

R. v. Sangris, 2014 NWTSC 23

S-1-CR-2011-000167

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

NARCISSE SANGRIS

Transcript of Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice K. Shaner, in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on January 17, 2014.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. Demone: Counsel on behalf of the Crown

Mr. P. Falvo: Counsel on behalf of the Accused

Charges under ss. 271 C.C. and 151 C.C.

Ban on Publication of Complainant/Witness
pursuant to Section 486.4 of the Criminal Code

1 THE COURT: It is my responsibility today,
2 Mr. Sangris, to impose a sentence on you and to
3 tell you why I am imposing that sentence.

4 Mr. Sangris was convicted of touching for a
5 sexual purpose under section 151 of the Criminal
6 Code on November 28th, 2013. I heard submissions
7 on sentencing yesterday, and I heard from Mr.
8 Sangris just now.

9 That this is a serious offence is recognized
10 by the Criminal Code. It carries with it a
11 minimum penalty of one year imprisonment when the
12 Crown proceeds by indictment, and a maximum
13 penalty of ten years.

14 This is perhaps the most difficult thing
15 that a judge has to do. Canadians, people who
16 live here, we value our personal freedom. Jail
17 takes that away. It has a profound effect on
18 offenders and offenders' families and friends.
19 It is something that I have spent a lot of time
20 thinking about in terms of coming up with a
21 sentence that is fair and reasonable for you, Mr.
22 Sangris, in all of the circumstances.

23 The first thing I want to deal with is the
24 credit for time served. That is an issue that
25 came up yesterday. I did have an opportunity to
26 thoroughly review the transcript of the show
27 cause hearing from March of 2013. I do see that

1 the judge had concerns about Mr. Sangris and his
2 attendance at the drum dance ceremony, however it
3 is not clear to me that the judge found that he
4 contravened the terms of his recognizance when
5 she heard that matter. I do note that there is
6 on Mr. Sangris' criminal record a conviction for
7 breaching a recognizance, however that is not the
8 same as the judge taking it into account and
9 revoking the recognizance on that basis. She
10 specifically left that for another day. So what
11 that means is that I have some doubt about what
12 the conclusions of the judge hearing the matter
13 were. Mr. Sangris is entitled to the benefit of
14 that doubt. As a result, I have concluded that
15 he is not disentitled to enhanced credit for the
16 time he spent on remand awaiting the disposition
17 of his case.

18 From what I have read in the PSR and what I
19 heard through submissions, it is my view that
20 there should be enhanced credit given. Mr.
21 Sangris has used his time on remand exceptionally
22 well: He has become involved with the inmate
23 committee; he's met weekly with the North Slave
24 Correctional Center's traditional liaison elder;
25 and, since July of last year, he has also been
26 attending weekly meetings with North Slave
27 Correctional Centre psychologist, with whom he is

1 working on an application to attend a 40 day
2 substance abuse program geared to aboriginal
3 individuals once he is released from custody. In
4 my view, this demonstrates a commitment to
5 rehabilitation and it is worthy of recognition
6 through enhanced credit. Accordingly, I am going
7 to grant enhanced credit to Mr. Sangris at the
8 rate of 1.25 days for each day served, so he will
9 be given credit for a total of 375 days. That,
10 in my view, strikes a balance between the fact
11 that Mr. Sangris did breach the terms of his
12 recognizance and also the work that he has done,
13 since breaching his recognizance, to get a
14 jump-start on rehabilitation.

15 I am now going to turn to the principles and
16 objectives of sentencing.

17 The Criminal Code sets out the principles
18 and objectives of sentencing that judges have to
19 follow. I am not going to go through each and
20 every one of these as they are not all relevant
21 to this case. I will, however, explain those
22 principles and objectives that are the focus of a
23 case like this, and it is worth stating as a
24 general context that the emphasis that is placed
25 on each of the principles and objectives very
26 much depends on the offence, the circumstances
27 under which it was committed, and the

1 circumstances of the offender. It is a highly
2 individualized process.

3 Where an offence involves abuse of a person
4 under 18 years of age, as is the case here, the
5 primary consideration is to be given to the
6 objectives of denunciation, which is an
7 expression of society's abhorrence for a
8 particular conduct, and deterrence, both for the
9 offender and the public at large.

10 The overarching principles that guide judges
11 in giving effect to sentencing objectives are
12 also set out in the Criminal Code. The most
13 important of these is proportionality, which
14 means that a sentence must be proportionate to
15 the gravity of the offence and the degree of
16 responsibility of the offender. That is also
17 called the moral blameworthiness of the offender.

18 Judges also have to consider aggravating and
19 mitigating factors, and sentences will be
20 increased or decreased accordingly. There is no
21 limit on what can constitute an aggravating
22 factor or a mitigating circumstance, but the
23 Criminal Code deems as aggravating, evidence that
24 an offender abused a person under 18 years of
25 age. This is a reflection of the importance that
26 Parliament and our society places on protecting
27 children.

1 Parity is another sentencing principle that
2 is set out in the Criminal Code. Simply put,
3 parity requires that sentences should generally
4 be similar for like offences and like
5 circumstances. Using a range of sentence types
6 and times is one of the ways that the court
7 ensures parity.

8 Finally, judges have to apply the principle
9 of restraint, and that means that they have to
10 consider all of the available sanctions other
11 than imprisonment that are reasonable in the
12 circumstances, with particular attention to the
13 circumstances of aboriginal offenders.

14 The events that form the basis of the
15 conviction in this case took place in
16 Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on
17 April 15th, 2011. The victim, a 14 year old boy,
18 was at a cyber cafe in Yellowknife around three
19 o'clock in the afternoon that day. He was using
20 Facebook to check messages. He received a
21 message from Mr. Sangris on the Facebook Instant
22 Messenger system. The message included an
23 invitation to the victim to come to Mr. Sangris'
24 apartment and view pornography. The victim had
25 never met Mr. Sangris personally, however this
26 was not the first time the two of them had
27 interacted through electronic communications.

1 The evidence showed that on March 2nd, 2011, Mr.
2 Sangris and the victim had a Facebook
3 conversation during which Mr. Sangris invited the
4 victim to his apartment. The victim declined
5 that invitation.

6 Following the Facebook conversation on April
7 15th, 2011, however, the victim walked over to
8 Mr. Sangris' apartment building. He rang the
9 buzzer at the main door and Mr. Sangris came down
10 to let him into the building. This was the first
11 time the two of them had ever met in person.
12 They proceeded to Mr. Sangris' apartment. At
13 that point, Mr. Sangris offered the victim
14 alcohol and cigarettes, both of which he
15 declined. Mr. Sangris then played a pornographic
16 DVD for the victim, who was on the couch. He
17 then went over to the victim and kissed him on
18 the lips and told him not to be afraid. Mr.
19 Sangris was naked from the waist down at that
20 point. The victim recounted that he could see
21 his penis. Next, Mr. Sangris unzipped and took
22 down the victim's pants. He rubbed the victim's
23 penis and he inserted his finger into the
24 victim's anus and moved it back and forth. The
25 victim said that this was uncomfortable and that
26 it made it very difficult for him to breathe. He
27 told Mr. Sangris this, and that at that point Mr.

1 Sangris stopped.

2 The victim said he wanted to leave
3 immediately but Mr. Sangris encouraged him to
4 remain in the apartment. I do note that there
5 was no attempt by Mr. Sangris to physically
6 restrain the victim, however at trial the victim
7 testified that he felt he could not leave the
8 apartment because Mr. Sangris was older and
9 stronger than he was. While I am not able to
10 make any conclusions on what, if any, the size
11 difference would have been between the two at the
12 time, Mr. Sangris was definitely an adult, while
13 the victim was merely 14 years old. The victim
14 did leave the apartment and, as he was leaving,
15 Mr. Sangris told him to keep their encounter a
16 secret.

17 Shortly before the victim left, he asked Mr.
18 Sangris to give him money. At trial, the victim
19 testified that he did so because Mr. Sangris had
20 mentioned giving him money in an earlier Facebook
21 exchange and that he wanted money so that he
22 could go buy something from the store.

23 Later that evening the victim told his
24 mother what happened.

25 I have had the benefit of a great deal of
26 background information through representations
27 that were made by Mr. Sangris' lawyer and through

1 the presentence report, as well as Mr. Sangris'
2 remarks made here today.

3 Mr. Sangris is currently 43 years old and he
4 is a Dene man. He was born in Yellowknife and he
5 grew up in Dettah. While he was growing up, Mr.
6 Sangris' parents spent a great deal of time on
7 the land, however Mr. Sangris was often left
8 behind with his grandmother while his parents did
9 this. He told the author of the presentence
10 report that this was because he got scared while
11 they were out on the land and he would get sick,
12 and also because he was considered unlucky. He
13 also told the author that he was the only one of
14 his siblings to be left behind like this.
15 However, another sibling interviewed reported
16 that others of the children were left behind as
17 well in the care of relatives.

18 The home in which Mr. Sangris grew up
19 definitely had problems. His parents separated
20 often and for varying amounts of time. It
21 appears that his father struggled with alcohol
22 addiction. When his father went on a drinking
23 binge, his mother would shelter the kids by
24 sending them to their grandmother. It was also
25 stated in the presentence report, and represented
26 by counsel, that Mr. Sangris was the object of
27 verbal and physical abuse by his father. Both of

1 Mr. Sangris' parents attended residential school,
2 and Mr. Sangris attended residential school as
3 well at Akaitcho Hall in Yellowknife.

4 I think it is fair to say that Mr. Sangris
5 has had more than his share of hardship in his
6 life. According to the presentence report, as
7 well as representations made before me yesterday,
8 he was the subject of bullying, harassment, and
9 abuse while he was growing up, linked to his
10 sexual orientation. He also reported that he was
11 himself the victim of sexual abuse on numerous
12 occasions during his childhood, including when he
13 was just six years old and also when he was a
14 teenager at residential school.

15 Not surprisingly, Mr. Sangris himself has
16 struggled with substance abuse and emotional
17 issues. He was at one point diagnosed with
18 depression. He sought help for these things from
19 time to time, but he has never had much in the
20 way of any formal or structured treatment. And I
21 say that, taking into account the fact that since
22 he has been incarcerated he has taken steps to
23 get more formalized and structured treatment.

24 I note, however, that one of the individuals
25 that he has gone to for help is Cyndi Caisse.
26 Ms. Caisse provided a letter of support on Mr.
27 Sangris' behalf which was tendered during defence

1 counsel's submissions. The two of them were
2 first working together on a 24 week program in
3 2008 which was aimed at individuals suffering the
4 impact of homelessness, addictions, trauma, and
5 other effects of residential schools. According
6 to what is in the presentence report, Mr. Sangris
7 began to meet regularly with Ms. Caisse for his
8 own benefit in 2009, and this continued
9 regularly, even while he was on remand and
10 awaiting trial. Ms. Caisse left the Northwest
11 Territories in September of 2013, however she and
12 Mr. Sangris continue to have contact by
13 telephone.

14 In addition to the letter from Ms. Caisse
15 which I just mentioned, I had the benefit of
16 reading a number of letters of support from
17 friends and family, all of which depict Mr.
18 Sangris as a helpful caregiver, who was well
19 loved and trusted by his family and friends.
20 Clearly, he continues to have their support and
21 this will bode well for him in the days to come.

22 The Crown is seeking a conditional [sic]
23 sentence in the range of three to four years, as
24 well as a number of ancillary orders. This is in
25 the appropriate range of sentence and it is
26 appropriate to consider this as a starting-point.
27 That is borne out in the cases that the Crown

1 submitted and I will discuss these later on.

2 Defence counsel seeks a sentence in the
3 range of two to three years, and certainly there
4 are some circumstances in which this court has
5 imposed sentences in that range for crimes of
6 this nature.

7 It is the Crown's position that this was a
8 major sexual assault upon a child and a custodial
9 sentence is necessary to achieve the objectives
10 of sentencing, particularly denunciation and
11 deterrence. And as I noted earlier, those have
12 to be given primary consideration.

13 It was unclear to me yesterday whether
14 defence counsel disputed that this was a major
15 sexual assault. He did point out some
16 distinctions between what happened in this case
17 and the act that formed the basis for the
18 conviction in a finding of major sexual assault
19 in one of the cases filed by the Crown, that
20 being R. v. Lepine. Defence counsel pointed out
21 that the victim in that case was asleep at the
22 time that the assault occurred and the
23 perpetrator had a lengthy criminal record. So in
24 those circumstances, I do need to address whether
25 I am characterizing this as a major sexual
26 assault and if so, why.

27 It is trite to say that there are no two

1 cases of a major sexual assault or any sexual
2 assault that will be exactly alike. In making
3 this finding, however, a sentencing judge can
4 look at jurisprudence for guidance as to whether
5 an act can be characterized this way. The Court
6 of Appeal in R. v. Arcand, which has been
7 accepted by our Court of Appeal here and which
8 our court considers binding upon it, said the
9 following at paragraph 171 with respect to what
10 is a major sexual assault:

11

12 A sexual assault is a major sexual
13 assault where the sexual assault is
14 of a nature or character such that a
15 reasonable person could foresee that
16 it is likely to cause serious
17 psychological or emotional harm,
18 whether or not physical injury
19 occurs. The harm might come from
20 the force threatened or used or from
21 the sexual aspects of the situation
22 or from any combination of the two.

18

19 The Court of Appeal then went on to list
20 examples of what acts would be included in this
21 category, but this is a non-exhaustive list.

22 In this case I have no difficulty concluding
23 that what Mr. Sangris did falls into the category
24 of a major sexual assault. It was an extremely
25 invasive act that, by any standard, violated the
26 victim's sexual integrity, and any reasonable
27 person would readily conclude that it would cause

1 serious psychological or emotional harm, as well
2 as physical pain to the victim. That it did, in
3 fact, have a significant emotional impact on the
4 victim is borne out in his victim impact
5 statement where he wrote that he felt fear,
6 powerlessness, anger, and shame, and that this
7 has changed his attitude towards school.

8 I was referred to a number of authorities
9 from this jurisdiction by the Crown with respect
10 to the appropriate range of sentence, including
11 R. v. Lepine, which I just mentioned, R. v.
12 Laliberte, R. v. P.S.T, R. v. Griffin, and R. v.
13 Nitsiza. Not surprisingly, there are
14 similarities and differences between these cases
15 and the one before me here today. They are,
16 however, instructional in that they all provide
17 an illustration of what factors are taken into
18 account in determining what an appropriate
19 sentence is within the range that the courts have
20 established.

21 In Laliberte, the offender had full
22 intercourse with a person under the age of 16.
23 He pled guilty to sexual interference. The
24 sentence imposed was two and a half years. The
25 sentencing judge noted that in cases involving a
26 victim under 18 and an offender in a non-parental
27 role, the starting-point is in the three to four

1 year range. She acknowledged a sentence of two
2 and a half years was therefore on the more
3 lenient end, but she placed great emphasis on the
4 fact that the offender pled guilty thereby
5 acknowledging his guilt and expressing remorse.
6 That factor, the guilty plea, is absent here.

7 In the P.S.T. case, the offender received a
8 prison term of 36 months for touching his
9 daughter's breasts as she slept. Again, the
10 offender pled guilty, albeit late in the
11 proceedings, and he expressed remorse. The act
12 there was also less serious than the act that was
13 perpetrated on the victim here.

14 The Griffin case involved the sexual abuse
15 of a stepchild over a period of several months.
16 Mr. Griffin was convicted following a jury trial,
17 and he was sentenced to three and a half years.
18 The sentencing judge acknowledged that the
19 starting-point for a crime of this nature
20 perpetuated by a person in a position of trust is
21 four years. However, she noted there was reason
22 to exercise restraint, specifically, the offender
23 was only 27 years of age and he had no criminal
24 record.

25 In this case I have acknowledged that Mr.
26 Sangris has a very limited and dated record;
27 however, he is significantly older than Mr.

1 Griffin was, being in his 40s.

2 In the Nitsiza case, the offender had full
3 sexual intercourse with a 13 year old girl on
4 several occasions. He received a sentence of two
5 and a half years following a jury trial. Like
6 the offender in Griffin, Mr. Nitsiza was quite
7 young, being only 22 at the time of conviction.
8 The fact that he had a fetal alcohol spectrum
9 disorder was also taken into account.

10 Other than the fact that the act was
11 characterized as a major sexual assault, the
12 Lepine case differs quite significantly on the
13 facts. It involved an adult victim and, as I
14 indicated, the offender there had a lengthy
15 criminal record, neither of which are present in
16 the case before me.

17 There is very little in the way of
18 mitigation in this case. I do acknowledge,
19 though, that today Mr. Sangris stood up and he
20 did apologize for the harm that he caused the
21 victim, as well as the grief that he has caused
22 his family, and he apologized to his community.

23 There are, however, some very, very
24 troubling factors in this case. The victim was
25 14 years old at the time. As I said earlier when
26 I talked about the principles and objectives of
27 sentencing, the Criminal Code deems this to be an

1 aggravating factor. As an aggravating factor, it
2 is further exacerbated by the age difference
3 between the victim and Mr. Sangris. Mr. Sangris
4 is not a young man relative to the age of the
5 victim. He was approximately 40 years old at the
6 time, a fully mature, adult man, and as such
7 someone who would reasonably be perceived by a 14
8 year old as having power and authority.

9 A very disturbing aspect of this case is the
10 degree of planning and premeditation that seems
11 to have gone into getting the victim, someone Mr.
12 Sangris had never met personally but who he knew
13 to be a teenaged boy, to come to his apartment
14 that afternoon with the goal of engaging him in
15 sexual activity. As I said previously, this was
16 not the first time the two had exchanges on
17 Facebook. The exchange in March of 2011, which
18 preceded the April incident, included an
19 invitation to come to Mr. Sangris' apartment,
20 which the victim declined. The exchange that
21 immediately preceded the victim coming to Mr.
22 Sangris' apartment on April 15th, 2011, included
23 a promise to give the victim a movie,
24 specifically girl-on-girl pornography, which the
25 victim was to come over and pick up. I agree
26 with the Crown's submissions that Mr. Sangris
27 manipulated the victim by showing him pornography

1 and offering him cigarettes and alcohol. These
2 things are generally forbidden to anyone other
3 than adults, making them tempting bait for
4 teenagers. Certainly this proved to be the case
5 with the pornography that was offered to the
6 victim.

7 In my view, the fact that Mr. Sangris did,
8 in fact, give the victim money is also
9 aggravating. I recognize it was the victim who
10 asked for the money, but his explanation for
11 making the request was that Mr. Sangris had
12 promised money to him during an earlier Facebook
13 exchange between the two of them. This, too, was
14 bait.

15 Finally, it is aggravating that Mr. Sangris
16 told the victim to keep what happened a secret.
17 In the circumstances, asking the victim to keep
18 that secret was tantamount to suggesting to him
19 that if the secret was revealed, he, the victim,
20 would face some kind of consequence, and that is
21 a highly manipulative thing to do to a 14 year
22 old boy.

23 Mr. Sangris' criminal record was tendered as
24 an exhibit. It is dated and very short, and it
25 contains no convictions for similar crimes. It
26 is not an aggravating factor and it is not
27 something I take into account as an aggravating

1 factor.

2 Mr. Sangris bears a very high degree of
3 moral blameworthiness in this case. The crime
4 was planned and deliberate, and the actions were
5 predatory. He took advantage of a young boy's
6 trust, curiosity, and naivety. He took advantage
7 of his position as an adult vis-à-vis a child,
8 and he used all of this for his own sexual
9 gratification.

10 The circumstances cry out for consequences
11 that will recognize the legal and moral need for
12 denunciation and deterrence and which will also
13 recognize the need to separate those who commit
14 crimes against children from society.

15 I spent a lot of time considering Mr.
16 Sangris' aboriginal status and in particular his
17 experience in residential school, which can only
18 be described as horrific. As I noted, his
19 childhood was very difficult. Frankly, though, I
20 find it difficult to relate this crime to the
21 Gladue factors. Mr. Sangris' actions do not
22 appear to have been driven by the systemic Gladue
23 factors that courts typically see. The nature of
24 this crime and the circumstances surrounding it
25 lead me to the conclusion that his motivation was
26 not driven by factors like poverty or addiction
27 or homelessness, but rather he was driven by

1 sexual gratification. It was planned and
2 deliberate. The victim was lured.

3 In the circumstances, it is my view that a
4 sentence of a shorter period of incarceration
5 would in fact make a mockery of the Gladue
6 principles and would fail to honour the
7 objectives of denunciation and deterrence.
8 Moreover, they would fail to take into account
9 the impact on the victim, himself an aboriginal
10 person. He has the right to be protected. That
11 is not to say that your background is not
12 troubling, Mr. Sangris. It is just to say that
13 the Gladue factors really do not have a place in
14 this sentence.

15 Mr. Sangris, can you please stand up.

16 Narcisse Sangris, upon being convicted of
17 sexual interference under section 151 of the
18 Criminal Code, and upon considering the
19 circumstances and the nature of the offence as
20 well as your own personal circumstances, I
21 sentence you to a term of three years and six
22 months in prison.

23 The time that you actually will be required
24 to serve will be reduced by the amount of time
25 you spent in custody awaiting the disposition of
26 your case on an enhanced basis, as I said
27 earlier, of roughly 1.25 days for each day

1 already served, which I will set at 375 days.

2 Do you understand, Mr. Sangris?

3 THE ACCUSED: (Non-verbal response).

4 THE COURT: All right, you can be seated.

5 I am now going to turn to the ancillary
6 orders. The Crown asked for a number of these.

7 First, I will deal with the no contact order
8 under section 743.21.

9 There will be an order under section 743.21
10 of the Criminal Code prohibiting Mr. Sangris from
11 communicating directly or indirectly with the
12 victim or the victim's mother for the duration of
13 the time that he is incarcerated.

14 There will be a firearms prohibition under
15 section 109 and that will be in effect for ten
16 years following Mr. Sangris' release.

17 The circumstances here also justify imposing
18 restrictions as set out in section 161(1)(a)
19 through and including subsection (d) which would
20 prohibit Mr. Sangris from attending at certain
21 public areas where children are likely to be
22 present; prohibiting him from obtaining
23 employment, whether remunerated or not, or
24 becoming a volunteer in a capacity, that involves
25 being in a position of trust or authority towards
26 any persons under the age of 16 years;
27 prohibiting Mr. Sangris from having contact with

1 any person under 16, unless under supervision
2 approved by the court; and prohibiting Mr.
3 Sangris from using the internet or other digital
4 network except for the purposes of employment,
5 treatment, and education. This will be in effect
6 for ten years.

7 Now with respect to the conditions on use of
8 the internet or other digital network, I
9 recognize that it is impossible for the court to
10 anticipate every situation where Mr. Sangris may
11 be required to use the internet. Employment,
12 treatment and education are the most common.
13 However in the event that Mr. Sangris feels it is
14 necessary to use the internet for other purposes,
15 then he will need to come back to court and have
16 the conditions varied to allow him to do so.
17 That will be in effect for five years following
18 Mr. Sangris' release from custody.

19 There will be an order for bodily fluids to
20 be taken from Mr. Sangris for DNA analysis, and
21 an order requiring him to comply with the Sex
22 Offender Information Registration Act pursuant to
23 section 490.012 of the Criminal Code. That will
24 be in effect for a duration of 20 years.

25 The forfeiture order will go as presented.

26 Unfortunately, I do not read section 490.1
27 of the Criminal Code as permitting the court to

1 order that the hard drive from Mr. Sangris'
2 computer be separated and provided to him. I
3 would ask you, Mr. Demone, to consider asking the
4 RCMP if they would, or whoever is in the
5 possession of the computer, if they will download
6 Mr. Sangris' personal photographs, assuming that
7 they are appropriate, onto a thumb drive and
8 providing that to Mr. Sangris or his counsel.

9 MR. DEMONE: Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Finally, there will be no
11 victims of crime surcharge given the length of
12 incarceration and as well the fact that the
13 conviction preceded the recent amendments to the
14 Criminal Code with respect to the victims of
15 crime surcharge.

16 Counsel, is there anything else?

17 MR. DEMONE: Just one very minor thing,
18 Your Honour. I believe it was just a matter of
19 misspeaking. You had indicated the Crown sought
20 a conditional sentence of three to four years.

21 THE COURT: No, a custodial sentence.

22 MR. DEMONE: Thank you. Perhaps I
23 misheard.

24 THE COURT: A custodial sentence, yes.

25 MR. DEMONE: Thank you.

26 THE COURT: Is there anything else?

27 THE COURT CLERK: The DNA order is primary?

1 THE COURT: Yes.
2 THE COURT CLERK: Thank you.
3 THE COURT: Anything from you, Mr. Falvo?
4 MR. FALVO: Nothing further, Your Honour.
5 Thank you.
6 THE COURT: Thank you.

7 Mr. Sangris, you have made a commitment to
8 rehabilitating yourself and dealing with your
9 past traumas. You will have many opportunities
10 in prison presented to you to deal with those
11 things. You have already started. I will
12 encourage you to do what you can to take
13 advantage of those programs and start your
14 healing process.

15 As well, I mentioned earlier that you do
16 continue to have the support of your friends and
17 family and that will bode very well for you when
18 you transition back from life in prison into
19 society. Please keep those contacts alive and
20 strong.

21 Thank you very much, counsel. Court is now
22 concluded.

23

24 Certified to be a true and
25 accurate transcript pursuant
26 to Rule 723 and 724 of the
Supreme Court Rules of Court.

27

Annette Wright, RPR, CSR(A)
Court Reporter