R. v. Oake, 2017 NWTSC 41

S-1-CR-2017-000038

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

DARCY OAKE



Transcript of the Oral Decision on Bail delivered by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 25th day of May, 2017.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. D. Praught: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C. Davison: Counsel for the Accused

An Order of the Court has been made prohibiting publication, broadcast or transmission of information contained herein pursuant to s. 525~(8) and 517 of the Criminai Code of Canada

Publication Ban no longer in effect pursuant to the direction of the

Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau dated December 5, 2018.

Official Court Reporters

R. v. Oake, 2017 NWTSC 41 S-1-CR-2017-000038

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

DARCY OAKE

Transcript of the Oral Decision on Bail delivered by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 25th day of May, 2017.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. D. Praught: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C. Davison: Counsel for the Accused

An Order of the Court has been made prohibiting publication, broadcast or transmission of information contained herein pursuant to s. 525(8) and 517 of the Criminal Code of Canada Official Court Reporters

```
1 THE COURT: Would you like Mr. Oake seated
```

- with you?
- 3 MR. DAVISON: Yes, please.
- 4 THE COURT: You can have a seat, sir.
- 5 MR. DAVISON: And, Your Honour, this is a
- 6 matter that's here for decision, but I do want to
- 7 mention, and I've mentioned this to Mr. Praught,
- 8 that Mr. Oake has brought with him this afternoon
- 9 some paperwork. He tells me he has been able to
- 10 start a treatment program while in North Slave
- 11 Correctional Centre. If he's granted release,
- 12 what he's just briefly told me about the program
- is such he would be able to continue the program
- 14 outside of the facility pending his departure for
- 15 the treatment centre if that is arranged and
- 16 permitted under the terms of release. The flip
- side is if he's not granted release, he will
- 18 still be able to carry on with the program inside
- 19 the correctional centre.
- 20 THE COURT: You've made the Crown aware of
- just now.
- 22 MR. DAVISON: Yes. I've just learned of
- this myself.
- 24 THE COURT: There's no need to be file --
- 25 the documents to be filed here. You're just
- telling me so I'm aware?
- 27 MR. DAVISON: Yes. I haven't looked at the

1 documents myself. So I'm just telling you so
2 you're aware.

3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I am
4 ready to give my decision on this. I'm just
5 going to say at the outset and remind everyone
6 that there is a publication ban in effect that
7 relates to the evidence that was presented at
8 this hearing a few weeks ago. That ban applies
9 to the things I am about to say.

Mr. Oake faces a number of charges arising out of events that are alleged to have happened here in Yellowknife. He has one Information that includes two breaches of recognizance said to have happened on the 19th of November, 2016, and he also faces charges on a five-count Information. The charges on that Information include importation of furanyl fentanyl between October 30th and November 28th, 2016; trafficking in fentanyl on the 23rd of November 2016; possession of fentanyl for the purpose of trafficking on November 25th, 2016; criminal negligence causing bodily harm on the 23rd of November 2016; and a breach of recognizance also on the 25th of November, 2016.

I heard at the bail hearing that he is also awaiting trial in Alberta on a charge of possession of cocaine for the purposes of

trafficking in relation to events that date back
to October 2015.

Since his arrest on the charges most recently laid against him in the Northwest Territories, he has been on remand. His charges came before this Court for review by operation of Section 525 of the Criminal Code and he now applies for release for the first time.

In support of his application, he has filed an affidavit that sets out his release plan. The Crown did not cross-examine him on that affidavit. Mr. Oake's parents also both testified at the hearing. They are both being proposed as sureties.

The Crown opposes Mr. Oake's release on all three grounds of detention that are set out at Section 515 of the Criminal Code.

I will start by summarizing the allegations. The Alberta charge, as I mentioned, stems from allegations dating back to October 18th, 2015. I was told that on that date a vehicle was intercepted by police following a complaint. There were three people in that vehicle: the driver and two passengers. Mr. Oake was one of the passengers.

After the vehicle was stopped, the police officer noticed a strong odour of cannabis inside

the vehicle. The driver gave a false name when he identified himself to the officer. The vehicle was searched and cocaine was found in the vehicle. I heard that just over 141 grams of powder cocaine and 142 grams of crack cocaine were seized from the vehicle.

According to the copy of the Indictment that was filed at the bail hearing, Mr. Oake and the driver of the vehicle are jointly charged with two counts of possession of cocaine for the purpose of trafficking.

I heard the case has passed the preliminary hearing stage and is currently pending before the Court of Queen's Bench in Alberta.

Mr. Oake was released on October 27th, 2015, on a recognizance with a cash deposit of \$1500. His father was the one who provided the funds for that deposit and he is noted as the assignee on the recognizance. But Mr. Oake's father was not named as a surety. There were no sureties on that recognizance.

The release conditions included, among other things, that Mr. Oake was to reside at 166 Borden Drive, in Yellowknife, (that is his father's residence) and that he was to abide by a curfew between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. every day. He was also required from refraining to possess,

consume, or purchase illegal drugs.

The Crown alleges that on November 19th,

2016, Mr. Oake was a passenger in a vehicle that
was intercepted in Yellowknife as a result of a

traffic violation. This occurred at 1:50 a.m.

The police officer who stopped the vehicle knew
that Mr. Oake was on a curfew and that is what
led to the two-count Information alleging
breaches. There is a breach of the curfew and a
breach of the condition that he keep the peace
and be of good behaviour. The two charges are
based on the same allegations.

Mr. Oake was released on a recognizance before an officer in charge that same day, and the only condition in that recognizance was the requirement that he abide by a curfew between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.

The next set of allegations are by far the most serious. Between November 23rd and 25th, 2016, there were a number of fentanyl overdoses in Yellowknife. I heard that the situation was so serious that medical officials issued advisories in the media that there was a particularly potent and dangerous type of fentanyl being sold on the streets of Yellowknife.

Mr. Oake was one of the people who overdosed

on fentanyl. This happened on November 25th at his father's residence at 166 Borden Drive. He was, as a result of that overdose, in extreme medical distress. Paramedics were called, and police were also called to assist. He was treated with the type of medication that is used in these situations and was rushed to the hospital.

The police officers that were at the scene spoke with his parents. They learned that Mr. Oake had used fentanyl on multiple occasions at the residence. Police officers felt that they needed to search the residence based on exigent circumstances given the very dangerous nature of the drug and the possibility there could still be some in the residence. Mr. Oake's father consented to the search of the residence.

As a result of the cursory search of the residence and garage, police found in Mr. Oake's bedroom a number of items, including a clear baggie that had a white substance in it and a digital scale. In the garage, they found a torn, empty envelope which appeared to have been mailed from Hong Kong. Police learned from Mr. Oake's father that Mr. Oake sometime spent time in the garage.

One of the officers who was involved in the

search began to experience worrisome symptoms suggesting that he might be affected by the substance that was being handled. That officer required medical attention, but, as far as I heard, was ultimately fine.

A search warrant was obtained for the residence. During the execution of that warrant, two more scales were found as well as another empty envelope which appeared to have been mailed from China. A laptop was also seized and it is still being examined, so at this point it is not known whether there is anything relevant to this investigation that will be found in it. The white substance in the baggies seized in Mr. Oake's room was tested and it was found to be furanyl fentanyl. Swabs taken from the inside of both envelopes tested positive for the same substance.

During the investigation, police interviewed Courtney Janes, one of the persons who had overdosed on fentanyl during those days in November 2016. She advised that she went to 166 Borden Drive and saw Mr. Oake there. They went inside the garage and there Mr. Oake made a line of drugs for them. He gave her some as well and some paper and told her to be careful on it as he had overdosed on it the day before. Ms. Janes

advised that later that day she blacked out. It is alleged that members of her family found her in medical distress and called emergency services. Ms. Janes also told police that she was present when Mr. Oake ordered some fentanyl from China.

During the investigation, Mr. Oake's parents were also interviewed. They both confirmed they knew their son was using drugs. His mother is a nurse and had talked to him about getting into a treatment program and he had agreed to go.

On November 28th, the police in Yellowknife were advised by their colleagues in British

Columbia that as part of a seizure that occurred at the Vancouver airport an envelope addressed to Mr. Oake at 166 Borden Drive, mailed from China, was found to contain 11.7 grams of furanyl fentanyl.

The charges arising out of the November events were sworn on November 30th and a warrant for Mr. Oake's arrest was issued. He was still in hospital at that point. The Crown alleges that he was, at that point or shortly after, in hospital voluntarily in the sense that there was no medical requirement for him to remain there.

On December 2nd police made attempts to make arrangements for him to turn himself in.

Surveillance was established at the hospital because police were concerned that Mr. Oake might decide to leave and not turn himself in.

The Crown alleges that Mr. Oake's mother was seen arriving at the hospital in a vehicle and that shortly after that Mr. Oake was seen walking out of the hospital with a hood over his head.

The Crown further alleges that Mr. Oake went back inside the hospital and his mother drove away. I understand the Crown's allegation to be that this happened because they saw police were there. But the discussions continued and eventually Mr. Oake did come out of the hospital and was arrested.

The Crown supplemented these allegation with background information about the drug fentanyl. These remain allegations at this stage, but the nature of this drug and its dangerousness has been the subject of comments by this Court over the past few months and by other Courts across the country as well, so at least some aspects of this are not really in issue.

Fentanyl is a very potent drug that creates physical dependency and it involves a high risk of overdose. The Crown has provided statistical information about the drastic increase, over the past few years, in deaths resulting from fentanyl overdoses. There have been two separate public

health advisories in the NWT in relation to this drug, one in February and one in November. I do not think anybody takes issue with the fact that this is indeed a very dangerous drug.

Mr. Oake's election on the five-count

Information is trial by judge alone. At the time
of the bail hearing, no date had been scheduled
for the preliminary hearing into these matters,
and I know from reviewing the file that the
matter is actually to be spoken to in Territorial
Court tomorrow unless something has changed since
those endorsements were made on the Territorial
Court file.

Those are the allegations that provide context for this application for release. The other important piece of course is the release plan being proposed.

It is clear on the evidence that Mr. Oake was born in Yellowknife and raised here. He spent virtually all his life here. His immediate family is here (his parents and his brother) and so are members of his extended family (an aunt, an uncle, and cousin). He is 22 years old and he does not have a criminal record.

In his affidavit, Mr. Oake acknowledges that he is an addict and needs treatment. He has attended Narcotics Anonymous meetings while on

remand. At the time of the bail hearing, he had not been able to access the substance abuse program offered at the jail because priority is given to people serving sentences. At the time he swore his affidavit, he was on the waiting list, but I heard just after we opened court this afternoon that he has now been able to begin a treatment program within the jail and that is a very positive thing.

Mr. Oake had taken steps to attend treatment before his arrest. I heard that he had been accepted into treatment at the Edgewood Facility in British Columbia and he was scheduled to attend in December 2016. His arrest prevented that from happening. His plan, if released, is to renew his application to attend this treatment facility.

My understanding of the evidence and the submissions made on the application is that

Mr. Oake is not able to reapply to Edgewood until and unless he is actually released on bail. His counsel advised that based on the information he has been able to gather, the application process to get into this treatment program requires the applicant to be "available", which to them means "not in custody" at the time the application is submitted.

I am going to open a brief parenthesis here just to draw to counsels' attention something that I came across more by coincidence than anything else, which does not change anything to my decision in this matter but I thought I should raise because it came to my attention.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

In an entirely different context recently, and Mr. Praught will be aware of this matter, as part of an estreatment hearing and, as part, I was provided background materials on another drug case. Of course, at the stage of the estreatment hearing, the only question was whether money should be forfeited, but I was provided the pre-sentence report that was prepared for that sentence as well as the Reasons for Sentence of the sentencing judge. And it may just be that information was reported incorrectly or that I misunderstood what I read, but it appeared that in that case when the accused had been released at some point during his case, he was released directly into the treatment plan at Edgewood. In other words, it sounded from what was referred to in the pre-sentence report that when he was in custody he was able to somehow apply while he was still in custody. Just so counsel are aware, the sentencing decision on that is reported at 2017 NWTTC 01, and this court's estreatment file is

2017-000009. I did not look at this very closely, I just happened to notice it because I had just heard this bail hearing.

I want to make it clear that I do not doubt for a second that the information I was provided at this hearing is the information that counsel were given and was an accurate representation of the situation as it was explained to counsel. I raise it only because it may be that there is a case where it does make a difference whether a person may be released directly to this treatment program. And, if not whoever is applying for release at any given point, the Crown would have an interest in knowing whether in fact it is possible or not to submit an application while in custody. But as I say, it makes no difference to my decision on this matter. I just wanted to raise it and now I close that parenthesis.

Turning back to this case, the information and the evidence that I have is that there is some uncertainty about when Mr. Oake might be able to attend treatment if he is released. It would depend on how quickly his application process can be completed and, of course, when space is available for him at the facility.

Also as part of the release plan, Mr. Oake is prepared to consent to provide samples of his

blood and urine, to allow his hands to be swabbed for the purposes of ensuring that he is continuing to abstain from consuming illicit drugs. He is prepared to subject himself to random testing without there being a need for the police officer requesting this to have any grounds to believe that he has actually breached his release terms, and he is prepared to waive his right to confidentiality as to any medical attention or intervention that he might receive and to authorization any medical personnel who deals with him to contact police and report details of his condition should he require intervention after have consumed illicit substances. So I guess, in summary, he is prepared to comply with any conditions the Court may place on him and he has proposed to give up several aspects of his rights to facilitate and encourage the monitoring of these conditions. It is proposed in the release plan that he would live with his mother.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

As I have said already, Mr. Oake's parents are both prepared for act as sureties for him. His father is prepared to cash in some of his investments and deposit an amount of \$1,000. His mother is proposing to pledge a surety in the same amount but without a deposit. Both of them

testified that they are prepared to monitor their son's compliance with conditions and to call the police if there are any breaches. Neither of them was a surety on the earlier recognizance.

Mr. Oake's mother was asked why she thought it would be any different this time if her son was released and why she believed this time he would abstain from consuming drugs and take treatment, considering that treatment had been discussed and arranged in the past and evidently he still continued to use. Her answer was "His death." I take this to mean that she believes that the near fatal consequences that he suffered as a result of his last overdose is what will make a difference to his resolve in tackling his addiction issues.

With respect to what happened when the police were trying to execute the arrest warrant in early December, Mr. Oake's mother explained that her intentions when she went to the hospital that day were to facilitate her son's attendance at the treatment program. She answered those questions very directly and she did not try to put any other spin on that. She said the treatment was something that Mr. Oake's doctors had approved and that, in effect, his arrest and preventing him from attending treatment at that

point went against what she understood his doctors wanted to see happen. Of course I do not have any evidence from the doctors, but this is what she said in her testimony. I think her evidence makes it quite clear that her priority at that time was to try to get her son into treatment. She believed that is where he should be and not in police custody.

She also testified that if her son is released and is accepted at the treatment facility, she intends on travelling there with him and take him to the treatment centre herself. She says she realizes it could take a long time before these matters go to trial, and she understands that by agreeing to be a surety and monitoring her son's compliance with conditions, she is making a major commitment. She maintained that she is prepared to follow through with that commitment.

Mr. Oake's father said he never saw evidence of the drug-related activities in the garage at his house on Borden Drive. He did acknowledge that he saw evidence of drug use in his son's room from time to time. He was asked why he did not report this illegal activity to the police and he said he did not think it was his responsibility. He maintained that he does

understand that as a surety it would now very much be his responsibility to call the police if this were to happen again, or if he became aware of any breaches of the release terms. He testified that he is between jobs at the moment and he would have some time and flexibility to check in on his son and make sure he is complying with the terms of his release. He acknowledged it may be difficult for him to monitor compliance with the curfew as Mr. Oake would not be living with him, and he also added that there is no landline at the residence, but he said he could drive over and make some checks himself.

Again, Mr. Oake did not seem to me to be trying to overstate anything. He answered the questions he was asked in a very matter-of-fact way and he did not try to justify or rationalize his conduct or any of the things that he was being cross-examined about during the hearing.

The Crown, as I have said at the outset, opposes Mr. Oake's release on all three grounds, emphasizing particularly the second and the third.

On the primary ground, the Crown says that the allegations involve very serious offences, that significant sentences will be imposed if Mr. Oake is found guilty, and that this gives

rise to a high risk that he may be tempted to abscond. The Crown also notes that Mr. Oake, knowing that there was a warrant for his arrest, appears to have attempted to leave the hospital, and his mother effectively confirmed that her intention, as I have said already, was to try to get him to treatment.

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

With respect to the second ground, which is focused on public safety, the Crown notes that the allegations reflect increasingly serious behaviour and suggest that being on conditions, even with a cash deposit, has not been a sufficient incentive to ensure that further offences would not be committed. The Crown also noted that Mr. Oake's acknowledged addiction is a powerful factor and creates a high risk of reoffending. The Crown is concerned that the proposed plan is not sufficient to control that risk. Mr. Oake lived with one of his parents when he is alleged to have committed the breaches and the subsequent drug offences. There is no guarantee that he will be accepted into treatment and no certainty as to when he will go. The Crown is not suggesting that Mr. Oake's parents do not have the best of intentions, but argued that especially given his involvement in importing and trafficking a highly dangerous

substance, Mr. Oake poses a significant risk to others.

On the tertiary ground, the Crown argues that its case is strong and, if convicted,

Mr. Oake faces a significant penalty. The Crown says that it is of particular concern that

Mr. Oake, having overdosed on the drug before, knew how dangerous it was and still provided it to another person. The Crown argues that

Mr. Oake's release in light of all of this would cause the public to lose confidence in the administration of justice.

Mr. Oake's counsel argues that the primary ground is not really a concern given Mr. Oake's ties to Yellowknife and his lack of criminal record. On the secondary ground, the defence notes that the allegations do not suggest that Mr. Oake is involved in commercial trafficking based on greed but, rather, that he is an addict and that this is what is at the root of his activities. Defence points out that the heart of the release plan is to ensure that Mr. Oake receives the treatment that he needs as soon as possible and that once that happens and the issue of his addiction is addressed, the concerns for public safety would no longer exist.

Defence notes that because there were no

sureties before, Mr. Oake's parents were, in

fact, not under any obligation to report anything

to police in the past, but that they have both

now sworn that they understand their

responsibilities if they do become sureties and

have sworn that they will abide by them.

Defence notes that Mr. Oake is a young person without a criminal record and argues that his detention is not necessary to protect the public.

On the tertiary ground, the defence acknowledges that the Crown's case on the importation charge is strong and that the likely sentence for that offence, if Mr. Oake is convicted, will be significant.

out in the Criminal Code, however, including the circumstance of the offence. Defence notes again that the situation of an addict who is primarily supporting his habit engages different considerations than the situation of someone who traffics in these dangerous substances purely for commercial and mercantile purposes. There is no allegation here or evidence suggesting involvement with gangs, weapons, or violence.

Defence argues that Mr. Oake's involvement is at the lower end of the scale and that his release

plan meets the concerns that may exist under the tertiary ground.

I have given the evidence, the submissions, and the case law that I was referred to a lot of thought in what I consider to be a difficult decision to make in this case.

On the primary ground, the question I must ask myself is whether Mr. Oake's detention is necessary to ensure that he will attend court.

To be sure, he faces a significant sentence if he is convicted, and that is always something that can raise concerns about the temptation a person might have to try to flee to try to avoid facing the consequences of a possible conviction.

At the same time, Mr. Oake is from
Yellowknife, his family is here. I think that
there are ways to craft release terms that will
minimize any flight risk that he might represent.
There can never be any guarantees in this regard.
Decisions on bail always require a risk
assessment, but, on the primary ground, I am
satisfied that it is possible to craft tight
conditions that would ensure Mr. Oake will come
to court as required and face trial when the time
comes.

The question I must ask myself on the secondary ground is whether Mr. Oake's detention

is necessary for the protection of the public. I must consider whether there is a substantial likelihood that if released he will commit an offence or interfere with the administration of justice.

1

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

With respect to this ground for detention, counsel have both referred to the Supreme Court of Canada decision in R. v. Pearson, [1992] 3 SCR 665, and I want to say a few words about that decision.

Pearson was the case where the constitutional validity of the reverse onus bail provisions for drug charges were challenged. In explaining why these provisions were Charter compliant, the Court made comments about the unique characteristics of drug trafficking offences, including how lucrative and organized a business it is and how strong the incentive is to continue trafficking even for someone awaiting trial. The Crown emphasized those comments and urged me to take them to heart and to recognize, when considering whether Mr. Oake's detention is necessary for the protection of the public, the incentive he will have to continue trafficking in this drug, because it is a very lucrative business and also because of the fact that he is an addict. Many addicts who traffic, traffic to

support their habits, and if Mr. Oake is not able to address his addiction, the risk that he may traffic again, if released, to resume supporting his habit is high. I have taken this into account, but, as noted by defence, there are other aspects of the Pearson decision that must also be considered.

One of the arguments that was made in Pearson was that because of the very broad definition of the concept of trafficking in the Act, the effect of the reverse onus provisions on bail was too far reaching. The Supreme Court of Canada's answer to that argument was that for the "small fry", or people who traffic essentially by sharing drugs with their friends and supplying their friends, it would be easier to rebut the reverse onus and be granted release. That is discussed as page 698 of the decision.

The Supreme Court recognized in this context, as it should, that not all trafficking offences are the same and not all drug traffickers are in the same position vis-a-vis the criminal organizations that effectively run drug trafficking activities and profit from it.

The evidence adduced at this hearing is more consistent with Mr. Oake being an addict who trafficked primarily to support his habit as

opposed to being high up in an organized hierarchy of fentanyl distribution in Yellowknife. That is not to minimize the seriousness of what he is alleged to have done. But the allegations before me, taken at their highest, do not suggest, not at this stage at least, that he is a high level trafficker making considerable profit. There no evidence that score sheets were found, there is no evidence that large sums of money were found on him or at the house. His father was the one who put up that cash deposit to secure his release on the Alberta charges.

Of course there is always a concern where there is evidence suggesting that an accused may not be inclined to comply with release terms, and there is that kind of evidence before me. The case on the breach of curfew appears to be strong, and, as the Crown noted, the next series of substantive charges that also represented breaches of the release terms arose just a few days after Mr. Oake was arrested for the breach of curfew. At the same time, I must recognize the difference between the release plan that was in place on the Alberta charges and the one that is being proposed now. The Alberta recognizance did not involve sureties. Mr. Oake was not being

supervised by anyone. The plan proposed now is much stronger. There is always a question as to whether a young adult's parents can actually have any control over his behaviour. I have not lost sight of the fact that Mr. Oake was living with his father when the November events arose. And I have not lost sight of the fact that one could say that his mother was not as cooperative or aligned with what the police were trying to do as she could have been when they tried to execute the arrest warrant. But, she has explained what her point of view was and she has sworn before this court that she understands what her responsibilities as a surety would be. She has sworn that she knows now that it would be her obligation to report any breach of the release terms immediately if that should happen.

1

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Mr. Oake lived with his father at the time of the November incidents. But, again, the father had supplied the cash deposit for the Alberta charges but he was not a surety. And he, too, at this hearing, swore that he understands the responsibilities that come with this. I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of either of these people and I did not understand the Crown to actually be questioning their sincerity either.

I am also mindful that Mr. Oake's parents also have a powerful incentive, quite apart from financial consequences to them should there be breaches, to keep a close eye on their son. It could be said that at this point for Mr. Oake to address in a meaningful way his addiction could very well be a question of life and death. And I am confident that for a parent that is a powerful incentive to do everything that they can to make sure that he does comply with his release terms.

As I said already, bail always involves a risk assessment. Can I be certain today that if I release Mr. Oake he will not engage in illegal activities again? Can I be 100 percent certain of that? Absolutely not, but that is not what is required for him to meet his onus. I am satisfied that with two sureties, with strict conditions, with some of the random monitoring measures he is willing to subject himself to, and with the plan of accessing treatment for his addiction, the risk that his release presents from the point of view of public safety can be sufficiently mitigated to not make his detention necessary.

That leaves the tertiary ground. The question that I must ask myself on that ground is whether Mr. Oake's detention is necessary to

maintain public confidence in the administration of justice. That proves to be a challenging ground, I think, in any case that involves allegations of trafficking in this very dangerous drug.

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The Supreme Court of Canada in St-Cloud, [2015] 2 SCR 328, has provided some welcome guidance as to how the tertiary ground should be approached. The Criminal Code itself says that some factors must be considered. They include the apparent strength of the Crown's case, the gravity of the offence, the circumstances of the offence, including whether firearms were used, and the fact that the accused could face a lengthy jail term if convicted. To this the Supreme Court of Canada has added in St-Cloud, at paragraph 71, that the circumstances of the accused should be considered: age, whether there is a criminal record, any physical or mental condition that is relevant, whether the person is part of a criminal organization.

On this ground, the defence has fairly conceded that the Crown's case on the importation case is strong and that these are serious offences that would carry, in the event of conviction, lengthy sentences.

The Alberta charge on its face is also

serious, but it is more difficult for me to assess the strength of the Crown's case on that charge based on what is before me. At the hearing, the Crown noted that there has been a committal to stand trial, but, in my respectful view, that means very little given the very low threshold under our law for committal after a preliminary hearing. The allegations as I heard them were in some respects quite vaque. There are no details, for example, as to where the drugs were found in the vehicle. What I have is an allegation that there was a vehicle, three people in it, including Mr. Oake, and drugs found somewhere it. So the outcome of the application today and whether the onus and the tertiary ground can be met turns much more on the nature of the Yellowknife charges and their circumstances.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The Crown has understandably emphasized the very dangerous nature of the drug fentanyl. The Crown also emphasized, also understandably, that Mr. Oake was aware how dangerous it was because he had overdosed on it already and still he chose to provide it to someone else. And there appears to be strong evidence that he is the one who was bringing this drug into the community.

As I have said, the defence has acknowledged

all of this but points that the overall circumstances do not suggest this was done for greed but rather, was the desperate action of an addict feeding his habit.

In St-Cloud, the Supreme Court clarified which public must be considered when deciding whether an accused's release, and sometimes whether an accused's detention, would undermine confidence in the administration of justice.

Some of the key things include that that public is supposed to be someone who understands that accused persons are presumed innocent until proven guilty, have the right to reasonable bail, and that the right to bail is constitutionally protected for everyone in this country.

To be sure, there is considerable concern around drug trafficking in general and with respect to trafficking in fentanyl in particular. That concern is growing exponentially as the number of overdoses and death overdoses continue to rise across this country. That concern is well felt in this community as I have had occasion to mention in a few decisions where I sentenced people for trafficking in this drug. But that concern, real as it is, cannot overtake the entire analysis. If it did, no one charged with fentanyl trafficking would ever be released

on bail, no matter what the circumstances and no matter what release plan was presented. That is not an acceptable outcome under our law. Under our law, even people charged with very serious offences, even murder, are entitled to reasonable bail if their detention is not necessary for one of the three grounds listed in the Criminal Code. The detention has to be necessary, not just helpful or convenient.

This Court is very concerned about the public health risk associated with fentanyl and its trafficking, but after considerable thought I have concluded that the release plan that Mr. Oake has presented meets the concerns under the tertiary ground as well. I conclude that given the nature of the terms that he is prepared to agree to, given his parents' willingness to act as sureties, given that they, too, know that for him at this point getting treatment may be a question of life and death, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Oake has met his onus on the tertiary ground.

Mr. Oake, I hope you understand that you are walking a very fine line for the next while. Do not expect leniency if you are caught breaching any of your release terms, at least not from me. There will be cumbersome conditions, that you

have agreed to, that you outlined in your affidavit. They could be in force for a long time. But if you do not want to end up back in custody, you have to follow them, as hard as it may be. The main objective here is get you to treatment and, once you return from treatment, to have you remain sober.

The other case I was talking about, and you know about it, I am sure, was one where the person did go to treatment, came back and overdosed again. So it is a long road and I know you know that.

It is essentially going to be up to you, and
I hope that what happened in November has been
the last lesson you needed to actually do what
you need to do.

I will grant the application and release

Mr. Oake on a recognizance, and I followed for

the most part the conditions that were set out at

Exhibit "B" of Mr. Oake's affidavit. On the

recognizance there will be two surety. Mr. Dean

Oake will be the first surety and there will be a

requirement for \$1,000 cash deposit by him. Lori

Dashney will be the second surety. There will be

a \$1,000 amount pledged by her but without a cash

deposit. The other conditions are as follows,

and listen carefully to these, Mr. Oake: You are

1 to attend court as required. You are to reside at 4919 - 44th Street in Yellowknife. You are to comply with a curfew every day from 8 p.m. until 3 7 a.m. You are to come to the door of the 5 residence or answer the telephone if the police 6 or bail supervision authorities come to check on your curfew compliance. You are not to possess 8 or consume any drugs except in accordance with a 9 medical prescription. In order to enforce that term, I am going to include the three things that 10 11 are listed in the exhibit to your affidavit. I will not read it all out here, Madam Clerk, but 12 13 you can refer to the exhibit.

COURT CLERK: Certainly, Your Honour.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

THE COURT: Essentially, you are agreeing that you are to provide samples of your blood or urine, if needed, and you are waiving a lot of your confidentiality rights with respect to medical matters, and you are saying that you understand that checks can be done at random.

I am going to require you to report - this is cumbersome, but I feel it is important for all the reasons I have been talking about - Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays in person. The proposed conditions refer to "bail supervision authorities". Often reporting conditions are worded as "requirements to report to the RCMP".

```
1
                 Mr. Davison, has the situation changed or is
            that intended to mean the RCMP? The reporting
            conditions, it is worded "to bail supervision
 3
            authorities". I am more familiar with "report to
            the RCMP", but we do not deal with that many bail
 6
            matters in this court.
        MR. DAVISON:
                               I had put it that way because
 8
            there is a bail supervisor -- effectively,
 9
            they're probation officers that do the bail
            supervision duties as well. However, I'm going
10
11
            to guess that there is a duty probation office
12
            who's on call on weekends or holidays. But there
            wouldn't be anybody in the office. So --
13
14
        THE COURT:
                               I think we will make the
15
            reporting requirement to the RCMP.
16
        MR. DAVISON:
                               Thank you.
        THE COURT:
                               To the RCMP detachment because
17
18
            we know that they are always there.
19
                 The next condition is that if you obtain
20
            employment, you are to provide the full details
21
            of that employment to the RCMP in Yellowknife and
22
            to the bail supervision authorities, including
23
            who your employer is, where you are working, and
24
            what your schedule is going to be.
25
                 I did not ask this at the hearing,
            Mr. Praught, but it was contemplated that there
26
```

be a no-contact order. Are there specific

27

- individuals you would like listed?
- 2 MR. PRAUGHT: Yes, Your Honour.
- 3 Ms. Courtney Janes.
- 4 THE COURT: Yes.
- 5 MR. PRAUGHT: There are other witnesses,
- 6 potential witnesses, on the file we'd ask to
- 7 include as well. That would be Dwight Carpenter,
- 8 Samantha Janes, Barb Mezaros. Just if I may have
- 9 a moment?
- 10 THE COURT: Yes.
- 11 MR. DAVISON: If I can help out. I did see
- 12 a Lance Kristensen named in the file, and I think
- he's also somebody that is associated with the
- 14 Section 145 charges. I would submit that's a
- name that should be on the list, too, if my
- friend wasn't going to propose --
- 17 MR. PRAUGHT: I thank my friend for that,
- 18 yes. And the Alberta recognizance will still be
- in place.
- 20 THE COURT: Yes, and I know that file is
- 21 not before me. So maybe when we are done here, I
- 22 am just going to ask that you make sure the clerk
- has the correct spelling of those names.
- You recognize those names, Mr. Oake?
- 25 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
- 26 THE COURT: All right. So you are to have
- 27 no contact with any of them, directly or

```
1
            indirectly.
                 The next condition is that upon your release
            you will take immediate steps to complete the
 3
            application process to be admitted to the
 5
            Edgewood treatment program.
 6
                 The next condition -- here again, Madam
            Clerk, I am using essentially what was paragraph
            10 of the exhibit to Mr. Oake's affidavit.
 8
 9
        THE COURT CLERK:
                               Certainly, Your Honour.
10
        THE COURT:
                               It is a series of conditions
11
            that will apply if you are accepted into the
12
            treatment program. The idea there is that you
            will have to make sure the RCMP and the bail
13
            supervision authorities here know when you are
14
15
            going and when you come back so that they know
16
            where you are. Your lawyer prepared this, so I
            think you are familiar with it, but the
17
            conditions include: to provide your bail
18
19
            supervisor with full details and provide your
            written consent to allow the persons assisting
20
            you in accessing the treatment program to provide
21
22
            ongoing details about your program and your
23
            progress; provide the Yellowknife RCMP with the
24
            details of your travel itinerary to and from the
25
            treatment program, including when you will be
```

travelling, the route, and your expected arrival.

You are to report in person to the local police

26

27

department or the closest RCMP detachment upon your arrival at the treatment program in question and provide them with a copy of your release documents.

Once you return to Yellowknife, the reporting conditions that I have already talked about will resume. You are to travel as directly as possible both to and from the treatment program in the company of your surety, Lori Dashney. This is not in what Mr. Davison had listed, but I think it is crucial that someone be with you. For the travel, I mean.

There is another paragraph that refers to the requirement if you have to overnight on your way to the treatment program: to advise the Yellowknife RCMP of the details of where you are staying and to continue to obey all the terms of your release.

The last subparagraph confirms, and I want this to be very clear to you, that all the other conditions, including the monitoring conditions, continue to apply whether you are in Yellowknife or at the treatment program. The only conditions that will not apply will be the residency requirement, obviously, because you will not be at home, and the reporting to the RCMP in Yellowknife requirement because you cannot do

```
that if you are not here. But whoever the police
 1
            force is in the location you will be will be
            authorized to monitor your compliance with the
 3
            other conditions exactly the same way as the
 5
            police here are.
 6
                 The next condition -- you understand?
        THE ACCUSED:
                               Yeah.
        THE COURT:
 8
                               The next condition is you will
 9
            remain in regular contact with your counsel and
            you will keep yourself informed of all court
10
11
            appearance dates scheduled for your case.
12
                 I forgot to ask this at the time of the
            hearing, but do you have a passport?
13
14
        THE ACCUSED:
                               I think it's expired.
15
        THE COURT:
                               All right. Well, if -- I am
16
            going to ask you to surrender your passport to
            the RCMP even if it is expired.
17
18
        THE ACCUSED:
                               Okay.
19
        THE COURT:
                               I doubt these days you would
            get very far with an expired passport --
20
        THE ACCUSED:
21
                               Yeah.
```

-- but surrender it.

I am also -- this is not going to come up

for some time, but I am going to include a

the custody of the North Slave Correctional

condition that you are to surrender yourself to

Centre, I think would be the logical place, no

THE COURT:

22

23

24

25

26

27

```
1 later than 72 hours before the date scheduled for
```

- 2 the start of your trial. The proceedings in
- 3 Territorial Court are another matter. I am just
- 4 talking about trial here. When we get to the
- 5 point of the trial in this court (we do not know
- 6 when that will be but at some point you will
- 7 know), 72 hours before that, at the latest, you
- 8 have to surrender yourself in custody.
- 9 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
- 10 THE COURT: Do you understand all that?
- 11 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
- 12 THE COURT: Is there anything that I have
- overlooked, Mr. Praught?
- 14 MR. PRAUGHT: Your Honour, I think a weapons
- 15 -- firearm condition is mandatory pursuant to
- 16 515(4.1) given that Mr. Oake is charged with a
- 17 Section 5 and Section 6 CDSA offence.
- 18 THE COURT: Do you agree, Mr. Davison?
- 19 MR. DAVISON: I think I do. If I can just
- 20 check?
- 21 THE COURT: Yes, yes.
- 22 MR. DAVISON: I hadn't thought about this,
- 23 but I think my friend is right.
- Yes, I do agree.
- 25 THE COURT: So that mandatory condition.
- And the reference, Madam Clerk, do you have it?
- 27 COURT CLERK: Section 515, Your Honour?

- 1 MR. PRAUGHT: Sub (4.1) sub (c).
- 2 THE COURT: (4.1)(c). Section 515 is a
- 3 long section. Anything else Mr. Praught that I
- 4 might have overlooked?
- 5 MR. PRAUGHT: No.
- 6 THE COURT: Anything not clear,
- 7 Mr. Davison?
- 8 MR. DAVISON: No. But if I might check one
- 9 point with his mother?
- 10 THE COURT: Yes.
- 11 MR. DAVISON: I was just checking about the
- 12 passport. Mr. Oake thinks it was at his
- mother's. His mother thinks it may have been
- 14 disposed of given it was expired. I wonder if we
- 15 could simply say surrender it by 4:30 tomorrow
- 16 afternoon?
- 17 THE COURT: If it, if it --
- 18 MR. DAVISON: Or confirm that --
- 19 THE COURT: Or confirm that there isn't
- one.
- 21 MR. DAVISON: Yes. That they can't find
- one, yes.
- 23 THE COURT: All right. So one or the
- other. Surrender or confirm that there isn't
- 25 one.
- 26 MR. DAVISON: And I am just thinking here.
- 27 Often that clause comes with an obligation or

```
1 prohibition against applying for any further
```

- 2 passport or further travel documents if that's of
- 3 concern to the Court.
- 4 THE COURT: Actually, now that you say
- 5 that, I will include a condition that aside from
- 6 the requirements of treatment, he is not to leave
- 7 the Northwest Territories. And also I think it
- is a good idea as a subset of the passport
- 9 condition that he is not to apply for a passport.
- 10 That is clear enough, I think.
- 11 MR. DAVISON: Now, in terms of not leaving
- 12 the Northwest Territories, of course the
- 13 treatment program is in British Columbia. So --
- 14 THE COURT: Yes, I said except for the
- purposes of attending treatment.
- 16 MR. DAVISON: Oh, I see. Okay. I'm sorry,
- 17 I didn't hear that.
- 18 THE COURT: Now, I think I made reference
- specifically to Edgewood in some of these
- 20 conditions. That is the treatment program that
- is being applied for, correct?
- 22 MR. DAVISON: It is. Now, I don't know if
- -- for example, if they say they're full, I don't
- 24 know if the authorities here will have another
- 25 alternative to offer. But that is the program
- 26 that we had in mind and referred to in the
- 27 affidavit, that we've had in contemplation

```
1 throughout.
```

2	THE	COURT: Well, I think that what I will
3		say is if that does not work out for some reason,
4		then presumably a written application for consent
5		amendment to include whatever other treatment
6		program could be submitted. I am deliberately
7		not leaving it very vague because if it was going
8		to be somewhere else, I would want the
9		arrangements to have been made, confirmed, and
10		that the Crown have an opportunity to make sure
11		that it is a known program. And I hesitate to
12		say legitimate, but there are all sorts of
13		programs that could justify leaving the
14		territories and that is not my intention.
15	MR.	DAVISON: No, I understand that.
15 16		DAVISON: No, I understand that. COURT: Now, the other thing,
16		COURT: Now, the other thing,
16 17		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an
16 17 18		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on
16 17 18 19		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on the endorsement its says "removal order by
16 17 18 19 20		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on the endorsement its says "removal order by video". I do not know how long it will take to
16 17 18 19 20 21		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on the endorsement its says "removal order by video". I do not know how long it will take to perfect this recognizance. The clerk has some
16 17 18 19 20 21 22		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on the endorsement its says "removal order by video". I do not know how long it will take to perfect this recognizance. The clerk has some work to do and I will have to review it and then
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on the endorsement its says "removal order by video". I do not know how long it will take to perfect this recognizance. The clerk has some work to do and I will have to review it and then there is the issue of the money deposit. So
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		COURT: Now, the other thing, logistically I don't know. There is an appearance tomorrow in Territorial Court and on the endorsement its says "removal order by video". I do not know how long it will take to perfect this recognizance. The clerk has some work to do and I will have to review it and then there is the issue of the money deposit. So there is nothing I can do about the Territorial

1		they will need it	tomorrow morning at 9:30.		
2	COU	RT CLERK:	Yes, Your Honour.		
3	THE	COURT:	And for the rest, if		
4		everything happen	as and you happen to be out of		
5		custody by tomorr	row morning by 9:30, then you		
6		have to be next of	door.		
7	THE	ACCUSED:	Okay.		
8	THE	COURT:	I am not sure how long this		
9		would take, but i	t is already 2:30 and it may be		
10		some time.			
11	MR.	DAVISON:	Understandable, yes.		
12	THE	COURT:	Anything else?		
13	MR.	PRAUGHT:	No, Your Honour.		
14	THE	COURT:	Thank you, counsel.		
15	MR.	DAVISON:	Thank you, Your Honour.		
16					
17					
18					
19					
20	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court				
21		01	the hards of doubt		
22					
23			ne Romanowich, CSR(A) art Reporter		
24			are noportor		
25					
26					
27					