IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

38, 1

 HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and -

VICKY ORLIAS

Transcript of Proceedings held before His Honour Judge T. B. Davis, sitting at Fort Good Hope, in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, November 14th, A.D. 1984.

APPEARANCES:

MR. N. SHARKEY

IN THE MATTER OF:

MR. J. VERTES

Counsel for the Crown

Counsel for the Defence

(Facts, submissions and sentencing)

THE CLERK: Vicky Orlias.

MR. VERTES: I appear for Mrs. Orlias, Your Honour. We're prepared at this point to take a plea on the charge under Section 84(1) of the Criminal Code.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Orlias, the charge is that at Fort Good Hope on the 15th of September you did without lawful excuse point a firearm at Elizabeth Kelly, contrary to Section 84(1) of the Criminal Code. Do you understand that?

MS. ORLIAS: Yes.

THE COURT: How do you plead to that charge, guilty or not quilty?

MS. ORLIAS: Guilty.

THE COURT: I accept the plea of guilty.

MR. SHARKEY: Thank you, sir. This is a conviction registered after the facts. If you find her guilty of this offence, we will not be proceeding and calling no evidence on the damage charge. Now, this took place around six o'clock in the evening on the 15th of September. The Defendant, Vicky Orlias, was drunk. She went into Patsy and Del Turo's house here in Fort Good Hope. She was carrying a Remington twelve gauge shotgun. The only people in the home at the time were Elizabeth Kelly, who is thirteen, and Dino, who is eleven, Dino Turo. They were watching television, and Vicky came into the house and pointed the shotgun at them, asked them where their parents were. Well, the kids said they didn't know, and then she left. We don't know if the gun was

loaded or not.

I would say by way of background here that this incident of Vicky walking into the house is somewhat a continuation of marital strife. The accused's husband, Alfred, apparently it is a well known fact, is living at another woman's house, and the Turos are very good friends of the other woman. And we simply suspect that it was because she was looking for either her husband or one of these people that she stopped in there with the shotgun in her possession. These are our facts, sir, on the pointing of the firearm charge.

MR. VERTES: The facts are admitted, Your Honour.

THE COURT: A conviction, then, will be entered under Section 84(1).

MR. SHARKEY: And there is a record of previous conviction, only for possession of brew. She received a hundred dollar fine back in September. The Crown's position on sentence is that the woman, Vicky Orlias, in pointing this shotgun at these young children, the young girl and boy, I think obviously now realizes the seriousness of what she did.

It is because of her personal circumstances and her age, sir, in this case we as the Crown urge that you impose a fine on this Defendant. Apparently she works atI have taken this up with Corporal Kendall, and apparently she works at the hotel here. We ask, as well, you make a discretionary order under Section 98 of the Code prohibiting her from possession of firearms for a period of a year,

simply to make the point further to her and to others that sometimes when you do drink and you do pick up a gun that certain serious repercussions will follow. That is a recommendation, sir, I make in this case after, again, speaking with Corporal Kendall as to what indeed in this case the Police feel might be a fair submission on sentence in this case for this Defendant. Even though there are young children, we are urging the Court to impose a fine. As you pass sentence, perhaps you might make note of the fact of the potential for danger that she well knows is there when you drink and pick up a gun.

NERTES: Thank you, Your Honour. I thank Mr. Sharkey for his comments and might say that I agree with his comments in terms of disposition, that the imposition of a fine would be very fair and appropriate. Furthermore, I see no problem with the type of restricted order that he is requesting under Section 98. This whole incident stems from what is indeed a sad set of circumstances, as Mr. Sharkey has related.

Mrs. Orlias is a forty-four year old woman, Your Honour, who has been married for twenty-one years to Alfred Orlias. I am told that since May he has been living with a woman who is a younger sister of Mrs. Orlias. And, indeed, since the separation she tells me that she has not been receiving any support from her husband, notwithstanding the fact that there are six children still at home supported by Mrs. Orlias. The six children range in age from eighteen

to five. Certainly, the incident was caused by feelings of anger on the part of Mrs. Orlias. She informs me that on the evening in question she had been drinking, and she had formed the opinion that Turos and her younger sister and her husband were all taunting her. As my friend indicated, it led her to go into the Turo household and try and find out where her younger sister and her husband were. I am advised that nothing further came of the incident and therefore, indeed, there was no actual repercussions from it or any injuries or any other ramifications from this situation.

She has been employed as a cook at the hotel here since August, earning approximately Four hundred and fifty or Five hundred dollars every two weeks. Certainly, it is my respectful submission that this is a mature woman who really shouldn't need to be put on probation of any means and a relatively small fine notwithstanding the seriousness of the charge, but because of the circumstances it is my respectful submission a relatively small fine would be appropriate. I think this woman is deterred by these proceedings. I have no comment to make, no argument against the restriction order as suggested by my friend that Mrs. Orlias not be in possession of any firearm for a period of a year. Those are my submissions, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Mrs. Vicky Orlias has entered a plea of guilty to a charge under Section 84(1) of the Criminal Code, admitting that on the 15th of September, 1984 she pointed a firearm,

which was a shotgun, at other persons when she was in an impaired state and when she was upset because of family problems. Mrs. Orlias is a mother of a number of children and therefore would certainly understand that any person who is in an impaired state has the possibility of causing serious damage to somebody else if they have in their possession any kind of a firearm.

I am accepting today the submission by counsel that Mrs. Orlias would have thought about this matter since being charged and realized how much danger other people can be in, the same as she would realize if her own children were in that place and somebody who was impaired pointed a firearm at them. It is as a result of that I am accepting the recommendations that it is not necessary for me to do much in the line of a heavy penalty, but to impose a very small fine and restrict Mrs. Orlias from having possession of a firearm so that she will know that the Courts consider this matter serious, even though there was no harm done in this instance.

Are you agreeable, Mrs. Orlias, to make sure that you restrict yourself in the future from any kind of activities of this type?

MRS. ORLIAS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to impose, then, a fine on Mrs. Orlias, who has employment, even though she supports a large family and that they will be the ones also to have less. I am going to impose a fine in the amount of Twenty-

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

five dollars, or in default thereof five days in jail.

Code, restrict Mrs. Orlias from having possession of a firearm or ammunition or explosive substance for a period of one year, which means, Mrs. Orlias, that you are not to in any way have possession of any kind of a firearm or ammunition or any explosive substance that could cause any people any injury for a period of a year. Do you understand that?

MRS. ORLIAS: Yeah.

THE COURT: How long will it take to pay the fine?

MR. VERTES: Thirty days, Your Honour.

THE COURT: The accused will be allowed one month to pay the

fine.

MR. SHARKEY: There is no evidence on the 397.

THE COURT: There is no plea entered. So, it is just a with-drawal on that charge. The other charge is being withdrawal, and they're not proceeding against you, Mrs. Orlias. So, you may be excused on that matter, as well.

Certified a correct transcript,

Jill MacDonald Court Reporter