IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

-V-

JAMES GEORGE THOMAS

Transcript of the Trial Decision delivered by the Honourable Justice A.M. Mahar, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 16th day of November, 2021.

APPEARANCES:

D. Praught: Counsel for the Crown (in person)

S. Straub:

J. Hale: Counsel for the Defence

(via videoconference)

Charges under s. 235(1) and s. 344 of the Criminal Code

There is a ban on publication, broadcast, or transmission in any way of the evidence, submissions of counsel, exhibits, and reasons heard or filed at the Respondent's trial, beginning 120 days prior to the commencement of Levi Cayen's trial in the

| Supreme Court, and ending after the jury retires to consider its verdict. | |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | INDEX | PAGE |
|----------------------|-------|------|
| RULINGS, REASONS | | |
| Reasons for Judgment | | 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | i | |

NOVEMBER 16, 2021

THE COURT: On the morning of December 28th, 2017, a snowplough was clearing the Wilderness Lodge Road on the K'atl'odeeche First Nation. The road is a private access road to the lodge with a gate at the entrance. When the snowplough driver reached the gate, he found it closed with a chain wrapped around the end but the lock undone. The driver opened the gate and commenced clearing the road. Approximately one kilometre in, he came upon a damaged Mazda sedan face in against the snowbank. All the windows were basically smashed. Inside he found the frozen body of Alexander Norwegian. Alexander was 25 years old at this time. The basic outline of what happened in this case is clear and unchallenged by the defence.

Alex Norwegian had returned to Hay River near the end of December 2017. He had been living in Edmonton where he was involved in the crack cocaine trade both as a user and as a low level dealer. He drove up in an older Mazda sedan that had been purchased by his father, Roy. His plan was to spend Christmas with his family and to make some money dealing drugs. He used an area on Lagoon Road to stash his drugs and used a location known as the Portage on Wilderness Lodge Road to conduct drug transactions from the Mazda. This location is quite isolated, being on a private gated road.

1 On December 26th he came into contact with 2 Sasha Cayen, Tyler Cayen and the accused, James 3 Thomas. On the first occasion, James Thomas drove 4 Sasha to the Portage where Alex sold her a gram of 5 crack cocaine. 6 Later that evening, Alex Norwegian got his car 7 stuck in a snowbank. He called Sasha Cayen. She 8 and Tyler drove with James Thomas in his pickup truck 9 to assist him. The three of them had been socializing 10 at James Thomas' residence. They pulled Alex's car 11 out of the snowbank and he gave Sasha a small piece 12 of crack and a few dollars. 13 The three of them returned to the Thomas 14 residence where they were joined by an intoxicated 15 Levi Cayen. A plan was made to rob Alexander 16 Norwegian out at the Portage. Sasha Cayen would set 17 up a buy at that location where Levi Cayen and James 18 Thomas would rob him. They decided to travel by 19 snowmobile because Alex would recognize James 20 Thomas' truck from earlier in the evening. Tyler Cayen 21 decided not to join in the plan because Alex was his 22 cousin. 23 Levi Cayen and James Thomas changed into 24 old clothes in a further effort to avoid being recognized. 25 They left on James Thomas' snowmobile. 26 They arrived at the Portage and found Alex

Norwegian in the Mazda. James Thomas had a small

wooden bat and Levi Cayen had something more substantial, either a metal bar or a bat. Levi hit all the windows in the vehicle and smashed most of them. He also assaulted Alex with the weapon causing serious injuries to his head and neck. James Thomas searched the inside of the vehicle. I will deal with the rest of what occurred at the Portage when I discuss my findings of fact which are more controversial.

They left the Portage across the ice and returned to James Thomas' house. James Thomas told Sasha Cayen and Tyler Cayen that Levi had gone too far and told Levi to go to the Rooster, a local convenience store, to tell the police that they had seen a drunk driver at the location of the robbery. Levi did this, but his call was unclear and the police did not follow up. A number of items, including clothing, were burned in the woodstove.

A short time later, James Thomas took Tyler
Cayen in his truck to the Lagoon Road to look for Alex
Norwegian's stash of drugs.

I move on now to findings of fact. I make these further findings of fact; where they are pivotal or significantly aggravating, I find that they have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Where I refer to evidence in reaching these conclusions, I have accepted that evidence.

James Thomas was actively involved in planning the

robbery

While I suspect that Sasha Cayen played a larger role than she admitted to in her evidence, it is clear from all the evidence that James Thomas was not an indifferent or reluctant participant. Both Sasha and Tyler gave this evidence. It was either his suggestion or he was one of the main instigators. He looked for old clothes so they could disguise themselves. He brought a rope. He decided what weapons to use and drove the skidoo they used to get there. After the robbery, he took Tyler to the Lagoon Road to search for the stash of drugs.

One of the odder aspects of this case is that the two actual robbers were not crack cocaine users. Levi Cayen was a hard drinker going through a difficult time with his girlfriend, and James Thomas used meth. Why the accused decided to do this, we'll never know. Maybe he wanted money. Perhaps he hoped to get some drugs for his girlfriend who was a cocaine user; but decide to do it, he did.

They dummy-locked the gate on the way to the meeting at the Portage

The reason this was done was not clear. I find for these purposes that it was done to avoid being disturbed in the act of robbing the victim and not to stop the victim from leaving the area or stop anyone from finding him after. I accept that leaving it in this state

was not done with malice.

Levi Cayen was significantly more intoxicated than James
Thomas. The accused had been consuming alcohol but
there is nothing in the evidence of either Tyler or Sasha
Cayen to suggest that he was anything more than slightly
impaired. Levi Cayen, on the other hand, had been
drinking for days.

Levi Cayen caused most of the injuries suffered by Alex
Norwegian.

Cayen. His testimony during the trial that he was the lone assailant was completely incredible and ridiculous, as acknowledged by the defence. His statement to the police that he gave shortly after his arrest was largely self-serving and I have given very limited weight to his attempts to minimize his involvement to the detriment of the accused. He did, however, provide some details which are either neutral or helpful to the defence which I have taken into account, as well as some other pieces of information which I have accepted because they align with the rest of the evidence.

James Thomas was armed with a small wooden fish knocker that broke when it struck the vehicle. It was found in the vehicle. The only forensic evidence on it were drops of blood which made sense given the location where it was found. There was no evidence to suggest that it had been used to assault the victim.

Levi Cayen was armed with either a metal bar which was never found or the aluminum bat found later in the residence of the accused, whichever one it was makes no difference. There was a suspicious drop of blood on the bat, perhaps the bat had been cleaned. The bat did not match paint samples that were taken from the vehicle. But it is also quite surprising that the bat would have been referred to earlier in evidence as having been taken as a weapon.

Whatever weapon Levi Cayen used, it was significantly more substantial than the weapon wielded by Mr. Thomas, and Levi used this weapon to smash virtually all the windows in the car as well as to inflict the serious injuries to the victim's head and neck. He acknowledged this in his statement more or less and the rest of the evidence points in this direction as well.

James Thomas knew that Levi was beating the victim and expected violence to take place during the robbery. He did not expect Levi to go as far as he did.

Some violence was clearly intended by the accused. Why else would he have taken weapons and rope to the meeting? As I said, I am willing to accept that Levi Cayen was the primary assailant and that he caused more injuries than James Thomas expected. I do not accept that James Thomas was unaware of what was going on because he was too busy searching the car.

1 There is no credible evidence to suggest this. It 2 is purely speculative. It also doesn't make sense. Alex 3 Norwegian was beaten and interrogated. James 4 Thomas was part of that. Legally speaking, James 5 Thomas was a party to the violence inflicted on the 6 victim. 7 There is no evidence of an actual intention to kill on the 8 part of either of the assailants. 9 The victim was badly injured by the beating. He 10 suffered significant blows to the head and his condition, 11 left untreated, was life threatening. 12 I do not find that death was likely or that the 13 extent of his injuries, such as they were, was 14 intentional. When I say "likely", I mean in a legal sense. 15 The evidence suggests that the intention of both parties 16 and specifically James Thomas was to attack the 17 victim, steal whatever drugs and money he had on him, 18 force him to reveal the location of his stash and then let 19 him go. 20 The victim's coat was taken during the robbery and later 21 burned. 22 I accept Sasha Cayen's evidence that one of the 23 items James Thomas burned in the woodstove was the 24 victim's Carhartt coat. The coat was taken from the 25 victim during the robbery. I do not believe this was 26 done to harm the victim. This does not connect 27 logically to allowing him to remain in his vehicle with 7

presumably the heater on. I suspect that it was taken in order to search it more thoroughly for drugs and cash. Whatever the reason, the effect was to make the victim substantially more vulnerable to the cold and is something the accused would have been clearly aware of when he left the scene.

The rope was used to confine Alex Norwegian.

The autopsy showed clear indications of ligature use on both the neck and wrist. The pathologist was of the opinion that a rope was used. He conceded on cross-examination that it was possible that the marks could have been caused by friction from the tugging of clothing.

We know James Thomas took a rope with him to the robbery. What appears to be the burned remnants of a rope was found in the woodstove. The search of the Lagoon Road location is evidence that Alex Norwegian must have provided this information to James Thomas and Levi Cayen which he would not have done willingly. I find that the rope was used during an interrogation and that for a time at least Alex Norwegian was forcibly confined.

Alex Norwegian was allowed to leave the location of the robbery. He either got back into the car by himself or was assisted back into the vehicle.

When the vehicle was found, the keys were in the ignition and the car was in gear. The battery was

1 dead, there was gas in the tank and the blower was on. 2 The tire tracks indicated that the car had left the 3 Portage, crossed the road at an angle and come to a 4 stop against the snowbank on the far side of the road. 5 There was no indication that it had backed up or 6 otherwise moved after coming to a stop. 7 On this issue, Levi Cayen's statement is helpful. The assertion in his statement that the victim had been 8 9 allowed to leave in his vehicle and did so under his own 10 volition is in keeping with the rest of the evidence. That 11 he had to try to get the car in gear twice before he was 12 able to leave also makes sense given the nature of the 13 injuries he had suffered. 14 The only reasonable conclusion is that the victim 15 lost consciousness while driving and came to a stop 16 against the snowbank while the car was in gear. This 17 caused the car to stall, as all manual shift cars would do in a situation like that, and the battery was quickly 18 19 drained by the blower and the lights afterward. 20 The skidoo used in the robbery belonged to the accused. 21 Other than Levi using it for a quick trip to his house 22 before the robbery and for the drive to the Rooster to call 23 the RCMP, the accused was the operator of the vehicle. 24 There is no evidence otherwise, nor does it 25 make any sense that the accused would have let the 26 intoxicated Levi do most of the driving. He drove the 27 skidoo.

The accused knew the victim was incapacitated when he left the scene on the skidoo.

I have come to this conclusion based on several pieces of evidence including the statement of Levi Cayen. I do not accept that Levi was concerned about the victim's welfare and James Thomas was not. I am not saying this was not the case, but I am not convinced by self-serving aspects of the statement that are not corroborated by other evidence. I do, however, find that the accused knew that the victim was unable to drive his vehicle by the time the accused and Levi left the scene.

There are a number of reasons why I find this. Along with the statement, the following lead me to this conclusion: When they returned to the residence, the accused told Sasha and Tyler that Levi "had gone too far." He told Levi to go to the Rooster to call the RCMP so they would find the victim. He decided to burn the evidence which he would not have been in a hurry to do if he had believed that the victim was on his way home. He decided to search the location on Lagoon Road which I conclude was provided by the victim. He would not have done this if he had believed that the victim was in any shape to retrieve the drugs himself. He certainly would not have waited until after burning the clothes.

I find that James Thomas knew the vehicle was

1 stopped against the snowbank when he decided to 2 leave the scene. He knew that Alex Norwegian was 3 too injured to be able to drive his car. He knew all the 4 windows were smashed and that the victim was 5 missing his jacket on a night when the temperature was 6 in the minus twenties. I am not able to conclude that 7 he knew that the vehicle had stalled. The workings of 8 manual shift automobiles are no longer common 9 knowledge and the lights, while likely dimmed, would 10 have remained on. 11 I am also willing to accept for the purpose of this 12 analysis that the accused simply forgot about the gate 13 to the road being closed and did not leave it in that 14 state to make the discovery of the victim more difficult 15 for anybody who might have gone looking for him. 16 I move on now to my analysis of these findings 17 of fact. If I could please have a copy of the indictment, Madam Clerk? 18 19 THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honour. THE COURT: 20 Thank you. James George Thomas is 21 charged as follows: On count 1, that between the 26th 22 day of December in the year 2017 and the 27th day of 23 December in the year 2017 at the K'atl'odeeche First 24 Nation Reserve, Northwest Territories, did commit first 25 degree murder on the person of Alexander Norwegian 26 contrary to section 235(1) of the Criminal Code; and 27 count 2 that between the 26th day of December in the

year 2017 and the 27th day of December in the year 2017 at the K'atl'odeeche First Nation Reserve, Northwest Territories, did rob Alexander Norwegian contrary to section 344 of the *Criminal Code*.

Robbery is a theft with violence. The defence concedes that the robbery charge is made out. It makes no difference in this case that the robbers did not find either what they were looking for or as much of it as they were looking for. It is enough that the victim's coat was taken. In any event, an attempt is as serious as a completed offence in a case like this. I find the accused, James Thomas, guilty of the offence of robbery.

Moving on to the other charge, first degree murder can be made out in one of two ways. The Crown must prove that either the killing was planned and deliberate or they must prove that a second degree murder took place in the course of committing another offence which falls on a list of specified offences. These offences include, for example, the killing of a police officer, a correctional officer or a killing during a sexual assault. That list also includes the offence of forcible confinement which is the offence that the Crown is relying on in this case.

In order to obtain a conviction of first degree murder against James Thomas, the Crown must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the death of Alexander

Norwegian constitutes a second degree murder and that this murder took place in the course of the commission of the offence of forcible confinement.

Second degree murder requires either an actual intention to kill or the intention to cause bodily harm that the accused knows is likely to cause death and the accused is reckless as to whether or not death ensues.

As I already said, I do not find that there was any actual intention to kill in this case. The bodily harm inflicted during the robbery in which the accused participated was very serious but not sufficient to allow me to draw the legal conclusion that the accused would have known it was likely to cause death.

What this case comes down to is the decision to leave Alex Norwegian at the Portage and its consequences, the consequences that flow from that decision. I suspect, and I am prepared to give the accused the benefit of this suspicion, that he fully intended that Alex Norwegian would be able to leave the Portage and drive home. This was not a reasonable expectation and when this did not happen, James Thomas made the decision to leave him there incapacitated, not dressed for the weather, in a car with no windows on a deserted road in the middle of the night in minus 20 temperatures.

At that point in this situation entirely caused by the actions of James Thomas and Levi Cayen, this

decision was the one which likely caused the death of Alex Norwegian. He was likely to die under those circumstances. I also find that James Thomas had to be aware of this. The robbery, the injuries, the decision to leave, form a continuous string of actions all of which James Thomas is responsible for, especially so the fatal decision to leave.

The mental element or guilty mind in this case falls very close to the line between manslaughter and murder. If Alex Norwegian had been able to drive away and lost consciousness further down the road out of sight, this would have been an extremely serious manslaughter with robbery, but that is not what happened here. I find that the first stage of the requirements for second degree murder is made out, that the accused caused bodily harm to the victim, knowing that this was likely to result in his death. That knowledge was not complete until the decision to leave the Portage, but upon that decision being made, the knowledge was complete. I now move on to consider the issue of recklessness.

The requirement that the accused be reckless as to whether or not death ensues is very seldom an issue in murder trials. Typically, the inflicting of the injury and the recklessness are one and the same.

This case is somewhat different. It took a long time for the victim to die of exposure to the cold. If the accused

had simply left and taken no further steps, then recklessness would be obvious in this case. Here, the accused told Levi Cayen to take his snowmobile and drive to a convenience store to report a drunk driver in the hope that the victim would be found and saved.

The accused did not go himself. He entrusted this potentially lifesaving task to the very drunk Levi Cayen who predictably made a mess of it when he made the call. After burning the clothes, he took Tyler Cayen on a search of Lagoon Road looking for the victim's stash of drugs. It would have been a simple thing to drive to the Portage to check on the victim but he did not. If James Thomas had made that call to the RCMP, if he had gone to check on the victim, I may have been willing to find that he was not reckless about the death that ensued, but he was reckless and the essential elements for second degree murder are made out.

I now have to consider the forcible confinement and the possibility of first degree murder. In order to find the accused guilty of first degree murder, I would first have to find that this death took place in the course of the forcible confinement. This requirement is not absolutely strict in terms of timing and causation but there does need to be a causal connection or nexus between the second degree murder and the confinement.

While I have found that at some point the victim was forcibly confined, I do not find beyond a reasonable doubt that the forcible confinement was contemporaneous with the serious injuries inflicted on the victim which appear to have taken place before he was questioned. I also have found that he was fully released and operating under his own volition when he drove into the snowbank. He wasn't in good shape, he was badly injured, but he was released. On this issue, the statement of Levi Cayen is very helpful to the accused in that the release of the victim is clear. I accept the statement on this issue. In any event, on the totality of the evidence, I do not find that the Crown has proven that the forcible confinement was sufficiently linked to the death of Alex Norwegian to raise this case to first degree murder. I therefore find the accused guilty of second degree murder.

Counsel, I want to make it clear that this case does fall just over the line between manslaughter and murder. The aggravating circumstances of the robbery, the assault on the victim, are circumstances that I would have taken into account in imposing a very severe sentence for either manslaughter or robbery. But the intention in this case that drives the conviction for murder is the decision to leave, and I say that in terms of the sentences that are possible or the various things that I can do upon a conviction for second

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

| 1 | degree murder and in terms of the steps that we next |
|----|--|
| 2 | take. |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 10:00 AM, NOVEMBER |
| 8 | 22, 2021, AT YELLOWKNIFE) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT |
| 14 | Neesons, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing |
| 15 | pages are a complete and accurate transcript of the |
| 16 | proceedings transcribed from the audio recording to the best |
| 17 | of our skill and ability. Judicial amendments have been |
| 18 | applied to this transcript. |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | Dated at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, this |
| 22 | 20th day of January, 2022. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | Kim Reen |
| 26 | Kim Neeson |
| 27 | Principal |
| | 17 |