IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

MAR 4 1991

- and -

CHARLIE MANTLA

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing of His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Friday, November 2, A.D. 1990.

APPEARANCES:

MR. H. PRUDEN

MR. T. BOYD

For the Crown

For the Defence

Charge under Section 266 C.C.

THE COURT:

Rae-Edzo of assault on his ten-year old son. The
Crown sought to tender proof of previous convictions
by way of consent, or agreement. The Crown has filed
with the Court today, in accordance with Section 667
of the Code, three certified summary conviction
informations, three court documents indicating a
conviction for assault in reference to Charlie
Mantla. I can not go beyond what those records reveal
on their face and speculate as to who filled them in,
how they were changed, or how it came to be that they
are written up in the form that they are written up.

The accused was convicted yesterday in

It is open for defence counsel to seek permission of the Court to cross-examine the clerk of the court who produced this record, but has not requested to do so. The uncontradicted evidence before me is that I have Charlie Mantla before me, born the 27th of April, 1942. One of the documents filed by the defence names a Charlie Phillip Mantla, born 16 July, 1955. On the evidence that is before me, notwithstanding Charlie Mantla's denial, I find that he is one and the same as the Charlie Mantla set out in Exhibit one.

I don't believe Mr. Mantla when he says he doesn't remember, or everyone is lying. He testified before me at his trial. I had the opportunity of observing him and listening to him, he is not a credible witness. On the evidence before me I am

satisfied that he has three previous convictions for assault as set out in Exhibit one.

In regards to sentence; Charlie Mantla was seen to strike his ten-year old son in the face. His son received injuries to the bridge of his nose, his lip, and a substantial black eye. Apparently the other conviction relates to acts of violence against family members as well.

I am deeply concerned with the allegation by the Crown that as a result of having to testify one daughter has been ejected from the home. In a way the criminal law is making a bad situation at home apparently worse. Society can't afford to sit back and allow this level of violence to exist within a family. I have no information and no power to go beyond a sentence on this accused today, so that some way the rest of the family can be protected. Mr. Mantla's daughter didn't testify because she wanted to, she testified because she had to, and for someone in the family to punish her for that is most unjust. Mr. Mantla, you are in court for what you did, not for what anyone else is doing to As I told you yesterday, you can correct your you. son, but you can't go punching him in the face like this.

I take into account that there is no remorse; there is a denial of what I found in fact to have

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

occurred.

Stand up please Mr. Mantla. On this matter I am going to sentence you to a term of imprisonment of one month. You are supposed to be a role model for your children and your son, Mr. Mantla, I suggest you might want to reconsider how you deal with a ten-year old boy, but I tell you that the law will not accept punches to the face like this, and that the truth can't be hidden behind locked doors.

You will also be placed on probation for one year, and be required to keep the peace and be of good behaviour, which means stay out of trouble. You will be required to report twice a month to the probation worker in Rae, that's it.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER WAS CONCLUDED)

Certified a correct transcript,

Loretta Mott, Court Reporter