IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

LUQMAN HUSSEIN

Transcript of the Sentencing Hearing held before The Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 15th day of May, 2019.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. D. Praught: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. P. Harte: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 465(1) of the *Criminal Code*, 5(1) of the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*)

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

THE COURT: Luqman Hussein has pleaded quilty to a charge of trafficking crack cocaine in Yellowknife between February 24, 2016 and April 4, 2016. The facts he admitted to are set out in an Agreed Statement of Facts that was filed as an exhibit at the sentencing hearing. A copy of that document was, at my direction, appended to this transcript. I will not repeat those facts now.

There is a joint submission in this case.

Joint submissions are to be given considerable deference by sentencing judges, the Supreme Court of Canada has made that very clear. In order to not follow this joint submission, I would have to find that it is clearly unreasonable. That is not the case. What is being proposed here is essentially either the same or very similar to the sentences that were imposed to other young men who were involved in the very same activity that the accused before me today was involved in. There is nothing unreasonable about this joint position. In fact, it is in line with what this Court has done with similarly situated offenders.

I certainly agree that parity is extremely important. I think the public's confidence in the court system would be greatly shaken if

2.2

offenders who are similarly situated, in other words people who commit similar offences and have similar circumstances, were to receive widely different sentences for similar crimes. Parity is an important sentencing principle and it is very relevant here.

I just want to go back to why this Court imposes significant sentences for this type of activity. I completely adopt what my colleague Justice Smallwood said in the R v Seyoume, 2018 NWTSC 14 as well as what Chief Judge Gagnon said in the other case that was filed, R v Mahalingham, 2017 NWTTC 13.corl. Chief Judge Gagnon quoted some cases from this Court in rendering her decision in that case.

The simple fact is that this is a very lucrative activity. It is one that causes immense harm in our communities. I have had occasion to say it in several sentencing decisions, and I will not go in as much detail here as I have in other cases but, to be blunt, this is a very expensive habit for the users to sustain. It leads to the commission of other crimes because people need to get their hands on money to sustain their habits. It means that people neglect their children and their family responsibilities. It has meant that businesses,

2.2

well established businesses, have gone bankrupt and been destroyed because their owners have developed an addiction to crack and no longer cared about anything else. In extreme cases it has lead to deaths. Deaths by accident, deaths by homicide, and no end of pain and trauma for many people.

What this particular accused and the others who were sentenced for similar crimes did is a good example of what the Courts are trying to put an end to, admittedly with not very great success judging by the number of drug trafficking cases we continue to see. But the point is exactly that this is relatively easy money to make.

It is actually a very dangerous activity to get involved with, as some people have discovered the hard way, but on the surface it seems like an easy way to make money. And I suppose those who do get involved in this type of activity may even convince themselves that they are really not doing anything that is that bad because they are selling a product that people want to buy. The reality, as I have said, is quite different, and the harm that this causes is very real.

It is difficult to know whether the sentences this Court imposes are known to people who might be inclined to come to this

2.2

jurisdiction specifically for the purpose of profiting from this. I imagine that over time the message might get through. There are a number of people I have heard about just this afternoon who found out about the sentencing ranges that are imposed in these cases. Presumably their friends, family members and others who hear about these cases will eventually get the message that there is a high price to pay for those who get caught. That is why the starting point for many years has been what it is, and even in jurisdictions where there is no starting point per se, generally sentences imposed for trafficking in cocaine for profit are high.

In this case, as counsel have noted, there are mitigating factors. Anyone facing a charge that arises of the type of long-term investigation is almost inevitably going to be facing a case where there are triable issues. Whether it is the initial authorization to intercept calls, or voice recognition, as defence counsel has pointed out, I recognize that in cases like this they are almost always triable issues. Giving up the right to have a trial on these charges is worth a lot.

It is obvious from what I have heard that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

26

this would have been a lengthy trial and potentially a complex one, so the guilty plea has saved a lot of resources. It also shows that Mr. Hussein is at this point prepared to accept responsibility for his involvement in this, and that is why guilty pleas are mitigating.

As Crown counsel said, the aggravating factors include the type of drug, the fact that this was at the high end of the retail commercial operation, and the fact that this was, effectively, run very much like a business and, by all accounts, a very efficient one and very lucrative one both for the suppliers and for those who were operating the phones.

For a first offender in his early 20's to face on his very first contact with the criminal justice system a sentence in the range that is proposed here shows the serious consequences of engaging in this type of activity. I can only hope that the lesson has been learned and that even in the face of some of the challenges that life will no doubt throw his way in the future, Mr. Hussein will have learned that this is not the way to go to make a living.

I have to say that any further involvement in this type of activity on his part would probably lead to the imposition of very

2.2

significant jail terms because any judge looking at a criminal record with one entry for trafficking and a sentence in the range that is going to be imposed today would know that this was a very serious first offence. There are many other ways to make a living. This may seem like the easy way from a certain perspective, but in the end it is a much harder way.

I agree that the joint submission is reasonable. It honours the principle of parity. One of the other persons involved, Mr. Bibby, got a slightly longer sentence, but he had some aggravating factors that Mr. Hussein does not have. Others got the same sentence as the one proposed.

Can you stand up please, sir. On the count of trafficking, I would have sentenced you to 30 months imprisonment if you did not have any time on remand. For the total 188 days that you have spent in custody during the two periods of time you were detained, I will give you credit for nine months. That means the further jail term is going to be 21 months in custody for this offence. You can sit down.

I will also issue a DNA order and a firearms prohibition order under Section 109 of the Criminal Code. The firearms prohibition order is

2.2

1		mandatory. The DNA order is discretionary, but,
2		again, as it was imposed in the other cases, and
3		given the nature of the offense and what Crown
4		counsel has referred to and specifically the way
5		these particular offences were committed, in my
6		view it is appropriate to issue a DNA order. Do
7		you want to seek anything with relation to
8		exhibits, Mr. Praught?
9	MR.	PRAUGHT: No, Your Honour.
10	THE	COURT: No. Okay. Is there anything
11		that I have overlooked?
12	MR.	PRAUGHT: I don't believe so, Your
13		Honour, no.
14	THE	COURT: All right. I direct, Madam
15		Clerk, that a photocopy of the Agreed Statement
16		of Facts be appended to the transcript, to put
17		what I have said in the full context of what Mr.
18		Hussein is being sentenced for.
19		I want to finish by thanking counsel for
20		their work in resolving this case. No doubt it
21		would have taken up a lot of the Court's
22		resources. Now those resources can be used for
23		something else. And I appreciated your
24		submissions, which were very helpful. Thank you.
25		On this type of offence, Mr. Praught,
26		firearms prohibition, you are asking for the
27		minimum?

Τ	MR. PRAUGHT: Ten years.
2	THE COURT: So commencing today, expiring
3	in ten years. Thank you.
4	
5	
6	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
7	
8	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
9	foregoing transcribed pages are a complete and
LO	accurate transcript of the digitally recorded
11	proceedings taken herein to the best of my skill and.
L2	ability.
L3	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
L 4	Alberta, this 4th day of June, 2019.
L5	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
L 6	of the Rules of Court
L7	
L 8	
L 9	Colleen Rea
20	Court Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	