.

IN THE MATTER OF:

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

JOHN TAPATAI

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing Delivered by His Honour Judge T. B. Davis, sitting at Baker Lake in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, May 15th.

A.D., 1985.

APPEARANCES:

MR. M. ZIGAYER:

MR. C. ROGERS:

Counsel for the

Counsel for the Defence

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

THE COURT: Mr. John Tapatai has entered a plea of guilty to a charge that he did, on or about the 26th of March, 1985, at Baker Lake in the Northwest Territories, in committing an assault on his wife, Winnie, cause her bodily harm and violated Section 245.1 of the Code.

On that date the accused, who has a full-time job with the Native Broadcasting Organization, returned home in the afternoon and had an argument with his wife and became angry and started breaking things around the home. He broke the sink with an ax, and struck his wife several times in the face with his hand. He had struck her so that the medical report filed by the doctor on an examination done two days later shows that the victim, his wife, had received numberous punches resulting in swelling around the eyes, bruises on her face and around her eye and chin area, and a five inch long, or possibly a little longer, bruise on her left thigh where she had been struck with a hockey She also had bruising around her chest and a stick. temporary inability to feel in some spots when tested. There was a fracture also that showed up on an x-ray around the orbital ridge which is around the eye, and in addition thereto a fracture had shown that had already healed from an injury to the shoulder at an earlier time when the accused acknowledges that he had struck her or thrown her around.

The accused comes before the court with no record of convictions, being 37 years of age and having been

26 27

1

2

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

married for 15 years with three children all of whom he has supported regularly with a good income from his present employment.

After the offence occurred the wife and children were removed from the home and were taken to Manitoba where they remain at the present time because they still have some concern and fear about returning to live in the residence of the accused.

The accused himself says that having been charged and having to appear before the court he has learned something, and that he has made some committments to try and overcome a tendancy to cause this kind of a problem to his wife, and that he has stopped drinking, and he has turned to religion for help. He also indicates that he would be prepared to take family counselling and would be agreeable to a direction not to consume alcohol or any other direction by the court because he wishes to have his family return to live with him. He explains that the hockey stick happened to be present and he just grabbed it and struck his wife with it when he was upset on that occasion. It is certainly obvious that the accused had lost control of his temper and was very violent in that situation by doing damage to the house, the sink included, and injuring his wife.

A number of cases have been referred to me for consideration which were decisions of courts in the Northwest Territories on spousal assaults which ranged from N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

six months in jail to approximately a year in jail in various circumstances of those particular cases. Some of the factors in each of those cases are before me today because the victim did suffer a fracture of a bone in her skull, and she was injured, and she was struck with a stick. I do, however, recognize as pointed out by Defence counsel, that in some of those cases, where up to a year was imposed as a penalty by the Supreme Court on trials within the last year, that the persons appearing before the court had previous convictions. The accused does not have previous convictions, but has acknowledged that in the past he has been abusive to his wife.

In a recent Appeal Court decision of the Court of Appeal of Alberta, which is the Appeal Court for the Northwest Territories, there was bodily harm caused with intent to wound on a charge where the accused was holding a person while another person repeatedly stabbed the victim with a jagged piece of glass. In that case the accused appeared before the court with no previous convictions. He was a taxi driver and was married and supported his family, and in the case of The Queen vs. Gill, (1985) 56 Alberta Reports at page 217, the Alberta Court of Appeal allowed the sentence to be served intermittently for a period of three months.

I therefore feel that to comply with the general sentences that have been imposed for this serious type of offence, some period of jail time is necessary so as to

N.W.T. 5349-90/0284

1 2 3

notify the accused and others that if they commit offences by assaulting and injuring other people, and that is any person whether it is or is not their wife or spouse, there usually will be some form of incarceration to be imposed by the court unless there are extremely exceptional circumstances that would avoid that situation.

I would like to be able to have the accused serve up to three months intermittently because I think the Alberta case is one that indicates generally the trend that the court can follow. I understand that intermittent sentencing would be very difficult to impose in this community.

Therefore, I am going to consider a lesser sentence to be served without having the advantage of the intermittenterm. I hope that the accused and others will know that in considering this lesser sentence it is not in any way the intention of the court to condone assaults.

I do feel that I have to take into account the fact that the accused is liable to lose his employment if he were to be away from it for a long period of time, and therefore, the long term advantage of security to his family who are entitled to support would be interfered with.

Because the accused has no previous convictions and has expressed remorse and intent to avoid any injury to anybody in the future, I am today prepared to impose a jail term on the accused of two months. In addition thereto,

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

Ŭ

.

a

I am going to require that the accused be placed on probation for a period of one year, and I am going to require that he report to the Probation Services as directed. In this instance, I am requiring reporting because it might be through the Probation Services that consultation and assistance and counselling can be made available to the accused, and therefore, possibly assist in his rehabilitation and the re-establishment of his family if he proves himself worthy of that on efforts that he makes or by efforts that he makes himself. Do you understand everything that I have said, Mr. Tapatai?

THE ACCUSED:

THE COURT: The clerk will be preparing the probation order that will take effect upon your release from jail.

Yes.

MR. ZIGAYER: Sir, I would ask to make two orders.

One under Section 98(1) which you are required to impose for a firearms, weapons and ammunition prohibition for a period of five years, and also an order requiring that the court reporter expedite a transcript of your sentence and all the proceedings today in the event that the Crown wishes to appeal.

THE COURT: We would ask in the ordinary way that the court reporter cooperate with the Crown if there is a request for a transcript, of course. The order that has been referred to by Crown is an order that must be imposed by the court if there has been violence associated

with an assault, and the order therefore will issue from the court that the accused will be restricted from having possession of or using any firearms, ammunition or explosive substance for a period of five years as a result of the offence today.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript,

Laurie Ann Young

Court Reporter

10

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25