R v Lafferty, 2018 NWTSC 46

S-1-CR-2017-000111

S-1-CR-2017-000112

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

PETER LAFFERTY AKA PETER JOHN LAFFERTY

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by the Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 10th day of August 2018.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. J. Scott: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J.K. Bran: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under 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

- 1 THE COURT: Peter Lafferty has pleaded 2 guilty to two charges of sexual assault, and it 3 is now my responsibility to impose sentence on 4 him on these charges. 5 The first sexual assault happened on 6 October 1st, 2016. The victim, B.E., had been in 7 Yellowknife with friends consuming alcohol. 8 was driven back to Behchoko. Her last 9 recollection is driving around Behchoko, but 10 after that, she has a blackout. She has no memory of what Mr. Lafferty did to her. 11 happened is known because of what other witnesses 12 13 saw and heard. 14 After they arrived in Behchoko, B.E. and 15 Nathanial Smith went to Mr. Lafferty's house, and they continued to drink. Ms. E eventually passed 16 out on a couch. Mr. Smith tried to wake her up 17 before he left, but he was not able to. 18 Mr. Lafferty kicked Mr. Smith out of the 19 residence. 20 Sometime after this, Theona Mantla, who was 21 22 a friend of Ms. E, went to Mr. Lafferty's house. 23 She saw her friend passed out there. She tried
- was the only other person there, and he was awake. He asked her to leave and locked the door

to wake her but was not able to. Mr. Lafferty

27 behind her.

1 She left, but she was concerned for B.E.; so 2 she went to another residence, and she called the 3 police. The police received that call shortly 4 after 3:30 in the morning. They attended the 5 residence, but there was no response at the door. 6 Based on the information they had, they were 7 concerned for B.E.'s safety; so they broke down 8 the door. They found Mr. Lafferty laying on the 9 B.E. was laying fully clothed and on the 10 mattress on the floor. Witnesses who had been in the house earlier said that there had not been a 11 mattress on the floor before. Police found a 12 13 used condom on the floor and a condom wrapper in 14 Mr. Lafferty's jeans.

B.E. was examined by a nurse. Exhibits were sent for forensic analysis and confirmed that Mr. Lafferty had sexual intercourse with her that night. It is also an admitted fact that B.E. was incapable of consenting to any sexual activity at the time this happened.

Mr. Lafferty was arrested that night and released on an undertaking later that day.

The second offence happened on October 22nd, 2016. In the early-morning hours, A.G., who was 13 at the time, and other teenagers were at Mr. Lafferty's house, drinking alcohol and smoking marijuana. Mr. Lafferty's house was

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

26

known to be a place where they could go and party. A.G. started feeling dizzy and went to one of the bedrooms, laid down, and fell asleep.

She woke up to Mr. Lafferty having intercourse with her. She told him to stop, and he did not.

One of the other teens who had fallen asleep on the couch heard noise and went to the bedroom. She saw Mr. Lafferty having intercourse with A.G. She said A.G.'s eyes were closed and that she was crying. The teen who walked in on this got angry and pushed Mr. Lafferty off A.G.

One of the other teens who had been at the house but had left returned sometime after this. He saw A.G. with her pants down and Mr. Lafferty in the room with her. He started assaulting Mr. Lafferty and punched him in the face. The youths then left the house.

In the meantime, a neighbour who had heard the fighting called the police. They attended and found Mr. Lafferty passed out on the couch, bleeding. He could not tell the officers his name. He was lodged in cells to confirm his identity, and the next day, he was charged with sexual assault of A.G.

Police obtained a warrant to search the house. They found a used condom in the back bedroom. They also arranged for A.G. to be

2.1

examined. Forensic testing confirmed that her

DNA as well as Mr. Lafferty's were on the condom.

Mr. Lafferty has been in custody since that day, October 22nd, 2016. It has taken quite some time for this matter to be dealt with, but there were a number of factors that contributed to the delay in this matter getting concluded. And I will just refer to that background briefly.

Mr. Lafferty's initial election was to have his trials before a judge and jury. Preliminary hearings had been scheduled to proceed in March 2017, but he waived his right to those hearings and no witnesses had to be called.

A pretrial conference was held in

August 2017 on the matter involving B.E. At
that time, it was expected the matter would go
to trial and that two weeks would be needed for
it. The time estimate was later revised to eight
days. In September 2017, the matter was
scheduled to proceed to trial in March 2018 on
the two short weeks on either side of the Easter
holiday.

Very soon after the docket issued, counsel advised the Court that only five days would be needed. They asked that the matter be rescheduled. It could not proceed on either of the two weeks that it had initially been

2.1

2.3

scheduled for because, as I said, those were short weeks. The matter was rescheduled.

On the matter involving A.G., there were early indications that it might resolve, and everyone agreed to defer the holding of a pretrial conference.

In December 2017, there was a change of defence counsel. A few months later, the new lawyer advised that there would be a re-election to judge alone on both matters and that there was a possibility of resolution, not just on the matter involving A.G. but on the other one as well.

In May 2018, there was another change of counsel, and that was when Mr. Bran, who now represents Mr. Lafferty, became counsel. A very short time after Mr. Bran got on the record, the Court received confirmation that both these matters were resolved. Counsel requested an appearance for the purpose of entering pleas and for the facts to be read in, which was done May 25th, 2018.

The reason I have gone over this history is to make it clear that although these cannot be characterized as early guilty pleas in the way we normally think of it, the overall context, including the changes in Mr. Lafferty's

2.3

representation, cannot be overlooked. And for that reason, I agree with what has been said about the credit that should be given to

Mr. Lafferty for his guilty pleas.

As of today, by my calculation, he has spent a total of 657 days on remand, which corresponds, roughly, to close to 22 months of pretrial custody.

The law is well-established that, generally speaking, while the discretion as to credit for remand time lies with the sentencing judge, offenders should ordinarily be credited for their remand time, roughly on a ratio of one-and-a-half days' credit for each day spent on remand. The Crown takes the position here that there is no reason for Mr. Lafferty not to receive credit for his remand time on that ratio.

I have the benefit of the presentence report that was prepared for this hearing. I am not going to refer to it in details here, but I have considered the information that was included in it, and I have also carefully considered the support letters and the other documents that were filed earlier this week. Those documents assist me in understanding more about who Mr. Lafferty is.

As is the case for any offender, there is

2.1

much more to Mr. Lafferty than these two serious crimes he has committed. According to the materials before me, Mr. Lafferty is a talented artist, and he hopes to eventually make a living from this. According to his uncle, who has employed him in the past doing construction work, he is a reliable worker, and he works well with others on the jobsite.

It is clear that Mr. Lafferty has taken some steps and has attempted to better his life and better himself despite some of the challenges he has faced. He has made use of some of the resources that were available to him on remand. He has seen the psychologist at the jail. He has attended AA meetings fairly regularly during some stretches of time; although, looking at the attendance sheets, there seems to also have been some gaps in his attendance.

From the presentence report, I know that Mr. Lafferty's childhood had some good sides but also some struggles. His grandmother raised him. She was not violent with him, and she did not abuse alcohol. They spent time on the land and engaged in traditional activities. On the other hand, an uncle who lived with them was sometimes violent when drinking, and Mr. Lafferty was afraid of him when he used alcohol.

2.1

2.3

The letter from Mr. Lafferty's mother outlines some other struggles that he went through, how her then husband treated Mr. Lafferty, and that although she has attempted to reach out and assist him over the years, that never worked out.

When he addressed the Court at the conclusion of submissions, Mr. Lafferty talked about numerous losses he has suffered. He has lost several relatives to cancer. He said that he is afraid. He said that he is sorry for what he did. And these things are also reflected in some of the comments in the presentence report.

There are things that are made very clear on the evidence before me. First, alcohol is a serious problem for Mr. Lafferty. The report says that his consumption of alcohol went completely out of control when he learned that his mother has cancer, but it is obvious that alcohol has been a problem for him in the past and was a problem for him well before that event.

I heard, among other things, that his conviction from 1999 for sexual assault occurred in very similar circumstances to the ones in these cases, that is, in a situation where alcohol was used to excess by everyone including him.

2.1

2.3

Mr. Lafferty has accessed treatment programs before. He likely will need help again to address his addiction. It is positive and encouraging that he has accessed some programming while on remand, and I am referring, again, in part, to the attendance at AA. As I mentioned, the attendance sheets suggest that he attended regularly during certain periods of time, but there have been some significant gaps. I do not know why that is. I do not know why for some stretches of time he went and for other stretches of time he did not.

One way or another, Mr. Lafferty is going to have to find a way, somehow, to address his drinking because it is very clear that it leads him to very bad places. Achieving sobriety is very difficult, but it is a necessary step towards rehabilitation for him. That will mean changing his own conduct, and it probably also will mean changing lifestyles, changing friends because this will be a lifelong battle.

I have to say, there are a few aspects of the presentence report that raise concerns in my mind from the point of view of Mr. Lafferty's insight into his behaviour. With respect to the assault on B.E., his comments to the author of the report are somewhat contradictory because, in

2.1

one part, he talks about the two of them making

out and her being awake, but later in the report,

he acknowledges he knows it is wrong to take

advantage of someone who is sleeping.

There is overwhelming evidence from the admitted facts that B.E. was highly intoxicated that evening and was passed out when these events occurred. Two different people tried to wake her up shortly before she was sexually assaulted.

Mr. Lafferty needs to come to terms with the full measure of what he has done. With respect to A.G., his comment in the presentence report is that he wishes those young people had not come by. But his place was known as a party place. He needs to acknowledge some responsibility for that, and there can be no excuse, no justification, and no watering down of what he did that day.

He raped a 13-year-old girl while she was asleep. She woke up and told him to stop, and he did not. Another person in the house heard her crying. That is what happened, and that is Mr. Lafferty's responsibility.

Another indication of lack of insight is that with respect to both victims, when asked about the effects he thinks his conduct had on them, his response in both cases is that they

2.1

must be mad at him. I believe Mr. Lafferty when
he said earlier this week that he is sorry. I
believe that he is sorry. He also said that what
he did is stupid.

I am not sure that word "stupid" quite captures what he has done. What he did was take advantage of intoxicated persons for his own sexual gratification. Both of his victims were in a highly vulnerable position. One was basically still a child. I agree it was a stupid thing to do, but it was far more than that. It was an awful breach of these people's personal and sexual integrity, and it is conduct that we know very well now causes terrible, terrible harm.

The more Mr. Lafferty understands just how much harm he caused to these two people, I am sure, the worse he will feel. That is a necessary passage, I think, for him to have the strength to address his issues and never put another person through this again. This has to be the last time. Being sorry now is one thing, and I accept he is, but it has to translate into action and into concrete steps to change, and it will be hard.

As the Crown prosecutor said, the law is clear that deterrence and denunciation have to be

2.1

2.3

the primary sentencing objectives in a situation like this. This type of sexual assault is very prevalent in this jurisdiction. Year after year, I have struggled to understand why this is so, and I still do not understand why this is so, but it continues to happen at an alarming rate in the communities in the Northwest Territories. I have, in other cases, called it an "epidemic", and I continue to think that using that word is not an exaggeration.

The solution to this problem is not something that is in this Court's hands. The Court deals with these matters after they have happened, after the harm has been done, and the Court has very limited tools. I continue to hope that people in the various communities in this jurisdiction will find ways to help stop this terrible cycle so that everyone in the community can feel safe and be safe, so that women and girls may be able to go to sleep without having to worry about waking up to being raped by a friend or acquaintance or someone who just happened to be in the house.

The fact that this happens so often does not make it any less terrible. Communities and people in general cannot get used to this and cannot accept this as a fact of life. This is

2.1

2.3

not normal. This should not be happening. And people in communities, if they decide to work together, if they decide that enough is enough, can help change things.

In the meantime, the Court can only use the tools that it has, and for serious crimes like this, the only tool is the imposition of a significant jail term in the hope that while in custody, Mr. Lafferty will be able to access programs and treatment that will help him change his ways. He has said he wants to change his life, and I say again I believe him. He will need help to do that, but, in the end, it will be up to him. He is the only person who will have control over his future actions.

Counsel have presented the Court with a joint submission. I heard very detailed submissions from the Crown explaining how it came to the conclusion that what is being jointly proposed would be a fit sentence. The law is that when a joint submission is presented, it has to be followed unless the judge finds it completely unreasonable, so unreasonable that it would cause reasonable people in the public to lose faith in the justice system.

There are very aggravating things about these offences: There were two separate sexual

2.1

2.3

assaults; the second one was committed a mere
three weeks after Mr. Lafferty was released on
the first one; he has a record for committing a
very similar crime in 1999 and received a
significant sentence that time, a sentence of two
years less a day; the two victims were extremely
vulnerable; and in A.G.'s case, her young age is
an aggravating factor.

But consideration must also be given to some important mitigating factors. The guilty pleas are very mitigating. They have spared these victims the harm and trauma of having to talk about these events in open court. They have provided certainty of outcome for all involved. And even in a case where there is forensic evidence that assists the Crown, even when a case appears on the surface to be strong, there are never any quarantees when a matter goes to trial. The standard of proof that the Crown faces is a very high one. Giving up the right to have a trial is giving up a lot. And with what I heard in this particular case about one victim not being cooperative with the Crown and issues with young, vulnerable witnesses who are all intoxicated at the time of the events for the other matter, I do accept that these guilty pleas should be given maximum mitigating weight.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

26

The specific circumstances of Mr. Lafferty as an Indigenous offender must also be considered. The principles that are engaged because of this are engaged daily in this jurisdiction; so I am not going to repeat them here. But restraint is a particularly important factor and sentencing principle when sentencing for Indigenous offenders. And even aside from the specific application of restraint to sentencing of Indigenous offenders, no sentence should ever be longer than what is needed to achieve the objectives of sentencing.

I also have to consider the principle of totality. Sentencing Mr. Lafferty for these two crimes is not simply a matter of deciding what sentence should be imposed for each offence and adding them up. I am required to take into account the global effect of the sentences. This is to ensure that the overall impact of the sentence is not crushing on Mr. Lafferty and does not turn into something that is counterproductive.

There is never just one right number or one right sentence for any given crime. There is always a range. The joint submission is certainly not at the high end of the range of what could be imposed for these two offences, but considering all of the circumstances in this case

2.1

2.3

and given everything I have heard and read, I
think it represents a very restrained but fair
outcome.

Counsel have made it clear that an important component of the joint position is to ensure that the sentence results in Mr. Lafferty having access to programs offered through the federal correctional system. I agree that this is both in his best interest and, also, ultimately in the best interest of the community because the reality is no matter what sentence I impose today, Mr. Lafferty will eventually be released. The best way for his community to be protected is for him to be able to address the underlying issues that have caused him to behave in this manner.

Crown and defence agree that I should endorse the warrant of committal to recommend that he be given access to sexual-offender programming, and I will do so. I am aware from other sentencing hearings that the high-intensity programs are only administered in southern institutions. These are lengthy programs, usually offered only once a year, and they cannot be delivered in the north.

I make mention of this because

Mr. Lafferty's counsel has also asked that I

2.1

2.3

recommend that Mr. Lafferty be permitted to serve his sentence in the north if at all possible.

Some of the people who wrote letters of support have also asked for that. I often endorse warrants of committal to ask that consideration be given to enable offenders who are sentenced to more than two years' imprisonment and have support from their community to be permitted to serve their sentence in the north. And I do this because I understand it is very hard for families who reside in the north to visit relatives and loved ones who are detained in southern Canada.

Here, my only concern about doing so is that it is important, I think, that priority be given to ensuring that Mr. Lafferty has access to the programming he needs. That is the most important consideration as far as the long-term objective of his rehabilitation and, also, the objective of protecting the community. So I will word the recommendations in such a way that I hope will make this clear, and hopefully the transcript of my remarks this morning will also make that clear.

Going back to the principle of totality that I have already referred to, there are two ways to ensure that it is respected. The first, when consecutive sentences are imposed, is to reduce

2.1

2.3

each sentence to ensure that the total is not crushing. The second way is to depart from the usual principle that distinct offences should give rise to consecutive sentences and impose, instead, sentences that are to be served concurrently, which means at the same time.

As I said earlier this week during submissions, while, certainly, these distinct assaults should normally result in the imposition of consecutive sentences, I am concerned about doing that because to arrive at the total sentence of four years and nine months, which is what the joint submission is, I would have to reduce each of these sentences to the point that I do not think either of them would reflect the true gravity of these crimes and the aggravating factors. For that reason, I have decided to exercise my discretion not to make the sentences consecutive so that each of them reflects the gravity of the offence.

I will deal with the ancillary orders. They are part of the joint submission and are not disputed, as I understand. There will be a DNA order because these are primary designated offences. There will be a lifetime order with respect to the Sexual Offenders' Information Registration Act because there is more than one

2.1

conviction. There will be a firearms prohibition order which will commence today and expire ten years after Mr. Lafferty's release from custody.

And as I have no discretion to do otherwise, I will impose a victim of crime surcharge on each

of these counts.

Can you stand up, please, Mr. Lafferty.

Mr. Lafferty, I am going to go along with what
the lawyers have suggested. If you had not spent
any time in custody, my sentence would have been,
for the sexual assault on B.E., three years, and
for the sexual assault on A.G., it would have
been four years and nine months concurrent.

For the 657 days you have already spent in custody, I am going to give you credit for two years and eight months, which means that the further jail terms will be, for the sexual assault on B.E., four months, and for the sexual assault on A.G., two years and one month concurrent. So the further jail sentence will be two years and one month. You can sit down.

The warrant of committal will be endorsed with two recommendations. First that

Mr. Lafferty be given access to sexual-offender treatment programming as soon as possible so that he can complete that during his sentence. The second is if at any point during his sentence,

2.1

2.3

Mr. Lafferty's programming needs do not require
him to be in a southern institution, that the
authorities give consideration to permit him to
serve those portions of his sentence in a
northern institution.

These are only recommendations. I cannot make this decision; I cannot order these things to happen. But the intent of these recommendations is not to have a northern placement if that would interfere with Mr. Lafferty's programming and treatment needs.

I certainly understand the concerns communicated to me through his lawyer, and his family's concerns about the problem with distance and him serving a sentence far away. But I think the record makes it very clear that it is really in his best interest to have access to treatment programs. That will most probably mean that at least some of the sentence will have to be served somewhere else, but I am hopeful that, in the long run, it will help him so that he can return to his community after his release, benefit from the support of those who want to help him, and, as he has said he wants to do, change his life.

Is there anything that requires clarification or that I have overlooked from the Crown's perspective?

2.1

2.3

1	MS.	SCOTT:	No, Your Honour.
2	THE	CHAIR:	Anything from your
3		perspective, Mr. B	ran?
4	MR.	BRAN:	No. Thank you.
5	THE	CHAIR:	All right. I thank counsel
6		for their work on	resolving these two cases and
7		for your helpful s	ubmissions to help me
8		understand how you	arrived at the joint
9		submission.	
LO		If there is n	othing further on this matter,
L1		madam clerk, we wi	ll close court.
L2		Mr. Lafferty,	my last words will be to wish
L3		you luck, and I ho	pe you are able to make the
L 4		changes you want t	o make. You are still very
L 5		young. You have a	lot of time ahead of you, and
L 6		you have a lot of	skills and good things going
L 7		for you. So I rea	lly hope you make the most of
L 8		the time you will	have in custody and that you
L 9		can return to your	community and be part of that
20		change I was talki	ng about because it is much
21		needed.	
22		Close court.	
23			
24	PRO	CEEDINGS ADJOURNED	
25			
26			

Dicta Court Reporting Inc.

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT:	
2		
3	I, Angela Porco, certify that the foregoing	
4	pages are a complete and accurate transcript of	
5	the proceedings, taken down by me in shorthand	
6	and transcribed from my shorthand notes to the	
7	best of my skill and ability.	
8	Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of	
9	Alberta, this 9th day of September 2018.	
10		
11		
12	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723	
13	of the Rules of Court	
14	Contraction of the second	
15	Angela Poul	
16	Angela Porco, CSR(A)	
17	Court Reporter	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		