S-1-CR-2016-000099

R. v. Abel, 2017 NWTSC 22

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- A -

DENEZA STANLEY JR. ABEL also known as STANLEY DESJARLAIS JR.; STANLEY ABEL JR.

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 17th day of February, 2017.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Lecorre: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C.B. Davison: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 236(b) of the Criminal Code of Canada)

No information shall be published in any document or broadcast or transmitted in any way which could identify the victim or a witness in these proceedings pursuant to s . 486 . 4 of the Criminal Code

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

NO.	DEFINITION		PAGE
4	SUPPORT LETTERS 1	FOR S. ABEL	3

```
1
       THE COURT:
                               Good afternoon, everyone.
 2
                Mr. Davison, would you like your client
 3
           seated with you for this proceedings?
       MR. DAVISON:
                               I would, please, yes.
 5
       THE COURT:
                               You can go sit with your
           lawyer, Mr. Abel.
 6
 7
                I am ready to give my decision on this
           matter. I will try to speak loud so that
 8
 9
           everybody can hear me. I know there is a lot of
10
           people here. Before I begin, though, we do have
11
           to mark as exhibits the support letters that were
12
           sent to the Registry by Mr. Davison.
13
                Mr. Lecorre, you confirm you are consenting
14
           to this?
15
       MR. LECORRE:
                               Absolutely.
       THE COURT:
                               All right. So there was the
16
           first group of letters and then a subsequent one,
17
           so they will all be marked collectively as the
18
           next exhibit.
19
20
       MR. DAVISON:
                               Thank you.
21
           EXHIBIT S-4: SUPPORT LETTERS FOR S. ABEL
22
       THE COURT:
                               Today it is my responsibility
23
           to sentence Stanley Abel. He has pleaded guilty
           to a charge of manslaughter as a result of the
24
25
           death of his uncle, H.A..
26
                Any time someone dies as result of being
27
           assaulted by another person, it is traumatic for
```

the people who are close to the people involved, and this case is no different. What makes it even harder for everyone involved in this case is that this happened within the same family.

Many people were here in court earlier this week for the submissions and even more people are here today. Certainly earlier this week, I saw the pain and sadness and the devastation on the faces of the people who were facing me as I was listening to the circumstances of this case, the Victim Impact Statements, and the sentencing submissions.

I am sorry for your loss, and I know that there is nothing that the court can do to repair that loss. I only hope at the end of these court proceedings everyone can continue with the process and the long path that you all have to go through to try to heal from what has happened.

The court received five Victim Impact
Statements. Some were read in open Court earlier
this week. And I, again, have to salute the
courage of the person who read them and the
wisdom of her words, as well as the wisdom of
some of the other things that were said in these
Victim Impact Statements.

Two of the Victim Impact Statements were written by H.A.'s young children. They

2.4

wrote letters and they made drawings depicting
how they remember their father. Those were truly
heartbreaking to see and to hear read in Court.

The Victim Impact Statements put words to things that I know are very difficult to explain in words: The impact of these events on H.A's family, which is also Stanley Abel's family. They also help me understand a little bit more about who H.A. was and what he meant to people. He was a gifted musician. He was a good mechanic. He was very handy and apparently could fix anything. He took his kids out camping. He will be sorely missed by many people. It is truly tragic that his life was cut short in this way.

Stanley Abel was very close to H.A..

That is also very clear from everything that I have been told in this case. They grew up together, hung out together, and were more like brothers to one another than uncle and nephew.

And I know that whatever sentence I impose today, Stanley Abel is already serving a life sentence of sorts because he has to live for the rest of his life with the terrible reality of what he has done. I suspect, based on what I have observed of Stanley Abel in court earlier this week, what I am observing now, and having heard him address

2.4

his family after counsel submissions earlier this week, that whatever sentence I impose today, it is not going to be as difficult as living with himself knowing what he has done. Still it is my responsibility to impose a sentence on him for this very serious crime.

In making that decision, just like in any other sentencing, I have to take into account the crime that was committed, the circumstances of Stanley Abel, and the principles of sentencing that are outlined in the *Criminal Code*. I need to talk about these three things. The first thing I will do is talk again about the circumstances of this offence, although I know it is painful for everyone to hear.

On the night this happened night, H.A.
had been out for supper at the Gold Range in
Yellowknife along with two other people, Ms. B
and Ms. M. They called a cab to return to
Dettah, and Stanley Abel joined them and they all
returned to Dettah together. They all went to a
house party and drank alcohol into the early
morning hours.

Stanley Abel drank so much that he has no memory of anything that happened between drinking at the house party and waking up at his house in Yellowknife the next day.

2.4

One witness said that during the party at one point, Stanley Abel said, "I could kill all of you and you wouldn't even know it." There does not seem to be any explanation or context for why Stanley Abel said that at that particular time, but it sounds like there was already some sort of anger boiling inside of him even at that point. Even though it seems from the evidence before me that everyone in Stanley Abel's life know him as a gentle and nonviolent person, something was happening with him that night.

Eventually H.A. and Ms. B went into a bedroom, and H.A. fell asleep on the ground in front of the bed. Stanley Abel became angry because he thought that they had taken his bottle of vodka. He went inside the bedroom and he attacked H.A. while H.A. was sleeping.

Ms. B saw him punch H.A., elbow him, and stomp him on the head while he was sleeping. Ms. B tried to stop Stanley, but she was not able to.

Ms. M heard the noise in the room and she went in. She saw Stanley kicking H in the head three or four times. She was not able to stop him either.

Police were called; and when they arrived,

2.4

they saw that H.A. had injuries to his
face and was bleeding. Paramedics later arrived
and took H.A. to the hospital. By this
point Stanley had left.

H.A. died from head injuries.

Stanley Abel has been in custody since his arrest. Counsel agree that he has spent a total of 321 days in pretrial custody.

I now turn to Stanley Abel's personal circumstances.

To understand more about him I have the benefit of the submissions from his lawyer, of a Presentence Report that was prepared and tells me about his background and his circumstances, and I also have a number of letters that were written about him by people who know him and support him.

I will now say that, although I also heard that Stanley Abel has a criminal record, it contains only one conviction. It is unrelated and minor, and that record was not at all a factor in my decision today.

Stanley Abel is 31 years old and of Chipewyan decent. He was more fortunate than many offenders who come before this court as far as the kind of upbringing he had. He appears to have had a largely positive upbringing. He himself describes it as a very good childhood.

2.4

1 That is what he told the author of the 2 Presentence Report.

He was taught traditional skills from a very young age by his grandfather. He learned to hunt, trap, and prepare traditional foods, and he still has those skills today and can survive out on the land.

Many years ago his parents did abuse alcohol on occasion. The Presentence Report says that at that point there was some domestic violence in the home, although Stanley Abel does not have any memories of that. He does remember some drinking sometimes going on at the house on weekends and that he would go to his grandparents' house when this was happening. But there is no indication that he was ever abused by anyone. I also know from the report that many years ago his parents stopped drinking and that resolved many of the issues in the home.

Mr. Abel is an Aboriginal offender, and for that reason, the principles and approach outlined by the Supreme Court of Canada cases of R. v. Gladue, [1999] 1 S.C.R. 688, 133 C.C.C. (3d) 385, and R. v. Ipeelee, [2012] 1 S.C.R. 433, 280 C.C.C. (3d) 265, are applicable to this case; but on the whole, Stanley Abel's counsel concedes that Mr. Abel's specific circumstances are such

that the *Gladue* and *Ipeelee* factors are not as significant as what we sometimes see in terms of this sentencing. In other words, Mr. Abel was fortunate to have had much better circumstances growing up than many offenders who come before the Court.

Alcohol was definitely a factor in the commission of this crime, and I want to say a few words about this.

The Presentence Report says that Mr. Abel consumed alcohol for the first time when he was 13. By the time he was 18 years old, he was using it on a regular basis. He would experience blackouts. He ended up in police cells as a result of his intoxication.

In the weeks prior to H.A.'s death,

Stanley had been drinking daily for two to three weeks. As I already said, he drank so much on the night of these events that he does not even remember what he did.

Before H.A.'s death, Stanley Abel did
not think his consumption of alcohol was
problematic. That is despite having blackouts,
despite ending up in the drunk tank, despite
drinking for days and weeks in a row on occasion.
That, I think, is an indication of how normalized
the excessive consumption of alcohol is for some

2.4

1 members of our community.

2.4

Alcohol abuse is a serious social and health problem in this jurisdiction. There are many reasons why people drink to excess. Often those reasons are complicated. It may start just as something people do with their peer group and then it becomes an addiction.

We also see a lot of cases in the criminal courts where we hear about people having started consuming alcohol at a very young age. We often hear and read that people consume alcohol to numb themselves to memories or difficult circumstances that they simply feel they cannot otherwise cope with. But, of course, getting drunk does not resolve any problems, and more often than not it leads to more problems.

Addictions can be overcome, even though it is a lifelong battle. There are many people who are the walking proof that addictions can be overcome. For some, counselling and support groups like AA can work. For others, much more intensive treatment is needed.

The resources to help people address their addiction issues are sorely lacking in this jurisdiction. Addictions counsellors, counsellors generally, and healthcare providers, are all doing their best to assist people; but

given the magnitude of the problem, given the impact it is having on adults and children in this jurisdiction and the number of lives that are affected and sometimes destroyed by this problem, it seems clear that we need far more resources to address this social problem. There is no residential alcohol treatment centre in the Northwest Territories. People can be referred and sent outside of the jurisdiction for residential alcohol treatment. That is better than not having access to treatment at all, but for some people it presents an additional obstacle to being able to access treatment.

We see in the courts so many manifestations of the ravages that substance abuse causes in our communities and how much harm results from it that we can only hope that someday, having more resources and more avenues to assist people overcoming their addictions and other problems will be made more of a priority.

But something else has to be said about this case. Alcohol was a factor in these events, yes; but this case is not only about the excessive consumption of alcohol. Sometimes when tragic events like this happen those involved, the offender, witnesses, family members, say that it is "because of the alcohol". We often see this

comment in Presentence Reports when people are asked to comment. We often read "This is not a violent person." "This person is very nice when sober." "It was the alcohol that did this." And there are some comments to similar effect in this case as well in the Presentence Report as well as in the letters of support that I have read.

I understand what people mean when they say that. They mean that the person would not have acted in this way if they had been sober. But I think everyone has to recognize that the truth is there is always something more than that. Many people drink. Many people drink to excess and do not become violent. And even people who become more aggressive and maybe somewhat violent when they drink, most of them do not launch into the kind of brutal senseless beating like the one that happened in this case.

To lay a beating like this one on a sleeping man over the perception that they had taken a bottle of liquor cannot be explained only by the fact that Stanley Abel was drunk. This was an incredibly violent act. That anger and that rage has to come from somewhere. It was buried inside Mr. Abel, and for some reason if came out in that moment.

I am not saying that his intoxication did

2.4

not contribute to this; but for what its worth, I think it would be a grave error for him and for those who love him and want to help him through this to fall into the trap of thinking in terms of this being only an alcohol problem. He has an alcohol problem for sure, but the facts of this case suggest that there was something at play here aside from alcohol.

Sometimes we hear about an offender's personal circumstance and background, and it is so tragic. It involves so much abuse, loss, and dysfunction that it is actually easy to understand why the person is full of anger, why they are turning to alcohol to numb the pain and the memories of those hard times. In Mr. Abel's case, it is not so clear, because as I said, his upbringing appears to have been positive and happy.

I hope that with help and with time Mr. Abel will be able to understand more about what happened that night. Because as hard as it is for those who know him in a different way and know him to be nonviolent, this violence did not come from the outside. It came from inside of him somehow.

I have talked about the circumstances of the offence and about the circumstances of Mr. Abel.

2.4

As I have said, the other thing I have to take into account today are the principles of sentencing. In dealing with serious violent offences like this one, deterrence and denunciation are very important. All that means is that the sentence has to send a message about how serious this is and it has to hopefully try to discourage violence in other people.

The crime of manslaughter has no minimum punishment and the maximum punishment is life imprisonment. That is the widest range of sentence that could possibly be available to the Court, and it reflects that there are many circumstances that can make out the offence of manslaughter.

What manslaughter means is causing someone's death by an unlawful act. That unlawful act could be a very minor assault that causes someone to fall and hit their head and die. It could be a single hit that causes a fatal injury. It could involve a weapon or not involve a weapon. Basically it covers situations all the way from near accident to near murder, and that is why there is such a wide range of sentences that can be imposed for it.

The more dangerous the actions of the person who caused the death, the more blameworthy it is

2.4

and the more the sentence has to reflect that.

In this case there were repeated blows and kicks and stomping on the head on a sleeping and completely helpless victim. That is very serious, very dangerous, and very blameworthy conduct, and it falls at the higher end of the spectrum of seriousness.

So the level of blameworthiness is high for this case. Mr. Abel attacked a completely vulnerable victim without any provocation. The attack was sustained. It was not just a single blow, and it continued despite the fact that others tried to intervene.

Balanced against that is the very important mitigating factor and that is Mr. Abel's guilty plea. Counsel has said, and I accept, that early on after he was charged Mr. Abel indicated a desire not to take this matter to trial.

His remorse was very clear to me during the sentencing hearing. He cried through most of it. It is very obvious to me today. And his remorse was also obvious when he spoke earlier this week at the end of the submissions. I have absolutely no doubt that Mr. Abel is very, very sorry for what he has done. He knows the harm he has caused and wishes more than anything that he could turn time back and change the course of

2.4

1 events.

2.4

The guilty plea has avoided this being even more painful for the family and even more divisive. With the certainty of outcome and the completion of these proceedings much faster than if they had gone to trial, everyone can now try to move forward, move towards the healing, each at their pace. The guilty plea, for all those reasons, is extremely significant.

As I have said, Mr. Abel virtually has no criminal record. The Presentence Report and the support letters that were filed at the sentencing hearing indicate that this was completely out of character for him.

Counsel have given me cases to help me make a decision in this case. Other cases are helpful because they give examples of sentences imposed on other people who were found guilty of manslaughter, what kinds of things were considered, and what range of sentences were imposed. Of course, no two cases are ever alike, and each sentence is arrived at by considering the specific features in every case. And each case has its own unique factors. It is very difficult to compare cases.

In R. v. Bruha, 2003 NWTSC 41, and R. v. Stromberg, 2002 NWTSC 49, for example, there were

aggravating factors that are not present here.

The victim was attacked in his own home by two people and there was an element of planning.

However, the force used in that case was far less violent than what happened here. In that case, the victim was struck a few times, but he suffered his fatal injury after he was thrown on

Throwing someone on a bed is far less violent than kicking and stomping on someone's head. Mr. Stromberg received a sentence of four years after he pleaded guilty. Mr. Bruha received a sentence of five years after trial.

his bed and rolled off of it and hit his head.

Those are two examples of manslaughter sentences given in this jurisdiction.

R. v. Sayine, 2014 NWTSC 85, is another example. That assault occurred in the context of a spousal relationship, which is aggravating, and Mr. Sayine had a related record. On the other hand, in that case, it was a single blow. He struck the victim once, and there was also evidence that he tried to help the victim afterwards, not realizing how badly injured she was. He was sentenced to five and a half years after trial.

R. v. Bourque, 2015 NWTSC 48, has some similarities with this case because the type of

2.4

violence that was used in that case and caused the victim's death was similar to what happened here. The difference is that in that case, the victim was initially awake when the assault started, but he was quickly knocked out and the offender continued to hit him repeatedly on the head after that causing the fatal injuries.

Mr. Bourque received a sentence of five years after the guilty plea, and that was a joint submission.

On this case, the Crown's position is that I should sentence Stanley Abel to six years in jail for what he did. The Crown says the facts are similar to the facts in *Bourque* but that the sentence should be higher in this case because H.A. was even more vulnerable than Mr. Bourque's victim because H.A. was not awake when the assault started.

Stanley Abel's lawyer says that a sentence of four years would be sufficient under the circumstances. He points to cases like *Sayine*, *Bruha*, and *Stromberg* and to the sentences imposed in those cases. As I have said, these cases had some aggravating factors that are not present here.

As I already noted, no two situations are ever alike in sentencing. There are always

2.4

differences about the offences that are committed, about the circumstances of the person who committed it. That is why sentencing is such a highly individualized exercise.

It is also very rare on sentencing that there is only one sentence that is appropriate. Usually there is a range, and at the end of the day the judge has to decide where in that range the sentence should be.

The six-year sentence that is sought by the Crown is not outside the range. It would be open to me to impose it. I do not think it would be an excessive or unfair sentence given what has happened.

But having given this matter a lot of thought and considering the guilty plea, remembering the importance of the principle of restraint, and remembering that this was out of character for Mr. Abel, I have decided that it is not necessary for me to impose a six-year sentence today. A sentence should never be longer than what is needed to achieve the goals of sentencing, and I do not think in this case that a sentence of six years is necessary to address the goals of sentencing, even though the crime Mr. Abel committed was very serious.

At the same time, I do not think that the

2.4

four-year sentence that Mr. Abel's lawyer is
suggesting would adequately reflect the
seriousness of this offence, the high degree of
blameworthiness of Stanley Abel, and the
aggravating factors that I have referred to.

The Crown has asked for some ancillary orders, and I will deal with those first.

There will be a DNA order. This is a primary designated offence.

There will be a firearms prohibition order commencing today and expiring ten years after Mr. Abel's release. I am not going to include the exemption in my order today. Mr. Abel will be free to apply for such an exemption when the time comes so that he can continue his activities on the land, but I think that given the length of his sentence I am going to impose that application should be made after he has spent some time in custody when he is ready to be released and hopefully when he has more insight into what triggered his actions that night.

I will make an order for the return of exhibits to their rightful owners if that is appropriate. Otherwise they will be destroyed at the end of the appeal period. And I am obligated by law to impose a victim of crime surcharge of \$200.

2.4

I will, of course, take into consideration the time that Mr. Abel has spent in pretrial custody. For the 321 days he spent in pretrial custody, I will give him the maximum credit that I am entitled to give him under the law which is one and a half day credit for each day spent on remand. Counsel agree that this works out to 481 days, which is roughly 16 months.

Mr. Abel, can you stand up, please.

Mr. Abel, I have decided that for this offence a fit sentence would be a sentence of five years if you did not have any remand time.

I will give you credit for 16 months for the time you have spent on remand. That leaves a further jail term of 44 months which is three years and eight months.

You can sit down.

I will ask the clerk to endorse the Warrant of Committal with my strongest recommendation that you be permitted to serve your sentence in the North. If I could order it, I would, but it is not within my powers to order it. All I can do is have the strongest possible recommendation, and I hope that the authorities will take that into account.

I want to make it clear that one of the reasons I am making this recommendation is that

1 you have a lot of support from your family, and I 2 am sure that being closer to them would be 3 helpful to you for your rehabilitation and to prepare your return to the community at the end 5 of your sentence. Have I overlooked anything from the Crown's 6 7 perspective? MR. LECORRE: 8 No, Your Honour. 9 THE COURT: Have I overlooked anything? 10 MR. DAVISON: No, not that I can think of. 11 Thank you. THE COURT: 12 Thank you. 13 Before we close court, I do want to thank 14 counsel for their submissions and their work in 15 resolving this case. It certainly is a better outcome than a long and prolonged trial into 16 these tragic events. 17 And to all the people who were here today 18 who are members of the family, the families 19 20 affected by this, again I extend my condolences. 21 I hope those who are grieving the loss of Herman

Abel will be able to move on to the next steps

perhaps now that the formal Court proceedings are

over. It will be a long road ahead, but I heard

a lot of strength and I see a lot of strength in

the courtroom today and I am sure that together

you can pull through this.

1	Close court.
2	
3	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
4	
5	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
6	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
7	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
8	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes
9	to the best of my skill and ability.
10	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
11	Alberta, this 14th day of March, 2017.
12	
13	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
14	of the Rules of Court
15	
16	The state of the s
17	Newlan Kaball
18	Linda Kimball
19	Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	