IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

NANCY BERTHA RUBEN

Transcript of Reasons for Sentence delivered by the Honourable Justice K. Shaner, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 23rd day of September, 2015.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. D. Praught

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Bock

Counsel for the accused

(Charge under s. 268(2) of the Criminal Code)

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23RD, 2015

2.0

2.1

2.2

REASONS FOR SENTENCE

SHANER J. (Orally):

On July 30th of this year, Nancy Bertha Ruben was convicted of aggravated assault against Nora Martin following a judge alone trial. Sentencing was adjourned so that a pre-sentence report could be prepared and provided to the Court, and to the Crown and defence.

I heard submissions from each of the counsel on Monday as well as a letter from Ms. Ruben, which was read out by her counsel, and the proceedings were adjourned to today for reasons and decision on sentencing.

Aggravated assault is a very serious offence which has a maximum penalty of 14 years. The Crown in this case is seeking a sentence of 20 months to two years, less time spent waiting for sentencing at a rate of one and a half days' credit for each day served which would amount to 88 days. This would be followed by a period of two years of probation, the terms of which would include a requirement to attend counselling as directed.

Defence counsel submits that a custodial sentence in the range of 15 to 20 months less credit for pre-trial and pre-sentence custody is

appropriate. From submissions, I understood that
defence counsel was in agreement with what the Crown
proposed with respect to the length of the
probationary period.

The salient aspects of the circumstances of the offence are as follows:

On the evening of October 15th, 2013, the victim, Nora Martin, was standing at the corner of 50th Avenue in Yellowknife, by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. She was with a friend. She had a re-usable shopping bag over her shoulder which contained, among other things, her wallet. She was about to cross the street to go to the bus stop.

Ms. Ruben and her husband, Jason Balsillie, approached them from the other side of the street.

The victim and Ms. Ruben were known to each other, but they were not close and they had not been interacting that day. Ms. Ruben initiated contact with Ms. Martin, asking her if she had money or liquor. Ms. Martin replied that she had neither.

Ms. Ruben then became angry and accused Ms. Martin of lying. She grabbed the shopping bag on

Ms. Martin's shoulder. In doing so, she pulled

Ms. Martin down with enough force for Ms. Martin to fall to her knees. Ms. Ruben then attempted to kick

Ms. Martin in the head. Ms. Martin put her left hand up to protect her head and Ms. Ruben wound up

2.0

2.1

2.2

1 kicking her in her left arm, breaking it. The 2 attack was unexpected and unprovoked.

The crime has had a significant psychological and physical effect on Ms. Martin, which persists to this day. Ms. Martin prepared a Victim Impact
Statement a few months after the events in which she indicated that, as a result of this injury, she was having difficulty with everyday tasks like showering, dressing herself and cooking. She has been unable to work and she has had to seek income assistance. She became fearful of walking around at night. She experienced what she described as an emotional roller coaster with feelings of helplessness, fear and sadness. At the trial she indicated that she was still unable to work and that she continued to suffer from having a limited range of motion in the arm which was injured.

The offender, Ms. Ruben, is homeless and she is poor. She has had and she continues to have a life characterized by many significant challenges.

Ms. Ruben is an Inuvialuit woman who was raised in Paulatuk, a small community in the Arctic. She is 41 years old. Her family was very large; her parents had 22 children. They lived a traditional lifestyle and, as a result, Nancy Ruben learned many traditional skills. Her mother was employed as a teacher.

2.0

2.1

2.2

Family life was very rough however. Her father and brothers abused alcohol and fought in the home. Her lawyer relayed to me on Monday that Ms. Ruben's mother would get scared and run away, leaving the children to fend for themselves. Ms. Ruben was picked on and bullied by other family members.

When she was eight, Ms. Ruben was abused by a babysitter, and this abuse lasted for about a year. At 15, she was the victim of a sexual assault and she became pregnant with her first son as a result of that. When she told her parents what happened and that she was pregnant, they beat her.

She started to abuse alcohol at that time and she quit school, thus attaining only a grade 8 level of education. She began to look after other family members' children. She eventually left Paulatuk when she was 17 or 18 years old.

At 20, Ms. Ruben had another son. Both children were eventually placed in foster care, something which has affected her deeply and following which she increased her use of alcohol. She has attended treatment programs and counselling at various times in the past, however she continues to drink.

Ms. Ruben has worked as a cleaner and as a camp cook, although she has not been employed steadily for a number of years. Given her lack of housing,

2.0

2.1

2.2

lack of education and her alcohol addiction issues, this is not in the least surprising. Further, she has physical injuries which impede her ability to work at the kinds of physically demanding jobs that she once did.

Ms. Ruben has been married to Jason Balsillie for six years. They are both homeless and so they do not live together, however they spend their days together. There has been quite a bit of violence in their relationship and each has been convicted of assault upon the other. That said, Ms. Ruben cares very deeply for her husband and she worries about him.

Ms. Ruben herself has a criminal record. There are 23 convictions which go back to 1995. Most of these are for failing to comply with various court orders. There are seven convictions for crimes of violence. The most recent ones are a 2007 conviction for assault with a weapon for which she received 18 months in prison, and a 2013 conviction for simple assault for which she received three months in jail plus a year of probation.

With respect to the last conviction, her defence counsel submitted a document entitled "Report Back to Court" prepared by Ms. Ruben's probation officer and filed with the Territorial Court in December of 2013, and in it her probation

2.0

2.2

officer reported that Ms. Ruben was actively participating in community-based programming and showing an eagerness to address issues such as alcoholism, anger and unhealthy relationships.

Unfortunately, it seems that she has not been entirely successful in this.

There are a number of objectives in sentencing that are set out in the *Criminal Code* and the case law which apply in varying degrees of importance depending on the nature of the offence and the circumstances of the offender. These include denunciation, specific and general deterrence, where necessary the separation of offenders from society, rehabilitation, reparation and the promotion of a sense of responsibility in offenders.

In this case, primary consideration must be given to the objectives of denunciation, deterrence and protection of the public. Restraint and parity of sentencing are also important here, as they are in all sentencing matters.

Overall, the sentence must reflect the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility or moral blameworthiness of the offender. This in particular must be borne in mind in considering how to achieve the objectives of sentencing.

In determining moral blameworthiness and in

2.0

2.1

2.2

determining what sentence will achieve the relevant objectives, it is incumbent on me, as the sentencing judge, to consider Ms. Ruben's Aboriginal background and the systemic factors in her background, which may have led her to her involvement with the justice system today. It is very clear that there is a whole host of systemic factors which have left Ms. Ruben predisposed to heavy involvement with the justice system. The odds were and continue to be stacked against her.

She was a victim of a very serious crime at a young and formative age, which resulted in a pregnancy. Her parents victimized her further by beating her up when she told them what happened. She dealt with this by abusing alcohol, and it is not clear what, if any, medical or psychological support would have been available to her at the time. I cannot imagine that there was much in Paulatuk at the time at her disposal, and this no doubt led her to deal with her problems through alcohol.

This seems to have sent her on a very tragic path. She lost her children, and while she has had periods of stability, she has spent more time homeless and transient and it seems she has never gained enough traction to get ahead of the curve in any meaningful way.

2.0

2.1

2.2

Parity means that sentences for like offences should be similar. That does not call for sentences to be exactly the same. However, it does mean that sentences should not, unless there is a very good reason, represent a marked departure from the normal range in sentencing.

In support of its position on the appropriate length of incarceration and the objectives that are engaged in this case, the Crown referred to and submitted a number of cases, namely, R. v. Mitchell, 2009 NWTSC 52, R. v. Catholique, 2010 NWTSC 37, R. v. Camsell, 2012 NWTSC 55, R. v. Wanderingspirit, 2013 NWTSC 44, and R. v. Apsimik, 2015 NWTSC 21.

All of these were cases of aggravated assaults. In all but the *Apsimik* case, where the custodial portion of the sentence was 22 months, the sentences imposed were lower than what is proposed by the Crown in this case. Crown counsel pointed out, however, that there are a number of distinguishing factors in this case which, it says, would justify a sentence in the higher range than it proposes here.

As well, in all of the cases cited earlier, except the *Mitchell* case, the offender pled guilty.

In the *Mitchell* case, the offender was initially trying to stop a fight. He went further, however, and he knocked the victim to the ground and then proceeded to kick him in the face, breaking his

2.0

2.2

jaw. That resulted in a serious disabling injury. 1 Mr. Mitchell was sentenced to 12 months 2 incarceration followed by a period of probation. 3 4 The offender, Mr. Mitchell, who was Aboriginal, was 5 nearly 20 years younger than Ms. Ruben, and although

he had a criminal record, it was not as extensive as Ms. Ruben's. The attack, though unjustified, 8 occurred in the context of a fight, unlike the case

9 here where the attack was entirely unprovoked.

> Catholique was an aggravated assault where the accused, also in the midst of a fight, threw the victim down some stairs, breaking his jaw and causing facial injuries. The accused then continued to kick the victim, who sustained serious injuries. Mr. Catholique was an 18-year-old Aboriginal offender. Although the Court found no indication of systemic factors related to his ethnicity or background which would affect sentencing, his youth and his limited criminal record elevated rehabilitation as an important consideration and, as such, the sentencing judge found that a lengthy jail term would be unjustified. The offender was thus sentenced to a period of incarceration of 15 months followed by 18 months probation, and this was based on a joint submission from counsel.

In the Camsell case, the 26-year-old accused received a sentence of 18 months incarceration and

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

26

one year probation. The victim was attacked in his own home after asking his assailants to leave. He suffered a broken jaw and he required extensive treatment. The sentencing judge cited as aggravating factors that the victim was attacked at home and restrained physically by one assailant while the other beat him. His guilty plea and expression of remorse were considered highly mitigating.

Wanderingspirit involved Mr. Camsell's co-accused. There the 36-year-old offender received a sentence of 19 months incarceration followed by probation. He had a significant criminal record which included two counts of assault with a weapon.

In the Apsimik case, the offender, as I noted, received a custodial sentence of 22 months which was followed by three years of probation. The attack there was sustained, with the victim being kicked repeatedly in the head and upper body while he was on the floor. The offender had an extensive criminal record. His guilty plea was a mitigating factor.

In my view, the cases suggest that a period of incarceration ranging from 18 to 24 months should be considered in this case. There are both aggravating and mitigating circumstances here. It is highly aggravating that the attack was unprovoked and

2.0

2.1

2.2

initiated entirely at the instance of Ms. Ruben.

The victim was completely unprepared for it and it is hard to imagine the shock and horror of being physically attacked and seriously injured in the middle of the street in the early evening in Yellowknife.

Ms. Ruben's criminal record is also aggravating insofar as the convictions for crimes of violence are concerned. She knows this is wrong. She has been convicted of and received punishment for similar crimes in the past, including one sentence of 18 months.

Although Ms. Ruben does not have the benefit of a guilty plea as a mitigating factor - and I will emphasize that the absence of a guilty plea is not an aggravating factor - she did have her lawyer, as I mentioned, read into court a letter during submissions on sentencing in which she acknowledged that her actions were wrong and that they caused harm to the victim. I took this as a sincere expression of remorse and acceptance of responsibility for what happened by Ms. Ruben, and I do give it weight.

Ms. Ruben's life, as I have said, has been very difficult and it continues to be so. Given her background, it is no surprise whatsoever that she has had such frequent contact with the criminal

2.0

2.1

2.2

justice system. This is particularly so insofar as the convictions for failing to comply with court orders are concerned. Being homeless and poor creates instability which may make it difficult to comply with court-imposed conditions; addiction only adds to this. Further, her addiction, which she has not effectively addressed, appears to add to her propensity for violence.

All of this supports the conclusion that

Ms. Ruben's moral blameworthiness must be treated as
somewhat diminished. That does not mean, of course,
that she is blameless. Ms. Ruben is here because
she committed a random act of violence and she hurt
someone very, very seriously. She must shoulder the
responsibility.

Denunciation and deterrence are very important and so is public safety. The victim Nora Martin and anyone else like her has the right to walk on our streets without fear of random attack. The sentence must thus strike a balance between recognizing Ms. Ruben has had significant challenges in her life which contribute disproportionately to her involvement with the justice system, while also being meaningful enough to motivate her to deal with her addictions and anger and to deter her from committing further violent acts. It must also strike a balance between the need for public safety

2.0

2.1

2.2

in the short term, which can be achieved through incarceration, and public safety in the long term which, in these circumstances, cannot be achieved through incarceration alone. A combination of incarceration with, hopefully, effective programming and close community supervision following prison is required.

For these reasons, I concluded that a period of incarceration of 20 months followed by a period of probation of two years is appropriate.

Ms. Ruben, can you please stand up.

Ms. Ruben, it is really difficult for me to say this, but I have to impose this sentence. Upon being convicted of aggravated assault and upon consideration of the circumstances and the nature of the offence as well as your personal circumstances, I sentence you as follows. You are sentenced to a period of incarceration of 20 months. You will be credited with a period of 88 days, which is approximately three months, which represent the time that you spent on remand, calculated on a basis of 1.5 days for each day served, and so you will have approximately 17 months left to serve.

That will be followed by a period of two years of probation, and I will tell you the terms of that probation order in a moment. Do you understand?

THE ACCUSED: (Indicates in the affirmative)

2.0

2.1

2.2

1	THE	E COURT: You can	sit down, Ms. Ruben.
2		The terms of the probation or	der are going to be as
3		follows:	
4			
5		• You will have to report	to Probation Services
6		within two business days	of your release and
7		after that as you are di	rected by your
8		probation officer.	
9		• You will keep the peace	and be of good
L 0		behaviour.	
L1		• You will appear in court	as required.
L2		• You will notify Probation	n Services or the court
13		of any change in your ad	dress, employment, name
L 4		or occupation.	
L 5		• You will abstain from co	nsuming alcohol or
L 6		other intoxicating substa	ances.
L7		• You will abstain from co	nsuming drugs except
L 8		those that have been med	ically prescribed for
L 9		you.	
20		• And, finally, I note tha	t your counsel stated
21		on your behalf in submis	sions that you are
22		prepared to attend treats	ment, possibly
23		residential treatment.	So it will be a term of
24		your probation that you	attend treatment
25		programs as directed by	your probation officer
26		and, of course, subject	to being accepted into

27

those treatment programs.

- 1 I would only add to that that I do hope that Probation Services is able to access the kinds of 2 3 treatment programs for Ms. Ruben that she is in need of. 4 5 I am now going to turn to the ancillary orders. 6 The Crown has asked that I impose a firearms 7 prohibition order under s. 109, and I will do so. 8 Crown, you are seeking just a 10-year firearms 9 prohibition? 10 MR. PRAUGHT: Yes, Your Honour. 11 THE COURT: You will also be required to 12 submit to the collection of bodily fluids for DNA 13 analysis. 14 Finally, I am unable to waive the victims of 15 crime surcharge because of recent amendments to the Criminal Code, and so you will be required to pay
- 16 17 \$200.00 as a victim of crime surcharge. Mr. Bock, 18 do you have any submissions on time to pay? 19 MR. BOCK: Due to her circumstances, 2.0 \$200.00 is obviously a lot of money. However, I 2.1 would submit that -- eight months, Your Honour. 2.2 THE COURT: All right. I will direct that 23 the Order provide that Ms. Ruben has eight months to 24 pay the victim of crime surcharge following her 25 release from prison.
- Counsel, is there anything else?
- 27 MR. PRAUGHT: Your Honour, the specific

1		request of Ms. Martin, the Crown did request a no		
2		contact condition on		
3	THE	COURT: I'm sorry, yes. The probation		
4		order should include a provision that Ms. Ruben have		
5		no contact with Ms. Nora Martin, the victim. And is		
6		there anything else?		
7	MR.	PRAUGHT: No, Your Honour.		
8	THE	COURT: Mr. Bock?		
9	MR.	BOCK: No, thank you, Your Honour.		
10	THE	COURT: Ms. Ruben, when you go to		
11		prison, you are going to have access to a number of		
12		treatment programs. Please, please take advantage		
13		of them and use this as an opportunity for		
14		rehabilitation and an opportunity to kickstart your		
15		work on beating your addictions because you are		
16		still a young woman, you are only 41 years old, you		
17		have got a lot of years ahead of you, and I know		
18		that you can change.		
19		*****		
20				
21				
22		Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court		
23		of the kutes of Court		
24		And Caria		
25		Lynn Carrière Court Reporter		
26				