R. v. Jerome, 2013 NWTSC 34 S-1-CR-2012-000045

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

DAKOTA JEROME

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice K. Shaner, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on the 5th day of June, 2013.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Johnson: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. P. Fuglsang: Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 344(1)(b) Criminal Code of Canada

```
1
       Proceedings taken in the Supreme Court of
2
       Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
       THE COURT:
                              Good afternoon.
       MR. FUGLSANG: Good afternoon, Your Honour.
 5
       THE COURT:
                              Mr. Fuglsang, do you wish to
 6
7
           have Mr. Jerome sit with you?
8
       MR. FUGLSANG:
                              I think that would be good,
9
           Your Honour.
10
       THE COURT:
                              Do you have any concerns,
11
           officer?
12
       SHERIFF:
                              No, Your Honour.
13
       THE COURT:
                              All right.
       MR. FUGLSANG:
14
                              Thank you.
15
       THE COURT:
                              And I am prepared to give
           sentence and reasons for sentence. Is there
16
17
           anything before I begin?
       MR. JOHNSON:
18
                              Not from the Crown, Your
19
           Honour.
20
       THE COURT:
                              Okay. Mr. Fuglsang?
                              Nothing, Your Honour.
21
       MR. FUGLSANG:
       THE COURT:
22
                              And as well, just as a
23
           preliminary point, I would like to thank all of
24
           you, counsel, and you, Mr. Jerome, and you,
25
           officer, for being able to accommodate this
          change of date from Friday to today. The court
26
27
           appreciates it very much.
```

With that, I will just give you my decision on sentence.

On June 3rd, 2013, Monday, Mr. Jerome pleaded guilty to a charge that he stole a bank card, business cards and a jacket from Tony Bernhardt, and at the time, he wounded Mr. Bernhardt contrary to section 344(1)(b) of the Criminal Code.

The circumstances of that offence were read into the court record by way of a statement of agreed facts. In summary, however, on the evening of January 24th, 2012, Mr. Bernhardt, who was then 48 years old, went to visit a friend at an apartment. Mr. Jerome and some others were visiting there as well. Mr. Jerome was on probation at the time, and of course, was required to keep the peace and be of good behaviour.

Mr. Bernhardt was familiar to Mr. Jerome.

Mr. Jerome and another man, Aron Kay, were intoxicated from drinking alcohol. At some point, Mr. Kay told Mr. Bernhardt that the latter owed him money. Mr. Bernhardt, the victim, denied this.

Mr. Bernhardt wound up in the washroom with Mr. Kay and Mr. Jerome. It's not clear who exactly got him there. A violent attack on

1 Mr. Bernhardt followed. 2 Mr. Kay grabbed Mr. Bernhardt by the neck 3 and threatened him unless Mr. Bernhardt gave him money. Mr. Jerome punched Mr. Bernhardt in the 5 chest and face. Mr. Bernhardt was forced backwards into the 6 7 tub, he thinks by Mr. Jerome. He ended up 8 lengthwise with his head at the end of the tub by 9 the faucet. 10 Mr. Kay and Mr. Jerome kicked and stomped on Mr. Bernhardt in the face, head, chest and neck. 11 When Mr. Bernhardt rolled onto his stomach to 12 13 protect himself, they stomped on his back. 14 Then Mr. Kay or Mr. Jerome took Mr. Bernhardt's wallet out of his back pocket. 15 Mr. Kay threatened Mr. Bernhardt in order to 16 17 obtain his personal identification number. Mr. Kay and Mr. Jerome then left the apartment. 18 Mr. Bernhardt suffered significant injuries. 19 20 He had two black eyes, a broken rib, bruising on 21 various parts of his body, and not surprisingly, 22 he was sore for weeks after the attack. 23 Mr. Jerome was arrested on January 25th, 24

Mr. Jerome was arrested on January 25th, 2012, and has remained detained in custody since that time, being a period of one year, four months and 11 days as of today.

Mr. Fuglsang provided information to the

25

26

court about Mr. Jerome's background and circumstances, and I also had the benefit of several letters of support, one from a longtime friend and one from Mr. Jerome's girlfriend and one from his adoptive mother. The latter was particularly helpful in providing background on Mr. Jerome's childhood and allowing the court to have some insight into the person he is.

Mr. Jerome is 23 years old and has a Grade 10 education. He is aboriginal. He was raised both in Inuvik and in Yellowknife, spending 13 years in the latter.

It's probably an understatement to say that Mr. Jerome had a rocky start in life. His biological parents were both in gaol when he was born, and I have no doubt that things would have been much worse but for Brenda Jerome and her husband, who took care of him as much as they could, as his biological parents struggled. These people, who I will refer to later as his mother and father, were finally able to adopt Mr. Jerome six years later.

In a letter that Mr. Jerome's lawyer provided to the court, his mother, Brenda, describes Mr. Jerome as a helpful son who has never been abusive to either her or his father. They both have health problems and he offers

1 assistance to them.

She also stated in the letter that

Mr. Jerome was diagnosed with fetal alcohol

syndrome when he was around four years old. Now,

I pause to point out that the court cannot accept

this as a proven medical diagnosis based on the

letter, for a variety of reasons. However, I

will come back to that point later.

The two other letters that were tendered were helpful as well. Both of them described Mr. Jerome as a person who truly wants to change. His girlfriend, Colleen Hawkins, seems to be prepared to offer Mr. Jerome a great deal of support in changing for the better.

Sadly, Mr. Jerome has an uninterrupted criminal record that dates back to 2002, when he would have been 13 years old. There are 41 convictions; about half of them are property related. There are four convictions for crimes of violence and there are two convictions for robberies. There are several convictions for crimes against the administration of justice. I will return to the matter of his criminal record and how it factors in to my decision later.

I always find it useful to return to the basic principles of sentencing that are set out in the Criminal Code. The objectives are as

follows: Denunciation of unlawful conduct, which is an expression of society's abhorrence of a particular type of conduct; deterrence, both aimed specifically at the offender and at the public; separating the offender from society if necessary; rehabilitation; reparation and promoting a sense of responsibility in offenders; an acknowledgment for the harm done to victims and to the community.

The Criminal Code also sets out a number of principles that guide judges in how they apply these objectives. Judges have to consider aggravating and mitigating factors and increase or decrease a sentence accordingly.

Judges must also consider restraint and similarity of sentence. Similarity of sentence means simply that there should be similar treatment for offences and offenders in like circumstances.

The principle of restraint means that imprisonment should be a measure of last resort, and this requires consideration of all available sanctions other than imprisonment that are reasonable in the circumstances, with particular attention to the circumstances of aboriginal offenders.

The most important principle, the overriding

one, is proportionality, and it is articulated as follows in the Criminal Code:

A sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

There are a number of aggravating factors that arise out of the circumstances of this particular offence. The victim was in a very vulnerable position. He was essentially trapped in a bathtub and could not escape from a sustained beating of blows and kicks visited upon him by Mr. Jerome and Mr. Kay. He was threatened. His injuries caused him pain for weeks following the attack.

Mr. Jerome's criminal record is aggravating as well. This is especially so in light of previous convictions for crimes of violence. But despite the aggravating factors, there are some mitigating ones as well.

Mr. Jerome's guilty plea is highly mitigating. It saves the court the time of going through a trial and it saves the witnesses from having to testify and relive the events.

In addition, Mr. Jerome's lawyer tendered a letter that Mr. Jerome wrote to the court in which you, Mr. Jerome, expressed remorse as well

as a recognition that you were responsible for what happened and for changing your life. You reiterated much of what was in that letter in your personal oral submissions to the court, and I find this very mitigating and very encouraging.

The Crown seeks a conditional sentence of two and a half years or 30 months. Defence submits that the sentence should be in the range of 18 to 24 months. Considering all of the circumstances, including Mr. Jerome's own personal circumstances, I have concluded that a custodial sentence of 30 months is necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of sentencing.

Mr. Jerome bears a high degree of moral blameworthiness in this case. From the agreed facts, it appears that Mr. Bernhardt went to his neighbour's apartment to socialize, and I think it's fair to say he was expecting to have a few drinks and go home. He probably was not expecting to get into an argument about a debt, and certainly he was not expecting to become the victim of a violent crime.

What was carried out was an act of unprovoked violence in a calculated and deliberate manner. This is not a situation of someone who flew off the handle, so to speak, and lashed out.

Mr. Bernhardt was lured into the bathroom where Mr. Jerome and Mr. Kay proceeded to punch, kick, stomp and rob him. Frankly, I am surprised, although very relieved, that the outcome was not more tragic than it was.

The Crown submitted a number of cases from various jurisdictions in support of its position on the appropriate length of sentence. Despite the fact that none of these cases has the same fact situation as I have before me, something which would indeed be highly unusual, there are sufficient similarities in all of them, both as to the offences and the circumstances of the offenders, to suggest that what the Crown seeks is within the acceptable range, thus satisfying the principle of similarity.

The sentence I impose has to send a message, both to the public and to Mr. Jerome, that conduct that causes injury to others is unacceptable.

Assaults in circumstances like this, where there is excessive drinking, followed by arguments and altercations, followed by violence, followed by harm, are way too common in the Northwest Territories. It just keeps happening.

Mr. Jerome is only 22 years old and already has four convictions for violence against others

on his record. Short periods of incarceration and community-based sentences have failed completely to deter him.

My point is this: People need to know that the law holds them responsible for their actions, and if they act irresponsibly and if they break the law and hurt others, there are real consequences. In the circumstances, the sentence that the Crown seeks, a 30-month custodial sentence, will send that message. I'm not confident that a lesser sentence would do the same thing.

I have given a great deal of consideration to Mr. Jerome's aboriginal status and his history despite the severity of the offence and the aggravating factors, and I have asked myself if a non-custodial sentence or a period of less incarceration and a community-based sentence could be imposed that would achieve the ultimate goal of rehabilitation.

As I indicated earlier, I think it's fair to say, and actually perhaps an understatement, that Mr. Jerome began life at a disadvantage, and as I indicated, I am very encouraged by the fact that he took responsibility for this crime and he expressed remorse. But unfortunately, a non-custodial sentence is just not realistic.

It's not just because of the severity of the crime, but also because of Mr. Jerome's significant criminal record for non-compliance with court orders and directions. That makes it abundantly clear that a community-based sentence would not serve any rehabilitative purpose.

He has been almost entirely unsuccessful in meeting obligations that have been imposed, and in my view, to impose a sentence would just be setting him up for failure. He will find himself back in court, back in the correctional system, no further ahead than he is now.

It may be tempting to think that a custodial sentence serves less of a rehabilitative and more of a punitive purpose than a community-based sentence, and there may well have been a time when that was true. But in this day and age, our correctional facilities offer programs that can and do allow offenders to rehabilitate themselves and become productive, law-abiding citizens.

Rehabilitation can and does occur all the time in correctional facilities.

Where the best place for rehabilitation is will very much depend on the offender and the circumstances of the offence, and in Mr. Jerome's case, it's my view that rehabilitation has the best chance of occurring inside of a correctional

1 facility.

Mr. Jerome was detained on the basis of his criminal record prior to sentencing, and so he is not eligible for enhanced credit for presentence custody because of the provisions in the Criminal Code. The custodial portion of the sentence would, however, be reduced by the time that you have spent awaiting disposition, Mr. Jerome.

Can you please stand up, Mr. Jerome?

Mr. Jerome, upon being convicted of stealing a bank card, business cards and a jacket from Tony Bernhardt, and wounding him at the same time, and upon consideration of the circumstances, the nature of the offence, as well as your own personal circumstances, I sentence you to a term of 30 months in prison. This will be reduced by the amount of time you spent in custody awaiting the disposition of your case on a one-to-one basis, which is as of today one year, four months and 11 days.

Do you understand?

22 THE ACCUSED: Yes.

23 THE COURT: You can sit down, Mr. Jerome.

There will also be an order for bodily

fluids to be taken from you for DNA analysis and

an order prohibiting you from possessing a

firearm or other weapons listed in section 109 of

the Criminal Code, and that will be in effect for 10 years from the date of your release.

Mr. Jerome, you have expressed what I consider to be a sincere desire and a willingness to change, and you need to change. You need to change, because if you don't, you are going to wind up in this position or perhaps an even worse one again.

You are a young man, you have many years ahead of you, and you have great insight into yourself. Your mother, in her letter to the court, indicated that you were diagnosed with FASD when you were very young, and as I said, for a number of reasons, it's not possible for me to accept this evidence in court as proof that that is in fact the case. But that's not to say that you cannot follow up and explore that possibility or the possibility of any other underlying cognitive disability that you might have, and explore the possibility of treatment for that, if in fact that's the case.

So please use your time wisely when you are in the correctional facility. Take advantage of the programs that they offer, because that will be a very good start on the path to changing your life. You are a young man. You have many years ahead of you, and you can change.

```
1
              Counsel, is there anything else?
                   Not from the Crown, Your
2
     MR. JOHNSON:
3
         Honour.
     THE COURT: Mr. Fuglsang?
4
5
    MR. FUGLSANG: No, Your Honour.
     THE COURT:
6
                         Very well. Mr. Fuglsang, can
7
         I adjourn court or is there something else that
8
         you require?
     MR. FUGLSANG: No, ma'am, I'm sorry, that's
9
10
         fine.
11 THE COURT: All right. The court is
12
         adjourned.
13
14
                  PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | I, the undersigned, hereby |
| 4 | certify that the foregoing pages are a complete |
| 5 | and accurate transcript of the proceedings taken |
| 6 | down by me in shorthand and transcribed to the |
| 7 | best of my skill and ability. |
| 8 | Dated at the City of Edmonton, |
| 9 | Province of Alberta, this 22nd day of June, 2013. |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | D. J. Halvorsen, CSR(A), RPR |
| 15 | Court Reporter/Examiner |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| | |