IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

ISAAC KAOTOLOK

Transcript of the oral sentencing delivered by His Honour Judge T.B. Davis, sitting at Cambridge Bay, in the Northwest Territories, Wednesday, March 13th, A.D. 1985.

APPEARANCES:

MR. M. ZIGAYER

Counsel for the Crown !

MR. G. CARTER

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Mr. Isaac Kaotolok has entered a plea of guilty to a charge that he did on the 15th of December, 1984 at Cambridge Bay wilfully set fire to a building which was a residence that he recently had taken over as an occupant from the Cambridge Bay Housing Association, and therefore violated Section 389(1) of the Criminal Code.

The accused and his wife were having a housewarming -party because they had just recently moved into the residende which was burned and which was a part of row housing, being the end unit of a number of joined houses, when an argument developed between the accused and his wife because she wished to continue partying. The guests left and shortly thereafter the wife and his six year old son also left, and it caused the accused to become upset. After having had some more beer he then found a five gallon can of gascline which he took to his residence and poured approximately one-eighth of the gas on the carpet and in the residence itself, havind then moved the balance of the five gallon container to another part of the room under a table, but did not put the cap on the remaining gasoline in the container. He then lit a cigarette and threw the cigarette on the carpet which was doused with gasoline when he was moving towards the bedroom, or was in the bedroom door. An immediate flash fire caused some injury to the accused by burning his hands and his face and having his hair singed. Because he could not get out of the apartment through the room that was on fire, he escaped through a bedroom window and notified some neighbours of the fire.

27

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As a result of that call the Fire Department extinguished the fire after it had caused approximately Seventeen to Twenty thousand dollars of damage.

The accused shortly thereafter admitted his activity in a warned statement to the Police. I also note from the facts that there were other people in the adjacent row housing units, and two units from the location of the accused there were some people who were passed out from intoxication. I therefore note that not only serious injury might have occurred to the accused but to other persons in the remaining part of the adjoined buildings.

The accused appears before the Court with a very short criminal record and a record in 1978 for common assault and in 1981 for careless use of firearms. They are not in any way related to the case before the Court today, and I am going to give that record minor consideration at this time. I also note that I have had the opportunity of reading over the pre-sentence report which indicates that the accused is twenty-seven years of age and is married and has now become separated from his wife, although he has the custody of his child who is presently living with the accused and some friends in this area. He has been very depressed and remorseful since the offence and has realized the seriousness of the The accused seems to acknowledge, as well, that his drinking and the drinking of his wife at the party might have contributed to some extent to his attitude on that occasion. He has since the offence stopped drinking, but

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

2

3

5

6

.

•

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

26

still is suffering emotionally because of the separation of he and his family. Because of the remorse with realizing the seriousness of the offence before the Court the accused also seems to have indicated that in the past a number of his marital upsets resulted from the use or consumption of alcohol. At the present time the accused is unemployed, and as pointed out by Defence counsel he has lost his job and has lost some of his property and has lost probably his family as a result of what has happened. The pre-disposition report also indidates that the accused because of his state of depression and his emotional upset is a person who needs counselling and might be suitable for supervised probation with counselling in the It is obvious that the accused's temper got out of hand when he became annoyed at his wife, and he as a result of that decided to commit some serious act because of the relationship that existed between he and his wife at the time.

I think it is proper that Crown counsel has presented to me a number of cases, because it is of a great assistance to the Court to know what similarities the case before the Court has with other cases that have been decided by Courts throughout the country. I especially take note of the case decided by Chief Judge Slaven in Frobisher Bay when he dealt with a twenty-three year old native person who had a spouse and a child and as a result of a domestic dispute set a fire in his house which caused Twenty-five thousand dollars in damage. Chief Judge Slaven in the case of The Queen v.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Ishulutak indicated that fires in residences often are such that they can cause possible danger to other residences in the vicinity. Even though the accused person had a very favourable pre-sentence report, he acknowledged the danger to the public and acknowledged, as well, that the accused suffered from emotional stress as a result of his domestic situation, but felt that it was necessary at that time to impose nine months in jail to be followed by two year's probation.

of The Queen v. Dennis Greely in the British Columbia County Court in 1980 a thirty-four year old tenant who argued with his landlord while he was drinking had set his property on fire and was sentenced to two years less a day plus two year's probation. The Court there acknowledged that there was no monetary gain for insurance purposes, and on that occasion the accused had an unrelated, old criminal record.

Another case that has been presented is <u>The Queen</u>

<u>v. Pruner</u> (1979), reported from the Ontario Court of Appeal

at 9 Criminal Reports (3d) S-8, where Twenty-two thousand

dollars worth of damage had been done by a fifty-three year

old person with no record. The Court of Appeal reduced the

sentence from the maximum of five years at the time to three

years in jail.

The New Brunswick Court of Appeal in the case of The Queen v. Poitras, December of 1978, dealt with a twenty-seven year old person who had been drinking and who had some offences on his criminal record which were property related

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

22 23

offences. Although only Four hundred dollars damage had been done at that time, he was required to serve sixteen months in jail, and the Court made the comment that on any setting fire to buildings the minimum that should be considered by any Court would be six months.

I think Crown counsel has been very fair in presenting its position in this regard, and I believe Defence counsel has acknowledged and was reasonable in not arguing about the facts in this situation that it certainly did cause other persons to be in a very serious potential for injury when a house is joined to others and has a flash fire occurring in one part of the residence. It was fortunate that the fire did not spread to other parts of the residence and cause injury to some people and damage to a substantial amount of property. I therefore have to acknowledge and recognize that in this situation there was great potential for injuries to others and for damage to other property.

The accused is at the present time unemployed and has lost his employment, so there is no likelihood of any restitution being made. Crown counsel has suggested that the accused should be imprisoned for a term in the range of twelve months. I am inclined to accept that recommendation, because I feel that it is necessary for the Courts to impose penalties and punishment that will protect the public by indicating to others that they must not commit offences of this nature or that they will be incarcerated or penalized for doing so. In that particular way the Courts hope that the sentencing

will deter others from allowing their tempers to get out of hand and causing injury or damage as a result of setting fires to properties.

I can recognize that the accused has suffered substantially as a result of his actions both emotionally and through the separation of his family. As a result of that I am not going to impose a longer period than is recommended but will give some credit to the accused for the injury that he already has suffered in the burns to himself and the loss of his property. I do feel, however, that Defence counsel was accurate when he said that the accused himself was very lucky because in a flash fire of this nature he was not injured, especially when the can of gasoline was in the same room in which the fire occurred. But the can itself with a major part of five gallons did not itself burn or explode or cause further injury.

Because the pre-disposition report has indicated that the accused has suffered emotionally from this matter, I am also going to make a recommendation that the accused when he is incarcerated obtain access to counselling services so that he will be able to reconcile his position with his actions and after he has served his time will have then satisfied the penalty imposed by society and be able to rehabilitate himself following his release from jail.

I am going to require that he also be placed on probation for a period of time so that counselling services as necessary will still be made available to the accused so

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

long as he is on the probation order. I am going to require that he participate in counselling services for his own benefit. I feel that the Chief Judge of the Territorial Court probably had selected a term of imprisonment that would satisfy the requirement of this Court today, and I am going to impose the same length of time as the Chief Judge has imposed for similar circumstances in Frobisher Bay. Therefore, I am going to sentence the accused to serve nine months in jail followed by two years probation. recommendation for his committal to jail I am going to recommend that he receive counselling treatment as recommended by the Social Services Department and the probation report. going to require that he report to the probation officer within two weeks of his release from jail and thereafter as directed. I am also going to require that the accused participate in any counselling and curative treatment programs recommended by the probation officer.

Mr. Kaotolok, do you understand all that I have said here today? Are you agreeable to the terms of the probation order in participating in the counselling as recommended?

All right. The Clerk will be preparing the probation order, and you will be required to sign that. I want you to know that I feel this is the minimum that the Court could consider for this type of offence, because I am sure from the pre-sentence report that you are familiar with how serious this matter must have been considered by the Court.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Certified a correct transcript,

Jill MacDonald Court Reporter