R. v. Jacobson, 2014 NWTSC 33 S-1-CR-2012-000118

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

GILBERT WILSON JACOBSON

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by the Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, in Tuktoyaktuk, in the Northwest Territories, on the 14th day of March, 2014

APPEARANCES:

Ms. A. Piche: Counsel on behalf of the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd: Counsel on behalf of the Accused

Charge under s. 271 Criminal Code of Canada

THE COURT:

I am ready to give my decision on this case. I thank counsel for their submissions this morning. Obviously, at the conclusion of the proceedings yesterday and last night, I did spend some time thinking about this case as I was aware of at least the evidence, and I am also aware of the principles of law that apply in a case like this. So I had some time to think about this matter since we received the verdict yesterday, and this morning I have had additional time to consider the submissions that were presented by counsel.

Before I give my reasons for my decision this morning, I just want to remind everyone that there is a publication ban in place which prohibits the publication of any information that could identify the victim in this matter. I am going to be referring to her by name in my decision, but I want the court reporter to use initials only in the transcript. If I refer to either of the young girls who were involved in this matter by name in my reasons, I also want initials used in the transcript.

Yesterday a jury from this community found Mr. Jacobson guilty of sexual assault for an incident that happened back in December of 2009, and today it is my responsibility to decide what

his sentence should be for this crime. Both lawyers have talked about the evidence and the factual basis for the sentencing this morning, and I think it is important to be clear as to what that is.

The jury's verdict does not leave any ambiguity as to the findings they made. To find Mr. Jacobson guilty, they had to have rejected his version of events, that the sexual activity that occurred that night was at D.L.P.'s suggestion and with her consent in exchange for alcohol and drugs. The jury had to have concluded instead that Mr. Jacobson had sexual intercourse with her either when she was unconscious or when she was so highly intoxicated that she could not consent validly to the activity; in other words, that she was either passed out or completely incapacitated by alcohol, although she may not have been actually passed out.

We know from the two other young women who testified at his trial that they were at the house drinking with D.L.P. and Mr. Jacobson. We know that a lot of alcohol was consumed that night, and we know that at one point the police showed up at the door and were banging on the door. How and why the police came to be at

Mr. Jacobson's house, why these two other young girls were so concerned about being found by the police is not something that is explained in the evidence, but what they were both clear about was that they ran out the back door to evade the police and that when they left, Ms. P. was still at the house and so was Mr. Jacobson.

We also know that at 7:00 in the morning D.L.P. walked into her brother's house half naked, very cold, and extremely intoxicated to the point that she fell down as she was getting in the door. Based on this, the only conclusion is that at some point between the time the two friends left and the time that D.L. arrived at her brother's house, Mr. Jacobson took advantage of the fact that she was in a highly intoxicated state and had sexual intercourse with her.

D.L.P. talked about an incident that she says happened several months later last spring. She alleged that she and Mr. Jacobson came upon one another on the street and that he threatened her. The threat was not an element of the offence of sexual assault, so the conviction does not mean that the jury accepted her evidence on that point, and it does not that mean that they were convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that that threat was made. It is not something that

flows inevitably from the verdict or necessarily from the verdict. It is I, as the trial judge, who has to decide whether that fact has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. If so, it would be a significantly aggravating factor. Ι am unable to attach any weight to Mr. Jacobson's denial of that threat because the jury concluded that he was not truthful about the sexual activity, which taints his entire evidence. leaves Ms. P.'s evidence on the point, and I have considered it carefully. On the whole, I cannot say that I am sure that this threat was made. Maybe it was; maybe it was not. But I have to give the benefit of that doubt to Mr. Jacobson, so I am not taking it into account in my decision today.

In a sentencing, one of the things I have to consider are the circumstances of Mr. Jacobson. His counsel, this morning, outlined those circumstances in a lot of detail. I will not repeat now everything that has been said except to say that Mr. Jacobson is an aboriginal man and he grew up in this region. He did show, in his life, initiative, and an ability to get training and get an education, something that not everyone in this jurisdiction is able or willing to do. I heard he has training and has worked as a heavy

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

equipment operator. He has also travelled out of the jurisdiction to acquire a certificate in environmental science. He has been employed and he has a good work record. It is also to his credit that he has raised three of his children as a single parent with the assistance of his own mother from the point in time when he separated from his spouse in 1997. I have taken what I have heard about him and in particular the positive aspects of his background into consideration.

I have taken into account that he is an aboriginal offender, and I have kept in mind the principles that the Supreme Court of Canada has outlined with respect to the approach that courts must take when sentencing aboriginal offenders.

In any sentencing, in addition to considering the facts of the offence and circumstances of the offender, the Court has to apply the sentencing principles that are set out in the Criminal Code, and the fundamental sentencing principle is proportionality. That means a sentence has to be proportionate to the seriousness of the offence and to the degree of blameworthiness of the offender. Every other sentencing principle flows from that fundamental one.

Sadly, very sadly, this scenario, a man sexually assaulting a woman who is passed out or very intoxicated, is very common in the Northwest Territories. It is a crime that seems to happen to women of all ages. It is a crime that seems to be committed by men of all ages. There are so many cases that involve this type of sexual assault that this Court has gone as far as to call it an epidemic. There is a long list of victims just like D.L.P. who have to spend the rest of their lives living with the consequence of having been violated in this way, and there is a long list of offenders like Mr. Jacobson who have been sent to jail for a long time for committing this type of crime. There are many families of victims and many families of offenders who have suffered greatly as a result of this type of crime, and unfortunately this case now adds itself to that list.

The Court does not know what it will take to stop these types of crimes from being committed in our communities. The Court does not have those answers. If anyone can change things, it is the people who live in the communities, and there is very little the Court can do except repeat the same message that this is wrong, that it causes harm. The harm that it causes is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

obvious from the victim impact statements that
were filed in this case.

Because of the seriousness of this type of crime, which is a serious violation of the victim's personal and sexual integrity, the Courts in this jurisdiction have long held that the most important sentencing principles when sentencing someone for committing this crime are denunciation and deterrence. Sentences imposed need to show clearly that this conduct is completely unacceptable. That is what denunciation is. They also need, to the extent possible, to discourage other people from committing similar offences.

I realize that a person who is highly intoxicated and about to sexually assault someone else is not going to be thinking about the sentences that are imposed by this Court for these types of crimes. But hopefully, maybe deterrence can operate before the drinking starts. Hopefully it can operate to the people who have unhealthy relationships with alcohol and other issues to do something about it so they do not end up drunk with no self-control, committing these serious offences, hurting their fellow community members.

All this to say deterrence and denunciation

are the dominant sentencing principles in a case like this one. Other principles such as rehabilitation must be kept in mind, but they do take second place.

Restraint is always an important sentencing principle, one that applies even more so when sentencing aboriginal offenders. As I have said, I have taken into account that aspect of Mr. Jacobson's circumstances, including the fact that he attended residential school and including the fact that his generation is one that saw a great change happening in this region. I think the fact that his parents were fluent in Inuvialuktun and that Mr. Jacobson does not speak that language is a very good illustration of some of the changes that occurred within the span of that generation.

The starting point on sentencing for offences of this kind is three years' imprisonment, as was noted by the Court of Appeal in R. v. A.J.P.J. and a host of other decisions of this Court as well as other appellate decisions. That is not a minimum sentence, and it is not a mandatory sentence. It is simply a starting point that reflects the seriousness of this type of conduct and the devastating impact it has on its victims.

On this specific offence, I have to say I find Mr. Jacobson's blameworthiness is quite high. The circumstances revealed by the evidence are deeply disturbing.

There are aggravating and mitigating factors that must be considered in the time the Court imposes sentences. Here, there are aggravating factors, significant ones. The first is the age of the victim. She was only 17 at the time. This is now an aggravating factor specifically set out in the Criminal Code, but this Court has always treated that factor as an aggravating factor.

The second aggravating factor is that she was sexually assaulted when she was in a particularly vulnerable position by virtue of her high state of intoxication. The fact that D.L.P. should not have been drinking underage, the fact that she was not behaving in a particularly good way that evening is one thing, and it is part of these circumstances. She and her friends were, one could say, out of control with their partying that evening considering what I heard about how much they had to drink. But that changes nothing to the fact that ultimately she was in a very vulnerable position when Mr. Jacobson assaulted her.

I also find it aggravating that Mr. Jacobson

supplied some of the liquor that was consumed.

In itself, supplying liquor to a minor is a

crime, but to do so in these types of

circumstances is particularly blameworthy.

I have also taken into account

Mr. Jacobson's criminal record. It does not include offences of a sexual nature, but it does include crimes against people. By this, I mean assault; there is a break and enter and assault for which he received a not insignificant jail term, although it was in the territorial range. I agree with the Crown that the criminal record is not particularly significant, but it is a factor. I am also mindful that a person should not be punished over and over again for the convictions that appear on their criminal record.

I have considered whether there are mitigating factors here, and I find it difficult to find any. There certainly is no evidence of any kind of remorse here. Mr. Jacobson's version of events, which the jury must have concluded was fabricated, was highly contemptuous to D.L.P. He claimed that she prostituted herself for alcohol and drugs, that she fabricated this allegation to get herself out of a difficult situation after she arrived in the state she did at her brother's house. He claimed that she extorted more alcohol

from him by telling him she would not charge him if he gave her more alcohol. And during his evidence he volunteered information about her sexual activity with another person when it was certainly not in response to a question that related to that topic.

He cannot be treated more severely for having exercised his right to have a trial, of course. I am simply noting that his evidence was contemptuous and demeaning to the complainant and confirms his absolute lack of remorse or any insight into his behaviour. The Court hopes that someday he will come to be in a different place.

As I have said, there are aspects of the evidence we have heard in this trial that are very, very disturbing and that I think the community should be concerned about.

It was clear on the evidence that these girls had been at Mr. Jacobson's house many times before. It is clear that they saw his house as a place they could go sit around and drink alcohol. I find it disturbing that a man of Mr. Jacobson's age, who has children himself, would welcome teenagers in his house for drinking parties, sharing and doing drugs with them, be prepared to supply more liquor to them.

As I said, these particular teenagers were

not behaving in an ideal way that night, far from it. But sometimes that is how teenagers act. Sometimes that is how adults act. But certainly when young people act in this way, one would expect that adults would try to stop them. If they were not able to stop them, one would hope that at least they would not enable them, that they would not help them continue drinking more and smoking more drugs. You would expect that adults would try to protect and guide younger people, not contribute to getting them completely intoxicated and then take advantage of them.

The harm that this type of offence causes, as I have said, is very real, and it is eloquently shown in the three victim impact statements that were filed in this case.

In addition, I found D.L.P.'s hurt very obvious during her testimony. At times she came across as somewhat hostile, but she did break down when she started talking about her blackout. Her hurt was obvious to me. Her brother testified as well. He talked about being in shock that morning when he saw her walk in. He repeats that in his victim impact statement. His hurt showed very differently from hers, but he too was evidently, to me at least, very upset during his evidence. As for D.L.'s father, he

was, as he was required to be, very stoic when he sat with her during her evidence as a support person. He also was when he read out his victim impact statement in court this morning. But still, it is obvious to me that he is very hurt and upset and has suffered harm as a result of this.

I also had occasion during the week to see some of the people who were here to support Mr. Jacobson, which I assume are members of his family or are friends. I am sure they are devastated about what has happened here, and I am sure they are hurt and devastated about the fact that he will be taken away from this community for some time. That is what is so sad about these types of cases. They cause harm to a great number of people.

The Crown's position is that the term of imprisonment I should impose in this case is four years, which is the same sentence that was imposed in the case of *R. v. A.J.P.J.* in the Court of Appeal for facts that are not dissimilar to the facts here.

The defence acknowledges that a jail term has to be imposed but asks me to limit it to two-and-a-half years. Defence argues that this would be sufficient to achieve the goals of sentencing. I am unable to agree that there is

any basis here for imposing a sentence in that range. To do so would not reflect the significant aggravating factors that I have talked about, and it would not reflect the blameworthiness of this offender for committing this particular crime.

There is nothing joyful about sentencing someone to a long jail term. There is really nothing that feels pleasant about it. The Court has compassion for the consequences that this decision will have on Mr. Jacobson and on his family, but those are the consequences of his own actions. The Court's response to this type of crime has to be proportionate to its seriousness, and it has to take into account the aggravating factors.

The Crown has asked for a number of ancillary orders, and I will make those orders. There will be a DNA order because this is a primary designated offence. There will be an order that Mr. Jacobson comply with the Sex Offender Information Registry Act for a period of 20 years. There will be a firearms prohibition order that will commence today and expire 10 years after his release from imprisonment. The law now forces the Court to impose a victim of crime surcharge, but these incidents arose

1	before that amendment. So I have discretion to
2	waive it, and I will for obvious reasons. I am
3	also going to make an order that any exhibits
4	seized in this matter be returned to their
5	rightful owners if that is appropriate;
6	otherwise, they are to be destroyed at the
7	expiration of the appeal period.
8	Mr. Jacobson, stand up, please. For the
9	sexual assault that you committed against D.L.P.,
10	I sentence you to a term of imprisonment of
11	four years. You can sit down.
12	THE ACCUSED: How long?
13	THE COURT: You can sit down. Four years.
14	Now, I will, Madam Clerk, ask you to endorse
15	on the warrant of committal the Court's strong
16	recommendation that Mr. Jacobson be permitted to
17	serve his term of imprisonment in the North to
18	facilitate his family's ability to have access to
19	him so that he can continue to benefit from their
20	support, which he obviously has.
21	Before we close court, I want to thank both
22	counsel for their work on this case and the court
23	staff for their hard work as well.
24	We will now close court.
25	
26	PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY
27	

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
2	
3	
4	
5	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that
6	the foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
7	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
8	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes to
9	the best of my skill and ability.
10	Dated at the Hamlet of Tuktoyaktuk, in
11	the Northwest Territories, this 14th day of March
12	2014.
13	1/1
14	(Pallet)
15	
16	••
17	,
18	Tiffany Low
19	Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc. –
 Phone: (780) 497-4223