IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT

OF THE

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

ORIGINAL

REGINA .

vs.

LEROY JOHNSON OMILGOITUK

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

AND

JUDGMENT

Chief Judge J.R. Slaven, Presiding

T.R. Humphries, Esq.,

Appeared for the Crown

J.I. Lillegran, Ms.,

Appeared for the Defence

C.F. Cameron, CSR(A)

Official Court Reporter

Inuvik, Northwest Territories
April 4, A.D. 1989

(Charge under Section 246.1 of the Criminal Code)

THE COURT: Thank you. The alleged victim,
Marilyn Kasook, appears to me to be in her mid or late 20's,
and is apparently, from her testimony, a regular heavy
drinker. On the day in question, by arrangement, she met
Mr. Omilgoituk at the liquor store when it opened at 1
o'clock. Two other fellows were with him. They got a 26 of
vodka and went to Twin Lakes to drink it.

Apparently the day before she had also started drinking right after 1 o'clock when the liquor store opened, carried on until 1 o'clock in the evening or the night, and it's not clear from her testimony as to how many days that had been going on. She says at Twin Lakes that day she drank the equivalent of one straight cupful of vodka, and that would make sense if four of them were sharing a 26. She says she was drunk, but knew what she was doing. Constable Harrish said she was quite intoxicated, also emotional and upset about what had happened to her.

She says that Lena Wainewright came by when they were at Twin Lakes. Lena Wainewright testified that she didn't. I think we have to prefer the testimony of Miss Wainewright on that point. But we must remember that all these events took place ten months ago. Miss Wainewright's statement was only taken December 23 of this year, more than half a year after the occurrence.

But Miss Kasook, as characterized by Mr. Humphries, appeared to be truthful; she wasn't shaken on cross-examination. There was an empty bottle of vodka, Smirnoff,



there. There was a bag with a sales slip for a 26 of Smirnoff purchased at 1:04 p.m. on that date, and I feel that this is some corroboration that they were there, although obviously that doesn't corroborate the alleged assault.

But the fact is that she says, I closed my eyes, I don't know who kicked me or who hit me, I don't know if anyone kicked me, I don't know who tore the chain off my neck, which I think is when I incurred the injury to my chin, I don't know who did all of that because I had my eyes closed; but I do know that the other fellow attempted to have sexual intercourse with me, apparently he achieved penetration, but she's adamant that he did not ejaculate. She's quite clear, and I take it that it was after that occurrence that with her pants down to her ankles, with her privates bare, Leroy Omilgoituk bothered her by placing his hand between her bare legs.

I don't feel she imagined this, made it up, or dreamed it in drunkenness. She was quite clear about it, and I am satisfied that I can on the basis of her evidence and the slight corroboration offered, I am satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the sexual assault by Mr. Omilgoituk on Miss Kasook took place as described by her, and I find him guilty as charged. Am I to sentence now?

MR. HUMPHRIES: Yes, Your Honour.

18

19

22

MS. LILLEGRAN: Yes, Your Honour.



MR. HUMPHRIES:

Sir, I'm showing Ms. Lillegran the

record.

MS. LILLEGRAN:

The record's admitted, Your Honour.

MR. HUMPHRIES:

Sir, the record is generally, I think

it's fair to say, unrelated to this sort of incident. Sir, the bench mark, if you will, of a major sexual assault is three years, according to the Sandercock case. characterizing this as a major sexual assault. Mr. Omilgoituk's participation in it, if you will, does not amount to -- doesn't take it into that major category. It's aggravating that he was with another person at the The other person, perhaps, might be characterized as having committed a major sexual assault, but not Mr. Omilgoituk.

In my submission, sir, the offense as well, of course, there is the injuries suffered to the chin which is aggravating. In my submission, the offense does call for a short gaol term, however, regarding Mr. Omilgoituk. are my submissions.

THE COURT:

Miss Lillegran?

MS. LILLEGRAN:

Yes, Your Honour, Mr. Omilgoituk is

28, had a Grade 9 education. He is divorced. There are two children from a previous marriage, ages 10 and 7. Mr. Omilgoituk looks after the 10 year old, and his sister, Ann Kasook, has the care of the 7 year old. Mr. Omilgoituk is employed. He's working for Sonex Exploration. He's worked for them as a line truck driver for the past three



years, and before that for the -- in total he's been involved in the same occupation for five or six years, but for a different company other than Sonex. When he -- that's seasonal employment, Your Honour.

When he is not involved in that, he traps, and he has an arrangement or assists Mr. Sembler who has a store in Inuvik. As well, he has a camp and one of the arrangements that he has with Mr. Omilgoituk is for Mr. Omilgoituk to go out and look after his trap line and so forth, and they split the furs and Mr. Sembler sells them. He's been doing that for a number of years.

With regard to the circumstances of this particular offense, Mr. Omilgoituk was -- has no memory of the events. He had been drinking on that day, and I think my friend also quite fairly categorized this as not a major sexual assault. My friend makes the point that it's aggravating that he was with another fellow, but there's no evidence here of -- of a plan or a concerted effort on Mr. Omilgoituk to assist the other individual.

If anything respectfully, I would submit, that whatever Mr. Omilgoituk -- it appears sort of as a spur of the moment. It's not a very major involvement. Miss Kasook's words were that -- got it straight, the touching didn't go on for very long, and it appeared to not turn into anything further. Would appear that definitely all parties involved had been drinking, and to considerable level of intoxication.



Mr. Omilgoituk has no related record, and respectfully I'd submit that Your Honour can also consider instead of imposing a short gaol short sentence, imposing perhaps a substantial fine. And Mr. Omilgoituk is scheduled to -- he was scheduled, unfortunately didn't appear for court yesterday. He was scheduled to leave today, but depending on what happens here, he is required to return to work to finish the season, and he would be leaving tomorrow, depending on what the disposition is today. Those are my submissions.

The Court: Thank you. Well, as counsel quite properly point out, what Mr. Omilgoituk did is not in the field of a major sexual offense. What the other man did likely is, but apparently as far as the sexual assault is concerned, after the other was finished, Mr. Omilgoituk put his hand around Miss Kasook's privates. She says that he didn't touch her for long, he was holding me and touching me, and she was crying and saying, please, leave me alone, and then he stopped. Here the other fellow said, all right, take off. She did. But Miss Kasook says, you know, he didn't try to stop her from leaving at that time, but both of them stopped her from leaving earlier on.

I think Mr. Omilgoituk has just a short record. I suppose the only really significant one is the break-enter in October last year, and that was dealt with by just a fine. And he apparently keeps himself occupied working at various endeavours. He does a lot better than a lot of young men



around here in Inuvik in that respect.

But the aggravating factor is that these men kept Miss Kasook there against her will, and a bit of a beating was laid on her by one or both, and I can't find on the evidence that Mr. Omilgoituk did that, but certainly she was kept there against her will for some period of time. And Mr. Omilgoituk availed himself of the opportunity of touching her around her privates when her pants were down to her ankles. And it's not the type of thing the community accepts. Miss Kasook was drinking a lot, but she's still entitled to the protection of the courts against things like this occurrence.

And I think she was particularly upset that she said she is, in effect, related to Mr. Omilgoituk. Her brother's married to his sister or vice versa. She's known him all her life, and she never thought that he would do anything like that to her; in other words, going with him, even though the others were strangers to her, she felt that she was safe. Certainly it proved otherwise.

Stand up, please, Mr. Omilgoituk. Despite the fact you've never been in gaol before, I do feel a gaol sentence is demanded for this occurrence. I convict you as charged and direct you be imprisoned for a period of four months.

MR. HUMPHRIES: Sir, I believe a Section 100 order is mandatory in this situation.

THE COURT: There is no evidence that violence



was used or threatened by Mr. Omilgoituk. I don't suggest there was no evidence, but I haven't made that finding. think violence has to be used or threatened. 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: Well, sir, in my submission it seems a part of the case, a part of the result that Miss 5 Kasook received an injury in the course of this. 6 case sexual assault is assault by definition. 7 THE COURT: The commission of which violence 8 against a person is used, doesn't necessarily say by him. 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: Well, sir, even if it's not found 10 as a fact that he participated in the cutting of the chin, 11 then as I say, assault -- sexual assault is assault by 12 definition. Degree of violence I suppose is a question of 13 fact, but there was an assault. Anyway, sir, in my 14 submission it's mandatory, that's the Crown's position. 15 THE COURT: Care to address that, Miss Lillegran? 16 MS. LILLEGRAN: 17 Yes, Your Honour, by definition I disagree with my friend's submissions there. What, as Your 18 Honour said, I respectfully submit that there was no 19 evidence that Mr. Omilgoituk used or threatened violence. 20 In fact all we ended up with was a touching. Now, whether 21 22 that's submit -- in the definition of assault, I mean that's 23 a non-consensual touching, whether that is equivalent to violence, I submit that respectfully that it's not because 24 25 if my friend's correct, in the case of simple assault we'd 26 have Section 100 orders imposed. 27 MR. HUMPHRIES: No, that's not true, sir, 10 year



maximum.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

THE COURT: And the maximum here is 10 years,

I believe.

MR. HUMPHRIES: I believe it's either 14 or 10,

sir, it's at least 10.

THE COURT: I think it's 10. What is the

number of the section now?

MR. HUMPHRIES: I believe it's now 271, sir, it's

10 years, that's correct.

THE COURT: Well, reading subsection 1 of Section 100, applies where an offender is convicted of an offence in the commission of which violence against a person is used, threatened or attempted, violence was used against her in this case, but there was no strong evidence that the accused used the violence. The subsection, by it's own terms is specific, in that it's a penal section. It says an order will be made in addition to any other punishment, so it is a form of punishment, and is penal rather than any type of regulatory thing. Being a penal section I feel it must be construed narrowly. Although violence was used against her, I have no evidence that the offender used violence. By the definition of assault, an assault is where force is used intentionally, in this case any force used by the accused was minimal, and I take it the word violence is used for a purpose in subsection 1 of Section 100, and to me violence is much more than some types of force. And certainly the minimal force that was used in committing the



sexual assault by placing his hand on her here, is in my opinion, such that subsection 100 (1) does not apply and I will not make an order under that section. So if you want to get your name in the law books, Mr. Humphries, you can take that to the Supreme Court. Might be worth it to keep testing it.

MR. HUMPHRIES:

It's an unusual section, sir.

THE COURT:

Someone say Mr. Storr was here?

MR. HUMPHRIES:

He was here.

MS. LILLEGRAN:

Yes, he is, Your Honour. I've

spoken to him. Sir, I wonder if we might take a very short

adjournment?

THE COURT:

Take five minutes.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

10

11

12

13

14

1

I, C.F. Cameron, CSR(A), Official Court Reporter, hereby certify that I attended at the above trial and took faithful and accurate shorthand notes and the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my shorthand notes to the best of my skill and ability.

Dated at the City of Calgary, in the Province of Alberta, on this 25th day of May, A.D. 1989.

C.F. Cameron,

Official Court Reporter

CC/cc

