## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN VS DAVID JOHN MENACHO DAVID JOHN MENACHO

Transcript of the oral judgement delivered by His Honour, Judge T. B. Davis, sitting at Fort Norman in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday, September 6th, A.D., 1984.

20

2

23

24

25

15

16

17

18

19

## APPEARANCES:

MR. D. GATES:

MR. A. WRIGHT:

Counsel for the Crown

00T 1 1081 I

THE COURT:

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

Mr. David John Menacho has entered a plea of guilty on a charge that he committed mischief by breaking a window in a property when he and the occupant of the property entered into an argument and he also pleads guilty today by doing so, violating Section 666 of the Criminal Code, because he was on probation at the time that he committed the mischief, and therefore, violated the probation order.

The accused in this instance had obeyed part of the probation order that was put into effect by Judge Smith when he dealt very leniently with the accused in April of 1984, because he did attend at the program at Delta House, ackowledging that he has had an alochol problem and as a result of attendance, was able to stay away from alcohol for a period of a month.

It's unfortunate that this incident has occurred because I see no alternative but to impose a substantial penalty, but I am able to take into account the fact that Mr. Menacho has made some efforts at his own rehabilitation and has taken the course and stayed away from alcohol, which appears to be a substantial effort after considering and reviewing the record of criminal convictions of the accused.

I therefore am in a position where I do not have to do what I thought would be necessary and that was to consider the maximum penalty in jail for the accused, since he's been advised now through his lawyer that he has to make some efforts. He also did make restitution and paid for the damage done to the window of the victim.

The accused is on and will remain on probation for the

balance of the two year period from April of 1984 and will still be required to report to the Probation Officer whenever he is directed to do so, so as to indicate to the accused and others that they must refrain from committing mischief, even if the value of the damage done is not substantial.

I'm going to impose a fine on the accused on that charge in the amount of \$150 or in default thereof, five days in jail On the second charge, which Crown Counsel has properly pointed out to be the more serious matter, I'm going to impose a short term in jail, being short compared to what I otherwise would have imposed, because of the reasons I have mentioned. The ' jail term is being imposed so that Mr. Menacho and others realize that if a Court orders that a person keep the peace and be of good behaviour, some punishment must be imposed upon failure to obey. I notice that in the past, the accused has been in jail for breaches of probation on various occasions, but rather than a six month period which I was considering, I'm going to impose a term in jail of 45 days in this instance giving him as much credit as possible for his own efforts at rehabilitation. That will run consecutive with any default, sq the five days in jail, if there is default, would be consecutive on the probation order violation which is 45 days.

THE CLERK: 45 days on the breach of probation and five days consecutive on the fine?

THE COURT: Yes, if there is failure to pay the fine.

How long will the accused require in order to pay a fine?

MR. WRIGHT: Two months should be sufficient, sir.

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

2

5

7

8

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you. The accused will be allowed two months in which to pay the fine. (AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED) Certified a correct transcript, Grenda Mar Mangale Brenda MacDougall Court Reporter : 14