IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

STEVEN MARK ORMROD

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 14th day of February, 2017.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. A. Piché: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C. Davison, agent for
Mr. D. Bullerwell: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 5(2) x2 Controlled Drugs and Substances Act)

1 THE COURT: Yesterday, Mr. Ormrod pleaded
2 guilty to a count of possession of marijuana for
3 the purpose of trafficking and a count of
4 possession of cocaine for the purpose of
5 trafficking. I must now impose a sentence on him
6 for those offences.

These offences date back over three years now. The circumstances that led to these charges are fairly straightforward. Police executed a search warrant at a residence in Yellowknife in October 2013. Mr. Ormrod was the leaseholder of that residence. When police arrived to execute the warrant, he fled the house and he tried to hide, but he was quickly found and arrested.

Police found just over 652 grams of marijuana in the residence and 344 grams of cocaine. Those are substantial quantities of drugs in terms of what we ordinarily see in cases of this sort in this jurisdiction. Several other items were seized at the residence. Mr. Ormrod, and this was made clear yesterday, does not admit that all of these items belong to him, but they were found in the residence, and the fact that they were found in the residence, I think, is an indication of the level of illegal activity that was going on or that the residence was associated with.

The full list of items that the Crown is going to be seeking various orders for was filed as Exhibit S2. There are some 118 items on that list and I do not intend to read it into the record. Suffice it to say it includes drugs, drug trafficking paraphernalia, a number of firearms, and money. The various amounts of cash that was seized adds up to something a little in excess of \$10,000.

There were changes in counsel earlier on in the proceedings and there were certain things outside of Mr. Ormrod's control that resulted in some delay, but he is responsible for large portions of the delay in this matter getting dealt with. I do not think it is necessary to go over the whole procedural history of this matter, but part of the delay arose because Mr. Ormrod failed to appear at certain points. Another part of the delay occurred while a warrant was outstanding for his arrest after his sureties asked to be released as sureties because they were concerned about his behaviour.

All this to say, although Mr. Ormrod is entitled to some credit for his guilty pleas, those could not by any stretch of the mind be considered guilty pleas offered at an early opportunity. But he is still entitled to credit

for that plea. It has saved court time, court
resources, the expenses of witnesses potentially
having to travel to Yellowknife to testify on
this. For a matter that is three years old,
chances are at least some of the witnesses may
not have still been here. So he is entitled to
some credit for his guilty plea.

He had no criminal record at the time of these offences. He has since been convicted of a breach of process, but this is not a case where the criminal record has any significance for the purposes of this decision I have to make today.

Mr. Ormrod is originally from British

Columbia. I heard that before moving to

Yellowknife he had employment in British

Columbia, that his employer had an accident, was seriously injured, and this compromised

Mr. Ormrod's employment.

He moved north and became involved in the drug trade. He had no ties here and no reasons to come here, really. He is not the first young man from southern Canada to do this and he is probably not the last.

This Court has never been particularly lenient on drug trafficking offences. The ranges of sentence that are imposed here are different from what they are in certain other jurisdictions

and, as far as I am aware, certainly different from the sentencing regime in British Columbia.

This sometimes comes as a surprise to those who come here to traffic drugs. The word does not seem to get around as much as one might hope, but, hopefully, it eventually will.

As I mentioned in the case I dealt with earlier this afternoon, R. v. Hein, case law from the Alberta Court of Appeal provides guidance for starting points in sentencing in drug trafficking cases because there is a wide range of conduct that can underlie a charge of trafficking. These starting points have been followed by this court.

In submissions yesterday, counsel agreed that given the quantities involved in the case, this is a case of wholesale trafficking. For this type of offence, the starting point is four and a half years' imprisonment, as I found in R. v. Castro, 2013 NWTSC 8.

The starting point reflects the harm that drug trafficking causes in our communities. As has been said many times, this is not a victimless crime. People get addicted to hard drugs and the consequences that follow can be devastating to them and their families. That story has been repeated time and again in this community. Lives are ruined; children are

neglected; people have been robbed and attacked in broad daylight by desperate people trying to get money to buy more drugs. Businesses have been destroyed, sometimes long-standing businesses, because their owners fell into, unfortunately, the trap of getting addicted to these drugs.

Those who traffic drugs for profit are predators. They exploit weaknesses in others and provide a product that is expensive, addictive, dangerous, and that many times can destroy lives - the life of the consumer, but, also, the lives of many people around the consumer, and it leads to all sorts of other crimes committed by people who are desperate to get their hands on more drugs. In short, people make money over other people's misery. It is a serious problem and it is not a problem that this Court alone can solve through its sentences. All that this Court can do is repeat the same message again and again through its sentencing practices.

I have mentioned the guilty plea and it is the only mitigating factor here. It mitigates sentence somewhat, but obviously not as much as it would if it had been offered at a much earlier time in the process.

There are no aggravating factors in this

case. As the Crown fairly noted, the large quantity of drugs involved is already taken into account in the starting point for wholesale trafficking, so it is not a separate aggravating factors. The four and a half years starting point necessarily applies to situations that involve a large quantity of drugs.

Mr. Ormrod's counsel told me yesterday about his personal circumstances. I heard that when he is finished serving his sentence, he would like to pursue his education in the trades. He is still a young man and he will have choices to make when he is released. I am sure he does not need a lecture from me. It is will be up to him to make his decisions when he is released and choose his path. If he stays on the path he was on when these offences happened, he probably will get caught again and spend more time in jail. If he chooses another path, there is no reason why he could not do something much more productive with his life than to sell drugs. Time will tell.

Counsel have presented a joint submission and say the sentence imposed should be four years before credit is given for the remand time.

Having regard to the applicable law in the circumstance of this offence and what I heard

about Mr. Ormrod's personal circumstances, I

agree that that is a reasonable sentence to

impose in all the circumstances.

I heard that Mr. Ormrod has been in remand for a total of 437 days and that if credited at a ratio of one-and-a-half-day credit for each day of remand, that works out to 655.5 days, which, in turn, is roughly 22 months. That is what I will credit Mr. Ormrod in sentencing him today.

The Crown has sought ancillary orders and those will issue. There will be a DNA order, this being a secondary designated offence. There will be a firearms prohibition order which will commence today and expire ten years from Mr. Ormrod's release. The order to surrender firearms will be forthwith.

Now, there will be a victim of crime surcharge. There are two counts, so there needs to be a surcharge on each of the counts. These going back to 2013, the same question arises that arose in the previous case. So I wonder, in the interim, have you found an answer, Mr. Davison?

MR. DAVISON:

I did find an annotation in Martin's that does seem to suggest the higher surcharges came into force October 24th, 2013, and Ms. Piché just indicated Mr. Ormrod's matters were October the 2nd of 2013. So, at the very

- least, the lower amounts, which I believe would
 be \$100 each, would apply. The question still to
 be answered, though, is about your discretion,
 whether those were the amendments that took away
 the Court's discretion.

 THE COURT: Right. So the surcharge will
- 6 THE COURT: Right. So the surcharge will
 7 be -- if there is one, would be at \$100.
 8 Ordinarily, back when the Court did have
 9 discretion to waive the surcharge, unless
 10 circumstances were very exceptional, when
 11 imposing a lengthy jail term, my usual practice
 12 was to waive it. So perhaps we should stand down
 13 and determine whether I have that discretion or

not before we complete these matters.

But dealing with the sentence itself, then, which I am prepared to deal with now. I will ask you to stand, please, sir. But for the time you spent on remand, sir, I would have imposed a sentence of four years on you for the count of possession for the purpose of trafficking of cocaine. For the time you have spent on remand, I am going to give you credit for 22 months, and there will be, therefore, a further jail term on that count of 26 months.

25 Ms. Piché, I seem to have not noted what you 26 had suggested for Count 2.

27 MS. PICHÉ: I suggested 18 months,

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 1 concurrent.
- 2 THE COURT: Eighteen months, concurrent?
- 3 MS. PICHÉ: Yes.
- 4 THE COURT: All right. The sentence on
- 5 Count 2 will be 18 months, concurrent. It is
- 6 what the Crown and defence suggested. I am going
- 7 along with what they have suggested. I think it
- 8 is fair, under all the circumstances.
- 9 Count 3 was being stayed. Were you planning
- on filing a written stay, Ms. Piché?
- 11 MS. PICHÉ: Yes, Your Honour.
- 12 THE COURT: Thank you.
- So the only detail we have to sort out is
- 14 whether I have discretion to waive the victim of
- 15 crime surcharge. I want to give counsel an
- opportunity to look into the issue of whether I
- 17 have discretion to waive it, given the date of
- 18 the offence. I will likely waive it. So we are
- not quite done, but you will be brought up again
- 20 in just a few moments once we have sorted that
- 21 out.
- 22 THE ACCUSED: Okay.
- 23 THE COURT: Now, you were going to submit
- another draft order?
- 25 MS. PICHÉ: Yes, Your Honour. And I was
- 26 expecting that Mr. Davison would have
- 27 instructions to sign a Consent Order, which I

- 1 understand he does not have instructions to do
- 2 so. So I would suggest that we -- I tried to
- 3 contact Mr. Bullerwell before court when I was
- 4 advised that Mr. Davison didn't have instructions
- 5 and I was unsuccessful. I would suggest that I
- file an order at a later date that would be
- 7 signed by Mr. Bullerwell.
- 8 THE COURT: I think that is fine. The
- 9 order can be submitted to the registry, be
- 10 brought to my attention. Once you have gained
- someone's consent confirming that, it can issue.
- 12 MS. PICHÉ: Thank you.
- 13 THE COURT: So we will stand down briefly.
- I will wait down here and maybe counsel --
- 15 actually, no. I will go back to my office in
- 16 case I can find this answer too. But we will
- 17 reconvene, hopefully, not too long to just wrap
- up, and when we reconvene, perhaps both Mr. Hein
- 19 and Mr. Ormrod can be brought up at the same
- 20 time. Thank you.
- 21 (ADJOURNMENT)
- 22 THE COURT: October 24th, 2013. Is that
- your answer?
- 24 MR. DAVISON: Yes.
- 25 THE COURT: That is what I found too. So
- at the time of the offences Mr. Ormrod committed,
- 27 the waiver -- the power to waive the surcharge

1		existed. Do you want to make any submissions on
2		that point?
3	MS.	PICHE: No, Your Honour.
4	THE	COURT: Well, I am going to waive it.
5		I am sentencing Mr. Ormrod to a lengthy jail term
6		and, under the circumstances, I will do with this
7		case what I would have done if it has been dealt
8		with at the time.
9		So there will be no victim of crime
10		surcharge order on your case, Mr. Ormrod, because
11		I do have the power to waive it.
12		I want to extend my thanks to counsel, and
13		please pass this on to Mr. Bullerwell
14		also, for resolving these matters. Obviously it
15		is a lot less resource intensive than if they had
16		gone to trial.
17		Court is closed for the day.
18		
19		
20		
21		Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
22		of the Rules of Court
23		Jane Romanowich, CSR(A)
24		Court Reporter
25		
26		
27		