# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

# IN THE MATTER OF:

# HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

# CALVIN GORDON VILLENEUVE

Transcript of the Ruling on Bail Hearing delivered by The Honourable Justice A. Mahar, sitting in Fort Smith, in the Northwest Territories, on the 2nd day of June, 2017.

# APPEARANCES:

Ms. M. Zimmer: Counsel for the Crown

Counsel for the Accused Mr. J. Bran:

(Charges under s. 271 of the Criminal Code)

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

1	THE COURT:	Thank you, M	r. Bran.
---	------------	--------------	----------

2.4

I will likely edit this decision substantially. There is value in doing this sooner rather than later. I don't see any reason to adjourn, but I may wish to go beyond the usual editing for grammar, editing for minor matters, and edit more substantially for content. None of the editing will impact on the basic reasoning or the decision that I am now about to make.

This is an application by the Crown under Section 523 of the *Criminal Code* for the revocation of bail upon conviction of Mr. Villeneuve.

One of the first comments I want to make is with respect to the case law that was provided. There is apparently a limited amount of case law on this issue. We have been provided with case law substantially from the Ontario Superior Court where it is indicated that these sorts of applications in Superior Court are unusual.

I take the position that they are far from unusual in the Northwest Territories. Perhaps it is a function of the sorts of offences that we are dealing with. It is tragically too common that when the court is dealing with convictions, after trial specifically or especially jury trials, we are dealing with convictions for

1 offences of significant personal violence.

This case, dealing with a full intercourse sexual assault against an underaged complainant, is a crime of significant personal violence. It is a serious crime.

At this point Mr. Villeneuve has lost the presumption of innocence and he is now found guilty. Not just presumed guilty, he is found guilty until some further finding of the court. So he is found to be a serious sexual offender who is at this point untreated.

There is also the fact that, after being granted judicial interim release, Mr. Villeneuve committed three offences of breach of a court order. While I accept the defence position that the Crown knew about this all along and could have taken steps to place Mr. Villeneuve in custody, I do not find that argument compelling. What Mr. Villeneuve has shown, and I agree that it was earlier on in this process, he has shown that he is unable to obey court orders. And that was when he was facing the possibility of a trial as opposed to the possibility of what in this case is certain jail. Given the law in the Northwest Territories, frankly given the law in Canada, it would be almost incomprehensible that Mr. Villeneuve would receive anything other than

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

a significant period of jail. So that is what he is facing at this point.

It is not exactly the same as one of the cases we looked at where somebody was facing a mandatory minimum sentence of three years in jail, but it is a significant period of jail. As well, in terms of the strength of the Crown's case, I do accept the reasoning in the case law that suggests that a finding of guilt by a jury substantially increases the strength of the Crown's case. This is no longer an issue in which we are dealing with a presumption of innocence. The case has been tried and a decision has been rendered and he has been found guilty.

This case is not to be taken as unusual in that were I dealing with this matter solely on the basis of a conviction for this offence in the absence of a criminal record and in the absence of a specific criminal record dealing with offences after the issuance of judicial interim release, I would still keep him in custody. The fact of the finding of guilt is not the sole reason for doing that, but the strength of the Crown's case tied in with the significant seriousness of this offence and the need for the public not only to be protected, but to feel

protected, which is contemplated by the tertiary grounds, cry out for detention.

I am not suggesting that the onus in any way shifts. It is still up to the Crown to establish that detention is warranted. What I am suggesting is that in cases like this of significant personal violence the notion that this is an exceptional or unusual application does not apply in this jurisdiction.

So to sum up, some of the issues that I am considering are, one, the only factor cannot be the conviction; however, the strength of the Crown's case having been augmented by the finding of the jury; the seriousness of the offence which is significant; the virtual certainty of imprisonment for a significant period of time, all suggest that under the tertiary grounds detention be ordered.

With respect to the secondary grounds, the fact of a finding of guilt on a charge of significant personal violence puts the offender, now convict, in a very different position than the presumption of innocence would. This is not the same thing as saying that the fact of conviction mandates detention. What I am saying is that we now have before us, as I indicated earlier, an offender who has been found guilty of

2.4

a serious crime of violence and who has not received any remedial attention. That brings into issue the secondary ground.

As well, the breaches, which perhaps were not taken as seriously before a finding of guilt, indicate that this person could pose a significant risk to re-offend, especially given the fact that alcohol plays a part in his offending.

Given all those concerns under the secondary and tertiary grounds, I am finding that he must remain in custody.

Now in terms of a return date for sentence, we are looking at six weeks for the production of the report. I am going to recommend on the Warrant of Committal there will be Form 8 that all efforts be made to keep him in Fort Smith. Chances are that the writer of the report is going to be acting in Fort Smith as well as going to be getting in contact with the family.

Now, Mr. Bran, I will leave it up to you actually.

So the choice is between here or Hay River or Yellowknife. Where would your suggestion be?

MR. BRAN: My client wants to stay here.

I'm not sure in all reality it's going to be

practical -- it's going to be even permissible

2.4

```
given that his father is a staff member at the
```

- local correctional centre, but his preference is
- 3 here. So I'll -- I'll leave the judicial
- 4 recommendation as it is. As I understand from
- 5 media reports, they are rarely followed in any
- 6 event.
- 7 THE COURT: I think I am just going to
- leave the recommendation out then, Mr. Bran.
- 9 Thank you.
- 10 THE COURT CLERK: Do we have a date for the
- 11 Presentence Report?
- 12 THE COURT: Well, let us pick a date to go
- 13 back to court and at least address it. Chances
- are we are going to be doing this in Yellowknife
- in any event. You have got a designation of
- 16 counsel, right, Mr. Bran? He doesn't have to be
- there for the first date just to speak to the
- 18 setting of the date.
- 19 MR. BRAN: I'm not sure I do have -- if
- there is a designation on file, but if there is
- 21 not and if he is here, he could appear by video.
- 22 THE COURT: All right. Why do not we put
- it to a criminal chambers approximately six weeks
- from now to see if we have got the report. Then
- I will order that the report be prepared for that
- 26 date.
- 27 MS. ZIMMER: Yes, Your Honour. I just

```
1
           wanted to put on the record that the family and
2
           the victim do have an interest and they would
 3
           like to be present for the sentencing. For that
           reason, they would prefer that it did occur here
 4
 5
           as opposed to in Yellowknife.
 6
       THE COURT:
                               It poses a significant
7
           challenge. I think I have overused that word
8
           this morning, but it poses a real challenge for
 9
           us because of the amount of work that we are
10
           trying to deal with with court. It is a
11
           difference between two days and one morning.
           we will see. I will make a note of that.
12
13
                We will speak to the matter next in
14
           Yellowknife, and I would ask you, Ms. Zimmer, if
15
           you or one of your colleagues could at least
16
           remind the court at that point in time of the
17
           wishes of the complainant, or the victim.
18
       MS. ZIMMER:
                               Yes, Your Honour.
19
       THE COURT:
                               Very good. So the next date
20
           will be in Yellowknife and it is simply to speak
21
           to a date. It is not the actual date.
22
                Do you have a date six weeks from now?
23
           Madam Clerk?
2.4
       THE COURT CLERK:
                               I don't have a calendar, sir.
25
       MR. BRAN:
                               Your Honour, perhaps July the
           3rd. It's a Monday. I think that's five weeks,
26
```

27

but the following two weeks I'm not in

- 1 Yellowknife. I'm --
- 2 MS. ZIMMER: The 3rd is a holiday I
- 3 believe. That's the long weekend.
- 4 THE COURT: It is the Canada Day weekend.
- 5 MR. BRAN: Well, then that's not going to
- 6 work.
- 7 THE COURT: Well, we are looking for about
- 8 six weeks out in any event.
- 9 MR. BRAN: Perhaps the 24th? It's seven
- weeks.
- 11 THE COURT: All right. July 24th, 10
- o'clock, to set a date; and I will order that the
- Presentence Report be prepared before that date.
- 14 THE COURT CLERK: Thank you, Your Honour.
- 15 THE COURT: Okay. I will order a Form 19
- for that date, Mr. Bran. If you are in a
- position to waive the need for him to come, you
- can just let us know ahead of time, let the court
- 19 services know.
- So there is a Form 8 with respect to the
- 21 detention and a Form 19 with respect to the
- return date.
- 23 THE COURT CLERK: Thank you, sir.
- 24 THE COURT: Thank you.
- THE COURT CLERK: We're done.
- 26 THE COURT: If there is nothing further,
- 27 we will close court.

1	
2	ADJOURNED TO JULY 24, 2017, AT 10:00 A.M.
3	
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
6	
7	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
8	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
9	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
10	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes
11	to the best of my skill and ability.
12	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
13	Alberta, this 11th day of June, 2017.
14	
15	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
16	Of the Rules of Court
17	
18	Nuin Kaball
19	Linda Kimball
20	Court Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	