I am of the view that he needs to give that question some careful thought.

Drinking alcohol is one thing; getting heavily intoxicated even is one thing. But behaving in this manner when intoxicated shows a level of loss of control and loss of

judgment that, in my respectful view, should
make Mr. Martino very scared to consume
alcohol.

I infer from what his counsel has said that Mr. Martino feels that alcohol was a contributing factor to the bad decision he made that night, although I also note he accepts responsibility for what he did. But I infer that he feels he would have made perhaps a different decision if he had been sober. That fact alone, the fact that he did choose to get himself involved in something so serious while intoxicated, raises some issues.

He has indicated through his counsel that he is willing to abide by a no drinking condition, and I think that is a good idea.

As I said during submissions, it is not something that I do as a matter of course and it is not something that I do unless I hear from the offender that they think they can comply with it and they wish that type of a condition to be part of probation. But I think it is a good idea in this case. And I also think it would be a good idea for Mr. Martino to explore a bit more the nature of his relationship with alcohol. The reality is that with this conviction now on his

- 1 record, he will not be able to expect or hope
- 2 for leniency in the future if he ever finds
- 3 himself involved in this type of conduct
- 4 again.
- 5 Can you stand up, please, sir.
- 6 Mr. Martino, for the reasons that I have
- 7 given, I am going to go along with the joint
- 8 submission that your lawyer and the Crown
- 9 counsel have presented. I hope that you do
- 10 understand it is a very lenient sentence,
- 11 considering what you did. I hope I am the
- 12 last Judge who has to sentence you for
- anything because if there is a next time, that
- Judge may not have the same options as those
- that I have today dealing with you. I hope
- 16 that you understand that.
- 17 THE ACCUSED: I do.
- 18 THE COURT: I am imposing a sentence of
- 19 two years less one day. And because you have
- 20 been in pre-trial custody for five months and
- 21 three weeks, you are going to get credit for
- 22 that time on a one-for-one basis which is all
- 23 that I am, in law, permitted to give you
- credit for. That will leave 18 months and one
- 25 week to serve.
- You can sit down.
- 27 THE ACCUSED: Thank you.

1	THE	COURT: This will be followed by a
2		period of probation for one year. For this
3		period, the conditions are going to be that
4		you keep the peace and be of good behavior;
5		that's fairly simple. Within 48 hours of your
6		release, you are to report to Probation
7		Services, and then they will assign a
8		probation officer to you, and thereafter you
9		will report as directed by your probation
10		officer. I am going to include a condition
11		that you take counselling as directed by your
12		probation officer. What I expect will happen
13		is that this will be the subject of
14		discussions between the two of you. I don't
15		think they tend to make people take
16		counselling that the person really doesn't
17		want to take but I encourage you to think
18		about whatever is suggested and think about
19		whether it might help you. Ultimately this is
20		for your own good. And I will include a
21		condition that you abstain absolutely from the
22		possession and consumption of alcohol for that
23		full year. It is a long time and if you reach
24		a point, and Mr. Petitpas can explain this to
25		you as well in more detail, if you reach the
26		point, for whatever reason, where that
27		condition feels like one that you cannot

- 1 comply with, you need to ask the Court to vary
- it. I don't know what would happen, it would
- 3 depend on the circumstances, but you cannot
- 4 just stop following that condition because
- 5 then it is an offence in itself to breach a
- 6 probation order. So you have to take steps to
- 7 get that changed if it becomes too difficult
- 8 for you for whatever reason. And the last
- 9 condition is that you will have no contact
- 10 directly or indirectly with Leon Durocher,
- Joanne Martel and Walter Beaulieu. I realize
- 12 that Hay River is not a large town but that
- 13 type of condition places the onus on you to
- 14 remove yourself from the situation if there is
- a risk that you might have contact with them.
- There will also be a DNA order; it is
- mandatory under the Criminal Code for this
- 18 type of offence.
- 19 There will be a firearms prohibition
- 20 order, also mandatory under the Criminal Code
- 21 for this type of offence. It will commence
- 22 today and it will expire ten years from your
- 23 release from imprisonment. Do you have any
- 24 firearms?
- 25 THE ACCUSED: No.
- 26 THE COURT: All right, so the order will
- 27 say that you are to surrender whatever you

- have forthwith. If you don't have any, that's
- 2 not a problem.
- 3 THE ACCUSED: Okay.
- 4 THE COURT: Finally, given that you have
- 5 been on remand for a number of months and
- 6 because I am imposing the jail term that I am
- 7 imposing today, I am going to waive the victim
- 8 of crime surcharge because I am satisfied that
- 9 imposing one would result in hardship.
- 10 I am not going to make an order dealing
- 11 with exhibits because I know that there is
- 12 this other matter that is still ongoing so I
- am just asking, Mr. Godfrey, that when that
- 14 other matter is concluded that the Crown
- 15 ensure that whatever needs to be ordered in
- 16 relation to the exhibits is. But for the
- 17 purposes of this case, I will not make any
- 18 specific order.
- 19 Is there anything, counsel, that I have
- 20 overlooked or that needs to be clarified?
- 21 MR. GODFREY: I don't believe so, Your
- Honour, thank you.
- 23 MR. PETITPAS: No, Your Honour.
- 24 THE COURT: All right.
- 25 MR. PETITPAS: Your Honour, just one last
- thing. Would the Court be inclined to make a
- judicial recommendation?

1	THE	COURT: Yes, thank you for reminding	
2		me, Mr. Petitpas; that is something that I	
3		completely forgot.	
4		Defence counsel had asked that the warrant	
5		of committal be endorsed with the judicial	
6		recommendation that Mr. Martino serve his	
7		sentence in the facility at Hay River because	
8		that is where his spouse is and that is where	
9		his connections are, and I am going to make	
10		that endorsement. It is not something that I	
11		can order, it is not up to me, but the	
12		recommendation will be there on the warrant of	
13		committal that he be allowed to serve his	
14		sentence in Hay River, assuming that it is	
15		deemed appropriate for his needs. It then	
16		will be up to the authorities to make the	
17		decision.	
18		Thank you for reminding, Mr. Petitpas. I	
19		am just going to sign the DNA order now.	
20		We will stand down briefly, counsel.	
21		There is another matter on the docket this	
22		afternoon that I am not involved with, so we	
23		will stand down and court will reconvene	
24		shortly.	
25		Thank you, counsel, for your submissions.	
26			
27			

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