S-1-CR-2018-000037

S-1-CR-2020-000089

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

## **IN THE MATTER OF:**

# HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V -

## TRINTON NIDITCHIE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by the Honourable Chief Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, delivered orally on the 6th day of October, 2020.

# **APPEARANCES:**

B. Green: Counsel for the Crown

J. Bran: Counsel for the Defence

Charge under s. 271 Criminal Code of Canada

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*.

		INDEX	PAGE
RULINGS, REA	SONS		
Reasons for Se	ntence		2
		i	

1 THE COURT: I am ready to give my reasons for 2 sentence on this matter. I am ordering a transcript 3 which is to be sent to me for review and may be edited. 4 I want to remind everyone that there is a publication 5 ban in effect pursuant to section 486.4 of the Criminal 6 Code which prohibits the publication or broadcast of 7 any information that could identify the complainant. 8 I will refer to her by name in my decision, 9 but I direct that the initial A. be used in the transcript 10 anytime I refer to her by either her first name, her 11 surname, or her full name. I also direct that the 12 publication ban be noted on the front page of the 13 transcript. 14 And finally, I will refer to some cases in 15 my decision. I will not read out the case references, but 16 I direct that the references be included in the transcript. 17 I will ask the Clerk to send the contractor a list of those 18 cases, the list of authorities, and the Crown's book of 19 authorities and a few others that I will refer to in my 20 reasons. 21 **REASONS** 22 THE COURT: Today I must impose sentence on 23 Trinton Niditchie for a sexual assault that he committed 24 against his cousin, A. I also have to sentence him for 25 an assault causing bodily harm he committed more 26 recently on his brother. Obviously, the sexual assault is 27 by far the most serious of the two offences and the 1

1 focus of my comments today will be on that offence. 2 Just for the record, I will refer to the facts 3 of the assault causing bodily harm charge. They are 4 quite straightforward. On January 24th, 2020, shortly 5 after 1:00 a.m., there was an argument between Mr. 6 Niditchie and his brother, Leon Cardinal. Mr. Cardinal 7 was highly intoxicated. Mr. Niditchie was intoxicated as 8 well, but less so. 9 Mr. Cardinal said something to Mr. 10 Niditchie and Mr. Niditchie punched him several times. 11 This was observed by their mother. She was not sure 12 how many times Mr. Cardinal was punched. His 13 injuries were swelling to his face and a nosebleed. The 14 Crown filed photographs at the sentencing hearing 15 vesterday that show injuries to Mr. Cardinal's face and 16 a fair bit of blood on his pants from the nosebleed. 17 When this happened, Mr. Niditchie was 18 awaiting trial on the sexual assault charge. He had just 19 been released a few weeks earlier on that charge 20 because he had failed to appear for his jury trial in the 21 fall and a warrant had issued for his arrest. One might 22 have expected him to be on his best behaviour, 23 considering all of that, but evidently that was not the 24 case. 25 With respect to the sexual assault, the 26 facts that are admitted in support of the conviction were 27 some, but not all, the events described by the victim

1 during her trial testimony. I will only mention today 2 those facts that form the basis for the guilty plea. 3 A. was at her home that day in 4 Tsiigehtchic, looking after her two-year-old brother. Her 5 mother and another sibling had gone to spend the 6 evening at their camp. She and Mr. Niditchie knew 7 each other for a very long time because they are 8 cousins, but they were not particularly close. She is 9 roughly six months older than him. 10 Mr. Niditchie came to the house as she 11 was doing the dishes. He sat on the couch and asked 12 her for something to drink. She gave him orange juice. 13 Once she was done doing the dishes she sat on the 14 couch as well. Mr. Niditchie started to tickle her and 15 she tickled him back. This was something that they 16 used to do when they were younger. 17 In her testimony she explained that Mr. 18 Niditchie then got on her. His legs were tangled in hers 19 such that she could not move her legs. He was facing 20 her. He put his hand down her pants under her 21 underwear. He touched her both on the outside of her 22 genital area and inside her vagina. She was trying to 23 push him off by pushing his shoulders. She was also 24 moving her head from side to side because he was 25 trying to kiss her and she was moving her head to stop 26 it from happening. She felt like she could not breathe. 27 She tried to get him to stop by telling him

1 she had a boyfriend, even though that was not true. 2 She told him she did not want to do this. She used the 3 words "Stop", "I don't want to do this", "Please". He did 4 not respond. In her evidence she said that he looked 5 like he did not even care. 6 This went on for about ten minutes. 7 Eventually she was able to push him hard and get him 8 off her. A. disclosed what happened to her soon 9 thereafter, after her mother returned from the camp. 10 Mr. Niditchie was eventually charged in 11 October 2017. He was ordered to stand trial in April 12 2018. He had chosen to have his trial before a judge 13 and a jury and that trial was scheduled to proceed in 14 Inuvik in September 2019. 15 I pause to note that the time gap between 16 the charge and the trial is fairly long for an 17 uncomplicated trial, even a jury trial in this jurisdiction. 18 The endorsements on the Territorial Court file show 19 that the preliminary hearing had originally been 20 scheduled to proceed in January 2018 but was 21 adjourned to April. The April date was peremptory on 22 defence, which suggests that the adjournment was a 23 defence request. 24 It took awhile after the matter was 25 transferred to this court before the trial date could get 26 set. There were several pre-trial conferences on this 27 matter throughout the summer and fall of 2018. For 4

1 several months there was no progress at all on this file 2 because defence counsel had lost contact with Mr. 3 Niditchie. 4 Eventually in December 2018 the 5 instructions that he wanted a jury trial were confirmed 6 and the trial was set to proceed in September 2018, 7 that being the earliest date counsel were both available. 8 At the time, Mr. Niditchie had a different lawyer and his 9 availabilities were very limited. 10 On that date scheduled for the trial in Inuvik, Mr. Niditchie failed to appear and a warrant 11 12 issued for his arrest. The warrant was executed 13 sometime later and in December 2019 the Crown 14 consented to Mr. Niditchie's release on conditions that 15 he reside with his mother in Fort Good Hope. As I 16 already noted, it was a few weeks later that he 17 assaulted his brother. 18 Having failed to appear for his jury trial, 19 Mr. Niditchie was presumed to have given up his right 20 to a jury trial and he did not attempt to convince the 21 Court that he should still have one. Because the matter 22 was proceeding as a judge alone trial, this was one of 23 the first cases that the court was able to schedule once 24 it became possible to once again hold in-person 25 hearings following the shutdown prompted by the 26 COVID-19 crisis. 27 The trial proceeded and in the middle of 5

1 it, after the Crown closed its case, Mr. Niditchie 2 changed his plea to guilty. 3 The reason I refer to all of this is that 4 through this whole delay, A. had to live with this 5 hanging over her head, knowing she would have to 6 testify, not knowing how and when matters would 7 conclude, and I have no doubt that this contributed 8 significantly to the very negative impact that this has had on her life. 9 10 Mr. Niditchie is now 21 years old. He 11 was 18 when he sexually assaulted his cousin. These 12 are his first convictions. He is Gwich'in and his 13 Indigenous heritage must be taken into account in 14 deciding his sentence. I have taken judicial notice of 15 systemic and background factors that have had an 16 impact on Indigenous persons in Canada and 17 contributed to their overrepresentation in Canadian 18 jails, as I am required by law to do. 19 I also have the benefit of a thorough 20 pre-sentence report that assists me in understanding 21 Mr. Niditchie's specific history and background. The 22 report does speak to both some positive aspects of Mr. 23 Niditchie's upbringing and some struggles that he has 24 faced. 25 Counsel have referred to some of the 26 factors specific to Mr. Niditchie in their submissions and 27 I do not think it is necessary for me to go over all of that 6

again in great detail, especially having heard from Mr. Niditchie's counsel that Mr. Niditchie finds it difficult to hear those things discussed.

I do want to make some comments about the report, though. There are some positive things that emerge from it. Mr. Niditchie was raised in a traditional household and was introduced to many traditional activities, which he enjoyed. I heard he hopes to pursue once again after he is released.

He has good friends who apparently seem to live a pro-social life. He has a supportive family network and he also reports that he felt loved growing up. Sadly, that is more than many offenders who come before this Court can say.

On the other hand, the report refers to certain negative aspects. His father was violent towards his mother, and while the report says that most of that violence did not occur in the presence of the children, it can still be expected, I think, to have had an impact on them. Ultimately, it led to the end of his parents' relationship. He formed a close bond with his mother's new partner and was affected significantly by that man's death in 2014. Mr. Niditchie would have been around 15 at the time.

The report also says that both his parents attended residential school, although it does not include any details about the experience that they had there.

That is not infrequent, as many people are reluctant to discuss some of the things that happened in residential schools. Not everyone's experience was the same, obviously, but courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have recognized that overall, the residential school experience was destructive for many and has led to considerable intergenerational trauma.

The report refers to Mr. Niditchie being bullied as a child. His mother believes that this may have been because theirs was, in her words, "One of the few families that was together in the community." There was an instance of bullying when he was 14 years old when he was not in his community that he had a rather extreme response to.

Mr. Niditchie would, I am sure, benefit from professional help and an opportunity to explore these issues, as this may be something that would assist him staying out of trouble in the future and also something that is important for his own well-being.

One aspect of the report that is of concern is Mr. Niditchie's apparent contradictory answers to some questions, and also in some cases, the answers themselves. For example, and I think this is the most striking example, one would think that the answer to the question "Do you think the victim deserved what happened to her?" would be a relatively straightforward thing to answer if someone truly

1 acknowledges wrongdoing. 2 To this, Mr. Niditchie answered 3 something along the lines of "No comments." I find that 4 a bit disturbing. That said, it is difficult to know what to 5 make of these comments. Mr. Niditchie's counsel 6 offered an explanation, based on his own experience 7 interacting with his client, which is rooted in Mr. 8 Niditchie's thought process and how he processes 9 questions, and that may well be part of it. 10 The contradictions in some of his 11 answers may also reflect a certain lingering 12 ambivalence on Mr. Niditchie's part about facing up to 13 what he has done. I say that because Mr. Niditchie, by 14 action and by omission, has delayed facing up to this 15 matter for quite some time. Ultimately, he took 16 responsibility for it only after the Crown had called its 17 case, and I will say, for having heard the evidence, a 18 compelling case for him to answer. So it was a very 19 long road for him before he was able to acknowledge 20 his wrongdoing. That being said, he did plead guilty. He 21 22 told the author of the report that he would like to 23 apologize if he did not have a no-contact condition in 24 place. And yesterday, when he was given a chance to 25 speak in court, he did apologize. I also was able to 26 observe when we were in Inuvik a very visible 27 emotional reaction from him at the time his plea was 9

1 entered. 2 And after this week's proceedings, having 3 heard these victim impact statements read into the 4 record, I sincerely hope that Mr. Niditchie truly 5 understands the magnitude of the harm he has caused 6 and I believe that he is sorry for it. 7 The fundamental principle of sentencing 8 is proportionality. A sentence must be proportionate to 9 the seriousness of the offence and the level of moral 10 blameworthiness of the offender. Sentencing requires 11 balancing a lot of principles and weighing how much 12 impact each should have on the ultimate decision. This 13 is not a simple exercise. 14 The range of sentence available for a sexual 15 assault proceeded by indictment is very broad. It goes 16 from no jail at all to ten years' imprisonment. Here the 17 Crown says a sentence of imprisonment of 18 months, 18 followed by three years probation, is required, the 19 probation period being there primarily to ensure that 20 there is a lengthy no-contact period to offer further 21 protection to the victim. 22 Defence argues that a jail term between 23 12 and 14 months would be enough to achieve the 24 goals of sentencing, given Mr. Niditchie's youth, his lack 25 of record and his overall circumstances. 26 In my view, it is very clear that the sexual 27 assault falls in the category of major sexual assault, as 10

described in *R. v. Arcand*, 2010 ABCA 363, and several other cases before it. *Arcand* was adopted in this jurisdiction by our Court of Appeal in *R. v. A.J.P.J.*, 2011 NWTCA 2.

As was noted in one of the cases quoted by this Court in *R. v. Lepine*, 2013 NWTSC 19, referred to by the Crown, there was a time where it was believed that there was a significant difference in seriousness between a case involving intercourse and a case involving digital penetration. With respect, in my view, that approach was seriously misguided. Both acts constitute a serious violation of the victim's physical, personal, and sexual integrity.

I entirely agree in this regard with the Court's conclusion in *Lepine* and I consider it to be a well-settled point in law, at least in this jurisdiction, a sexual assault that involves digital penetration is a major sexual assault within the meaning of *Arcand* and *A.J.P.J.* And while the more prolonged any assault, the more serious it is, the fact that a sexual assault is not prolonged does not take it outside that category.

As a result, the starting point in sentencing is three years imprisonment. It bears repeating, so I repeat again, this is not a minimum sentence. It simply is a starting point that reflects the objective seriousness of this type of conduct. From this starting point, a Court will determine a fit sentence by

1 adjusting the sentence to reflect aggravating factors 2 and mitigating factors that are present. 3 Here there are aggravating factors. First, 4 Mr. Niditchie was quite persistent in his assault. The 5 victim tried to resist him, pleaded with him, tried to get 6 him off her, and yet he persisted in assaulting her, 7 using some force to overpower her attempts to resist. 8 Second, it is aggravating that she was a 9 family member. This is now specified in the *Criminal* 10 Code, but it would have been an aggravating factor in any event. I agree that the evidence does not show 11 12 that Mr. Niditchie was in the legal position of trust 13 towards her, as they were roughly the same age and 14 they were not particularly close. But he was a family 15 member, someone she had known for a long time, 16 probably her whole life, someone she should have 17 been able to trust to let in her house without worrying that he may harm her. This was not a stranger she let 18 19 into her house. It was someone who was well known to 20 her and should have had no reason to fear. 21 Third, the impact that this crime had on 22 the victim is also an aggravating factor. That too is set 23 out in the *Criminal Code*. Here there is ample evidence 24 of that impact. The two victim impact statements that 25 were read yesterday are sad and eloquent. 26 This event crushed A. It has taken her 27 sense of safety away. It has made her depressed. It 12

1 has made her fearful and disengaged socially. It has 2 made her give up her plans to go to school, and it has 3 turned her into a hermit. She describes this in a 4 gripping way in her victim impact statement, and her 5 mother describes it too. 6 The victim impact statements are 7 eloquent enough, but I could also see this impact when 8 she testified. All this time later, the very real and very 9 raw pain that she still experiences as a result of this 10 were very, very obvious to me. 11 Her mother testified briefly at the trial as 12 well and one could see all the weight of the sadness on 13 her too. She feels powerless, does not know how to 14 help her daughter. She has seen her go from an 15 outgoing, happy young woman to someone who is 16 depressed, totally isolates herself and is basically in 17 survival mode to get through each day, and 18 unfortunately there appears to be very few resources in 19 the community for this mother to try to help her child. 20 The Court can only hope that with the 21 end of this case, A. will get closure and will be able to 22 slowly hope to get back to her normal self. But this 23 case is a very good illustration of the harm that sexual 24 assault causes. 25 And I will add, because I must, that I find 26 it especially sad that some family members have 27 ostracized A. This was not her fault. She was the 13

victim in all of this. The fact that family members, instead of trying to support her through this difficult time, would shun her and pressure her to drop the charges, is profoundly disturbing and shameful.

It is not something that should be held against Mr. Niditchie, of course, but I feel it has to be said. I can only hope that now that Mr. Niditchie has owned up to what he has done, others will follow suit and stop making A. pay the price for his wrongdoing. All this to say the impact on her was significant and that is an aggravating factor.

There are also mitigating factors in this case. The guilty plea is mitigating, although less so than it would have been if it had been offered at an earlier point. The reason why guilty pleas are mitigating is that they save time and resources and, most importantly, they spare victims from having to testify. This guilty plea did not achieve any of those things.

The criminal justice process followed its full course. The victim had to testify at the preliminary hearing. The Court traveled to Inuvik and she got ready to testify for the jury trial, which did not proceed. And ultimately, when the trial did proceed, the Crown called its full case. These witnesses, and the victim in particular, were not spared anything. A. was not spared from recounting what happened to her, and as I

1 already said, it was obvious that it was a very hard 2 thing for her to do. 3 But I do agree with what counsel said. 4 The guilty plea has achieved something that even a 5 conviction after trial would not have. Through it, Mr. 6 Niditchie told the community, his family, the public in 7 general, and anyone who thought this was a false 8 complaint, that it was not a false complaint. As I said, I 9 sure hope that those who did not believe A. or 10 somehow blamed her for this will rethink their positions. 11 And Mr. Niditchie himself acknowledging his 12 wrongdoing was possibly the only thing that hopefully 13 could achieve that. 14 In submissions, Crown counsel 15 mentioned the lack of record as a mitigating factor, but 16 with respect, that is not accurate. A criminal record, 17 when there is one, is aggravating. When there is no 18 criminal record, that merely shows the absence of what 19 would otherwise be an aggravating factor. That point 20 was made by our Court of Appeal in A.J.P.J. at 21 paragraph 13. In that case, the Court of Appeal found 22 that the sentencing judge erred in principle in treating 23 the fact that the accused had a clean record for 20 24 years as a mitigating factor. 25 That said, the fact that Mr. Niditchie is 26 young, has no criminal history, has a lot of positive 27 things in his background and has a supportive network 15

is relevant to his rehabilitation prospects, so it is relevant to what constitutes a fit sentence.

Finally, Mr. Niditchie's circumstances as an Indigenous offender are relevant to his moral blameworthiness and give the principle of restraint even more importance than would otherwise be the case.

But as I said, I do not find that the impact of those factors is as significant in this case as it sometimes is, because there are, thankfully, many positive aspects to Mr. Niditchie's circumstances. I think there actually are very good prospects for his rehabilitation.

In the final analysis, it is clear that deterrence and denunciation are the paramount sentencing principles in a case like this. Apart from any statutory requirements that may be engaged in this regard, based on the vulnerability of the victim, the law has long been that those are the paramount sentencing principles in cases of major sexual assault. In addition, as this Court has said countless times, the sheer prevalence of serious sexual assaults in this jurisdiction requires that Courts impose denunciatory sentences.

Courts have very few tools in their hands to respond to crime. The long-term solutions to these problems are education, prevention, and addressing the social issues that underlie this conduct. This Court and others have imposed stern sentences for these offences for decades and we still see a depressing

steady flow of these cases in our courts. This demonstrates that sentencing practices alone cannot solve these issues.

But the Courts have a role to play in continuing to send the same consistent message and

continuing to send the same consistent message and a duty to use the tools that they do have to continue express, case after case, that this type of conduct is unacceptable, harmful, and will be met with severe consequences.

When I consider the starting point and the aggravating factors and even when I consider the mitigating factors and the importance of attempting to support Mr. Niditchie's ultimate rehabilitation and reintegration, I cannot see how a sentence lower than what the Crown seeks could be imposed. In my view, that is the absolute minimum sentence that can be imposed to adequately address the sentencing principles and objectives.

Credit for the remand time has to be addressed. I heard that Mr. Niditchie has spent a total of 83 days on remand and if credited at the maximum ratio of one-and-a-half day credit for each day of remand, that would add up to a credit of 124 days and a half.

The Crown has sought a number of ancillary orders. The DNA order is mandatory, as this is a primary designated offence, and one will issue.

1	An order that Mr. Niditchie comply with
2	the requirements of the Sex Offender Information
3	Registration Act for 20 years is also mandatory.
4	A firearms prohibition order is mandatory.
5	Its minimum duration is that it should commence today
6	and expire ten years from his release. Based on what I
7	heard about Mr. Niditchie's activities on the land and
8	the fact that this is certainly a positive thing that he can
9	do when he is released, I will include the exemption,
10	pursuant to section 113 of the Criminal Code, that he
11	will be permitted to be in possession of a firearm for
12	sustenance and employment purposes on conditions to
13	be set out in due course by the Chief Firearms Officer.
14	Mr. Niditchie, can you stand up, please?
15	Mr. Niditchie, for the sexual assault of A., the sentence
16	of this Court if you did not have any remand time would
17	be 18 months imprisonment. For the 83 days you have
18	already spent in custody, I will give you credit for four
19	months, so the further jail term will be 14 months
20	imprisonment. You can sit down.
21	I will endorse the warrant of committal to
22	include a no-contact condition with A., pursuant to
23	section 743.21 during the custodial portion of the
24	sentence.
25	This will be followed by probation for
26	three years, Mr. Niditchie, and there will not be a lot of
27	conditions. The first is that within two days of your
	18

release, 48 hours, you are to report to a probation officer in whatever community you end up going to.

The second is that you take counselling as directed. This is not to punish you. This is to help you out. I think there are issues from your past that you could use some help with and I am sure there are a lot of things that could be achieved if you learn how to talk about some of these things and try to understand why you react the way you react sometimes. So it is to help you. That is really the objective.

The next condition is that you are to have no contact with A. I think you understand why. She is very upset still by all of this. There may come a time where she is able to receive an apology from you, but that is going to have to be on her time and on her terms. So for now you are to have no contact with her in custody, and for the duration of your probation period you are not to have any contact with her either. After that I cannot control it, but I would strongly suggest that unless she reaches out, you should really respect the space that she needs.

There will also be a condition that you are to stay 50 metres away from her residence or from her place of employment. And I am also going to add another condition, that should you find yourself in any place where she is, you are required to leave. I think it should be you that leaves, not her who has to avoid

1 you. 2 Now, this probation order is also going to 3 apply to the assault causing bodily harm charge, so 4 there will be a condition that you do not have any 5 contact with Leon Cardinal unless he agrees to it. I do 6 not know what the situation is between the two of you 7 or what it will be when you are released. You are 8 brothers. If you live in the same house or if it is thought 9 that you might live in the same house, this condition 10 may become a bit of an issue. 11 Your lawyer can explain to you that if 12 there are good reasons to change that order, an 13 application can be made and it is a condition that could 14 be removed if everybody agrees, so that is something 15 that when the time comes you can perhaps bring up. 16 On the assault causing bodily harm 17 charge, I have taken into account your early guilty plea, 18 the fact that it was a short assault, the fact that you do 19 not have a criminal record, and the importance of 20 restraint, so I agree with the Crown's suggestion, and I 21 do not think your lawyer was in disagreement, that the 22 sentence will simply be one day in jail, consecutive, and 23 the probation order will apply to it as well, with the 24 no-contact order. 25 There will be no victim of crime surcharge 26 on the sexual assault. The timing of this offence was 27 that the legislation that governed surcharges had either

1	been struc	ck down or was struck down after, but I do not			
2	intend on	intend on imposing a surcharge on that one. I am not			
3	sure if by t	sure if by the time the assault causing bodily harm			
4	occurred t	occurred the new legislation was enforced. Do you			
5	know offha	know offhand, Mr. Green?			
6	B. GREEN:	I'm afraid not, Your Honour.			
7	THE COURT:	Do you know, Mr. Bran?			
8	J. BRAN:	Not off the top of my head.			
9	THE COURT:	I did look into this relatively recently. I			
10	think the n	ew legislation that gives discretion may have			
11	been in pla	ace and I would waive the surcharge in this			
12	case in an	y event. If I have jurisdiction to waive it, I			
13	waive it, a	nd if I do not have jurisdiction to waive it, then			
14	the law wa	as invalid, and there will not be one either			
15	way.				
16		I will make an order that exhibits be			
17	returned to	their rightful owner if that is appropriate, and			
18	otherwise	they are to be destroyed at the expiration of			
19	the appea	l period.			
20		Mr. Green, you were not counsel			
21	yesterday,	but can you think of anything that I may			
22	have over	looked?			
23	B. GREEN:	No, Your Honour, that's everything that			
24	had been	noted by Ms. Halliburn.			
25	THE COURT:	Mr. Bran, have I overlooked anything that			
26	you had ra	nised and I neglected to address?			
27	J. BRAN:	No, but I do have one question and I may			
		21			

1	have missed it. On the no-contact with Mr. Cardinal,			
2	was that for the entirely of the probation order, or was			
3	that specif	that specified as a shorter period of time?		
4	THE COURT:	I intended it to be only for the first year,		
5	and so if I	did not say that, thank you for reminding me.		
6	Mr. Clerk, that was intended to be for the first year.			
7	THE CLERK:	Yes, Your Honour.		
8	J. BRAN:	Thank you.		
9	THE COURT:	And as I say, I do not know what the		
10	situation w	vill be when Mr. Niditchie is released, but I		
11	certainly w	certainly would encourage an application to be brought		
12	forward if	forward if this condition becomes an obstacle to his		
13	reintegrati	on instead of what I think the Crown intended		
14	it to be.			
15	J. BRAN:	I'll put that in next year's calendar and		
16	look into it	and if it needs to be addressed we'll take		
17	appropriat	e steps.		
18	THE COURT:	And finally, I would add that if it were to		
19	be someth	ning that is agreed to, it could easily be done		
20	by way of	a written application, I think.		
21	J. BRAN:	Thank you.		
22	THE COURT:	All right. Good luck, Mr. Niditchie. There		
23	are a lot o	f good things going for you, so I hope that		
24	you can p	ut this behind you now and you have a long		
25	life ahead	of you and I am sure you can contribute to		
26	your comr	nunity. You might be able to help others that		
27	are strugg	ling with some issues and I hope that things		
		22		

1	work out for you. Thank you for your work, counsel.
2	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)
3	(i iii
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
6	Neesons, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing
7	pages are a complete and accurate transcript of the
8	proceedings transcribed from the audio recording to the best
9	of our skill and ability. Further judicial amendments have
10	been applied to this transcript.
11	
12	
13	Dated at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, this
14	26 <sup>th</sup> day of October, 2020.
15	
16	
17	Kin Reen
18	Kim Neeson
19	Principal
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	23