## R v Kuptana, 2019 NWTSC 4

#### AMENDED ORIGINAL

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

#### MATTHEW JAMES KUPTANA

Original amended as of October 25, 2018 to:

Cover page: Appearances: <u>Mr. E. McIntyre</u> Counsel for the Accused

Transcript of the Decision held before The
Honourable Justice A.M. Mahar, sitting in Inuvik, in the
Northwest Territories, on the 25th day of May, 2018.

## **APPEARANCES:**

Mr. J. Potter: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. E. McIntyre: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 271 of the Criminal Code)

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

1	THE	COURT: Good morning everybody. I
2		have come to a decision. I will reserve the
3		option of substantially editing my reasons
4		because I haven't written them out. I simply
5		wanted to get this done in the most efficient way
6		possible. I may not substantially edit it, it
7		depends how it comes out, what the issues are.
8		First, looking at the procedural history in
9		this matter: It is a bit complicated because Mr.
10		Kuptana was facing two charges, not one.
11		Back in April of 2015, he was charged with
12		one sexual assault and was released. He was then
13		charged in September of that year with this
14		offense, and he was taken into custody.
15		In October of 2015, then represented by
16		Michael Martin, he waived his preliminary
17		inquiries and he elected to be tried by judge
18		alone in the Supreme Court on both charges.
19		On December the 14th, 2015, he entered
20		guilty pleas to both charges. On April 13th,
21		2016, Mr. Martin made an application to be

guilty pleas to both charges. On April 13th, 2016, Mr. Martin made an application to be removed from the record, and I am assuming that at that point in time it became clear that Mr. Kuptana was considering changing his plea.

Mr. Bran took over the file, and on May the 2nd, he indicated that Mr. Kuptana wanted to change his plea. I am not exactly sure why an

application was not brought at that point in time with respect to both matters. It seems fairly clear that Mr. Kuptana's intention was to withdraw his plea with respect to both of the charges.

A decision was made by Justice Smallwood in August of 2016 rejecting the application to strike the plea because Mr. Kuptana was properly advised at the time of his guilty pleas, understood what he was pleading guilty to and entered the plea fully aware of what the consequences might be and fully aware of his rights.

Mr. McIntyre today does not ask the Court to revisit that issue. I spoke earlier this week about the fact that it would seem redundant to have brought a separate application to strike the plea in this case because those issues were fully canvassed by Justice Smallwood. As Mr. McIntyre quite candidly agreed, those aspects of the case were made out and it would be improper to strike the plea under those circumstances.

So here we are in what is essentially a Gardiner Hearing on the issue of facts required to prove the necessary elements of the offence, which is an unusual circumstance. There is a paucity of case law to assist me.

We are all agreed that the Crown must prove the issue beyond a reasonable doubt.

As Justice Charbonneau said in an earlier decision, it would be difficult to imagine that the Crown would face a lesser burden with respect to a fact on an essential element of the offence as opposed to a fact in aggravation, and the case law is quite clear that facts in aggravation have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. Potter is in an unfortunate situation this week because a case that would otherwise perhaps have been quite a strong case was hamstrung by his inability to get the witness here for this hearing, and he has had to rely on an unsworn statement that was simply audiotaped on the morning of the events in question.

The statement was taken at 8:30 in the morning by a Constable Sharpe. The alleged event occurred between five and seven in the morning and the complainant admitted in her statement that she had consumed approximately 12 drinks on the night in question.

I do not have any external information about the statement. It was not videotaped and not sworn, but that is not particularly surprising in the context of a witness who is being interviewed at the health centre shortly after an incident

1 when she has been consuming alcohol.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

2.6

27

I do not know why a further statement was not taken. I do not want to speculate beyond simply suggesting a possibility: The officer may not have wanted to take the full statement until he was satisfied that the complainant was sober. One of the things that troubled me about statement was the complainant's reference to Mr. Kuptana as her uncle and herself Mr. Kuptana's daughter's cousin, and yet she does not know his last name, and she does not where he is from. I do not take that as indication of untruthfulness, but it does connect with the defence suggestion that I should not be totally convinced of the sobriety of the witness at the time that she gave the statement. statement is not just a key piece of evidence. It is the only piece of evidence that I have on which to base a conviction.

I am again thankful to counsel for suggesting a limited scope in terms of what the remedies are in this case, and I do not believe there is any value in me deciding what remedies could be available in a different sort of case. Hopefully we do not find ourselves in this situation very often. What could and should happen in the event that the Crown is able to

mount a full case in a hearing like this I will leave for another judge at another time to decide.

In this case, both counsel and I agree that an appropriate remedy, if I find that the Crown has not proven the case beyond a reasonable doubt or proven this fact, would be to strike the plea and order the matter set for trial.

Mr. Kuptana chose to testify on his own behalf. This is a sentencing hearing, it is not a trial. The usual procedural safeguards with respect to a trial are not entirely in place.

I have allowed the Crown to rely on hearsay evidence in the form of a statement, and I have accepted that it has threshold reliability for the purpose of this hearing. In that sense it is very fortunate for Mr. Kuptana that he did decide to testify because that threshold reliability is difficult to argue against in the absence of any evidence to the contrary.

I will look first at Mr. Kuptana's testimony. Mr. Kuptana says that on the night in question around 6 o'clock, 6:30 in the evening he went out to get some alcohol from the liquor store. He bumped into the complainant who he was not expecting to see, but she was also picked up by the same cab at the North Mart. They went to

the liquor store. She ended up going wherever she went, and he picked up a flat of 15 beers and went home with it.

He went home to watch bingo with his family. His common-law spouse was there, his daughter, his daughter's friend Salome, and at some point the complainant showed up, also to watch bingo. Mr. Kuptana was not entirely clear about what transpired during that evening. This is not surprising given the passage of time and how unremarkable the events would have been; watching bingo with his family and his family's friends.

He knew the complainant as the friend of his daughter. They were clearly fairly close friends. The complainant came back at some point during the night. He remembers hearing the bell because everybody else had basically gone to bed, and he heard the bell because the bell is very close to where he was sitting with headphones on listening to YouTube videos of music. He let the complainant in and he did recall that earlier in the evening when they were out in the car, the complainant had talked about being upset with her common-law spouse because he had cheated on her.

He believes that the complainant came to his house between 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning.

She immediately went up to bed in his daughter's

2.2

2.4

room and presumably fell asleep or passed out.

Mr. Kuptana says that he continued watching videos, and sometime between five and seven in the morning, he stopped watching videos and went upstairs and decided to see if the complainant would like to have sex with him. He went into the room, shook her awake, and asked her if she wanted to have sex. She said yes. They proceeded to have sex. His common-law spouse came into the room, started yelling, and that is when the complainant woke up.

The complainant provided a statement, as I have indicated. It was a short statement, ten minutes long or so. She basically agreed with what the accused said about most of the night in question. It was a bit unclear about how exactly she ended up over at Mr. Kuptana's house again. She said she had locked herself out of her place, could not find her keys, went back to his place and went in. She said the first thing that she became aware of was Mr. Kuptana on top of her having sex with her when she was woken up by yelling from Mr. Kuptana's common-law spouse.

She said that she fell asleep in the same bed as the accused's daughter Sandy and that when she woke up, she was on the other bed with her pants removed with Mr. Kuptana having sex with

2.3

1 her.

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

27

With respect to Mr. Kuptana's evidence, it 2 3 is significantly impacted by the guilty plea. The quilty plea in itself is not evidence and its 4 5 impact is somewhat limited by the fact that he did not admit the facts at that point in time. 6 However, it is a clear indication that he 7 8 intended to admit the necessary facts to ground 9 the offence and to that extent casts a pall on It is definitely something that 10 his evidence. 11 the Court should and does take into account when 12 assessing his credibility.

The story that he tells is not particularly believable. His testimony was, while not great, not terrible.

The main issue that I had with it is the idea that some three or four hours would go by between the time that the quite intoxicated complainant went upstairs to go to bed and the time that Mr. Kuptana would decide to go upstairs and see if she wanted to have sex.

It does not strike me as hard to believe in terms of his intentions, but it does strike me as hard to believe in terms of the common sense understanding of what would be likely to occur with somebody who has been heavily drinking, passes out, falls asleep and is woken up a few

hours later, presumably out of a dead sleep, and asked to have sex. I do not find the narrative otherwise incredible. I do not find it particularly believable, but I do not find it incredible. I find that particular aspect of it causes me some significant concern.

Meshing that with the fact of the earlier guilty plea, I can clearly say that I do not believe Mr. Kuptana, and I do not accept most of his evidence.

The next part of the analysis is does his evidence raise a reasonable doubt in the context of the evidence as a whole. I have to look at the rest of the case before I completely reject Mr. Kuptana's testimony.

The fact that Mr. Kuptana decided to testify is important in so far as it at least establishes that he denies these events in terms of the lack of consent, and that denial is an important consideration when I look at the strength of the Crown's case, which is based entirely on a very limited statement.

There are a number of aspects of that limited statement that would have benefitted from viva voce testimony and the ability of the defence to cross-examine the witness.

We touched on some of these yesterday during

1.3

submissions and comments on submissions. One of these aspects is the way in which this incident was discovered. I found it somewhat concerning that the complainant would be able to stay unconscious when she was presumably moved from one bed to another, would be able to stay unconscious while her clothes were being removed, able to stay unconscious while sex was initiated but somehow is woken up by simply somebody yelling. I am open to believing that, but in the absence of the evidence being tested under cross-examination and in the absence of an ability to see the witness testify and to see how she testified about it, I find those issues somewhat troubling. I am not suggesting that it indicates a lack of truthfulness, it is just an issue that I would like to have heard more fully fleshed out.

Another aspect that I would have wanted more evidence about was her level of sobriety at the time when she gave the statement. I am being asked to rely on this statement to ground a conviction for a very serious offence. Although it does cover all of the necessary elements of the offence, I do not have any evidence from the police officer who took it to indicate the complainant's level of sobriety.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

26

I agree with the Crown's comments that she sounded sober, at least from what I could tell from the audio statement. She did sound sober, but that is of limited value. She was also very quiet. She was responding slowly to the questions. She clearly was not highly intoxicated at that point in time, but as indicated earlier, I was troubled by her reference to Mr. Kuptana as her uncle because it is an unnecessary mistake, and it does not appear to be borne out from either Mr. Kuptana's evidence nor in her later assertion that she does not know what his last name is or where he is from. That does not lead me to believe that she is intentionally misleading the Court or anything like that, but it does cause me to question her level of certainty.

One of the more critical aspects that I would have wanted to hear evidence about was one that Mr. McIntyre raised, which is the possibility that events can happen when someone has no memory that are not necessarily occurring when somebody is either unconscious or asleep.

I'm not suggesting that there is anything in the complainant's statement that would indicate that, but in an event like this where somebody is coming to consciousness and where there are

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

questions about how other events took place
without waking her up, it is at least a line of
questioning the Court would have wanted to hear
before coming to a firm conclusion about the
reliability of that aspect of the complainant's
testimony.

With all of that said, I do have a reasonable doubt with respect to the issue of consent on the basis of the evidence before me. That is not to indicate that there is anything about the statement that in and of itself would cause me to reject the evidence of the complainant, but I simply would have needed to hear more in order to be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt.

So on that basis, the application to strike
the plea is granted, and the matter is set over
for trial.

19 MR. MCINTYRE: Thank you, Sir.

20 THE COURT: And, gentlemen, what I would 21 suggest is that you -- well, obviously you're 22 going to talk about what needs to happen at this point in time, but if you are anticipating 23 24 another trial taking place, you can provide your 25 dates to Court Services, and I'm sure Justice Charbonneau will take it from there in terms of 26 27 setting the dates.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1	MR.	MCINTYRE: Certainly. One issue my
2		friend and I discussed leading up to this
3		possibility was Justice Smallwood obviously made
4		the decision on the plea and has already, I
5		think, considered herself disqualified.
6		Justice Charbonneau, of course, heard the other
7		matter in its entirety, thus she would be
8		disqualified. Having heard what you've heard on
9		this hearing, I mean it is up to Your Honour, of
10		course, but my friend and I thought that it might
11		be best if you were disqualified as well. That
12		leaves us with exactly one quarter of the Supreme
13		Court bench.
14		Now Justice Shaner took the original plea
15		but no evidence was heard, and it was a long time
16		ago. Now it would, of course, be up to her
17		whether she felt she was conflicted or not, but
18		that should be an issue that should be flagged
19		when scheduling this thing, either a Deputy has
20		to come up or it should be Justice Shaner.
21	THE	COURT: Well, you have a number of
22		deputies, and you are right, I suppose it
23		shouldn't be me. I would probably be prepared to
24		do it given that I made limited findings with
25		respect to the evidence that is in front of me,
26		but there's probably no need to push that
27		envelope if I do not have to. So I will let I

- 1 will write an e-mail suggesting that we take some
- 2 steps to find a different judge to do it.
- 3 MR. POTTER: Thank you.
- 4 THE COURT: Is there anything else?
- 5 MR. MCINTYRE: Well, . yes. So there is the
- 6 issue of bail. Now I have never checked the
- file. Mr. Kuptana's testimony is that he was
- 8 denied bail, but as you've set out, there's a
- 9 long procedural history. In any event, whatever
- 10 his bail status is right now I understand that my
- 11 friend is in a position to consent to reopen
- bail, and we've negotiated some terms here.
- 13 THE COURT: All right. So this is on
- 14 consent?
- 15 MR. POTTER: That is right, Your Honour.
- 16 THE COURT: What do you suggest, Mr.
- 17 Potter?
- 18 MR. POTTER: Actually, I'll let my friend
- 19 put to you the conditions because he's prepared
- 20 them so...
- 21 MR. MCINTYRE: Yes. I prepared some
- 22 conditions, and I meant to print them off for
- 23 Madam Clerk here to assist her but I will show
- I couldn't get the printer to work in the
- business centre here, so the bail we're proposing
- is a \$500 no cash surety. That surety is a woman
- 27 named Justine Okheena O-K-H-E-E-N-A. She is the

- common-law spouse of Mr. Kuptana's brother Joseph
  Kuptana. They live in Ulukhaktok. That is where
  he will be residing once he can get the funds
  together to get from Inuvikto Ulukhaktok. They
  have to raise money for a ticket.
- I have also secured an interim residence 6 here in Inuvik, while I understand it costs about 7 \$700 to get that ticket, and the family is 8 9 working on that, and that is actually with Ms. 10 Barb Malogana (phonetic). I have talked to her. 11 She is willing to let Mr. Kuptana stay with her 12 on a temporary basis until that ticket is 13 purchased. So the first condition would be 14 reside at Unit Number 6, 170 McKenzie Road in 15 Inuvik.
- 16 THE COURT: Do you have -- you have all of this written out?
- 18 MR. MCINTYRE: I do. I'm not sure, some 19 judges like me to read it in.
- 20 THE COURT: I am going to ask you to read
  21 it in, but in terms of how we are going to go
  22 about preparing the order -- I will let you read
  23 it all in. You can assume if the Crown is
  24 agreeable to this I am assuming -- you can assume
  25 that I will be as well. So read it in for the
- 27 MR. MCINTYRE: Yes, we'll have to figure that

record.

1		out in terms of getting the order together. The
2		other concern is if the surety does not call in
3		today, he may be transported back to Yellowknife
4		and then back to Inuvik where he will be released
5		because Court Services will release him from his
6		point of arrest is my understanding here so
7	THE	COURT: Perhaps I can help with some
8		direction on that.
9	MR.	MCINTYRE: Hopefully we can figure that
10		out.
11	THE	COURT: So carry on with the terms of
12		the order.
13	MR.	MCINTYRE: So I left off upon release
14		reside at Unit Number 6, 170 McKenzie Road Inuvik
15		until such time as you have made arrangements to
16		travel to Ulukhaktok, Northwest Territories.
17		While you are in Inuvik, report to the RCMP
18		detachment in person within 27 hours of release
19		between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. and thereafter as
20		directed by the RCMP here. Once you have moved
21		to Ulukhaktok, you will reside at Unit 58 PO Box
22		114 Ulukhaktok. I understand there's no street
23		names there. Report in person to the Ulukhaktok
24		RCMP detachment within 72 hours of your arrival
25		between 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., thereafter as
26		directed by the RCMP. No contact or
27		communication, direct or indirect, with Chantel

1		Kodlak aka Chantel Ninjlak (phonetic). Do not
2		use, possess or consume alcohol or other
3		intoxicating substances and provide a copy of a
4		confirmed itinerary returning to Inuvik within
5		three weeks of the trial date to the Ulukhaktok
6		RCMP. That last condition because of the
7		financial concerns with getting here. We don't
8		want another trial date to be set and have him
9		to have difficulties, so that would at least
10		provide the Crown with some assurance that this
11		ticket will be provided and we'll know that he'll
12		be able to attend for that trial when it happens.
13	THE	COURT: What is his release status on
14		the other matter?
15	MR.	MCINTYRE: My understanding is he was
16		sentenced this is coming from him, I haven't
17		checked with sentence administration North
18		Slave is that he has served that sentence
19		finished serving it approximately two months ago
20		was my understanding was his release date here.
21		March is what he is saying is when he finished
22		his warrant on that.
23	THE	COURT: All right.
24	MR.	MCINTYRE: So my understanding is this is
25		the only thing holding him in custody right now.
26	THE	COURT: Well, I'm sure the RCMP and
27		Corrections will look into that and we'll all be

satisfied. What do you suggest we do in terms of 1 2 the order. So we don't have the means 3 MR. MCINTYRE: 4 to --5 THE COURT CLERK: I can go to the courthouse and type it and up and fax it to Ulukhaktok and then 6 7 I guess it would be up to the RCMP once it is signed. Usually it is once we have the signed 8 9 copy, then he's released, but I'm getting on a 10 plane. THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't we do this, 11 12 why don't we break court and then we can have a 13 candid conversation about how we are going to 14 make this happen. I do not think there is any reason for us to do it on the record. 15 I'll just say before we rise 16 MR. POTTER: 17 that the Crown consents to this release as discussed by my friend assuming, of course, the 18 19 warrant has completed on his sentence that he's 20 served. Obviously this will be subject to that 21 warrant in any event. 22 MR. MCINTYRE: I would hope they wouldn't 23 release him if there's still a warrant of 24 committal. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, gentlemen, 26 we'll break court.

1	
2	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
3	
4	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
6	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
7	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes
8	to the best of my skill and ability.
9	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
10	Alberta, this 6th day of June, 2018.
11	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
12	of the Rules of Court
13	
14	ce es
15	
16	
17	Colleen Rea
18	Court Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	