IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

T. W. L.

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment held before The Honourable Justice A.M. Mahar, sitting in Inuvik, in the Northwest Territories, on the 9th day of February, 2017.

## APPEARANCES:

Counsel for the Crown Mr. A. Godfrey:

Mr. P. Harte: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s.271, s.349(1), s.271 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 of Canada

This transcript has been altered to protect the identity of the witnesses, victim, or young person pursuant to the direction of the presiding Justice THE COURT: There has been a trial this
week. T. W. L. is charged with three Criminal
Code offences. Two sexual assaults and one
unlawfully in a dwelling.

On November the 4th into the 5th, 2015, there was a small party at T. L.'s residence in Sachs Harbour in the Northwest Territories.

There were approximately half a dozen people involved. These included the two complainants

L. K. and K. L.; their cousin and friend, M. L.; the accused; T. L.; and J. K. A large amount of vodka was consumed and everybody became highly intoxicated.

The Crown called several witnesses. L. K. is now 19 years old which would have made her approximately 17 or 18 at the time of the events. Her recollection of the party is that she went there around 10 p.m. and stayed a couple of hours. She believed that she was drinking before she went, but in any event, she was consuming straight vodka with chasers and any number of cups somewhere around five in total. She became very drunk.

She returned to her residence -- actually, her aunt and uncle's residence. The residence of Y. and L. C.'s which was next door to T. L.'s residence. She was there with M. L. She went to

sleep or passed out on the mattress on the floor in the living room along with M. L. She came to or woke up and she saw the accused at the foot of the bed. He was trying to climb on M. L. M. L. kicked him off and came over to her. She said nothing; did nothing. As he was touching her leg, she blacked out. She recalls him touching her and sex commencing when she blacked out again. She woke up in the morning.

In the morning, she went to the nursing station. The nursing station contacted the RCMP, the sex assault kit was done. A vaginal swab was positive for semen, and after a DNA warrant was executed on the accused, the semen was determined to be his. Her testimony was that he was not invited to that house. She had simply left him at the party. When she was asked if it was possible that she invited the accused to have sex with her instead of M. L., her answer was that she did not remember saying that.

I am going to go slightly out of order because it makes more sense in terms of the evidence. M. L. also testified. With some minor deviations, she testified to the same party, same level of intoxication, and she and L. K. ended up back at Y. and L. C.'s place passing out on the bed in the living room. Her recollection is that

she came to. The accused was bothering her, on top of her, and she remembers L. K. telling the accused to basically do it to her instead, inviting the accused to have sex with her is my understanding of the words that were used.

She believes that L. K. had locked the door, she did not see the accused come in, she woke up around 9 o'clock in the morning, nobody was there, and she later spoke to the RCMP. She came back and spoke to the RCMP again a few days after that. Her specific testimony about the comment L. K. made to the accused was "L. K. told him to do that to her instead of me."

J. M. K. was called. He was the only sober witness apart from the RCMP officers that we heard from. Sober at the time of the events, to be clear. He is now 21 years old. He works as a swamper for the hamlet. His cousin K. L. contacted him on Facebook and asked him to keep her company on that night. When he arrived at T. L.'s place, J. K. was passed out. K. L. took J. K. to the room. He stayed for about 90 minutes. When he left, he basically put K. L. to bed in her room.

My understanding was that it was a different room from the room that J. K. was in. He locked the door to her room and left, and then he went

back to check on L. K. and M. L. It was around 2 o'clock in the morning when he arrived at the T. L. residence. It was approximately 3:30 in the morning when he attended at Y. and L. C.'s residence to check on L. K. and M. L. He could not hear anything. So his understanding was that they were asleep. He checked the doors. The side door was already locked. He locked the front door and left.

K. L. testified. She had a very difficult time with her testimony and was clearly very upset. As I indicated before, all the parties were heavily intoxicated. She appears to have been especially so. She is not sure where she went to sleep. She is not sure not only of what room but in what residence. She remembers coming to at some point, somebody getting on top of her, pulling her pants down, and having sex with her. She testified during the trial that she said no. It became clear in cross-examination that she originally believed this person to be J. K.

In her statement to the police, she indicated that J. K. was bothering her, and J. K. followed her into the room. She was asked what woke her up, she indicated that J. K. did, doing what, and she said pulling my pants down. She agreed under cross-examination that when she told

the police that it was J. K., she was pretty sure it was him. The RCMP asked her at the time if it could have been the accused, she indicated no, but it was possible if he was awake.

I take her evidence to be or I find from her evidence that she was originally quite sure that it was J. K., and it was likely only later when she realized the results of the DNA testing that she came to the conclusion that it was the accused. Some of the accused DNA was found on the inside of her underwear. There was no indication if the DNA was semen, saliva, or what it was, but it was simply that it was his DNA. On the basis of this evidence, I am asked to convict the accused. One of the interesting aspects of K. L.'s evidence is that she recalls the accused going back and forth to the other house, the house next door.

With respect to the complainant L. K., I found her to be a credible but utterly unreliable witness. Her level of intoxication was such that I am unable to make any firm conclusions based on her recollection of events. Given the testimony of M. L., which indicated an invitation to sexual contact, in the context of this completely unreliable evidence, the only conclusion that I can come to is that the accused and L. K. had

sex. In terms of whether or not this sex was consensual, I am simply not sure. On that basis, I must acquit the accused.

With respect to the sexual assault on K. L., while I have my suspicions, which I have with all of these offences, K. L. as well was a credible and unreliable witness. Her level of intoxication if anything was greater than that of the other witnesses. Her ability to recall events on anything approaching either a chronological order or even locational specificity is lacking. I am unable to conclude where things happened, what exactly happened, and given the need for proof beyond a reasonable doubt, I find that I have a reasonable doubt.

I will be more specific about what concerns me: It is tempting to speculate because of the DNA evidence that the events and actions that she originally attributed to J. K. were committed by the accused, but given that four days or more passed before her clothing was turned into the RCMP and given that she placed herself in her evidence in a location where the accused DNA would have been found, at least in one version of where she might have fallen asleep, I have doubts.

I also have doubts based on her level of

intoxication of what may or may not have occurred during one or many blackouts. I simply have no way of being sure how the accused's DNA ended up on her underwear, and as such, I must give him the benefit of that doubt and find him not quilty.

When an accused is facing several charges on the same indictment, the trier of fact must be careful not to conflate the charges, not to allow the suspicions that arise on one charge to have an impact on the proof required of the Crown attorney on the other charges. I have already indicated that I am highly suspicious of T. L.'s activities that night.

With respect to the unlawfully in a dwelling, there is no indication in the evidence that T. L. was ever invited over to that residence. He was, however, a former resident of that home, and I was troubled by K. L.'s comment that he was going back and forth between the two residences. I was originally planning to convict T. L. on this charge, but, Mr. Harte, giving credit to where it is due, you did change my mind in your submissions this morning. I am simply not sure when the events at Y. and L. C.'s took place. If they took place before J. K. locked the doors or after, and if they took place before

given the lack of specific recollection available to any of these witnesses and given T. L.'s prior connection to that home in any event, I find it very difficult to come to a conclusion with the degree of certainty that I am required to in order to enter a conviction.

I have to remember that all of these people before this event were friends who were in regular contact with each other and could be expected to attend at each other's residences.

Accordingly, I reluctantly find T. L. not guilty of that charge as well. I will say this though,

T. L., I am not finding you innocent. If I was deciding this case on the balance of probabilities, I would be finding you guilty on all three charges, and you would be going away for a long time. That is what I think happened, but I am not sure.

What I am going to do is this: I am going to use my common law jurisdiction to direct that you enter into a peace bond for a period of two years, with a nominal amount of \$1,000, no cash deposit, but I will tell you that if you break this peace bond, you are in breach of a court order, and you can be brought back and dealt with. So it's serious. You are to have no contact directly or indirectly with the three

```
1
            woman who testified here today, K. L., M. L., and
 2
            L. K. You are to have no contact directly or
 3
            indirectly. What that means is no texting, no
            phoning, no messaging. If you see them at a
 4
 5
            residence, you leave. Do you understand that?
 6
        THE ACCUSED:
                               I understand, Your Honour.
                               Okay. Once you have signed
 7
        THE COURT:
 8
            that peace bond, you will be free to go.
 9
            Anything, counsel?
10
        MR. GODFREY:
                               No, Sir.
11
        MR. HARTE:
                               No, Sir. Thank you.
12
        THE COURT:
                               Mr. Godfrey.
13
                               No questions about that, Your
        MR. GODFREY:
14
            Honour. I do want to if I could assist the Court
15
            with respect to J. K, I think you referred to him
16
            with an incorrect last name. His last name is
17
            actually K.
18
        THE COURT:
                               My apologies. Let the record
19
            reflect K. Thank you. We will close court.
20
        (ADJOURNMENT)
21
        THE COURT:
                               A couple of things I forgot,
22
            T. L. I do not want you to have to wait around
23
            to sign the order. You can sign that order
24
            tomorrow. We will have that available here at
25
            the courthouse. I think that although I have
26
            misnamed J. K. it should be anonymized in the
27
            transcript of when it is ordered. He was never
```

```
1
            charged with a criminal offence, and I do not
 2
            want -- I do not think it is fair to him to have
 3
            his name out there. Any comment about that from
 4
            either one of you?
                               That's fine.
 5
        MR. GODFREY:
 6
        THE COURT:
                               I do reserve the option of
 7
            editing the transcript beyond simply grammatical
 8
            errors if necessary, I do reserve the right to do
 9
            that. So I just wanted to let you all know that.
10
            Is there anything else that I forgot that you
11
            want to deal with at this point?
12
        MR. HARTE:
                               My friend and I were chatting,
13
            Sir, about the correcting -- ironically, the
            correcting of J. K.'s name. And perhaps I've
14
15
            spoken to several people about a lesson to be
16
            taken from this series of events, and so I'd urge
17
            Your Honour to consider anonymizing everybody's
18
            name who needs to be anonymized in the transcript
19
            so that it actually is something that people's
20
            attention could be drawn to in terms of the
            trouble that can arise from these kinds of
21
22
            events. I'm just putting that out there for your
23
            consideration, Sir.
24
        THE COURT:
                               And what do you say?
25
        MR. GODFREY:
                               I'm fine with that, Your
26
            Honour.
```

Well, given T. L.'s close

27

THE COURT:

Τ		connection to the	parties involved as long as the
2		Crown attorney has	s no difficulty with the
3		anonymizing of his	s name, I am prepared to do that
4		given that his rel	ationship with these people is
5		going to be obviou	as once the if the record is
6		read, then everybo	ody in Sachs Harbour would know
7		who is being refer	rred to as the complainants. So
8		I think on that ba	asis, it might be necessary to
9		anonymize T. L.'s	name as well.
10	MR.	GODFREY:	I don't have any difficulty
11		with that.	
12	THE	COURT:	I'll just order that when a
13		transcript is prep	pared, that all the names be
14		anonymized.	
15		All right. A	Anything else?
16	MR.	GODFREY:	Just on the expiration of the
17		bail period is to	return any exhibits and order
18		that all exhibits	will be returned.
19	THE	COURT:	All exhibits will be returned
20		at the conclusion	of the bail period.
21	MR.	GODFREY:	Thank you.
22	THE	COURT:	Thank you. We will close
23		court.	
24			
25			
26			

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