R v Betsidea, 2018 NWTSC 8

S-1-CR2016000088

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

ANTHONY BETSIDEA

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable
Justice K. M. Shaner, at Yellowknife in the Northwest

Territories, on January 12th A.D., 2018.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. J. Scott: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. L. Moore: Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 348(1)(b) and 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

- On November 6th, 2017, 1 THE COURT: 2 following a trial by judge alone, Anthony Betsidea was found guilty of two charges: First, breaking and entering with intent contrary to section 348(1)(a) of the Criminal Code; and secondly, sexual assault contrary to section 271 of the Criminal Code. These proceedings are subject to a publication ban with respect to information that would identify the victim. Accordingly, 10 11 when I am talking about the victim in this case and in these reasons, I will refer to her 12 as "the victim" rather than by her initials or 13 14 her name. I have had an opportunity to hear from 15 16 Crown and defence counsel with respect to the 17 length of the sentence that they feel would be 18 appropriate. 19 I have also read and considered the 20 pre-sentence report that was prepared by 21 Probation Services on January 9th, 2018. 22 Defence counsel's submission and the 23 pre-sentence report were particularly helpful
- 26 And finally, I have considered the Victim

Betsidea.

to me with respect to learning about Mr.

24

25

victim and her mother and which Ms. Scott read

out in court yesterday.

Sentencing is an individualized process.

The sentencing objectives are set out in the

Criminal Code and they apply with varying

degrees of emphasis depending on the nature of

the offence and the circumstances of it and

the offender's circumstances. They include

denunciation and deterrence, both specific and

general, rehabilitation, reparation, and the

promotion of a sense of responsibility in

offenders.

In both break and enter with intent and sexual assault the key objectives, and those which attract the most emphasis, are denunciation and deterrence. A sentence must be imposed in accordance with certain principles as well and these, too, are found in the Criminal Code.

The fundamental principle of sentencing is proportionality. That is, the sentence must reflect the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

Other principles are parity; that is, that similar sentences must be imposed on similar offenders for similar crimes; and totality and

27 restraint.

Finally, when the Court is imposing sentence on an Indigenous offender, it must consider all available sanctions other than prison which are reasonable and consistent with the harm done to the victim and the community.

The last principle must be applied with regard to what are referred to as Gladue factors in an offender's background. Those are systemic factors such as intergenerational trauma, poverty, addiction, food and housing insecurity, substandard education, and others which are all too often found in the backgrounds of Indigenous offenders. The stated purpose of that is to address the disproportionately high number of Indigenous offenders in the Canadian prison system.

The Crown in this case is seeking a global sentence in the range of two and a half to three years. Defence counsel argues that these crimes together attract a more lenient sentence in the range of 16 to 18 months.

The facts leading to the convictions were set out in my reasons for decision that I gave on November 6th, 2017, but I will summarize them here for the sake of context.

the victim, a young Dene woman, was sleeping on a couch in the livingroom of her house in Déline. She lived alone and when she went to sleep, there was no one else in the home. The door to the house was broken at the time and it could neither be shut all the way nor locked. The victim tried to make the door as secure as possible before she went to sleep that night.

The victim and Mr. Betsidea knew each other. They lived in the same small community and the victim was friends with Mr. Betsidea's former common-law partner. The victim also testified that they were cousins albeit distantly related ones. Mr. Betsidea lived a short distance from the victim's home. It is fair to characterize their relationship as one of acquaintances.

The victim awoke sometime after falling asleep on the couch because she felt someone touching her. She found that Mr. Betsidea was kneeling at the end of the couch by her feet and he was tugging at her pants. Mr. Betsidea said "please". The victim told him to get out and she kicked at him. She thought that he had left and she got up and went to the

1 When she returned to the livingroom Mr.
2 Betsidea was there again. He asked her for a
3 cigarette. She again told him to leave and
4 this time he did.

The victim then called a friend and asked him to start walking to her house and meet her en route. She left her house, met her friend, and they walked to his house where she went to sleep. Her friend testified that the victim was upset and angry when they met up.

Later that day the victim gave a statement to the police at the RCMP detachment in $\label{eq:detachment} \text{D\'eline.}$

The victim provided two Victim Impact

Statements - the first in November of 2016,

and the other in October of 2017. As I said,

these were read out in court yesterday by the

Crown prosecutor.

In the first statement, the victim said that the event led her to drink and feel suicidal. In the second statement she said, among other things, that she continues to feel traumatized and scared. It is clear that these crimes have had a lasting negative impact on her.

The effect on the victim's mother has also

- describes being unable to think, worrying

 about her daughter's safety, getting up and

 checking the windows, being sad and crying all

 the time, and isolating herself from her

 family and her community. She also said that

 the incident has made her feel like a failure.
 - Information about Mr. Betsidea was provided through the pre-sentence report as well as through his counsel.

- Mr. Betsidea is a Dene man. He is 42

 years old and he has lived most of his life in

 Déline. He was in a common-law relationship

 for a fairly significant period of time and he

 has two children from that relationship.
 - He spent his early years up until about age seven with his grandparents, learning traditional skills. He is fluent in both North Slavey and English and he practices many of the skills that he learned from his grandparents even now.
 - Unfortunately, life became very chaotic when he returned to live with his parents, both of whom were victims of the residential school system themselves.
- The home was plagued by violence and substance abuse. At times Mr. Betsidea's

- family's cabin to escape the violence. Mr.
- 2 Betsidea and his siblings were also neglected
- 3 and impoverished.
- 4 Mr. Betsidea's family life was marked by
- 5 tragedy in later years as well. There were
- 6 seven children in the family five boys and
- 7 two girls. Of the five brothers, Mr. Betsidea
- 8 is the only one who is still alive. Two of
- 9 his brothers died from suicide, one died in an
- 10 accident where alcohol was a factor, and one
- 11 perished after becoming lost while hunting.
- Not only did Mr. Betsidea suffer the
- 13 effects of the intergenerational trauma
- brought on by the residential school system,
- 15 he is himself a direct survivor of the
- 16 residential school experience.
- 17 He left his home in Déline to attend high
- school in Inuvik for Grade 9. He had been a
- 19 capable student. Tragically, while attending
- 20 high school in Inuvik, he was sexually abused
- and this led him to quit. It also led him to
- 22 start using alcohol and drugs. These have
- 23 been part of his life consistently since that
- 24 time and have led to his interactions with the
- justice system.
- That said, it appears Mr. Betsidea has

1 number of periods of sobriety.

Mr. Betsidea has not ever had long term labour market employment in the traditional sense as we understand it, however it appears that this is a function of the limited opportunities in his community of Déline.

He spends a significant amount of time on the land, he carves, he cuts and sells firewood in the community. He has certainly not been idle.

To his credit, Mr. Betsidea has obtained a number of skills and certifications over the years as well and he has been working on upgrading his education.

Mr. Betsidea has a criminal record dating back to 1991 when he was a youth. Convictions have been sustained roughly every two to three years since then. There are 32 convictions in all, excluding the ones in this case. Eleven of the convictions are for breaking and entering, four are for assault, including assault with a weapon, five are for uttering threats. The remaining ones include failing to comply with court orders, failing to attend court, possession of a weapon, and mischief.

The break and enter convictions appear to

that he received was 18 months in 2003 for
breaking into a business.

The last conviction for break and enter with intent was in 2010. Mr. Betsidea was sentenced to four months incarceration followed by 12 months probation.

There are no convictions for sexual assault or other related crimes on his record.

When asked to make submissions on his own behalf, Mr. Betsidea apologized for the grief these charges have caused the victim and her family. His apology was not taken as an admission of guilt and was not taken by me as accepting responsibility for what happened.

There are a number of aggravating factors in this case and those must be taken into account as well as any mitigating ones in imposing sentence.

The victim in this case was asleep and thus in a very vulnerable state. Further, she was asleep in her own home, a place where she had the right to be safe and to be without fear. Upon being awakened, the victim told Mr. Betsidea to leave. He either did not leave at all or he left momentarily and came back in. Either way, he continued to violate

All of this was a terrifying ordeal for the victim. She was scared to the point of having to leave her home in the early hours of the morning and go to a friend's house. As she pointed out in her Victim Impact Statement, she continues to feel traumatized and scared.

It will be recalled that during
submissions yesterday there was discussion
about the characterization of the sexual
assault in this case and whether it is a
"major sexual assault" or not.

I emphasize again that the distinction between a sexual assault that falls into the category of a "major sexual assault" and one that does not fall into that category is not meant to, nor does it in fact, diminish the seriousness with which this Court views all sexual assaults.

All sexual assaults are violations of the victim's sexual integrity and the consequences for the victims are serious regardless of the category into which the sexual assault in the particular case falls for the purpose of sentencing.

By itself, the fact that formed the basis

Betsidea was tugging on the victim's pants,
means that it does not fall into the category
of a "major sexual assault". That said, the
circumstances surrounding it work to move it
towards the more serious end of the spectrum.

In R. v. T. L. G., 2006 ABCA 313, which was submitted by the Crown, the Alberta Court of Appeal discusses at paragraph 12 how what may appear to be a less serious sexual assault can turn into something more serious by reason of the circumstances under which it occurs.

In those cases, a sentencing Judge must consider not only the actual nature of the sexual assault, that is the type of touching, but the context within which it takes place.

The Court stated:

The fact that this sexual assault took

place in the context of a break and enter

makes it more serious. Again, the victim was

asleep alone in her own home. Mr. Betsidea,

having wrongfully entered her home, took

advantage of her vulnerable state thereby

violating her personal sexual integrity as

well as the sanctity of her home. From any

perspective, it would be terrifying to wake up

and find someone tugging at your clothing and

- how long it had been occurring. That has got
 to have a lasting impact on anyone.
- 3 The other aggravating factor is Mr.
- 4 Betsidea's criminal record. It is aggravating
- 5 particularly because of the number of
- 6 convictions for break and enter. He knows it
- 7 is wrong. He knows the consequences. Yet, he
- 8 continues.
- 9 I am unable to identify any mitigating
- 10 factors in this case.
- 11 Mr. Betsidea does have significant Gladue
- 12 factors in his background, and I have taken
- them into account in my deliberations.
- 14 He had a traumatic childhood characterized
- by violence, substance abuse and poverty, no
- doubt due in large part to his parents own
- 17 experiences in residential school. He himself
- 18 was a victim of sexual violence at a very
- 19 young age and he left school as a result.
- 20 It is not at all surprising to me that Mr.
- 21 Betsidea started using drugs and alcohol at a
- young age, that he continues to struggle with
- 23 alcohol addiction, that his educational and
- career opportunities have been limited, and
- 25 that he has a long history of criminal
- 26 behaviour.

- 1 Mr. Betsidea's moral blameworthiness.
- 2 Nevertheless, Mr. Betsidea has been found
- 3 guilty of two very serious crimes.
- 4 Breaking and entering into a dwelling
- 5 house with intent is an indictable offence
- 6 with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.
- 7 Parliament considers it very serious.
- 8 Sexual assault carries with it a maximum
- 9 sentence of ten years in the case of an adult
- 10 victim. Moreover, sexual assault is a rampant
- 11 crime in the Northwest Territories. It is
- 12 something that we see in this Court all too
- often.
- 14 The Crown filed a number of authorities in
- 15 support of the length of sentence that she is
- 16 seeking. She also fairly conceded that each
- of these cases has fairly different
- 18 circumstances and that it is difficult to find
- 19 anything that it completely on point.
- 20 In R. v. Simpson, 2015 NWTSC 45, the
- 21 offender had a criminal record that included
- four convictions for sexual offences including
- one against the same victim. In that case,
- the offender received a sentence of three
- 25 years. This followed a guilty plea and the
- sentence imposed followed a joint submission

In R. v. Sunrise, 2006 NWTSC 47, the offender was sentenced for breaking and entering and committing sexual assault and breaking and entering with intent to commit theft. He pleaded guilty to the latter and was found guilty of the former following a trial. The offender broke into his former partner's home and sexually assaulted her while she was passed out from intoxication.

The offender received a sentence of two years for the sexual assault and one year consecutive for the other offence. He had a lengthy criminal record of some 30 convictions and it included three convictions for break and enter and one for sexual assault.

R. v. Kochon, 2010 NWTSC 24, involved a very serious prolonged major sexual assault which took place in the victim's home in the presence of her 7-year-old daughter. The offender was sentenced to four years following a trial.

The Crown also submitted cases from the New Brunswick, Manitoba and Alberta Courts of Appeal.

In R. v. Flatfoot, 2009 MBCA 109, the

Manitoba Court of Appeal sentenced a youthful

four years incarceration for a break and enter
and a sexual assault on a minor. The
circumstances of the sexual assault are not
specified in that case, however, it was not

characterized as a "major sexual assault".

In R. v. Maisonneuve, 2014 NBCA 32, the

New Brunswick Court of Appeal imposed a

sentence of nine months incarceration followed

by 18 months probation. The offender in that

case broke into the victim's home through a

basement window, went to her bedroom, and

touched her breasts. The victim was

profoundly affected, sustaining both financial

and emotional harm. The offender was 21 at

the time. There is little information about

the offender's background or the criminal

record in that case.

In R. v. T. L. G., which I have mentioned previously, the offender was the victim's neighbor. He entered the house through an unlocked door, removed all of his clothing and climbed into bed with the two victims - a mother and her ten-year-old daughter. They were asleep at the time. He touched the mother all over her body, including her genitals, and he touched the daughter and

had pleaded guilty following a preliminary
inquiry and he was sentenced initially to two
years less one day followed by three years
probation. The Court of Appeal set aside that
sentence and imposed a sentence of four years.

The case that I have before me is troubling, and it calls out for a sentence that sends a message to both Mr. Betsidea and society at large that this conduct cannot be tolerated.

Entering someone's home without permission in the middle of the night is a serious crime. It violates profoundly one's sense of peace and safety. Touching the victim in a sexual manner exacerbates the seriousness even further. This type of contact has lasting and significant consequences for the victims, their lives, and their loved ones.

That said, the circumstances of this particular case are distinguishable from those in Simpson, Sunrise, Kochon, Flatfoot and T.L.G. with respect to both the acts perpetuated on the victims and, in the cases of Simpson, Sunrise and Kochon, the nature of the offender's criminal history. Accordingly, that must be taken into account in the

Factually, this case is much closer to

Maisonneuve although there are significant

differences in the offender profile.

In my view, the amount of incarceration that the Crown seeks is not justified. At the same time, what defence counsel proposes will not achieve the goals of denunciation and deterrence nor will it sufficiently recognize Mr. Betsidea's degree of moral blameworthiness or the impact of this on the victim and her family. That Mr. Betsidea's last conviction for break and enter attracted a short sentence of under a year does not justify a shorter sentence in this case.

Mr. Betsidea committed two serious crimes. They were prosecuted by indictment. In particular, breaking and entering with intent to commit an indictable offence must be prosecuted by indictment when it involves a dwelling house and that elevates it to a much higher level. The sentence has to reflect that.

Taking into account the circumstances of this offence, the impact on the victim, Mr.

Betsidea's circumstances and the jurisprudence from this jurisdiction and others, it is my

1	breaking and entering with intent, a period of
2	custody of two years less a day, followed by
3	probation, will achieve the goals of
4	denunciation and deterrence while recognizing
5	both the impact on the victim and Mr.
6	Betsidea's particular circumstances.
7	The probationary aspect of the sentence
8	will contribute structure and hopefully lead
9	Mr. Betsidea to the resources required to keep
10	him on a better path following his
11	incarceration.
12	It is further my view that the appropriate
13	sentence for this offence of sexual assault in
14	this case is eight months. And it is also
15	appropriate that those two sentences be served
16	concurrently, taking into account the totality
17	principle.
18	Mr. Betsidea, will you please stand.
19	Mr. Betsidea, I sentence you to a term of
20	two years less a day of imprisonment and 18

Mr. Betsidea, I sentence you to a term of two years less a day of imprisonment and 18 months probation for the crime of break and enter with intent to commit an indictable offence.

I further sentence you to a term of eight months for the crime of sexual assault.

You will serve the prison terms

- 1 your release. Do you understand this
- 2 sentence?
- 3 THE ACCUSED: Yes, Your Honour.
- 4 THE COURT: All right, you can sit down.
- 5 From the two years less a day, 142 days
- 6 will be deducted which represents credit for
- 7 the time that you have spent in remand
- 8 awaiting trial and then your sentence, and
- 9 this is calculated on the basis of 95 days at
- 10 a credit rate of 1.5 days for each day in the
- 11 the pre-sentence custody.
- 12 I will also impose an order that you
- provide a sample of your bodily fluids for DNA
- analysis and a lifetime SOIRA order.
- There will be a firearms prohibition as
- well, which will remain in effect for ten
- 17 years. But, because you are a subsistence
- hunter, Mr. Betsidea, you may apply for an
- 19 exemption to possess a firearm for that
- 20 purpose pursuant to section 113 of the
- 21 Criminal Code. Mr. Moore can explain that to
- 22 you.
- The terms of your probation will be those
- that are found in the Criminal Code;
- 25 particularly, you will keep the peace and be
- of good behavior. You will not communicate

1		expressed permission of this Court. You will
2		make appearances in court as required. You
3		will notify your probation officer promptly of
4		any change in your address, name or
5		occupation. And you will report to a
6		probation officer within two working days of
7		your release.
8		I am not going to impose any condition
9		that you abstain from using substances because
10		those are your choices to make for yourself.
11		I would, however, encourage you to continue to
12		work on yourself, Mr. Betsidea, as you have
13		been doing, to address the trauma in your own
14		life and importantly to learn how to deal with
15		that trauma in a more constructive manner.
16		Is there anything else, counsel?
17	MS.	SCOTT: Not from the Crown, Your
18		Honour.
19	MR.	MOORE: Nothing further, Your
20		Honour.
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Certified to be a true and
2	accurate transcript pursuant to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
3	Supreme Court Nures,
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter
9	Coult Reporter
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	