IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

-V-

LENNY PAUL NITSIZA

Transcript of the Decision delivered by the Honourable Justice K.M. Shaner, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 16th day of September, 2020.

APPEARANCES:

T. Johnson: Counsel for the Crown
B. Rattan: Counsel for the Defence

01 ----- 454 -- 1 - 074 -(4 - 0 '--'-- 10 - 1

Charges under s. 151 and s. 271 of the Criminal Code

There is a ban on the publication, broadcast or transmission of any information that could identify the complainant pursuant to s. 486.4 of the *Criminal Code*.

i

	INDEX	PAGE
REASONS FOR DECISION		1
	ii	
	11	

1 (REASONS FOR DECISION) 2 THE COURT: Lenny Nitsiza pleaded guilty to sexual 3 assault earlier in these proceedings, and a conviction 4 was entered today. It is now my responsibility to 5 impose a sentence on him. 6 As I noted earlier in these proceedings, there is 7 a publication ban respecting any information that might 8 identify the victim, and for that reason, I will not refer to 9 her by name in these reasons. 10 The circumstances of the offence are set out in 11 an Amended Agreed Statement of Facts which was 12 placed on the record after being read into it. I am not 13 going to repeat that in its entirety, but I will provide a 14 summary for contextual reasons. 15 The offence occurred on May 17, 2018. 16 Mr. Nitsiza was 27 years old, and the victim was 14. 17 The two knew each other, and they had been communicating over social media earlier that day. At 18 19 some point, Mr. Nitsiza agreed to go over to the victim's 20 house and sell her cannabis. The victim was at home 21 alone when Mr. Nitsiza arrived. 22 Mr. Nitsiza told her the price for the cannabis. 23 She told him that she did not have the money. She 24 approached Mr. Nitsiza and began to unzip his pants. 25 He understood that she was offering to perform oral sex 26 on him in exchange for the cannabis. He did not 27 immediately move to stop her, and he allowed her to

1 continue to unzip his pants. 2 As she finished unzipping his pants, and before 3 any further sexual acts occurred, the victim's mother 4 arrived home. The victim then ran to her room. Mr. 5 Nitsiza ran out of the house as the mother was 6 entering, zipping up his pants while he was doing so. 7 I am going to turn now to Mr. Nitsiza's circumstances. Most of the information before me 8 9 about Mr. Nitsiza comes from the pre-sentence report 10 which was prepared by Probation Services and 11 augmented by Mr. Nitsiza's lawyer here today. 12 Mr. Nitsiza is a relatively young man. He is 29 13 years old. He is Indigenous, and he grew up in Whati, 14 which is a small community in the Tłycho, accessible by 15 boat, plane or winter road. He continues to live there 16 with his parents. According to the pre-sentence report, 17 he was well cared for in a loving home with healthy 18 parents. They did not abuse alcohol or drugs. He is 19 connected to his family and his culture, participating in 20 hunting and trapping, drum dances, and Dene hand 21 games, among other things. He has taught younger 22 community members how to play traditional hand 23 games. 24 Unfortunately, while Mr. Nitsiza's family life 25 was not directly affected by systemic disadvantages 26 and issues that so often inflict Indigenous families such 27 as food, water, and housing insecurity, addiction, and

violence, he was nevertheless a victim of a significant, violent nature by members of his community in 2014. He was beaten in the face with a bat. This resulted in him losing one of his eyes. Not surprisingly, this has had a serious, adverse effect on his mental health and his perception of himself.

He told the author of the pre-sentence report that he is embarrassed in social interactions and when looking for employment. When the pre-sentence report was authored, Mr. Nitsiza was living on disability income. Over the summer, however, he obtained employment and worked as a labourer for the Development Corporation.

He completed grade 10, and he completed a course called "Introduction to Mining" after leaving school. He now has plans to upgrade his skills in the near future.

Mr. Nitsiza has a criminal record. It is not extensive and it is relatively dated. The last entry was in 2013. Most of the convictions are for failure to comply with orders and directions of the Court. There are four convictions for simple assault. The last one was in 2013. Mr. Nitsiza received a custodial sentence of 10 months for that offence. While he has been on release awaiting the hearing in this case, Mr. Nitsiza has complied fully with the terms of his release and he has sought amendments ahead of time as the need

has arisen rather than making a unilateral decision.

Mr. Nitsiza says he drinks on special occasions and he uses cannabis regularly. There has been no suggestion that he has any sort of substance use disorder.

The *Criminal Code* sets out the principles and objectives of sentencing that provide a framework to guide judges in imposing a sentence that is just and appropriate. Those objectives are listed in section 718. Briefly, they are denunciation of the unlawful conduct, which is an expression of society's disapproval or abhorrence of a particular conduct; deterrence aimed both at the offender (specific deterrence), and the public at large (general deterrence); separating offenders from society where necessary; rehabilitation; reparation; and promoting a sense of responsibility in offenders and an acknowledgment of the harm done to victims and to the community.

The emphasize that should be placed on each of these objectives very much depends on what the offence is, the circumstances under which it was committed, and the circumstances of the offender.

Where the offence involves a sexual assault of a young person under 18 years of age, and where the victim is vulnerable because of personal circumstances, including being Indigenous and female, the *Criminal Code* requires a sentencing judge to give primary

consideration to the objectives of denunciation and deterrence. This is borne out in case law throughout Canada.

The *Criminal Code* also sets out a number of principles to be applied in determining what is an appropriate sentence. The most important principle is that of proportionality. A sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

In determining what is a fit sentence, judges are guided by the principles of restraint and parity as well. The principle of restraint requires consideration of all available sanctions, other than imprisonment, that are reasonable in the circumstances, with particular attention to the circumstances of Indigenous offenders. Parity requires that there be similar treatment for like offences and offenders, bearing in mind that it does not call for identical sentences to be imposed for the same crime. Sentencing is a highly individualized process.

In imposing a sentence, the Court must take into account both aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Section 718.2 of the *Criminal Code* deems a number of factors to be aggravating, although that is not an exhaustive list. These include evidence that the offender abused a person who is under 18.

In sentencing, our law here differentiates between sexual assaults that are considered major and

those that are not. This is not to suggest that sexual assault is anything other than serious, regardless of the legal classification for sentencing purposes. Rather, this is a guidepost for sentencing, given that the definition of sexual assault captures a wide spectrum of circumstances which can form the offence.

There are a number of aggravating factors that arise out of the circumstances of this particular offence. First and foremost, the victim was only 14 at the time. Secondly, and related to this, there is a significant age gap between the victim and the offender. Mr. Nitsiza is nearly twice the victim's age. Third, the offence took place in the context of an illegal drug transaction where the victim had no money to pay for drugs.

With respect to Mr. Nitsiza's criminal record, criminal records are often considered aggravating, but in this case, I do not find it particularly so. That is not to say it is irrelevant, but as noted, the record is limited and it is dated. Although there are a number of convictions for failure to comply with court orders and directions, as I noted earlier, Mr. Nitsiza, since being on release, has demonstrated that he is willing and able to comply. Accordingly, I give the criminal record very little weight.

The most mitigating feature in this case is Mr.

Nitsiza's guilty plea. As the Crown pointed out, it did

not come at the first opportunity, but it did indeed come.

I agree with the Crown that it deserves significant weight. It has spared the victim and her family the stress of a trial, including having to give testimony about events which are highly personal and sensitive, and it has removed the element of uncertainty of outcome. It demonstrates above all that Mr. Nitsiza is taking responsibility for what happened.

The Crown is seeking a custodial sentence of nine months to be followed by probation of one year. It is the Crown's position that a custodial sentence in this range is necessary to achieve the objectives and principles of sentencing, particularly denunciation and deterrence.

The defence submits that the sentence should be in the range of three months of custody followed by probation for one year.

This case does not fall into the category of a major sexual assault, but, as I said, it must nevertheless be treated seriously. Sexual assault is all too common in the Northwest Territories, and sexual crimes against young people are particularly troubling. The consequences of sexual assault for victims can be profound and the Court must not lose sight of this. It must sentence accordingly. Denunciation and deterrence are, as noted, the most important objectives.

Mr. Nitsiza bears significant moral

blameworthiness for this offence. I have stated in previous decisions that children are in a weak position in relation to adults. Adults have all the power and they must act responsibly to do the right thing. Children have to be able to trust adults and they have to be able to rely on adults to conduct themselves in a manner that protects rather than victimizes children. We, as a society, have a significant interest in upholding this standard.

Not surprisingly, what happened has had a negative effect on the victim. She stated in her Victim Impact Statement that she has lost her family's trust. She says that a lot of people in her community talk about what happened and this has upset her to the point of wanting to kill herself. She feels she cannot talk to anyone and that people look at her differently.

I have considered Mr. Nitsiza's Indigenous status, as I am required to do under section 718.2(e) of the *Criminal Code* and the Supreme Court of Canada in *Gladue* and *Ipeelee* and other decisions. In particular, I must consider "Gladue" factors, those being the systemic factors such as poverty, addiction, undereducation, un- or underemployment, and violence. The goal of section 718.2(e) is, of course, to address the significant overrepresentation of Indigenous individuals in our correctional facilities. I am required to consider all available sanctions other than

incarceration that are reasonable in the circumstances and consistent with the harm done to the victim.

As I noted earlier, Mr. Nitsiza's family life was not directly affected by the systemic factors that are so often present in the lives of Indigenous offenders. Mr. Nitsiza has good parents and solid familial support. However, he was a victim of a significantly violent act in his community, which in and of itself is a Gladue factor.

Further, it does not take a great leap in the imagination to conclude that living in a small, isolated community has necessarily limited Mr. Nitsiza's access to formal education, employment and healthcare, particularly for his mental health. These are factors which can lead to someone being more vulnerable to coming into contact with the justice system and they have to be taken into account.

Although denunciation and deterrence are the primary objectives in sentencing in this case, the other objectives remain important and highly relevant.

Rehabilitation is particularly important. Where it can be achieved, rehabilitation offers society and victims the very best protection against future crimes by the offender.

Mr. Nitsiza is young and he has spent his entire life in Whatì. There is nothing to indicate that he plans to leave there. It is a small place where everyone is at once safe from, yet vulnerable to, crime. Whatever

sentence I impose has to have a significant emphasis on rehabilitation so that Mr. Nitsiza can return to and continue to live in his community without jeopardizing the safety of others there.

The consequences have to be meaningful.

When I say that, I mean that they have to resonate with Mr. Nitsiza in a way that allows him to learn from them and to fully rehabilitate. While I have no doubt that our correctional institutions offer programming to assist offenders with rehabilitation, for a person like Mr.

Nitsiza, who is strongly connected to the land and to his traditions and culture, and who has the support of a stable family, putting an emphasis on community-based consequences is, in my view, more likely to achieve a lasting rehabilitative result than a period of incarceration.

Parity is also an important principle to bear in mind. This is, as the Crown pointed out, a very difficult case. To put it simply, the circumstances are ugly. As I said earlier, sexual assault, no matter where it falls on the spectrum, must always be treated as a serious offence, especially where the victim is a child. That said, the overall ugliness of the circumstances must not overshadow what actually happened. Examining this closely, it is undeniable that what happened falls at the less serious end of the sexual assault spectrum and this has to be reflected in the sentence.

The sexual offence here was a sexual touching which consisted of the victim undoing Mr. Nitsiza's zipper while Mr. Nitsiza acquiesced. The zipper was located over his genital area on his pants. Things may well have gone further had the victim's mother not come home unexpectedly. Had they gone further, I expect I would probably be dealing with a sentencing on a major sexual assault.

The fact is, though, that things did not go further. What I am dealing with is a sexual assault in the form of the victim touching Mr. Nitsiza's genital area over his clothing for a very limited period of time. In my view, this would necessarily attract a sentence far below what is suggested by the Crown, even taking into account the victim's age and even without considering the guilty plea. While Mr. Nitsiza bears significant moral blameworthiness, the circumstances of the offence, the gravity of the offence, cannot justify a period of nine months incarceration. That would be unfairly disproportionate to Mr. Nitsiza.

Taking into account the circumstances of this offence, Mr. Nitsiza's circumstances, including his Indigenous status, the aggravating and mitigating factors and the goals and objectives of sentencing, I conclude that an appropriate sentence is one that has a short period of incarceration followed by a longer period of probation.

Lenny Paul Nitsiza, upon being convicted of sexual assault, and upon consideration of the circumstances and the nature of this offence, as well as your personal circumstances, I sentence you to a term of 60 days of incarceration, which will be followed by 18 months of probation.

Now, before I finish here today, I will be asking the lawyers if you had served any time that would then be deducted from your incarceration. You can sit down now, and I will talk about your probation.

The terms of your probation will include, first, that you report to Probation Services within 72 hours of your release and thereafter as directed by your probation officer. You will have to attend counselling as directed by your probation officer, and you must have no contact with the victim. So among other things, that means that you have to not attend her workplace, her school, or her home. If you are out somewhere and you see her, you are going to need to leave.

The Crown also requested some ancillary orders which are mandatory. I will impose a 10-year firearms prohibition under section 109 and that will start to run after you are released. But, it is subject to an exemption for subsistence hunting under section 113, and Ms. Rattan, your lawyer, will be able to explain to you what you have to do to apply for the exemption.

There will also be an order for bodily fluids to

4	he taken from Mr. Nitains for DNA analysis, and se
1	be taken from Mr. Nitsiza for DNA analysis, and an
2	order requiring him to comply with the Sex Offender
3	Information Registration Act pursuant to section
4	490.012 of the <i>Criminal Code</i> , and that will be in effect
5	for 20 years.
6	
7	(PROCEEDINGS CONTINUED)
8	
9	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
10	Neesons, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing
11	pages are a complete and accurate transcript of the
12	proceedings transcribed from the audio recording to the best
13	of our skill and ability. Judicial amendments have been
14	applied to this transcript.
15	
16	
17	Dated at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, this
18	15 th day of October, 2020.
19	
20	
21	Kin Reen
22	Kim Neeson
23	Principal
24	
25	
26	
27	
	13