

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

۷S

JOHN DIADENTA

Transcript of an Oral Judgment given by His Honour Judge R. W. HALIFAX, sitting at Fort Liard in the Northwest Territories on Friday, April 8, A.D. 1983.

APPEARANCES:

MR. J. SHIPLEY

Counsel for the Crown

MR. N. SIBBESTON

Agent for Ms. L Counsel for

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



THE CLERK OF THE COURT: John Diadenta.

MR. SHIPLEY:

Our information, Your Honour, is that

Mr. Diadenta is in Fort Nelson, B.C., at the moment.

THE COURT:

You're appearing on this matter, Mr. Sibbeston

MR. SIBBESTON:

Yes, sir, I'm appearing as agent.

THE COURT:

It's a summary conviction matter, so you can

appear as agent.

MR. SIBBESTON:

Your Worship, I'm appearing as agent for Miss

Erickson in this matter.

THE COURT:

She was appointed by the Court to act on

behalf of Mr. Diadenta.

Okay, it is a matter for judgment with regard to the issue raised of a loss of jurisdiction. The circumstances arising were that the matter had been adjourned on a couple of occasions to December 1, 1982, at 11 a.m. in Fort Liard, Northwest Territories, on a charge that he did unlawfully hunt Wood Bison, contrary to Section 13(a) of the Wildlife General Regulations made pursuant to the Wildlife Ordinance of the Northwest Territories.

On that day, due to aircraft mechanical problems, the court party was unable to arrive in Fort Liard. There was a message passed ahead to the R.C.M. Police that there was going to be a delay and, eventually, that the court party would not be able to attend.

The Justice of the Peace heard several of the matters on the docket and adjourned them to a further date. However, the Diadenta matter did not appear on the docket.

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

1

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



It was not called nor was the accused John Diadenta present.

The Information was not before the Justice of the Peace which, in my view, is not a necessity.

The issue comes down to whether or not as a result of nothing being done on the 1st of December, in these circumstances, there is a loss of jurisdiction.

Now, I have had the written argument provided by Miss Erickson and on behalf of the Crown which I have had an opportunity to review. It seems to me, however, after consideration of all the circumstances, that we are in a situation that has been referred to by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Krannenburg case, a judgment of Mr. Justice Dickson; and I just wish to refer to two parts of that case which is found in 1980, 51 Canadian Criminal Cases, Second Edition and, firstly, at page 209 where Mr. Justice Dickson in the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

It should be observed at the outset that this case approximates the situation in Trenholm . . .

which is the Krannenburg case:

... where "nothing is done", rather than in <u>Doyle</u>...where there was a clear contravention of a specific provision of the Code relating to adjournments. <u>Doyle</u> did nothing to erode the view expressed in <u>Trenholm</u> that when the assigned date passes, without action taken, jurisdiction is lost.

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



Again, at page 211, Mr. Justice Dickson states again in Krannenburg:

The problem in the instant case was not one of contravention of the requisites of the Code relating to adjournments. There was no failure to comply with any provision of the Code. The imbroglio arose because the Court failed to appear and nothing was done at the time and place set for trial.

There is also the <u>R. versus Thompson</u> case by the Supreme Court of Canada which is, again, in 1980, 51

<u>Canadian Criminal Cases</u>, Second Edition, at page 212. It was heard together with the <u>Krannenburg</u> case, and it is a case that arose out of Hay River, Northwest Territories, where the accused had appeared; the Information was not before the Court; and nothing was done. The Supreme Court of Canada held in that case following <u>Krannenburg</u> that there was a loss of jurisdiction.

Now, when considering the aspects of this case, I feel that I am bound, of course, by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. I do not feel that the actual circumstances of what applied in this case that the <a href="Krannenburg">Krannenburg</a> decision and the <a href="Thompson">Thompson</a> decision can be distinguished.

It seems to me what has happened is that on the 1st of December, the date to which this matter was adjourned, nothing was done; the case was not called; and it

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



was not adjourned by the Justice of the Peace. As a result, in my view, there is a loss of jurisdiction. That being so, the matter is a nullity. The charge, in my view, is therefore dismissed.

I appreciate that this causes some problems in the Northwest Territories where we have problems with weather conditions; we have problems with aircraft mechanical difficulties from time to time. In summary conviction matters, it causes loss of jurisdiction which cannot be cured if it is past the limitation period as in this case occurred.

The offense is one that occurred on the 1st day of July. By the time the matter came before the Court again in January, it was past the limitation period of six months. As a result, there can be no further charge laid against the accused John Diadenta.

As a result, the charge will be dismissed.

Certified Correct:

Margaret indunial

Margaret Andruniak Court Reporter