| 1 | IN THE TER | RITORIAL COURT OF THE |
|------------|---------------------------|---|
| 2 | NORTH | WEST TERRITORIES |
| 3 | | *************************************** |
| 4 | | |
| - 5 - 5 | e et i | REGINA |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | . v. | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | NOAH NOWDLUK | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | JUDGEMENT AND | |
| 13 | REASONS FOR JUDGEMENT | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | PRESIDED OVER BY | |
| 17 | HIS HONOUR JUDGE T. DAVIS | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | Tom Humphries, Esq., | Appeared for the Crown |
| 21 | Neil Sharkey, Esq., | Appeared for the Defence |
| 22 | Sandra Haslett | Court Reporter |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | FROBISHER BAY | |
| 26 | NORTHWEST TERRITORIES | |
| 27 | FEBRU | ARY 18, 1986 |
| | | |



THE COURT:

1

2

3

5

6

7

B

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Noah Nowdluk who is 25 years of age presently lives with the victim of an assault which caused his father bodily harm when his father tried to stop the accused from fighting with his common-law wife and hitting his, the accused's, mother and wife.

The accused at approximately 1:00 a.m. in the morning of December 25th was highly intoxicated, and he struck his father, knocked him to the floor and kicked him, and in addition thereto actually bit his father's lip to the extent that it was in need of substantial medical treatment to sew the completely split lip together which resulted, as the medical report has said, or a short medical letter has said, in a reasonably satisfactory result, but it is still obvious there has been injury to the lip of the victim.

The victim and the accused have now again resumed living together in that the son is living with the father, and the father has indicated he has forgiven his son for this injury and for the assault on himself. The accused does not remember assaulting others but was aware of the fact his father had been injured, and after waking up in gaol while he was still in custody had been concerned about the well being of his father.

The accused effectively has no criminal record in that I am not concerning myself at all with the causing a disturbance charge in 1980 for which he was fined \$50. common-law wife has moved out, and he, therefore, has at the present time suffered the loss of his family situation. The



accused himself has very little memory of the circumstances of the offense which seems to have occurred without any premeditation, but was, as has been explained by the Crown, rather a bizarre activity that was more of a reaction than a fight in which the accused was involved, not intended in advance of what was taking place at the time.

The accused also seems to have support from a number of people in that his father has forgiven him and a former employer has appeared in court to give support to the accused. It does seem to be out of character for this to happen, although the accused admits to periodic drinking to excess.

My reading of the various cases on assaults ordinarily leads me to the belief that a period of time in gaol is necessary on serious assault charges, but because the accused is attempting to get his own taxi for a taxi business in Frobisher Bay and presently has a job as a taxi operator, I am inclined to consider intermittant sentencing on a gaol term.

Would that be of any value to the accused at this time,

Mr. Sharkey, if I had to consider a short time in gaol?

MR. SHARKEY:

I don't know when he works. He

gets Monday and Tuesday off, two days on, one day off.

THE COURT:

As pointed out by the Crown it is

the duty of the court to impose a sentence that not only

protects the public but has consideration for the accused

and circumstances of the accused, so that they have to



balance the need for public protection and deterrence of 1 crime against the specific needs of the accused and not impose a gaol term that will be excessive or more of a 3 burden than is appropriate for the offense itself considering the circumstances. 5 I don't see how it would be possible for me to not impose some sort of period of time in gaol, and under the circumstances I am going make it so short that it will do A nothing other than try to indicate to the accused that this type of offense is something the court can not permit. 10 On the term, I am going to impose 14 days in gaol. 11 addition thereto I am going to place the accused on 12 probation for a period of one year, and on the probation 13 order I am going to require that he restrain absolutely or 14 be prohibited absolutely from the possession or consumption 15 of alcohol for a period of four months. 16 17 If I could direct Your Honour's MR. HUMPHRIES: 18 attention to the provision of Section 98. 19 THE COURT: Again Section 98(1) of the Criminal 20 Code has not been amended as had been expected, it still 21 requires the order against the accused, Mr. Noah Nowdluk, 22 restricting him from possession of any explosive substance 23 or weapons or firearms or ammunition for a period of five 24 years. 25 Do you have any rifles or --

THE COURT: He is a hunter. There is precedence

He is a hunter.



26

27

MR. SHARKEY:

| in the Northwest Territories to hear submission or evidence | |
|---|---|
| on if he is in fact a hunter enough to be subject to this | |
| particular | |
| MR. SHARKEY: | He does not do it for a livelihood, |
| as a sole livelihood | |
| THE COURT: | I think Justice Marshall on one |
| case found that if he did it in support of some of the | |
| family needs, that it would not have to be as a sole method | |
| of livelihood and he would still be entitled. | |
| Do you want me to postpone the balance of the | |
| sentencing on that aspect of the matter until we hear | |
| submissiions at a later time? | |
| MR. SHARKEY: | We can look at it, sure. It might |
| be worthwhile | |
| THE COURT: | Maybe we will adjourn the balance |
| of that application for | restriction under Section 98(1) |
| because I do feel I am bound by that unless we have | |
| something that supports it now. | |
| MR. SHARKEY: | I do not think I do, but maybe it |
| bears a closer look. | |
| THE COURT: | When do you think we might bring it |
| back on that aspect of it, April? | |
| MR. SHARKEY: | I would have to sit down and talk |
| to Noah about his background and how much he hunts. | |
| THE COURT: | What time in April are we back |
| here? | |
| MADAME CLERK: | April 7th at 7:00 p.m. |
| | on if he is in fact a huparticular MR. SHARKEY: as a sole livelihood THE COURT: case found that if he difamily needs, that it wo of livelihood and he would be not be sentencing on that aspect submissions at a later MR. SHARKEY: be worthwhile THE COURT: of that application for because I do feel I am be something that supports MR. SHARKEY: bears a closer look. THE COURT: back on that aspect of improved the court in t |



THE COURT: Maybe we can put it over until April the 7th at 7:00 p.m. for consideration of the futher portion of the appication under Secion 98(1). (CASE ADJOURNED) I, Sandra Haslett, Court Reporter, hereby certify that I attended the above Examination 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, Province of Alberta, this 23rd day of October, A.D. 1986. Sandra Haslett CSR Court Reporter.

