# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

# IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

### NORMA MARY MITCHELL

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice K. M. Shaner, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 20th day of June, 2019.

# APPEARANCES:

Counsel for the Crown Mr. J. Potter:

Mr. J. S. Cowan: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 268 of the Criminal Code)

THE COURT: Good morning, Counsel. Again,

Ms. Mitchell.

I will start by saying that sentencing is an individualized process. So that means that every person who comes before the Court has different circumstances, and those circumstances have to be taken into account. It is also probably the most difficult job that a judge has because it means that, in most cases, we are required to take away someone's liberty, something that is very dear to us in Canada. It is particularly difficult when it is clear that the crime before the Court represents somebody hitting rock bottom, or near rock bottom, and that as a result of that they have taken positive steps to improve their life and improve their circumstances; but, unfortunately, an incarceratory sentence can sometimes mean that those steps are difficult to maintain or that momentum is interrupted.

I also feel it is necessary to acknowledge that on sentencing it is very important that both the Crown and defence provide meaningful, justified and well-thought-out submissions on sentence. This case exemplifies, in my mind, what ought to be before the Court and the thoughtfulness that should go into submissions made to the Court when sentence is being

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

considered. I want to thank counsel for
providing a very thoughtful proposal, both of
you, with respect to what is in the best
interests of Ms. Mitchell and what is in the best
interests of society.

With that, I will turn to my reasons and my decision.

We are here because Norma Mitchell was convicted of aggravated assault following a jury trial. In summary, the facts are that Mitchell, the victim, and a third person were drinking alcohol at the victim's apartment. Ms. Mitchell and the victim were in an intimate-partner relationship. The victim and the third person were sitting on the couch. Ms. Mitchell thought that the victim was touching the third person in a sexual manner. She became angry or "triggered". She picked up a knife, and she stabbed the victim in the leg. She and the other person then left the apartment. The stab wound was a serious one, and the victim lost a great deal of blood. Fortunately, he managed to call the police for help before becoming unconscious. A number of transfusions were necessary to save his life.

Aggravated assault carries a maximum penalty of 14 years, and it falls into the definition of

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

a "serious personal injury offence". Therefore, a conditional sentence order is not available. The only options are prison, probation or a combination of those two. In this case, Crown and defence counsel are recommending a period of prison and probation. Where they disagree is on the length of the custodial portion of the sentence.

The Criminal Code sets out principles of sentencing that provide a framework to guide judges in imposing an appropriate sentence. The fundamental purpose of sentencing is set out in s. 718:

"...to contribute, along with crime prevention initiatives, to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by imposing just sanctions that have one or more of the following objectives...".

Those objectives are to denounce unlawful conduct; to deter the offender and others from committing offences; to separate offenders from society only where necessary; to assist in rehabilitating offenders; to provide reparations for harm done to victims or to the community; and to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders and acknowledgement of the harm done to the victims and the community. The emphasis that is to be placed on any one of these objectives

2.2

varies with the circumstances of the offence, the nature of the offence and the circumstances of the offender.

Proportionality is the overarching principle in sentencing, and that is that a sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender. In other words, the moral blameworthiness of the offender. Section 718.2 also sets out a number of other principles, key among which in this case is that all available sanctions other than imprisonment that are reasonable in the circumstances should be considered for all offenders with particular attention to be paid to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.

As the Crown pointed out, and I am sure as defence counsel concedes, this is a very serious offence. Stabbing another person, even if it is done in a highly-charged emotional situation, is at the higher end of the continuum of culpability and blameworthiness. The results for the victim in this case could have been far more serious. I think it is fair to say he could have died, and it is a matter of luck more than anything that he did not. There had been no previous altercations nor arguments between Ms. Mitchell and the victim on the night this happened, and it appears that

the attack was completely unexpected and unanticipated by the victim. Ms. Mitchell may well have been very angry at what she thought she saw, and it is acknowledged that she was in an unhealthy, toxic and sometimes violent relationship with the victim, but these are not mitigating circumstances. In fact, as the Crown pointed out, the fact that Ms. Mitchell was in an intimate-partner relationship with the victim is, by statute, an aggravating factor.

Ms. Mitchell has a criminal record, and that is typically an aggravating factor, but in this case the record is dated, and other than convictions for breaching her release conditions, neither of which were crimes of violence, there have been no entries for over ten years. The Crown quite fairly submitted, and I accept, that Ms. Mitchell's criminal record is not a particularly aggravating factor in this case.

Our law recognizes that there are systemic and historical factors that have put Indigenous people in Canada into circumstances that have greatly increased the probability of coming into conflict with the law. Consequently, there is significant overrepresentation of Indigenous people in our correctional facilities and in our justice system in general. Through the

Presentence Report and defence counsel's submissions I learned about Norma's personal circumstances including her upbringing. She was a victim of the intergenerational trauma that came from the Residential School system. addition to being a survivor of that system herself, her relationship with her parents lacked displays of love and affection so important in the development of a healthy child. struggled in school, and she had a number of toxic, violent relationships with intimate partners. She has struggled with drug and alcohol addiction. Her life has been very hard which is, I acknowledge, an understatement. have no doubt that her experiences have contributed to her being here today. In my view her experience in life diminishes somewhat her moral blameworthiness for this crime.

Despite the hardships in her life, there are some very, very positive things about

Ms. Mitchell, which I find mitigating. Since this incident occurred in December of 2016, Norma has taken concrete steps to change her life. She has attended treatment for addiction. She has actively participated in counselling. She attends AA meetings. She plans to upgrade her education, and through both her words and her

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 conduct it is clear she has accepted
2 responsibility for what happened here. She
3 recognizes that her actions were wrong.

Unfortunately, as I said earlier, this is not a crime for which sanctions other than imprisonment are realistically available. That is just what the law is and what Parliament has dictated, and I am bound to follow that. This is a serious offence, and the circumstances of this offence, in particular, are serious.

The Crown seeks a term of 34 months in custody, less credit of 304 days (which is approximately ten months) to be followed by two years of probation. The Crown submits that this would allow Ms. Mitchell to serve the custodial portion of her sentence here in the Northwest Territories, and that it strikes a balance between the need for deterrence and the need for rehabilitation. It also recognizes the Gladue and Ipeelee factors at play as well as the positive changes and steps that Ms. Mitchell has made in her life since December of 2016.

Defence counsel agrees with the probation but suggests that a term of 24 months in prison, less the 304 days of presentence credit, is more appropriate.

The case law is that the appropriate range

of sentence is 30 months to five years for this offence, although there are cases where less time in custody has been imposed.

While I am not convinced that what is suggested by defence counsel is adequate for the custodial portion given the objectives of sentencing and the principles, I do feel that a shorter period of custody than what is suggested by the Crown is sufficient in the circumstances. It is, among other things, incumbent on me to exercise restraint in sentencing, and so the term of custody that I impose must be no more than is necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of sentencing.

For that reason and in consideration of the seriousness of this offence, but also the mitigating factors and the activating factors, I am going to impose a custodial sentence of 30 months. From this, credit for presentence custody of 304 days, which is approximately ten months, will be deducted. This will be followed by a term of probation.

Norma, can you please stand up. Norma

Mitchell, this is difficult for me to do, but I

sentence you to a term of imprisonment of

30 months less ten months and one day, for a net
sentence of 20 months. This will be followed by

- 1 a term of probation of two years. Do you
- 2 understand?
- 3 THE ACCUSED: Yes.
- 4 THE COURT: Okay. You can sit down. I am
- 5 just going to go over the probation.
- The terms of the probation order, in
- 7 addition to the statutory conditions, which your
- 8 lawyer and the clerk can explain to you, are
- 9 these: You will report to a probation officer
- 10 within seven days of being released and then
- after that as the probation officer directs.
- 12 You are to have no contact with the victim,
- Mr. Betsina, nor attend his place of work or his
- 14 residence without written permission from your
- probation officer. You will attend counselling,
- 16 therapy or rehabilitation programs as directed by
- 17 your probation officer. In addition, I will
- grant the ancillary orders, so there will be an
- 19 order for a DNA sample to be taken, that is
- 20 mandatory, and there will be a firearms
- 21 prohibition pursuant to Section 109 that is in
- 22 effect for ten years.
- Counsel, do you have any other issues that I
- need to address?
- MR. POTTER: No, Your Honour, not from me.
- 26 MR. COWAN: Thank you, Your Honour.
- Nothing further.

1	THE COURT: Nothing further? All right.
2	Norma, when I said earlier that I am very
3	impressed with the steps you have taken, I really
4	mean that. I think that you still have a very
5	bright future and many years ahead of you, and I
6	hope that you continue along this path, and I
7	wish you all the best.
8	THE ACCUSED: Thanks.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, Crown and defence.
10	MR. POTTER: Thank you.
11	
12	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
13	
14	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
15	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
16	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
17	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes
18	to the best of my skill and ability.
19	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
20	Alberta, this 21st day of June, 2019.
21	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
22	of the Rules of Court
23	
24	a Thoman
25	
26	Darlene Sirman, CSR(A)
27	Court Reporter