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----------------------------------------

Charge under s. 271 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

Official Court Reporters

1 THE COURT: I am going to now deal with

2 the application that was heard earlier in this

3 trial with respect to the exclusion of the

4 public for the evidence of the complainant.

5 This application was brought in the

6 context of a trial on charges of sexual

7 assault and sexual interference. The offences

8 are alleged to have occurred during the summer

9 of 2015 in Tsiigehtchic.

10 The complainant was 11 years old at the

11 time of the alleged events, and 13 at the time

12 of the trial. She and the accused are first

13 cousins.

14 Earlier this week, at the start of the

15 trial, a voir dire was held to determine

16 whether the videotaped statement given

17 by R. A. to a police officer in Whitehorse

18 could be used as part of her evidence,

19 pursuant to section 715.1 of the Criminal

20 Code.

21 She was called as a witness on that voir

22 dire because one of the statutory conditions

23 for admissibility of this type of evidence is

24 that the witness has adopted the contents of

25 the recording.

26 The Crown sought an order excluding the

27 public for her evidence pursuant to section
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1 486 of the Criminal Code, as well as orders

2 for the use of a screen and the presence of a

3 support person with her during her testimony.

4 These requests were made both for the voir

5 dire and for the trial itself.

6 The defence did not oppose the requests

7 for the screen and the support person but

8 objected to the request that the public be

9 excluded.

10 In support of the application, the Crown

11 relied on the representations of Crown

12 counsel. No evidence was adduced in support

13 of the application.

14 Crown counsel indicated that R. was

15 nervous about testifying with the accused's

16 parents present in the courtroom given the

17 nature of the allegations and the close family

18 connections between all involved. Crown

19 counsel underscored the age of the witness,

20 the nature of the allegations, the family

21 connections between the witness and the

22 accused and his parents. I should say that

23 the only members of the public who were

24 present at the time and throughout the trial

25 were the accused's parents.

26 There was also reference during the

27 submissions to the testimony of another
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1 witness who had been called already in the

2 trial. That witness, now 16 years of age, is

3 also related to the accused and to R. That

4 witness was asked about her family connections

5 in Tsiigehtchic and said that she is related

6 to virtually everyone in that community.

7 An order excluding the public for her

8 evidence was sought and was not strongly

9 opposed by defence.

10 In the case of that witness, the basis for

11 the request was that she felt some pressures

12 from R.'s family, felt torn between the two

13 sides of her family in this case, and was

14 reluctant to testify about this matter. I did

15 exclude the public for the testimony of that

16 witness.

17 The legal framework that governs

18 applications to exclude the public is set out

19 at section 486 of the Criminal Code. As I

20 have noted in other cases, that provision was

21 amended a few years ago and this has altered

22 the legal framework somewhat. I discussed

23 this in some detail in a few cases, including

24 R. v. K. M. 2017 NWTSC 27. I discussed the

25 fundamental principles that are engaged in

26 applications like this and the effect of the

27 2015 amendments. Without repeating what I
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1 said in R. v. K. M. here, I adopt my analysis,

2 in that case, for the purposes of this

3 application.

4 In opposing the exclusion of the public

5 for R.'s evidence, the defence underscored the

6 importance of the open-court principle but

7 also noted because of the nature of the

8 application and the testimony, R. would not in

9 this case have to recount all the details of

10 the alleged events. As part of the voir dire,

11 she would, for the most part, be watching and

12 listening to the videotaped interview. She

13 may be asked a few additional questions but

14 would not have to describe the events in great

15 detail.

16 This, counsel argued, would reduce the

17 burden on her and thereby reduce the concerns

18 about the necessity to exclude the public to

19 obtain a full and candid account of events.

20 The Crown countered that even if the

21 witness did not actually have to describe the

22 events, having to sit and watch a video of

23 herself describing those events to a police

24 officer in the presence of the public, and of

25 the accused's parents, would be difficult and

26 could compromise her ability to answer

27 whatever questions might be put to her
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1 afterwards.

2 As I said already, there was no evidence

3 adduced on the application. Although the

4 representations of counsel can serve as a

5 basis for granting applications like this one,

6 when we get into things like comparing levels

7 of trauma or difficulties that might arise in

8 different situations, the effect of watching a

9 statement in the presence of the public and

10 the impact of that on the person's ability to

11 testify afterwards, we are venturing into an

12 area that may require evidence as opposed to

13 simply the representations of counsel.

14 So in considering the application, I

15 approached that aspect of the submissions with

16 great caution. And I didn't feel I could

17 attach much weight to either counsel's

18 representations about how the use of the video

19 would or would not mitigate the impact on the

20 witness of having the public present for her

21 testimony.

22 But aside from that evidentiary concern

23 and from the point of view of policy

24 considerations that are engaged in these types

25 of applications, the effect of the position of

26 the defence, if it prevailed, would be that

27 where section 715.1 is used in a trial, it
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1 would be more difficult for the Crown to

2 succeed on an application to exclude the

3 public. A child witness that is benefitting

4 from the section 715.1 accommodation would be

5 more likely to be deprived of another

6 potential accommodation (the one contemplated

7 by section 486). And I agree with the Crown's

8 submission that this would be somewhat of an

9 incongruous result.

10 Section 715.1 was enacted to facilitate

11 the presentation of evidence of child

12 witnesses, in recognition of the failure of

13 the justice system to address the special

14 needs of child witnesses, particularly in

15 sexual assault cases. This is explained in

16 some detail in the Supreme Court of Canada

17 decision of R. v. L. (D. O.), [1993] 4 S.C.R.

18 419 where the constitutional validity of

19 section 715.1 was upheld.

20 Clearly, concern for young witnesses was

21 also one of the things that was addressed in

22 the 2015 amendments to section 486, as was

23 encouraging the reporting of offences and the

24 participation of witnesses in the criminal

25 justice process. It would be an odd result to

26 have the 715.1 procedure become an argument

27 against offering a young witness the
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1 accommodation contemplated by section 486.

2 In deciding that the application to

3 exclude the public for R.'s testimony should

4 be granted, I considered her age, the nature

5 of the allegations, the family relationship

6 between R. and the accused, the size and

7 close-knit nature of the community of

8 Tsiigehtchic (which I would take judicial

9 notice of, even if I did not have the evidence

10 of the other witness about her being related

11 to everyone in the community).

12 Although the public was also excluded for

13 the evidence of one other witness in this

14 trial, the public could be present for the

15 rest of the proceedings, other testimony, the

16 submissions of counsel, and eventually my

17 ruling.

18 The allegations and the evidence are a

19 matter of the record and will not be kept

20 secret. There has been no application by the

21 Crown to ban publication of the evidence aside

22 from information that would be specific enough

23 to identify R. So the order sought, in my

24 view, is as limited as necessary to achieve

25 its intended purpose.

26 The Crown also applied to exclude the

27 public during R.'s testimony during the trial
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1 itself. Previously I was referring to the

2 voir dire. My reasons for granting the

3 application for the voir dire apply equally to

4 the trial proper. More so, in fact, because

5 the scope of cross-examination and of

6 examination in-chief in the trial itself would

7 exceed what it was in the voir dire. And

8 that's why I granted that application as well.

9 The last issue to be dealt with is access

10 to the videotaped statement that was marked as

11 an exhibit on the voir dire.

12 That issue arose as a result of the

13 question I asked during submissions on the

14 application to exclude the witnesses. My

15 understanding of the law is that the

16 open-court principle applies to testimony in

17 court. It also applies to access to exhibits.

18 Exhibits that are presented during a trial

19 are not ordinarily sealed. The Court has

20 jurisdiction to seal them on application. But

21 the same kind of balancing between

22 transparency of court proceedings and other

23 important principles has to be considered

24 before access to exhibits is prevented.

25 On a successful 715.1 application, as was

26 the case here, the video-recorded statement

27 becomes a substitute for what would otherwise
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1 be the bulk, or at least part of, the

2 witness's testimony in-chief. It is not

3 marked as a trial exhibit but it is marked as

4 an exhibit on the voir dire.

5 As far as the publicity of proceedings in

6 the open-court principle, I am not aware of

7 any legal principle that draws a distinction

8 between voir dire exhibits and trial exhibits

9 when there is no sealing order. My

10 understanding of the rule is that those are

11 accessible to the public barring a court order

12 stating otherwise. Here, there was no such

13 application. I see no legal basis to prevent

14 access to exhibits in this case. There may

15 well be logistical issues that come up,

16 particularly when we are on circuit, but as

17 far as the principle is concerned I do not

18 think access can be prevented.

19 Those are my reasons for the ruling I

20 delivered earlier in this trial.

21 ----------------------------------------------
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