

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**

**- v -**

**VICTOR SHANE UGYUK**

---

**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 28th day of August, 2020.**

---

**APPEARANCES:**

**A. Paquin:**

**Counsel for the Crown**

**J. Bran:**

**Counsel for the Defence**

---

**Charge under s. 236(b) of the *Criminal Code***

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

**RULINGS, REASONS**

Reasons for Sentence

1

1 THE COURT: On September 3rd, 2019, Victor Ugyuk  
2 assaulted Mark Poodlat, punching him several times in  
3 the head. This caused a serious head injury that  
4 resulted in Mark Poodlat's death. Today it is my difficult  
5 responsibility to impose a sentence on Mr. Ugyuk for  
6 that crime.

7 I acknowledge that nothing I say or do in  
8 sentencing Mr. Ugyuk today can truly reflect the  
9 magnitude of the loss that Mr. Poodlat's mother, his  
10 friends and his community have experienced and are  
11 still experiencing because of these events. There are  
12 not any words that can accurately describe such a loss  
13 or do justice to the depth of the pain that comes with it.

14 Sentencing is a difficult task for a judge  
15 because it requires taking into account and balancing a  
16 lot of things, usually factors that point in different  
17 directions. Some things point towards being more  
18 lenient. Other things point towards being more severe.  
19 I have done my best to balance all of these things and I  
20 realize that whatever sentence I impose, it may well be  
21 seen by some as too harsh and seen by some as too  
22 lenient.

23 I hope that the fact that these  
24 proceedings will be over after today will be a step, even  
25 if a small step, that will help those affected by those  
26 events to move forward towards some form of healing.  
27 I know that court proceedings add anxiety and

1                   uncertainty for everyone, even when they are not going  
2                   to be a trial. So I do hope that the conclusion of these  
3                   proceedings will remove that uncertainty and that  
4                   anxiety and maybe help a little bit those who are trying  
5                   to cope with what happened.

6                                   In deciding what an appropriate  
7                   sentence is for the crime that Mr. Ugyuk committed, I  
8                   have to take into account a lot of things. I have to take  
9                   into account what he did. I have to take into account  
10                  who he is, his personal circumstances and background,  
11                  and I have to take into account the principles of  
12                  sentencing.

13                                  I will start with the circumstances of the  
14                  offence, what Mr. Ugyuk did. Mr. Ugyuk and Mr.  
15                  Poodlat knew each other. They were cousins. They  
16                  were both in their mid-30s at the time of these events.  
17                  Mr. Ugyuk was just a few years older than Mr. Poodlat.  
18                  The day this happened they were outside the Sobering  
19                  Centre in Yellowknife. There was a dispute between  
20                  them. How it started, what it was about is not clear, but  
21                  there was an argument.

22                                  Unfortunately, Mr. Ugyuk took it to a  
23                  physical level. He attacked Mr. Poodlat three separate  
24                  times over a period of about six minutes. The entire  
25                  incident was recorded by a video surveillance system  
26                  installed on a building across the street. This video  
27                  was played in court earlier this week and I have

1 watched it again during my deliberations. It does not  
2 have any sound but it shows what happened. It is  
3 chilling to watch. It is chilling to watch what unfolded,  
4 knowing the terrible consequences that followed.

5 The video shows a series of assaults.  
6 The first time Mr. Ugyuk punched Mr. Poodlat in the  
7 head and face area four times. Mr. Poodlat fell to the  
8 ground but got back up. By then Mr. Ugyuk had walked  
9 a short distance away off to the side of the building. Mr.  
10 Ugyuk started walking in that direction. The facts  
11 agreed to before me are that he was walking towards  
12 Mr. Ugyuk with his arms behind his back "as if he was  
13 taunting Mr. Ugyuk."

14 Mr. Ugyuk started walking towards Mr.  
15 Poodlat quite fast. According to a witness he seemed  
16 really angry. He said that Mr. Poodlat had called him  
17 and his friends The Three Stooges and that he would  
18 "show him The Three Stooges." When he got to Mr.  
19 Poodlat he punched him once in the face or head.  
20 Someone intervened and Mr. Ugyuk stopped and  
21 walked away.

22 Mr. Poodlat stood in the same spot for a  
23 few minutes and again started walking in Mr. Ugyuk's  
24 direction with his arms behind his back. Mr. Ugyuk  
25 again walked up to him and struck him, this time  
26 punching him three times. Mr. Poodlat fell and  
27 collapsed as he tried to get back up, and this time he

1 did not get back up.

2 We saw on the video that aside from the  
3 person who intervened during the second attack, no  
4 one seemed to have much of a reaction at any other  
5 point during the incident. And even for a few moments  
6 after Mr. Poodlat collapsed the last time, none of the  
7 people who were around seemed to have any particular  
8 reaction either. But soon after, people came out of the  
9 Sobering Centre, went over to Mr. Poodlat and must  
10 have realized that something was seriously wrong with  
11 him, because from that point on we can see people  
12 looking like they are trying to help him. Clients from the  
13 Sobering Centre and some staff members came out to  
14 help too, and they tried to provide Mr. Poodlat care until  
15 the ambulance arrived.

16 Mr. Poodlat was transported to the  
17 hospital and medivaced to Alberta. He died two days  
18 later from bleeding to the brain and swelling of the brain  
19 caused by the laceration of a major artery in his neck.  
20 Mr. Poodlat's blood level was very high, almost three  
21 times the legal limit for driving.

22 It is an agreed fact that intoxicated people  
23 are more at risk of suffering the type of injury that he  
24 died from because intoxication affects the guarding  
25 neck muscles and causes exaggerated movement if  
26 there is a hit to the head or face. All this puts additional  
27 tension on the arteries in the neck and makes a person

1 more vulnerable to the injury that Mr. Poodlat suffered if  
2 they are hit on the head.

3 Mr. Ugyuk was arrested the same day.  
4 He was uncooperative and aggressive during the  
5 booking process, but the next day he provided a  
6 statement where he admitted hitting Mr. Poodlat. He  
7 said he was very intoxicated that day and did not  
8 remember everything perfectly, but he did remember  
9 Mr. Poodlat saying things to him that upset him, and  
10 that he wanted to make him "shut up." He said he did  
11 not intend to hurt him, that he had punched him before  
12 and nothing had happened. Those are the facts of this  
13 offence.

14 Turning now to Mr. Ugyuk's  
15 circumstances, I have the benefit of a detailed  
16 pre-sentence report that outlines his family history and  
17 background. It is a thorough report. It has been made  
18 an exhibit and it is part of the record of these  
19 proceedings. I am not going to refer to everything that  
20 is in it, but I have taken it all into account in reaching my  
21 decision. I do find it important to refer to some aspects  
22 of the report, though, because it is important to  
23 acknowledge Mr. Ugyuk's background and some of the  
24 very tragic and traumatic aspects of his personal  
25 history.

26 Mr. Ugyuk is Inuk and he is originally  
27 from Taloyoak in Nunavut. The relationship between

1 his mother and father ended before he was even born  
2 and his father apparently never involved himself in his  
3 upbringing. The report says that his father was from a  
4 prominent family in the community of Taloyoak and he  
5 ended up having other children. It seems he did not  
6 see it as part of his responsibilities to be involved in Mr.  
7 Ugyuk's life. That is troubling and sad, but  
8 unfortunately not uncommon.

9 When Mr. Ugyuk was a child, his mother,  
10 a residential school survivor, struggled with addictions.  
11 As a result, he lived with an aunt and uncle over  
12 periods of time, and when he was with them lived a  
13 traditional lifestyle. They spent time on the land and  
14 hunting. His uncle taught him traditional skills, which is  
15 something Mr. Ugyuk valued. By all accounts, this was  
16 a healthy environment.

17 But Mr. Ugyuk also occasionally spent  
18 time living with his mother. The report says that when  
19 he was 14 years old he lived with her in Cambridge Bay  
20 for a time. Family members report that something  
21 happened to him during this time. Exactly what it was  
22 remains unknown, but he returned to Taloyoak and he  
23 was not the same. He refused to go to school and  
24 started consuming alcohol excessively on a regular  
25 basis. Ultimately he was asked to leave his aunt and  
26 uncle's home because of his behaviour. This, it seems,  
27 was the start of a downward spiral that never ended.



1 I heard that he has been prescribed  
2 medication which has positive effects when he takes it,  
3 but he is not taking it consistently. His mother says that  
4 when he stops taking his medication and goes back to  
5 drinking he becomes unstable and violent again. To  
6 this day she says she wants to support him but is afraid  
7 of his violence.

8 As the Crown prosecutor acknowledged,  
9 it is difficult to imagine a more difficult and tragic  
10 background of ongoing struggle and trauma. Sadly,  
11 there are many other people who I have had to  
12 sentence whose personal history includes significant  
13 tragedy and trauma as well. I do not know how well  
14 this is known in the public at large, but it is a fact and it  
15 is a very uncomfortable truth. There are more people  
16 than any of us would like to think in our communities  
17 who live with almost unimaginably tragic and difficult  
18 personal histories and background.

19 The degree and level of trauma that  
20 many people in our communities are carrying with them  
21 every day is staggering and often, as is the case here,  
22 that trauma leads to the commission of serious  
23 offences, leading to more tragedy and more trauma.

24 Mr. Ugyuk is an Indigenous offender and  
25 this means that the well-established principles  
26 emerging from the cases of *R. v. Gladue* and *R. v.*  
27 *Ipeelee* are engaged in this case. I have taken judicial

1 notice of systemic and background factors that have  
2 affected the lives of Indigenous people in this country  
3 generally and also the factors specific to Mr. Ugyuk,  
4 which are extensive and compelling.

5 While it is very clear that in this case  
6 incarceration cannot be avoided, Mr. Ugyuk's  
7 circumstances as an Indigenous offender must also  
8 carefully be weighed in considering the length of the  
9 term of incarceration to be imposed. They require that I  
10 exercise as much restraint as possible in sentencing  
11 him, keeping in mind other sentencing principles and  
12 objectives.

13 The lawyers talked about those  
14 sentencing principles and objectives when they made  
15 their submissions earlier this week. I will not repeat  
16 everything that they have said. The objectives of  
17 sentencing and the principles that govern it are set out  
18 in the *Criminal Code* and I have taken them into  
19 account and done my best to find the right balance  
20 between them in reaching my decision.

21 Everyone acknowledges that Mr. Ugyuk  
22 did not intend to kill Mr. Poodlat. If he had, he would be  
23 facing a charge of murder and would automatically be  
24 receiving a sentence of life imprisonment. By contrast,  
25 to commit manslaughter is to cause another person's  
26 death by committing an unlawful act but without  
27 meaning to cause the death.



1 of unlawful acts that can lead to conviction for  
2 manslaughter: acts likely to put the victim at risk of  
3 bodily injury; acts likely to put the victim at risk of  
4 serious bodily injury; and acts likely to put the victim at  
5 risk of life-threatening injuries.

6 Where a particular case fits on that scale  
7 does not answer the question as to what the sentence  
8 should be. It simply helps situate the level of  
9 seriousness of the unlawful act in relative terms. These  
10 categories are elaborated on and explained further at  
11 paragraph 17 of *Laberge*. I will not get into those  
12 details today because I do not think I need to.

13 In *Nerysoo*, The Court of Appeal  
14 concluded that the assault in that case fell in the least  
15 serious category of unlawful act referred to in *Laberge*.  
16 At paragraph 50 the Court said:

17  
18 This case would not be in the middle of  
19 higher levels of gravity for manslaughter.  
20 This was a case of a pointless altercation  
21 between two highly intoxicated cousins  
22 who were friends.

23  
24 There was some debate on appeal in  
25 *Nerysoo* as to whether the sentencing judge had  
26 properly understood the facts of the offence.  
27 Ultimately, the Court of Appeal found that whether he

1 had or not did not make a difference. It was clear that  
2 the unlawful act committed by the accused in that case  
3 was in the context of what had been a consensual fight.

4 In Mr. Ugyuk's case there was no  
5 consent fight. Mr. Poodlat never hit or tried to hit Mr.  
6 Ugyuk. The facts of this case are very different from  
7 the facts in *Nerysoo*.

8 In *Sayine*, I concluded that a single kick  
9 to the head fell in the middle category of the three  
10 broad groups that I have referred to because of the  
11 inherent risk in that particular act. In my view, what Mr.  
12 Ugyuk did, repeated punching to the head or head  
13 area, falls in the same category as the actions of Mr.  
14 Sayine, again because of the inherent risk in repeatedly  
15 hitting someone in that part of the body.

16 This does not dictate what the sentence  
17 should be. It simply serves, as I have said, to situate  
18 the conduct of Mr. Ugyuk, which he acknowledges was  
19 motivated by anger, and it puts it in the middle of the  
20 range, comparatively speaking, of unlawful acts that  
21 can lead to a person's death.

22 There are mitigating factors in this case  
23 and they must be taken into account. The most  
24 significant one is the guilty plea. I heard that from the  
25 very beginning Mr. Ugyuk instructed his counsel that he  
26 did not want to take this matter to trial. It has to be  
27 recognized that this was an overwhelmingly strong

1 case for the Crown. It is very rare in a criminal case  
2 that the Crown has video footage that actually shows  
3 the offence being committed.

4 But even that being so, Mr. Ugyuk had  
5 the right to put the Crown to the proof of its case, and  
6 he chose not to do that. This has saved court time and  
7 resources. Much more importantly, it told everyone  
8 affected by this case that he would take responsibility  
9 for what he did, that there would not be a need for  
10 anyone to testify, and that there would not be any  
11 lingering uncertainty about the outcome of this case.

12 The guilty plea is an indication that Mr.  
13 Ugyuk is remorseful about what he did, and I do not  
14 doubt for a moment that he is remorseful.

15 Those are all the reasons why a guilty  
16 plea, and his guilty plea, is a significantly mitigating  
17 factor. In addition, his difficult circumstances, outlined  
18 in the pre-sentence report and in the submissions of his  
19 lawyer, reduce his moral blameworthiness and require  
20 that I exercise restraint.

21 There are also aggravating factors,  
22 however. The first is that Mr. Ugyuk, after his initial  
23 series of punches, chose two other times to continue  
24 the assault on Mr. Poodlat. He struck him repeatedly.  
25 Unlike what happened in the cases of *Abel* and  
26 *Bourque*, he did not continue to hit Mr. Poodlat after he  
27 was on the ground or unconscious, but he still showed

1                   considerable persistence in his attacks.

2                   The second aggravating factor is Mr.  
3                   Ugyuk's extensive history of violence. This must be  
4                   approached with caution because Mr. Ugyuk's lawyer is  
5                   right: Mr. Ugyuk should not be resentenced today for  
6                   earlier crimes. His criminal record shows, however,  
7                   that he has committed crimes of violence several times  
8                   over the past many years, including serious ones that  
9                   have led to the imposition of significant jail terms.

10                  The most serious is the aggravated  
11                  assault conviction just four years ago which led to the  
12                  imposition of a two-year jail term. More recently, Mr.  
13                  Ugyuk was sentenced on other assaults not long before  
14                  these events and was on two separate probation orders  
15                  at the time he attacked Mr. Poodlat.

16                  His last conviction before this one was in  
17                  June 2019. He had spent 109 days in pretrial custody  
18                  on an assault charge and was sentenced to time  
19                  served followed by probation for one year. This means  
20                  that when he committed this offence on Mr. Poodlat,  
21                  Mr. Ugyuk had only been out of custody for three  
22                  months.

23                  As I said, and it is worth repeating, he  
24                  must not be punished again for his earlier crimes, but  
25                  his record shows that unfortunately, Mr. Ugyuk cannot  
26                  at this point control his anger and his violence, and  
27                  because of that he poses a threat to others.



1 sincere in that wish he has for the future to not resort to  
2 violence anymore, but on the evidence before me, it  
3 seems clear that there is a lot of work ahead of him for  
4 him to achieve that.

5 General deterrence is an important  
6 sentencing objective here. Physical fights are not  
7 uncommon on the streets and elsewhere. I imagine  
8 most of us in the courtroom have witnessed loud  
9 arguments on the streets, fights breaking out or looking  
10 like they are about to break out. Unfortunately, these  
11 incidents are not rare, and as I say, they do not just  
12 happen on the streets.

13 Not everyone who gets punched in the  
14 head or face dies, obviously. There are probably even  
15 many times where no one gets seriously hurt from  
16 being struck this way. Mr. Ugyuk himself said that he  
17 had punched Mr. Poodlat before and nothing  
18 happened.

19 I expect many people may think that this  
20 type of conduct is no big deal. But punching someone  
21 on the face or head is, in fact, a very dangerous act. It  
22 would be a grave error to become desensitized to it and  
23 underestimate the harm it can do just because it  
24 happens often. It is even more dangerous when the  
25 person being punched is intoxicated, for the reasons  
26 set out in the agreed facts which I have already referred  
27 to.



1 understand that it is not going to be that simple.

2 But I do hope that Mr. Ugyuk will be able  
3 to access some programs while in custody and that he  
4 will do his best to engage and make the most of the  
5 resources available, knowing the terrible consequences  
6 of what he has done, and that he will try to address the  
7 root causes of his behaviour to try to learn how to  
8 change that behaviour.

9 I do not think it is an exaggeration to say  
10 that with his record as it now stands and with this  
11 manslaughter conviction, if Mr. Ugyuk uses violence  
12 again and harms someone, he is at a very high risk of  
13 facing an application by the Crown to have him  
14 declared a dangerous offender. The stakes for him are  
15 very high at this point. If these events and this  
16 sentence do not become a turning point for him, he  
17 may well hurt someone else seriously. He may even  
18 kill someone else and ultimately face a dangerous  
19 offender designation and either a very long time in jail  
20 or possibly an indeterminate sentence.

21 As I said in *Sayine*, sentencing is not and  
22 should never be about revenge. But it is about holding  
23 people accountable for their actions. It is about  
24 showing society's strong disapproval of certain  
25 behaviour. It is about protecting the public and it is  
26 about the rehabilitation of offenders.

27 Mr. Ugyuk has struggled for most of his

1 life. He has been largely homeless since he was 14  
2 years old. He struggles with psychological and  
3 psychiatric issues and various disorders. He lives with  
4 enormous trauma from his past and all of that has to be  
5 taken into account. At the same time, as things stand  
6 now, he is a danger to others in the community. The  
7 need to protect others from that violence is not  
8 diminished by his unfortunate circumstances, and that  
9 is exactly what makes it so difficult to sentence persons  
10 like him, who have suffered a lot in their lives but are at  
11 the point where they cause significant suffering to  
12 others as well.

13 The Crown argues that the shortest  
14 sentence that can reflect the seriousness of Mr.  
15 Ugyuk's conduct, using maximum restraint, is a  
16 sentence of six years. The defence agrees that six  
17 years is within the range, but argues that in all  
18 circumstances it would be crushing for Mr. Ugyuk and  
19 more than what is needed to achieve the purposes of  
20 sentencing. Defence asks me to consider a sentence  
21 between three-and-a-half and four-and-a-half years.

22 I want to return briefly to the cases that  
23 were brought to my attention.

24 It is always difficult to compare cases.  
25 The assaults committed in the *Bourque* and *Abel* cases  
26 were aggravated by the fact that they continued after  
27 the victim was unconscious.

1                                   The assault in the *Stromberg* case was  
2                                   not particularly violent, but it was aggravated because it  
3                                   was planned, because it involved breaking into the  
4                                   victim's home, and because two people were attacking  
5                                   one person.

6                                   The assaults in *Firth* and *Nerysoo* are in  
7                                   a different category because they occurred in the  
8                                   context of what was as first a consent fight. And in *Firth*  
9                                   there was a joint submission, which greatly reduces the  
10                                  precedential value of the sentence, given the state of  
11                                  the law that requires courts to follow joint submissions,  
12                                  unless for whatever reason they are so off-base that  
13                                  following them would be contrary to the public interest.

14                                 Some of the offenders in these cases had  
15                                 criminal records, but none had the same extensive  
16                                 history of violence that Mr. Ugyuk has. On the other  
17                                 hand, while some of these offenders had faced  
18                                 struggles in their personal history, none of them  
19                                 appeared to have endured the same levels of hardship  
20                                 as Mr. Ugyuk has.

21                                 I talk about these details just to  
22                                 underscore and illustrate the many different factors that  
23                                 make each case different. Having carefully considered  
24                                 the cases that were brought to my attention and the  
25                                 overall circumstances I am facing here, I do not think  
26                                 that a sentence in the range of three-and-a-half to four-  
27                                 and-a-half years would reflect the seriousness of the

1 offence and achieve the purposes of sentencing. In  
2 particular, I do not think that such a sentence would  
3 address the need to protect the public from Mr. Ugyuk's  
4 violence.

5 It gives me no joy to sentence people to  
6 lengthy jail terms, but ultimately, the role of the criminal  
7 justice system is to promote the peace and safety in our  
8 communities and to protect the public, all members of  
9 the public. Mr. Ugyuk at this point presents a serious  
10 threat to the safety of his community and of the  
11 community in general.

12 The best way to protect the community in  
13 the long term is for Mr. Ugyuk to achieve rehabilitation.  
14 He needs to address issues from his past. He needs to  
15 consistently take medication that helps him cope with  
16 his medical issues and he needs somehow to develop  
17 tools to deal with his pain and anger in different ways.  
18 Hopefully he can get some help doing that during his  
19 sentence. Hopefully he will be able to start addressing  
20 his issues a meaningful way so that he does not spend  
21 the next decades of his life in and out of custody, as he  
22 has done for the past 15 years or so.

23 Mr. Ugyuk has been in custody since his  
24 arrest and he is entitled to credit for the time he has  
25 spent in custody. The law is clear that generally  
26 speaking, that credit should be roughly one-and-a-half  
27 days credit for each day spent in custody. No one has

1 suggested otherwise in this case, so that is how I have  
2 calculated the credit for his remand time.

3 In arriving at my decision I have reminded  
4 myself several times of the importance of exercising as  
5 much restraint as I can.

6 The Crown has sought some ancillary  
7 orders that are not opposed and will all issue. There  
8 will be a DNA order, as this is a primary designated  
9 offence. There will be a firearms prohibition order, a  
10 lifetime order, given that the Crown has filed notice of  
11 intention to seek greater punishment, and Mr. Ugyuk  
12 has been subject to firearms prohibition before. And  
13 there will be an order that Mr. Ugyuk not have any  
14 contact with Rita Aodla while in custody, pursuant to  
15 section 743.21 of the *Criminal Code*.

16 Can you stand up please, Mr. Ugyuk. Mr.  
17 Ugyuk, for the unlawful killing of Mark Poodlat, I hereby  
18 sentence you to five-and-a-half years imprisonment.  
19 For the 360 days that you have spent in custody, I will  
20 give you credit for one year and five months, so there  
21 will be a further term of imprisonment of four years and  
22 one month. You can sit down. You may sit down.  
23 Thank you.

24 Ms. Paquin, did you want to address the  
25 forfeiture order today or to you want to submit materials  
26 at a later date?

27 A. PAQUIN: I've discussed with my friend and we're

1 prepared to submit a draft order for forfeiture and return  
2 of some things that were seized. This is on consent.

3 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Clerk. You have seen this,  
4 Mr. Bran?

5 J. BRAN: Yes, I have. That can be on consent.

6 THE COURT: So Appendix B is to be returned to the  
7 people mentioned and Appendix A is to be forfeited?

8 A. PAQUIN: That's correct.

9 THE COURT: All right. So that order will issue, Mr.  
10 Clerk.

11 THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honour.

12 THE COURT: Is there anything I have overlooked from  
13 the Crown's perspective?

14 A. PAQUIN: Perhaps the victim of crime surcharge. I  
15 don't remember that my friend made submissions about  
16 those.

17 THE COURT: Well, the provision that made them  
18 mandatory has been struck down, and with the  
19 sentence I have imposed I am not going to impose a  
20 victim of crime surcharge. Anything further from  
21 defence?

22 J. BRAN: No, thank you.

23 THE COURT: I thank you for your submissions,  
24 counsel, and for your work in resolving this case. And  
25 as I said at the beginning, I hope that the end of these  
26 proceedings can be the beginning or the next step in  
27 everyone carrying on, even though I understand that it

1 is very difficult. We will close court.

2 THE CLERK: All rise. I declare the Supreme Court  
3 closed.

4

5 **(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)**

6

7 **CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT**

8 Neesons, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing  
9 pages are a complete and accurate transcript of the  
10 proceedings transcribed from the audio recording to the best  
11 of our skill and ability. Judicial amendments have been  
12 applied to this transcript.

13

14

15 Dated at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, this  
16 15th day of September, 2020.

17

18

19



20

Kim Neeson

21

Principal

22

23

24

25

26

27