

\$.

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

7 8

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

JERRY IRISH

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Judgment Delivered by His Honour Judge T. B. Davis, sitting at Aklavik in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, February 1st, A.D., 1984.

APPEARANCES:

MR. M. ZIGAYER:

MR. G. CARTER:

Counsel

Counsel for the Defence



THE COURT: Mr. Jerry Irish is charged that he committed an assault upon Beverly Irish, his sister, on the 11th day of June, 1983, and in committing this assault, threatened to use a weapon, in this instance a screw driver, contrary to Section 245.1(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

It is obvious from the evidence that has been given before this court originally intended to be a preliminary inquiry, but then by consent, transferred to a trial, that in the afternoon on June the 11th, 1983, the accused and his sister were in the house of their parents, and there was some disagreement between them because the accused had been annoyed at a neice that had taken a tape for his recording machine.

The alleged victim of the assault then attempted to stop the accused from being concerned about the tape, and she said that she tried to stop him from fighting and making or causing an upset, and that in doing so, while he was still some number of feet away from her, she was of the opinion that he had taken the screw driver in his hand, raised it above his head, and at the time had threatened her to the extent that she became afraid.

During this time Clarence Rufus, who also gave evidence at the hearing, was awakened and came into the room to observe that the accused and his sister were having this argument, and he observed also that the accused had taken a screw driver from what I thought he said to be the top of the television set, but it might have been the top of



a bookcase, and pulled it up and threatened the sister at the time, but very shortly thereafter, Mr. Rufus was able to immediately take charge of the situation and remove the screw driver from the accused and hold him in a bear hug for a few minutes until the police arrived.

Mr. Rufus, in giving evidence, indicated that the accused and his sister were in relatively close proximity, possibly up to three feet, while the sister herself, the alleged victim, thought that at the time of what she classified as the assault, the accused was more than ten feet away.

I am satisfied that the accused technically was in a situation where by his voice he threatened his sister, and would have caused an assault under the terms of the Code.

My difficulty, though, arises from whether or not the accused should be convicted of the charge and under the section of the Code that is referred to, which says that he carries, uses or threatens to use a weapon or an imitation thereof when committing an assault, or whether it is a person committing an assault which by definition means that he attempts or threatens by an act or a gesture to apply force to another person if that other person believes he has the present ability to effect his purpose.

It would seem to me that the victim of the assault giving evidence before the court is the person that should be most strongly listened to in determining when and how far the persons were apart when any threat would have been

1 2



considered to have been a threat by the alleged victim. It also seems to me that a screw driver or any other item that was not in the form of a weapon that has in itself some ability to be effective at some distance would be nothing more than causing the person to believe that there was ability to carry out the threat that was being made, but in doing so the threat would be such that it was only an assault referred to under Section 245 of the Criminal Code as determined by the definition section.

Under the circumstances, I believe that it would be proper for me to enter a conviction for a common assault or what has been in the past referred to as a common assault, now being under Section 245 off the Criminal Code, because I don't think in law that this set of circumstances is such that it would qualify under what was intended by the legislature to apply when Section 245.1(1)(a) is referred to.

Under the circumstances then, I will find the accused guilty of an assault contrary to Section 245 of the Criminal Code.

MR. ZIGAYER: For clarification, sir, you have therefore found that the accused did commit an assault, but in the commission of that assault he did not threaten to use a weapon?

THE COURT: It was not that he uses amd threatens to use a weapon. It is that he committed an assault by an act or threatens by an act or gestures to apply force. That is



the finding that I am making.

MR. ZIGAYER: That is under 244, but under the offence charged, am I correct that you have found that an assault was committed, but that the accused did not threaten to use a weapon in the commission of that assault?

THE COURT: Yes, my finding is that he was threatening to apply force by his words and not by the use of a weapon.

MR. ZIGAYER: Alright then, is it that the screw driver is not a weapon?

THE COURT: The screw driver in this instance would not be classified as a weapon in my finding, that is correct. If you wish, I could in my judgment on that, I could indicate specifically that under the circumstances I am not finding that the use by the accused of holding the screw driver, even in the situation which he held it, was not in my opinion a weapon as required to be such under Section 245.1(1). Does that point out your concern about the clarification?

MR. ZIGAYER: Yes, sir. I was not in any doubt that you found that there was an assault. It was just what weight you gave or how you construed the possession of that screw driver to be at the essential moment.

THE COURT: Yes, that would be the additional paragraph that I would put in. It would clarify it to that extent that I am not in a position to consider it a weapon for that purpose. Is that alright then now?

MR. ZIGAYER: Yes, sir.

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



THE COURT:

Alright, thank you.

(AT WHICH TIME THE REASONS FOR JUDGMENT WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript,

Laurie Ann Young Court Reporter