1 2

U

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and -

TIMIUSIE EVIC

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by His Honour Judge T. B. Davis, sitting at Pangnirtung, in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday, May 7, A.D. 1987.

APPEARANCES:

MR. B. A. BRUSER

MR. N. A. SHARKEY

On behalf of the Crown

On behalf of the Defence

Timiusie Evic admits that he committed a spousal THE COURT: assault on January 30, when he was drinking, came home, annoyed his wife and punched her a number of time. He was upset to the extent that he broke one of the bars in the baby's That probably provoked crib, and it snapped in his eye. him further as he was yelling at his wife, striking her, slapping her in the face, pulling her hair, and ended up kicking her and bruising her so that she suffered a black and closed eye, bruised other eye, swollen lips, and a small cut on a lip, multiple bruises on various parts of her body, soreness in a number of parts of her body, because during a period of time when this was occurring, he had dragged her and pulled her around by the hair and struck her, and when doing so had struck his child and caused the child on two occasions to have a bleeding nose.

munity, comes before the court with a very good recommendation from the Social Services officer. The report indicates that Timiusie himself realizes it's a serious offence; and although, the wife had been so upset that when she was finally allowed to leave the house the following morning, she then left for a few days after being treated at the nursing station. Since then, she has attempted to reconcile with the accused, and they have been receiving counselling and assistance from other members of their family. He has had a good work record and appears now to have been accepted as a carpenter trainee for the community of Pangnirtung and has had

1

2

3

4

5

ล

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

various jobs in the past. He has worked in the past, but presently is being assisted by his common-law wife, who is a librarian.

Alcohol had a substantial affect on the accused at the time the offence occurred. He seems to periodically have problems in that he drinks when alcohol is available. He is a well-looking, physically fit young man. I say young because he gives the impression of being a young, healthy man, although he is 28 years of age, has close relationships with his relatives, and he has indicated a willingness to participate in any counselling for his alcohol problems and seems to have come to a realization the seriousness of the offence before the Court.

Mr. Sharkey, his lawyer, has indicated that he acknowledges that what he had done is certainly unlawful and harmful to his wife and that he is remorseful and sorry for what he has done and has tried to make up suitably with his common-law wife. The probation officer suggests that he should and would be willing to participate actively in an alcohol related program and family counselling. Considering the good report that has been prepared, I think I am entitled to go below the term that has been suggested by Chief Judge Slaven when he delt with a matter recently, within the last few months, in the Western Arctic, when he suggested that a bench mark for these offences should be approximately two years in jail, and that could be increased for more serious offences and decreased for less serious offences, but that

the court should consider spousal assaults in a serious enough vein that jail will usually result.

Although I would not have ordinarily read Section 98(1) to have thought that the government expected an order to be granted which prohibits a person from having possession of weapons and firearms when violence is involved, unless a firearm is used, the appeal courts have in fact directed the trial courts to consider violence even without weapons as offences that require an order under Section 98(1). I think counsel have indicated that that seems to be a need of the court as part of the sentence today.

Crown counsel has properly suggested that jail is a requirement under the law for circumstances similar to the ones before the court, and the range that was suggested is probably substantially appropriate, but I feel I can amend that to some extent because of the good recommendation of the probation officer and submissions made on behalf of the accused, who has only on one occasion had any involvement with jail in the past; and that is when he was involved with 21 days being served intermittently in 1984. The other theft, and break and enter charges, and possession of narcotics, are of a different nature than the assault charge before the court today; and therefore, I am not putting too much emphasis on those charges for the purposes of sentencing, because I think the accused has recognized the seriousness of the offence and has in fact been actually, severely and truly remorseful and sorry for what he has done.

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

mendation of jail made by Crown; although, I do feel it is not an unreasonable recommendation, and I am going to impose instead a shorter period of time in jail and a period of probation to follow it in which he will be expected to participate in programs recommended by the probation officer. The period of time will be six months in jail. He will be required then to be on probation for a period of one year following his release. During that time, he will be required to report to the probation officer when and as directed; and in addition thereto, he will be required to participate in any alcohol counselling or treatment programs recommended by the probation officer.

Do you understand all that, Mr. Evic?

THE ACCUSED: (Nods head.)

THE COURT: The clerk will be preparing the probabion order, and it will be available if not today, whenever the clerk has it available for your signature.

MR. BRUSER: The Section 98(1) order, your Honour?

THE COURT: Mr. Evic, I'm going to have to, as I said before, prohibit you from having possession of any firearm, ammunition, or explosive substance for a period of five yesrs.

MR. BRUSER: I suppose there should be a time specified within which Mr. Evic could dispose of any such items in his possession.

26 THE COURT: Do you have any firearms or explosive substances,
27 Mr. Evic?

	ł		1
1	THE A	CCUSED:	What's that?
2	тне с	OURT:	Do you have any firearms?
3	THE A	CCUSED:	Yes, I own a rifle.
4	THE C	COURT:	How long do you think it might take you to arrange
5		for transf	er of that to somebody else, either sale or trans-
6		fer to som	me other family member, so you don't have it?
7	THE A	ACCUSED:	Okay.
8	THE C	COURT:	Can you do that within a month?
9	THE A	ACCUSED:	Yes.
10	THE C	COURT:	All right, he will be allowed one month in which to
11		arrange fo	or the disposal of any firearms or explosive sub-
12		stances.	
13		(AT WHICH	TIME THIS MATTER WAS CONCLUDED.)
14			
15			
16			Certified a correct transcript
17			The state of the s
18			Edna Thiessen, Court Reporter
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			$N_{ m c}$