

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 Mr. Ugyuk went back living with his
2 mother, who by then had moved to Yellowknife, and
3 this did not go well. She was still struggling with her
4 own issues and he continued struggling with his and
5 abusing alcohol. Eventually she asked him to leave.
6 After he left his mother he returned to Taloyoak, but
7 again, his behaviour was such that he was not
8 permitted to stay with his aunt and uncle.

9 When he was 18 years old, Mr. Ugyuk
10 began a relationship with a woman and had children
11 with her. He was very violent towards her. Six years
12 into the relationship, she and two of the children died in
13 a house fire which was later determined to have been
14 set deliberately by her to kill the children and herself.

15 Mr. Ugyuk told the author of the pre-
16 sentence report that community members blamed him
17 for that tragedy because of how he had treated her in
18 years past. His lawyer advised that to this day these
19 are not events that Mr. Ugyuk is able to talk about.

20 The pre-sentence report also refers to
21 psychological and psychiatric issues that Mr. Ugyuk
22 has struggled with over the years. He has been
23 diagnosed with personality disorder, bipolar disorder
24 and various other disorders, including a substance
25 abuse disorder. Mr. Ugyuk has been suicidal and was
26 admitted to the psychiatric ward at Stanton Hospital on
27 several occasions for that reason.

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