

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

MICHAEL PELLISSEY

Transcript of oral judgment delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday, the 14th day of July, 1983.

## APPEARANCES:

D. GATES:

E. JOHNSON:

Appeared for the rown.

Appeared for the Accused.



Michael Pellissey is before this court convicted of four offences: one, break, enter and theft contrary to Section 306(1)(b); two, an offence contrary to Section 3(1) of the Narcotic Control Act; three, an offence contrary to Section 133(2) of the Criminal Code; and finally, an offence contrary to Section 62 of the Liquor Ordinance here in the Northwest Territories.

I am sure counsel are well aware of all the factors
the Court can consider when imposing sentence, and that the
High Courts have often remarked that difficulty is in trying
to arrive at a balance of the various factors rather than
identification of them.

I will deal first with the accused's criminal record, not because it is to be used to increase his sentence, but I think it can be used as a reflection of the accused's attitude and antecedents. This accused, since 1973, has been sentenced to a total of in excess of seven years in jail as a result of convictions for over 25 Criminal Code offences.

They involve a gambit of commonly occurring offences; failure to comply with probation orders, failures to appear in court or comply with undertakings, assaults, breaches of probation, mischief, drinking offences, break and enters. Lastly, in September of 1992, possession of firearms and assaults causing bodily harm. If there was any hope of rehabilitation founded on something concrete before me today, I would obviously consider that and place some emphasis on it in my sentence. However, the accused has shown no inclination, as far as I



can see, as reflected by his record since 1973, to modify his criminal behaviour in any way. Therefore, I am content to leave the matter of rehabilitation to the administrative boards and tribunals that are set up within the penitentiary system and follow the observations of the Quebec Superior Court in R v. Levesque, 19 CR, p 43.

The accused has not been deterred by any of his sentences in the past, and he has received some sharp penalties for some of his criminal activities. He was released from imprisonment in November or December of 1982 for a break and enter, and within six months was back at it. He has had many occasions to appear before the Court in virtually every year except 1981, and as I have said, he has never been deterred. No sentence imposed on him to date has given any indication to the Court that Michael Pellissey is prepared to change his ways.

I think it would be fair to observe from his criminal record that he is more than a nuisance to the public; he is a danger to the public. He is someone who is bound and determined to do what he wants to do, regardless of how it might affect other people. In this particular case, it involved a break and enter at the El Camino Lounge.

Dealing with the break and enter, this Court observes that to date break and enters are the most common crime here in the Northwest Territories. They account for approximately one-half of all criminal convictions, and I think it is also fair to observe that the courts have, in the past, dealt with break and enters quite leniently. When one compares what

. N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)

3 4 5



sentences are for break and enters in the Northwest Territories to those imposed on the first or second offenders in the south, it is startling to see the differences in treatment. A second, third, fourth or even fifth break and enter here in the Territories will usually result in a sentence of less than six months. A second conviction for break and enter in some jurisdictions will almost invariably result in a term of penitentiary.

I think there is nothing before me to indicate that this situation calls for special treatment, especially lenient treatment. I think the Court is justified in responding to the break and enter the way the courts in the south respond to break and enters. Michael Pellissey is well aware of the implications of break and enters as this is the second time he has been convicted of it.

One cannot use unsophistication or naivete or some of the other adjectives that are used in asking for leniency with respect to this accused person. I think the courts must attempt, as best they can, to redress the situation with respect to break and enters and send out a message very clearly that break and enters are a crime, that they call for a maximum of 14 years imprisonment, and that the Court is not going to tolerate continued break and enters, regardless of whether the amount involved is small or large. Here, a total of \$335 worth of goods were stolen. The final loss, after recovery by the police, being \$15 or \$30.

Dealing with the failure to appear in court. There is

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)

2 3

5 6

7 8



not much point, I suppose, in saying very much to Mr. Pellissey. He is well aware of his responsibilities to appear in court as he has been convicted for the same offence on occasions in the past. Having been sentenced in 1976 for failure to appear, he was treated leniently; ie. \$250 fine. He was also sentenced in 1979 for which he received two months in jail consecutive, then again in 1982 and received one month jail consecutive for identical offences.

Michael Pellissey, I am sure, is intelligent. He is aware of the consequences of failing to appear, he is aware of his obligations to appear in court, and he simply chooses not to bother. He made, apparently, half-hearted attempts, in that he states to his counsel that he tried hitchhiking back to Hay River from Rae/Edzo, but took no other steps whatsoever. That, in my view, would not amount to much by way of mitigation.

The accused is 25 years of age. He is well aware of his responsibility in terms of answering to court process. I believe that the 133 matter merits a significant consecutive term of imprisonment, in excess of what he was last sentenced to. Mr. Pellissey is virtually thumbing his nose at the Court.

With respect to the Liquor Ordinance offence and the Narcotic Control Act offence, I do not see that they should be dealt with much differently than they are normally dealt with in this court. I would note, however, and it is an aggravating factor, that the subsequent offences occurred after he was released on the first offence of break and enter.

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)

: 



I am taking into account what has been said with respect to the degree of premeditation. There must have been some planning involved. There was no violence. With respect to the participation alleged by Michael Pellissey, the gravity, which I indicated at the outset I consider it to be a grave matter, a serious matter, and not one that can be dismissed lightly by the courts. Also taking into account the accused's criminal record, as indicated earlier, his age, his character as reflected in the criminal record, and taking totality into account, (I would prefer to deal with sentencing consecutively because I am concerned that it be understood by Mr. Pellissey that when he ignores court process that will not be treated lightly. However, I think it is more appropriate for the Court to deal with the sentencing by way of one global sentence. hope that Mr. Pellissey will make the distinction in his mind when he is serving his time.)

Mr. Pellissey, would you stand, please. For the break and enter, I sentence you to two years in Federal penitentiary. For the 133 offence, I sentence you to four months in jail, concurrent. For the Narcotic Control Act offence, I impose a fine of \$200, in default, 20 days in jail concurrent. With respect to the Liquor Ordinance, I impose a fine of \$25, in default, 10 days in jail.

Does the accused require time to pay the fines, Mr. Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: In view of the sentence, it is unlikely he will be paying the fines, your honour.

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)

2

1

4

3

6

8

10

11

13

15 16

17 18

19 20

22

21

23

24

26



THE COURT: Thank you. I take that to mean he does not require time. Is that everything for this afternoon?

MR. GATES: Yes, it is. Thank you, sir.

8 9 10

R. M. Bourassa, Territorial Court Judge