

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

LEVI KAUNAK

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment of His Honcur Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on Tuesday, November 1500 A.D., 1983.

APPEARANCES:

MR. G. BICKERT:

MR. G. PHILLIPS:

Counsel for

Counsel for the Defence



1,

THE COURT: Levi Kaunak is convicted of five offences today: An offence under Section 67(1) of the Liquor Ordinance; two counts under Section 306(1)(b); and two counts under Section 666(1).

It is said to say that Levi Kaunak would appear to respresent an all too common occurrence in this court, and that is a young man who without any regard whatsoever to the rights of people and their property, or the rights of the community and its property, and without any regard to his obligations as a citizen, his special obligation to the court while on probation, commits break and enters and continues in the pattern of behavior that brings him in conflict with the law.

He is only sixteen, and although young in years, I have no doubt and no hesitation in concluding that he is an adult in every sense of the word, and can be treated as such.

I believe him to have a sense of maturity that comes with people being on their own here in the north something seen more frequently here than in the south.

In any event, he is convicted of serious offences, and this court has repeatedly stated in the past that there has to be an end to this kind of behavior, this kind of gratuitous break and enter.

Levi Kaunak was before this court in February of 1983 for an identical offence of break and enter and theft. At that time he was given one day in jail which was served by

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



him being in court, and he was admonished to obey the law, to stay out of trouble because the door to jail was open to him, and that a longer jail term would be imposed if necessary in the future. He was placed on probation and ordered to do some community service work. I am advised that he performed the community service work, but in every other respect, Levi Kaunak was a failure with respect to probation. Not only did he consume liquor while under age in May and breach his probation, but while on his probation and while under process for those two offences, he went out and committed two break and enter offences and a further breach of probation.

It is obvious that the lenient treatment and the admonishment and the efforts I am sure were extended to him by probation services have had no impact on him whatsoever in terms of deterring him or rehabilitating him.

I have commented in the past that break and enter offences are in epidemic proportions here in the Northwest Territories, and in my estimation the courts have to start imposing more severe sentences than in the past. It is quite common in cases such as Mr. Kaunak to see criminal records with one break and enter with lenient treatment such as he received followed by another four or five break and enters with small increments of punishment from one day in jail to one month to two months to three months, and those small increments of punishment do not seem to have had the effect of deterring people from committing break and enters. I don't



intend to follow that pattern that in my view has not worked in the past in deterring people like Levi Kaunak.

I take into account that he has been imprisoned for the last two months awaiting the disposition of this matter, but I have to take that into account tempered by the fact that he is awaiting disposition of these charges in jail as a result of his own activities, as a result of his own refusal to comply with the terms of his interim release, and not for any other reason. I think in those circumstances an accused's plea that his time already served be taken into account must be diluted somewhat.

I take into account the accused's age. I take into account the fact that the accused has only one previous conviction although these convictions follow that conviction by a matter of a few months.

I think it is very important that the court make a point with Levi Kaunak and a point that is understood by him and a point that is understood by others that are similarly inclined. This kind and pattern of behavior will not be tolerated.

I take into account that the aggravating factors, the break and enters which are the more serious of the charges I am dealing with, were committed while he was on probation and while he was under process with respect to the other charges. Also that they were committed with some forethought and planning by somehow obtaining a key and copying that key and using it. I take into account the value and the nature



of the goods stolen and their ultimate disposition.

I take into account that they both occurred at the same time and it would be appropriate therefore to treat them concurrently in terms of sentencing. With respect to the Liquor Ordinance offence; while the Crown has said that it is aggravating that this took place in a community that is attempting, through its own alcohol committee, to restrict the consumption and use of alcoholic beverages, I can only accept that to a degree.

Levi Kaunak, would you stand, please. On the Section 67(1) of the Liquor Ordinance offence, I impose a fine of \$25, in default, five days in jail. With respect to the breach of probation, I sentence you to thirty days in jail. I make that sentence particularly significant in my estimation to bring home to Levi Kaunak that when he makes a promise to the court that he has to keep that promise.

With respect to the Section 306(1)(b) offence at the Community Hall Warehouse, I sentence you to one year in jail. With respect to the break and enter and theft into the Hamlet Warehouse, I sentence you to one year in jail concurrent. With respect to the breach of probation, I sentence you to thirty days in jail concurrent. I direct that a copy of these remarks be transcribed and forwarded to the Hamlet Council in Hall Beach and translated into Inuktitut, and as well to the R.C.M.P. detachment in Hall Beach. I think that is the minimum step the court should take in view of the fact that this accused is from there.



MR. BICKERT: Thank you, sir. THE COURT: Is that everything for this afternoon? 3 THE CLERK: Time to pay for the \$25 fine? THE COURT: I am sure the accused doesn't require time to pay the fine, Mr. Phillips. It is concurrent time. MR. PHILLIPS: 6 That's satisfactory, sir. 7 (AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.) 9 10 11 12 Certified a correct transcript, 13 14 15 Laurie Ann Young Court Reporter 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24

25