### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

# IN THE MATTER OF:

# HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

#### COLTEN MCNEELY

Transcript of the Proceedings held before The
Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in
Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 16th day
of July, 2018.

#### APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. MacPherson: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C. Davison: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 235(1) of the Criminal Code)

Ban on publication pursuant to s.517 and 522(5)of the  $Criminal\ Code$ 

1 THE COURT: Colten McNeely is charged with
2 second-degree murder, and he now applies for
3 release. I am not going to repeat all the
4 details of the allegations here this afternoon.

The events giving rise to this charge occurred in Fort Good Hope on September the 3rd, 2017.

The day before, the deceased was arguing with his common-law spouse over text massages, as she had been out consuming alcohol for the past day or so, he had been taking care of their young children, and he was upset about this. I heard that in the text exchange, the deceased expressed his displeasure about his spouse's drinking and her lack of loyalty towards him. The exchange ended with him saying he no longer wanted to be in a relationship with her.

The accused ran a bootlegging operation in Fort Good Hope at the time. He was living at his grandparents' house. I heard that behind that house there was a shed where he stored equipment and hosted social gatherings. This shed was known around the community as "Colten's Shack."

On September 2nd, Mr. McNeely had made a trip to Norman Wells and had brought back alcohol to be sold in the community. Just past midnight on September the 3rd, the deceased went to

Colten's Shack and bought two mickeys of alcohol from the accused. A while later, the deceased's spouse came to Colten's Shack wanting to purchase mickeys and have some water. I heard that the accused walked with her to his grandparents' house to get the alcohol and water.

Shortly after that, the deceased arrived back at Colten's Shack. He was intoxicated and angry, and he was looking for his spouse. He learned from others who were at the shack that she was in the house with the accused, and that made him angry. Part of the context of this is that he was aware that she and the accused had had a brief affair the previous year.

The deceased yelled and swore and walked to the house. His spouse left through the back door, and the accused came out the front door and was confronted by the deceased, who demanded to know where his spouse was. He started hitting the accused. The accused did not fight back at that point. He tried to explain why he and the deceased's spouse had been in the house together, but the deceased did not believe him and continued to hit him. The accused ended up with a bloody nose as a result of this confrontation.

Two women who had been at the shack came towards the door to try to calm the deceased

2.0

down. Eventually the assault stopped and the deceased left, walking away down the road and onto the driveway that leads to a trail into the woods. Sometime after, the accused followed him and there was a further altercation. During that altercation, it is alleged that the accused stabbed the deceased multiple times on his chest and side and that one of the stab wounds pierced the heart.

In his statement to the police -- the admissibility of that statement will have to be determined at trial -- the accused said that after the deceased walked away, he went back to the shack, retrieved the knife, and walked into the woods towards where the deceased was. There was yelling back and forth. He did not tell the deceased he had a knife with him. There was a further physical confrontation during which the deceased head butted the accused, and the accused stabbed him with the knife.

One of the young women who had been at the shack heard the deceased's calls for help. She ran towards where the two of them were in the woods. When the accused saw her, he dropped the knife and ran. He ran some distance and then called the RCMP's operational call centre saying that the deceased had pulled a knife on him.

2.0

Several people on the scene tried to assist the victim, and emergency personnel were called, but he was pronounced dead shortly thereafter.

As I have already noted, one of the stab wounds pierced his heart.

At the time of these events, the accused was on an undertaking. That undertaking had been entered into on July 28th, 2017. It included conditions to keep the peace and be of good behaviour and not to consume alcohol. It is alleged that the accused was consuming alcohol on the day of these events.

The facts alleged as part of the bail hearing also include reference to two other matters involving the accused. That surfaced when the police were investigating these events. The first is that a man named Ryan Proctor, who is a friend of the accused, reported that two weeks before the events that gave rise to this charge, the accused came to his house and was upset at someone. He had a knife in his possession and was talking about "sticking" a man named Domi. Mr. Proctor took the knife away, and I heard that he gave it back to the accused sometime later. It is not specified when.

The second incident dates back a few years. No one reported it to police and there are

2.0

inconsistent accounts about what actually happened, but it involved the accused and a person named Gerald Pierrot. Mr. Pierrot's version or recollection of the events is that he saw the accused being assaulted by two men. He stepped in to help him, and the accused pulled a hatchet from his pants and struck him in the face with it.

The accused's version of this incident, which was discussed with him during the same statement to police that I have referred to already, was that he had been beaten, that after the beating a friend gave him the axe for protection, and that sometime later, while he was sleeping, Mr. Pierrot tried to wake him, and the accused struck him in the face with the axe.

According to him, this occurred while he was in a blackout state. It is not entirely clear how he remembers or how he came to believe this to be the version of events if he was in a blackout state. In any event, there are inconsistent versions of what happened on that occasion. And as I said, the police was not called by anyone involved.

The accused has a criminal record, which includes only one entry for failure to comply with a no-contact condition on an undertaking.

2.0

He was convicted of this in 2014 and received a fine.

The accused has been in custody since his arrest, and this is the first time he applies for bail.

Because of the charge he faces, the onus is on him to satisfy the Court that his detention is not necessary for any of the grounds listed in the *Criminal Code*. His release plan is to go live with Jolean Modeste in Norman Wells and to have her be his surety. She is prepared to sign a recognizance in the amount of \$5,000, without deposit, to support his release. The accused would also commit to paying that sum of money in the event of a breach.

Ms. Modeste testified by telephone at the bail hearing. When she was asked what her relationship to the accused is, she said she is like an aunt to him, although technically, as she said, they are cousins. She has known him since he was born, but has seen him less frequently in the past several years because she moved to Norman Wells for work several years ago. But she has continued to see him on occasion when she visits Fort Good Hope.

She is employed full time as a client service manager for the Government of the

2.0

Northwest Territories, and she has worked for the GNWT for the last 17 years. She confirmed that she knows the charge that the accused faces, that she is familiar with the release conditions being proposed, and that she is willing and able to enforce them.

She explained the living arrangements at her residence. She has an adult daughter and 12-year-old son, and she testified about her work schedule and her ability to check in on the accused regularly if she were to be his surety and be under her responsibility to do so. She expressed a clear intent to supervise him, and that if he failed to check in with her or comply with his conditions or any of her rules of the house, she would report him to the police.

She said that she would be able to pay \$5,000 in the event of a breach, but that it would be a financial hardship for her, and she has no intention of allowing that to happen. She also expressed confidence in the fact that, given the relatively small size of the town of Norman Wells, she would become aware fairly quickly if the accused was taking steps to leave the community in contravention of his conditions.

On cross-examination she was asked if there is alcohol in her home, and she said that right

2.0

now there is. She occasionally consumes alcohol, as does her daughter. In response to the question I asked about whether she was prepared to have her home be an alcohol-free home for the whole period where the accused is staying with her, she answered that she was prepared to do that.

One of the witnesses, the deceased's common-law spouse, now lives in Norman Wells.

Ms. Modeste confirms that she knows this person and that she lives about a five-minute walk from her house. Obviously this is a concern.

As the Crown fairly conceded, Ms. Modeste testified in a very straightforward manner and appeared to be a very straightforward person. She answered questions on cross-examination as readily as she answered the questions put to her in her examination in chief. I am satisfied that she understands the responsibility she will be taking on as a surety, and that she would be prepared to contact the police if she had any concerns about the accused breaching his conditions.

The Criminal Code reverses the onus on bail hearings for certain charges that are considered more serious, and murder is one of them. But an accused charged with murder still benefits from

2.0

the presumption of innocence and from the constitutionally protected right to reasonable bail.

The Defence has filed written submissions that outline the legal framework that governs this application, and I do not understand there to be anything contentious about that framework. As is often the case, the assessment of whether this particular accused should be released and has met his onus is very much fact driven.

The Crown maintains its objection to the accused's release on the primary and secondary grounds. This is not because of any identified weaknesses in the release plan. The Crown candidly confirmed that, in its view, under the circumstances, no plan would alleviate the concerns about granting the accused bail.

The primary ground is concerned with whether the accused will attend his trial. Any time a person faces a very serious charge where the jeopardy is high, it can be argued that there is an enhanced risk that the accused will be tempted to flee to avoid facing any potential consequences of a trial. At the same time, this risk has to be assessed in the overall context of the matter.

Here we have an accused who has spent his

2.0

whole life in Fort Good Hope, and the plan proposes to have him reside in another small community in the Sahtu region. His surety has lived there for many years. It is not hard to imagine that if the application is granted and the accused goes to live with her, the whole town will be aware of the situation.

It would not be that simple for this accused to simply disappear, especially if there are tight reporting conditions and the surety takes her role seriously and does supervise his comings and goings, which she has said, under oath, she is prepared to do. She stands to lose a lot of money if she does not and there is a breach.

The Crown raised as a concern the fact that the accused fled the scene immediately after the altercation when the young women showed up after having heard the deceased's cries for help.

However, it is also common ground between the parties that the next day he turned himself in to the RCMP. In my view, his initial flight, when looked at in this context, does not enhance the primary ground concerns. I am satisfied that it is possible to craft a combination of conditions that will address any concerns that exist under the primary ground.

As for the secondary ground, the concerns

2.0

under that ground relate to public safety, including the substantial likelihood of commission of other offences or of there being interference with the administration of justice. It is, of course, a grave concern that the accused was placed on an undertaking at the end of July, and that despite this, he continued his bootlegging activities and he consumed alcohol in breach of the no-alcohol condition.

Certainly at that point, being on process did not seem to have much of an effect on him. That is of concern, as is his conviction for the breach of the no-contact order a few years back. Overall, it does not paint a picture of someone who has a great deal of respect for the court process or court orders. And as is the case for any release plan, the basic premise has to be that the accused will respect the release conditions, and that is what will serve to prevent any further crimes or any interference with the administration of justice. In other words, if the Court cannot have confidence that the conditions will be respected, it does not matter how good the plan is.

The Crown also has concerns about the other recent incidents where the accused appears to have been intending or prepared to resort to the

2.0

use of weapons to settle disputes. It is always a concern when there are indications that someone is thinking of using weapons to settle disputes.

The allegation that a few weeks before this incident the accused expressed to his friend the intention to stick someone is disturbing, but it appears the friend took the knife away without difficulty, returned it to the accused some time later, and that nothing more came of it. There is no indication that the accused took any steps to follow through on his stated intention.

As for the second incident, there are very different versions of what happened, and on both versions, the accused was the one who was initially attacked by others. What actually happened that day remains fairly unclear, and I find it difficult to rely on that particular allegation to any extent for the purposes of the decision I have to make today.

The strength of the Crown's case is specifically listed as a factor to be considered under the tertiary ground. That does not mean it is irrelevant to the other grounds. With respect to the primary ground, arguably the temptation to flee may be greater if the Crown's case is stronger. And with respect to the secondary ground, a very strong case on a very serious

2.0

offence suggests a higher level of concern regarding public safety.

Here there are elements of the Crown's case that lend some strength to it in that there are eyewitnesses, the weapon was recovered, and there is forensic evidence tieing it to the accused. There is also a warned statement that will be of some assistance to the Crown if it is ruled admissible. But there is nothing before me on this hearing that enables me to form any kind of even preliminary view as to how that issue might get resolved at trial once it is litigated.

But even with all of that, there will remain a triable issue relating to what exactly occurred between the accused and the deceased in that final confrontation in the woods, and what the accused's state of mind and intent was. It appears that the Crown's case will demonstrate fairly clearly that the deceased was the initial aggressor and was quite persistent in his attack. The outcome of this case will turn out findings to be made as to what happened after the accused followed him in the woods and what the accused intended when he followed him in the woods.

I note as well that while part of the Crown's concerns are related to the incident involving Mr. Proctor when Mr. Proctor took the

2.0

accused's knife away, it is also part of the facts before me that Mr. Proctor described the accused as usually mild mannered; the kind of person who gets drunk and goes home.

The Crown has argued that the evidence adduced at the hearing establishes the beginnings of a pattern of conduct on the part of the accused, one that involves using weapons. I do not think the evidence establishes such a pattern. Of course, there is no need for such a pattern to be established before detention can be ordered on the secondary ground. I simply note, since the submission was made, that I do not see such a pattern being established here.

The Crown is also concerned, and understandably so, about potential interference with witnesses. Here, one of the witnesses lives in Norman Wells, a short distance from where it is proposed that the accused will live. The proximity with witnesses is not an unusual consideration in this jurisdiction when bail is examined, and we must be very careful that the small size of our communities and that potential proximity does not result in virtually eliminating any possibility for people to be released pending trial.

As I said already, the right to reasonable

2.0

bail is constitutionally protected, and it is constitutionally protected for people who live in large places just as it is for people who live in smaller places. The advantage of a small place, as the surety noted during her evidence, is that it is much more difficult for people to do things they are not supposed to be doing and remain undetected.

Although the Crown's concern are perfectly understandable, and there always are concerns in a murder case, having carefully considered the plan, I am of the view that it does address the concerns under the primary and secondary grounds. The Crown has not attempted to rely on the tertiary ground, and in my view, that is a wise decision as I do not see that ground being engaged in the circumstances of this case.

I want to make it very clear to the accused and to the surety -- and for that I count on defence counsel to make this clear to the surety, because she is not here today and she is not on the phone today -- that this Court will not be inclined to leniency if the release terms are not strictly complied with. This is a very serious matter.

It is to be expected that the trial will not proceed for some time, and this is a release plan

2.0

that will be very onerous, both for the accused and for the surety. It is going to be in place for quite some time. So it is very important that everyone remain as determined and as committed to this plan in the months to come as they are today. The surety stands to lose a lot of money if she does not do the things she has said under oath that she would do, and the accused stands to lose his pre-trial freedom if there are any breaches, no matter how minor.

For these reasons, I am going to grant the application and release Mr. McNeely on a recognizance with Jolean Modeste as the surety in the amount of \$5,000 without deposit. And here I am going to list the conditions. I have a few questions as I go along. But, Mr. McNeely, listen very, very, very carefully to these conditions.

The first is that you will keep the peace and be of good behaviour. That means not committing offences, staying out of trouble. The second is that you appear before the Court when and as required. The third is that you remain in regular contact with your defence counsel,

Mr. Harte. It is your responsibility to remain in contact with him. The fourth is that you reside at 1 Carcajou Avenue in Norman Wells and

2.0

not change your residence without an order from
the Court.

The fifth is that you follow all the rules of the house as communicated to you by Jolean Modeste. The sixth is that you remain in Norman Wells except if you are required to travel outside of Norman Wells for the purpose of attending Court. The seventh is that you abstain from the possession and consumption of alcohol and not be in any house or premise in which alcohol is stored or consumed.

Mr. Davison, I would appreciate if you make sure that Mr. Harte communicates to the surety that that means that for the duration of this matter, her home has to be an alcohol-free home, and that is why I asked that question at the hearing, and she said she was prepared to do that.

But, Mr. McNeely, if that changes, or if for whatever reason someone brings alcohol in their home, it is not for you to find another place to live. You have to surrender yourself to the police, because then you will no longer have an alcohol-free home to live. Do you understand that?

26 THE ACCUSED: Yes.

27 THE COURT: The next condition is that you

2.0

1		are to report in person to the Norman Wells
2		detachment every day from Monday to Friday and
3		report in person or by phone every Saturday or
4		Sunday to and this is where I need counsel's
5		help is it Greg Thompson the name of the bail
6		supervisor that Mr. McNeely
7	MR.	MACPHERSON: It's Scott Thompson.
8	THE	COURT: Scott Thompson. He is a
9		probation officer. He is in Norman Wells, and it
10		will be up to you to find out how to contact him.
11		But I basically want you reporting seven days a
12		week. But on Saturday and Sunday, I will permit
13		you to do it by phone to Mr. Thompson.
14		The next condition is that you will provide
15		a sample of your breath or urine that are
16		suitable for analysis on the demand of a peace
17		officer who has grounds to suspect you have
18		alcohol or a controlled substance in your body.
19		This is just to make sure they can do the
20		necessary checks. You are to comply with a
21		curfew and remain inside the residence at
22		1 Carcajou Avenue between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m.
23		The next condition is that you present
24		yourself at the door of the residence if you are
25		asked to do so by a police officer or by the bail
26		supervisor for the purpose of ensuring your

27

compliance with the curfew. I heard that there

is no landline at that house and a cell phone can be used from anywhere, so I fully expect the authorities will conduct regular, in-person curfew checks. And if you are asked to come to the door, you have to come to the door yourself.

Mr. Harte had proposed the condition that you not be in possession of any firearms, and I am going to include that condition, but I am also going to include a knife on the list. You are not to be in possession of any knife, firearm, crossbow, prohibited or restricted weapon, ammunition, prohibited ammunition, or explosive substance.

You are not going to be permitted to have any contact, direct or indirect, with any other persons that are going to be listed at what is going to be the appendix of this recognizance, and I am going to get that from the Crown. And you are not allowed to be within 15 metres of their residences. This is especially important for the witness who lives in Norman Wells. And you know who she is. You have to stay away from her, and you cannot communicate with her. If you find yourself in a place where any of these people are, it is your responsibility to leave, no matter where it is.

Now, I gather that the preliminary hearing

2.0

1 has been completed? I saw an indictment filed
2 recently.

3 MR. MACPHERSON: Yes.

4 THE COURT: Okay. So the last condition 5 is going to be that you are going to be required -- we do not know when that will be yet, 6 7 but you are going to turn yourself into the 8 custody of the RCMP in Norman Wells no less than 9 five days before the date scheduled for your 10 trial, and you will find out that date from 11 Mr. Harte. And I want you to turn yourself in so 12 that there is no last-minute temptation to flee.

And the last condition, unless counsel suggests another one is, just to make sure everyone is able to monitor what you are doing, you are going to have to keep a copy of your recognizance on you at all times. And that was a condition that was suggested by your counsel.

You have not been in court a lot. You do not have a very long criminal record,

Mr. McNeely, but the evidence before me is that you have not taken release conditions seriously until now. You are in a very different category of situation now than you were when you were released in July 2007. You are not going to get any more chances, and so I hope that you will not prove me wrong by having released you today.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

26

Your aunt is taking a big commitment in agreeing to take you in, and I hope you do not let her down either. I want to emphasize that Condition Number 5 is that you follow her rules.

And, again, Mr. Davison, I would like this to be communicated to the surety. I want her to have some abilities to make Mr. McNeely check in with her if she thinks it is necessary. She will be right there. She will see what is going on. And if she decides she wants him to check in with her at lunch every day or however many times a day, whatever her rules are then, are the rules for the duration of this recognizance.

That is why I say I know it is going to be onerous and hard on her and on you, possibly, as well. But it is not just my conditions. I am making it harder because it is also her rules for her house. So keep that in mind because you have to listen to what she has to say. And you heard her last week. She said you have two choices, you follow her rules or you go back to jail, and I got the impression she was quite serious.

I will ask first, does the Crown have a list of witnesses that can be turned into -- I was contemplating Appendix A being the list of conditions and Appendix B being the list of witnesses.

2.0

- 1 MR. MACPHERSON: Yes, Your Honour.
- 2 THE COURT: Thank you. And is there
- 3 anything I have overlooked in conditions the
- 4 Crown wanted to see? I have included the ones in
- 5 your submissions, but is there anything that you
- think should be added to strengthen this?
- 7 MR. MACPHERSON: I think it had been
- 8 contemplated at one time -- I don't know if this
- 9 was in a draft by Mr. Harte, but a no-attend
- 10 taverns or bars, because there are those places
- in Norman Wells.
- 12 THE COURT: Yes, I saw that. You are
- right. I just want to double check, but I think
- that would be part of not being in a place where
- 15 alcohol is consumed or stored.
- 16 MR. MACPHERSON: Okay.
- 17 THE COURT: Right? I mean, that was my
- 18 intention. It is the house --
- 19 MR. MACPHERSON: Yes.
- 20 THE COURT: -- but it is any place where
- 21 alcohol is consumed or stored, which would
- include a private residence and also a bar.
- MR. MACPHERSON: Very well. And the other was
- the specific no-qo to Fort Good Hope, simply
- because it is possible to, I think, get to Fort
- 26 Good Hope and back in the course of a day,
- 27 especially on the winter road. But I know

```
1 that --
```

- 2 THE COURT: But if he is not supposed to
- 3 leave Norman Wells, he would be in breach of that
- 4 condition if he went to Fort Good Hope, right?
- 5 MR. MACPHERSON: Oh, right.
- 6 THE COURT: I went broader because, I
- 7 mean, the requirement is that he is not leaving
- 8 Norman Wells.
- 9 MR. MACPHERSON: Yes.
- 10 THE COURT: To go anywhere.
- 11 MR. MACPHERSON: That's fine.
- 12 THE COURT: You understand that includes
- 13 you are not going to Fort Good Hope, right,
- Mr. McNeely?
- 15 THE ACCUSED: Yes.
- 16 THE COURT: If there is anything along the
- 17 lines of a medical emergency -- obviously if an
- 18 accident happens and you need to be medivaced,
- 19 for example, you would not be in breach. But
- anything that is not something like that, even if
- 21 you think you have a very good reason, whether it
- is work or anything else, to leave Norman Wells,
- you will have to speak to Mr. Harte, and you will
- have to get the Court to permit you to do it, and
- 25 we will have to make sure that your surety is in
- agreement as well.
- 27 So changing this is not going to happen

- 1 easily. It is only going to be done on
- 2 application to this Court in the same way this
- 3 whole hearing had to be in front of this Court.
- 4 Do you understand.
- 5 THE ACCUSED: Yes.
- 6 THE COURT: Is there anything that is not
- 7 clear from your perspective, Mr. Davison?
- 8 MR. DAVISON: The only thought I had was
- 9 going back to the last possibility that you
- 10 raised, and that was if he had to leave for a
- 11 medical emergency. In other matters where I've
- been involved, we've addressed that by way of
- inclusion, that if that happens, he would still
- let the RCMP know so that they know he's not in
- Norman Wells and not at home. And then possibly
- 16 also an obligation to return to Norman Wells as
- soon as practicable or as soon as possible after
- 18 the medical emergency has been addressed. I
- 19 don't know if the Court wants to go that far or
- 20 not.
- 21 THE COURT: Well, I think the kind of
- 22 emergency I am contemplating would be a real
- emergency.
- MR. DAVISON: Yes.
- 25 THE COURT: And if that were to happen, I
- am sure no police officer would lay a breach
- charge, and the surety would be aware. I am

- 1 trying to leave very little to the discretion
- 2 here, and so I have done that.
- 3 MR. DAVISON: All right.
- 4 THE COURT: But thank you. Thank you for
- 5 those comments.
- 6 MR. DAVISON: Thank you.
- 7 THE COURT: Anything else from the Crown?
- 8 MR. MACPHERSON: Another -- it occurred to me,
- 9 Your Honour, when you mentioned the trial, that
- there will likely be a voir dire before the
- 11 trial. And I just raise that as an issue so
- 12 he -- if we just accept that the voir dire makes
- up part of the trial, and he then has to
- 14 surrender himself --
- 15 THE COURT: Well, how about the condition
- 16 reads five days before any day scheduled for
- these proceedings?
- 18 MR. MACPHERSON: Very well.
- 19 THE COURT: It would be -- I mean, that is
- 20 a very good point. I know the pretrial
- 21 conference is already scheduled, and perhaps
- those kinds of details can be addressed. But,
- yes, my intention is that whenever you are
- 24 required to attend court, you turn yourself in
- 25 five days in advance. To be honest that is
- 26 simply to make sure they have time to look for
- you if you do not turn yourself in, which I hope

- will not happen.
- Now, I do not know -- I will leave it to the
- 3 pretrial conference to have the discussions about
- 4 issues like venue and where things are to happen,
- 5 but are there any other conditions that I have
- 6 missed?
- 7 MR. MACPHERSON: No, that's fine. Thank you.
- 8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Clerk, I am
- going to give you this document. This is going
- 10 to be Appendix -- I will just read, actually,
- sorry.
- 12 THE COURT CLERK: Yes, Your Honour.
- 13 THE COURT: I will read this into the
- 14 record. These are the people you are not allowed
- to have contact with, Marissa McNeely,
- 16 Jeanette Kakfwi, Harley Pierrot, Ryan Proctor,
- 17 Dylan Kakfwi, Tylan Drybone, Janelle Pierrot,
- 18 Gerald Pierrot, Cora Rabisca, Antoine Tobac,
- 19 Willy Winters, Michelle Grandjambe,
- Danielle Clark, Trent T'selie, and
- 21 Sabrina Sturman, okay?
- 22 THE ACCUSED: Okay.
- 23 THE COURT: So that will become
- 24 Appendix B, Mr. Clerk.
- 25 THE COURT CLERK: Yes, Your Honour.
- 26 THE COURT: I will be able to email you a
- 27 list of conditions, I expect.

1	It is going to take a little while to get
2	the documentation prepared, Mr. McNeely, because
3	your surety also has to sign it. I think I am
4	going to ask once the transcript of my
5	decision is filed, I am going to direct the clerk
6	to send an extra copy to Mr. Harte so that it can
7	be sent to the surety. I want to make sure that
8	the surety is fully aware of the comments I have
9	made, particularly towards the ends of this

- 11 MR. DAVISON: And just so I'm clear,
- Mr. Harte was anticipating the documents would
- now be sent to the RCMP in Norman Wells for the
- 14 surety's signature.

decision.

- 15 THE COURT: I am going to stay out of
- 16 that.

- 17 MR. DAVISON: Okay.
- 18 THE COURT: Mr. Clerk, how do you
- 19 normally --
- 20 THE COURT CLERK: Yes, Your Honour. We would
- 21 fax a copy -- a signed copy of the recognizance
- 22 to the RCMP detachment, and then they will fax it
- 23 back once it's signed by the surety.
- 24 THE COURT: All right.
- 25 MR. DAVISON: Thank you.
- 26 THE COURT: Thank you. Anything further
- 27 on this?

1	MR.	DAVISON:	Not that I know of.
2	THE	COURT:	Anything further from the
3		Crown?	
4	MR.	MACPHERSON:	No, thank you.
5	THE	COURT:	All right. Well, thank you
6		for your submission	ns, Counsel.
7		And, Mr. McNee	ely, we do not know what date
8		this is going to be	e scheduled for because there
9		is going to be a pr	retrial conference, but as I
10		say, these condition	ons are likely to be in force
11		for a long period	of time. So just remember it
12		is up to you at thi	s point whether you are able
13		to stay out of cust	tody, but you do have to
14		strictly comply wit	th all of these. If you are in
15		breach and I am the	e one dealing with the
16		application to rele	ease you, it is going to be
17		very much an uphil.	l battle. I want you to
18		understand that.	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

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 1st day of August, 2018.
11	
12	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the
13	Rules of Court
14	
15	
16	
17	Kaylene Davidsen, CSR(A)
18	Court Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	