IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

## RUSSELL HAMILTON

Transcript of the Oral Decision delivered by The Honourable Justice K. Shaner, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 30th day of April, 2014.

REVOCATION OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCE ORDER

## APPEARANCES:

Counsel for the Crown Ms. J. Bond:

Mr. N. Homberg: Counsel for the Accused

(Charge under s. 266 of the Criminal Code of Canada)

1 THE COURT: On April	7th,	2014,	Ι
-----------------------	------	-------	---

his former partner, Brandy Bourke. Part of that sentence was a conditional sentence order, which is commonly referred to as house arrest, and that required that Mr. Hamilton adhere to certain conditions. Among these was a condition that he abstain from alcohol, intoxicating substances or drugs, except in accordance with the directions of, or a prescription from, a licenced medical practitioner.

On April 20th, 2014, Mr. Hamilton breached that term of the order. He appeared before me with counsel on April 28th, 2014, and admitted to the breach.

The circumstances of the breach are set out in a report from Mr. Hamilton's conditional sentence supervisor and the report and its attachments, including witness statements from the conditional sentence supervisor and a statement prepared by Constable K. Hipolito, from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which were admitted by the defence.

This is a summary of what happened: On April 20th, 2014, the RCMP received a telephone call from Shawna Ekotla, Mr. Hamilton's current partner and the mother of his youngest child.

She believed that Mr. Hamilton was intoxicated at his residence, located in an apartment building, and she provided the address. The RCMP went to the apartment building and there they encountered Social Services personnel who explained that they, too, had received a call about Mr. Hamilton being intoxicated and that they were there to do a wellness check on the children in his care.

The RCMP and the Social Services personnel gained entry to the main apartment building and went to the door of Mr. Hamilton's apartment.

The RCMP members banged loudly on the door and identified themselves as police officers. This went on for approximately 15 minutes, during which time the door was not answered. There was loud music coming from the apartment.

The property manager arrived subsequently and let the RCMP and the Social Services personnel into the apartment. Inside, they found Mr. Hamilton along with two small children. The children were asleep in a bedroom. Mr. Hamilton was passed out on the floor of the living room in the apartment. The RCMP observed bottles of vodka as well as empty beer cans. They managed to rouse Mr. Hamilton, who, as he admitted in court on Monday, was drunk. Mr. Hamilton was arrested and has been detained in custody since

2.4

1 that time.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

2 Section 742.6(9) of the Criminal Code 3 provides four options to the Court where there has been a breach of a conditional sentence order: The Court can take no action; it can change the optional conditions, of which this is 6 one; it can require the offender to serve a portion of the sentence in custody; or it can 8 terminate the conditional sentence order 9 altogether and direct the offender to be 10 committed to custody for the remainder of the 11 12 time.

When I heard this matter on Monday, Defence counsel suggested than an appropriate penalty in the circumstances would be to suspend the conditional sentence order for the period of time that Mr. Hamilton has spent in custody since his arrest on April 20th but to permit him to serve the remain of the conditional sentence order in the community in accordance with the terms that were imposed on April 7th. The Crown submitted that this is an appropriate case for the Court to terminate the order completely.

Before I get into the positions of each party, I want to say some things about conditional sentence orders.

First, a conditional sentence order is not

intended to be an easy ride. As I suggested in
the sentencing hearing on April 7th, a

conditional sentence order can, in some ways, be
even tougher than jail. In jail, the choices are
largely made for offenders. It is a highly
structured and controlled environment and thus,
it is harder to make bad choices. Some offenders
need this.

Under a conditional sentence order, an offender is required to make choices on his or her own and, in doing so, prove that he or she is capable of making the right choices even in difficult situations.

Second, a conditional sentence order is a form of punishment. It is imposed because an offender committed a crime that is serious enough to attract significant restrictions on the offender's liberty, albeit not jail. A court order is a very serious thing. The courts, and society for that matter, expect nothing less than the most scrupulous adherence to court orders and directions, failing which there are consequences that must be commensurate with and reflect the seriousness of the breach.

Third, as with all sentences, a conditional sentence order is intended to meet the goals and objectives of sentencing having regard to the

circumstances of the offender, the circumstances of the offence, and the circumstances of the crime itself. Among those goals are denunciation and deterrence, both specific and general, and of course, the goal of rehabilitation for the offender.

Rehabilitation can take place in a variety of circumstances and with varying levels of intensity. The effectiveness of any rehabilitative program will depend very much on the individual offender. Some offenders require little structure and supervision while others will need more intervention to effectively address the underlying factors that contribute to that offender's illegal conduct.

Once a person is convicted and sentenced by a court, the courts do not generally follow up on how effective a sentence is while it is being served. The Court's role is to determine if an offence has been committed and then craft what it considers to be an appropriate sentence, using information it has about the offender's past to try and impose a sentence that will be effective in the future. If a sentence is ineffective, offenders appear before the courts again.

To a certain extent, a community-based sentence, such as a conditional sentence order,

is an exception to this limitation. Unlike a jail sentence where breaches and infractions are, for the most part, addressed by the institution itself, if an offender breaches a conditional sentence order, he or she comes before the same court - and, typically, the same judge - that imposed the order. Ideally, the judge will have the benefit of receiving, in addition to the report about the circumstances of the breach, an explanation as to why that breach occurred. From this, the judge can, at least in part, determine if the sentence needs to be altered and perhaps even how it should be altered to make it more effective in achieving the goal of rehabilitation before it is over. This is largely reflected in the remedies available to the Court under the Criminal Code to which I referred earlier. Finally, although sentencing is a highly

Finally, although sentencing is a highly individualized process, and we often emphasize for good and valid reasons the circumstances of an offender in crafting an appropriate sentence, the interests of society as a whole remain important. Sentences must appropriately protect members of our community and they must express society's disapproval for illegal conduct. They must engender respect for the law and respect for one's legal obligations. They must discourage

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

illegal conduct both generally and by the
individual offender. Anything less than that
risks undermining significantly the community's
confidence in our justice system as a whole.

With those four factors in mind, I now turn to the specific circumstances of this case.

Many of the submissions that were provided by the defence, including the submissions from Mr. Hamilton himself, covered ground placed before me at the sentencing on April 7th, 2014. These included Mr. Hamilton's age, employment status, family circumstances, and, not insignificantly, his struggles with substance abuse. It was also pointed out once again that Mr. Hamilton was able to comply with conditions similar to what were imposed in the conditional sentence order for a period of approximately two years, between the time of the charge and the time of the sentencing.

Notwithstanding his recent arrest and detention, Mr. Hamilton's current employment supervisor confirmed that he is still employed as a security guard and that he may resume his duties. She also suggests that he is an excellent employee.

Mr. Hamilton's current partner, Ms. Ekotla, provided a letter of support in which, among

other things, she explained that the two of them plan to take counselling together and address their issues. She reiterates that he is the breadwinner for the family and states that if he is sent to jail, it will entail hardship for the family as a whole.

As I noted, Mr. Hamilton, you also made a number of submissions on your own behalf. In those submissions, you expressed remorse for breaching the terms of your conditional sentence order and you suggested that you are taking responsibility for your actions.

You also offered an explanation as to why this breach occurred. While I do not doubt the sincerity of your expression of your remorse, Mr. Hamilton, insofar as you are unhappy with the situation in which you now find yourself, I am not at all convinced that you are, in fact, taking responsibility for what happened, nor that you are remorseful for committing the breach itself. I am struck and more than a little dismayed by the extent to which you, as well as Ms. Ekotla, blame the victim, Ms. Bourke, for leading you to consume alcohol and thereby to breach the terms of your conditional sentence order.

Mr. Hamilton, you, and you alone, are

responsible for what happened on April 20th. We are all faced with choices throughout our lives. We can take responsibility for our lives and our actions, or we can blame others. In this context, the latter is simply not acceptable.

You chose to respond to a stressful situation by drinking and you chose to drink to excess. You did this knowing full well that you were breaching the terms of your conditional sentence order. You did this notwithstanding your own acknowledgment at your sentencing hearing, held scarcely two weeks before, that alcohol and substance abuse were prominent factors in your past criminal behaviour. You did this notwithstanding your representation to me and to this court on April 7th that you were actively taking steps to change and to address your substance abuse problems, and that you would be capable of handling the relative freedom and choices inherent in that conditional sentence order. The abstention provision was, as you will recall, something that was proposed by you.

This happened only 13 days into the term of that conditional sentence order. It should come as no surprise to you that a breach that comes so soon following the imposition of a conditional sentence order erodes significantly my

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

confidence, and the Court's confidence generally, in the overall effectiveness of that form of sentence for you.

The amount of liquor involved in this case is highly aggravating. The admitted facts are that there were two bottles of vodka and several opened, empty beer cans in your apartment when the police found you. You had passed out as a result of the alcohol you consumed. This was not a "one-off" or a minor incident. This was not a case of an unintentional or negligent transgression. The facts lead me to conclude that this was a decidedly intentional act on your part.

At your sentencing on April 7th and again on April 28th, much was made of your family responsibility and the fact that you are an active caregiver for your children. There was also much made of the way that a conditional sentence order would allow these responsibilities to be accommodated. In light of this, it is extremely disturbing that you breached your order and engaged in heavy drinking notwithstanding that you had two young children entrusted into your sole care at the time. You put those children at great risk.

I have taken into account the fact mentioned

earlier that you complied with conditions similar to these successfully for approximately two years, between the time of the charge and the time of the sentence. However, the seriousness of the circumstances here are such that the impact of this past positive behaviour is diminished. Moreover, the breach here goes to the very essence and rationale put forward for the order in the first place. The fact that you had complied with the Court-ordered terms of your bail gave me some assurance that you could comply with the conditional sentence order. By your actions on April 20th, however, you have shown that you cannot.

As I said earlier, Mr. Hamilton, a court order has to be obeyed. There is no choice and it is not optional. Those who are subject to conditional sentence orders have to appreciate this and they have to show the Court and others in the justice system that they appreciate this by complying with the terms of the order.

You have demonstrated that you do not appreciate it or, alternatively, that you are incapable of controlling your actions so that you can comply with its terms. You come before the Court now not with a plan for what you might do to ensure that you comply in the future but,

rather, with empty excuses for why you breached

it and, quite frankly, a shocking lack of insight

as to why.

There is simply too little assurance that you will be able to comply with the conditional sentence order if it is continued. You have not demonstrated that you have the personal insight or sense of responsibility to allow you to make the right choices instead of breaching your order. That, in turn, sets you up for failure and turns the Court into nothing more than an enabler. As well, in this context, it sets you up for more serious legal and, consequently, personal consequences down the road. You will just wind up digging yourself deeper into that hole, and your friends and your family, and ultimately you, will suffer from that.

In the circumstances, the only viable course of action that I can see is to terminate the conditional sentence order altogether.

Mr. Hamilton, it is very important that you understand this does not mean you cannot be rehabilitated or that you are beyond hope. I am a firm believer that everyone can change. I have seen people change. What it means, however, is that a conditional sentence order is not the right vehicle for you to get to where you need to

1		be.
2		So, Mr. Hamilton, you will serve the
3		remainder of the term of the conditional sentence
4		order in custody. If you are truly committed to
5		changing Please pay attention to me and do
6		not shake your head at people in the gallery.
7	THE	ACCUSED: I'm just talking to my mom.
8	THE	COURT: Do not talk to your mother
9		while I am speaking.
10		If you are truly committed to changing,
11		Mr. Hamilton, you will have many opportunities to
12		deal with your substance abuse and other issues
13		through the programs offered through the
14		institution.
15		The no contact order with respect to Brandy
16		Bourke will continue. The community service
17		hours that were imposed will have to be completed
18		during the term of your probation which will
19		
		follow your release. The time to pay the victims
20		of crime surcharge was, on April 7th, set for
21		four months from that time, but that was of
22		course premised on Mr. Hamilton being in the
23		community and working. In the circumstances, I
24		am going to extend that once again - the time to

Official Court Reporters

26

pay the surcharge - to December 31st, 2014.

Counsel, is there anything else?

MS. BOND: No, Your Honour. Just to

1		confirm j	ust to	be clear,	, the no	contact	order
2		will be on t	he Warr	ant of Co	ommittal	?	
3	THE	COURT:		Yes. Mr.	. Homber	g?	
4	MR.	HOMBERG:		Nothing f	further,	Your Hon	our.
5	THE	COURT:		Very well	L then.	We are	
6		adjourned.					
7	MS.	BOND:		Thank you	1.		
8							
9							
10							
11						Rule 723	
12			of th	e Rules o	of Court		
13							
14							
15				Romanowio Reporter		A)	
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							