IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

FRANK FULOP



Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Inuvik, in the Northwest Territories, on Tuesday, October 8, A.D. 1985.

APPEARANCES:

MR. J. R. SHIPLEY On behalf of the Crown

MR. J. U. BAYLY

On behalf of the Defence

With what has been given to me on this sentencing THE COURT: hearing, Mr. Fulop is going to have to realize that when he is ordered to provide a sample of his breath in proper circumstances, he has to provide a sample of his breath. penalties for refusing to provide a sample of breath are the same as the penalty for having care and control while impaired, and the same as the penalties for driving while impaired, and the same as penalties for driving with over 80 milligrams of alcohol. I dare say from what your lawyer has said, Mr. Fulop, if you had provided a sample of your breath, your reading may very well have been below the legal limit. While you may still have been charged with being impaired. I would think your defence counsel would have had a lot easier time in fighting the case, based on involuntary intoxication, than the case that the facts presented to him.

This is the second time Mr. Fulop has refused to provide a sample of his breath; and as I said, Mr. Fulop is going to have to understand that if the demand is legally made, he has to provide that sample. He is no different than anyone else. I also want to point out to you, Mr. Fulop, that there is going to be a change in the Vehicles Ordinance shortly, and for convictions of drinking and driving offences you are going to lose your licence automatically. You might want to consider that before you have a couple or three drinks, regardless of the circumstances.

The previous conviction is in 1978. On the bare facts, I suppose a jail sentence could be contemplated, but

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

after hearing Mr. Bayly, I don't think a jail sentence should be called for. I have also contemplated an order pursuant to Section 54 of the Vehicles Ordinance, either prohibiting or restricting the accused from driving. However, he is con victed under Section 235, and the Vehicles Ordinance provides for the jurisdiction of this Court to prohibit the man from driving where the offence arises out of the operation of a motor vehicle; and absent argument on whether or not a 235 offence arises out of the operation of a motor vehicle, and given the particular circumstances, I don't propose to make that kind of an order. But I want Mr. Fulop to clearly understand that he has responsibilities with that driver's It may very well be a way of earning his living, licence. but if he is not going to take the necessary precautions, he can't expect anyone else to save him. Taking into account then everything that has been;

Taking into account then everything that has been said on your behalf, as well as the facts as related by the Crown attorney--stand up, please, Mr. Fulop--I'm going to impose a fine of \$800.00, in default seventy days in jail. Do you require time to pay the fine?

THE ACCUSED: Two months.

THE COURT: Two months to pay the fine.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER WAS CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript

Edna Thiessen, Court Reporter

27

2

3 4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26