.

EU.

## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and -

MORRIS SANGRIS



Transcript of the Oral Judgment delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, February 1, A.D. 1984.

## APPEARANCES:

MS · N. BOILLAT

On behalf of the Crown

MR. C. ROGERS

On behalf of the Defence

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

I think this could be the case of the phantom identical twin. Theresa Sangris complains of being burned on the face, twice, with a cigarette by her husband. She claims that sometime later on the same day he beat her up, he pulled her by the hair, kicked her in the face, twisted her arm, knocked her to the floor three times. In his own defence, the accused, Morris Sangris, takes the stand and confirms that, yes, he was drinking, but his wife was drinking a lot more. He skated through Friday and Saturday hardly ever seeing his wife and certainly not having the opportunity of inflicting these injuries.

I don't think the confrontation in evidence is as direct as suggested by Defence Counsel. I think Mr. Sangris attempted quite skillfully to skate around the basic issue, which is whether or not he assaulted his wife. I'm satisfied on the evidence of Mrs. Sangris. I believe her Her evidence was straightforward. Even if she was drinking as much as is alleged by Morris Sangris, her story is confirmed by Beaulieu, who saw her and her husband standing close beside her at the bar.

While there may be some weaknesses in the Crown's case, and I suppose one can say it would have been nice to have the evidence of Archie Doctor, it would have been nice to have the evidence of the Mrs. Mary Betsina, and that their evidence may have been more valuable than the evidence of Constable Powers or Breitkreuz; but as nice as it would have been to have that evidence, I don't think I need it. I

I believe

don't think the Crown has to call a hundred witnesses to prove a point. I believe Mrs. Sangris' evidence. that her husband burned her twice--once on the forehead, 3 once on the cheek--with a cigarette, and that later that day, on the thirteenth, when she was at home, he came home drunk and assaulted her. I don't believe Mr. Sangris when he says he never fought with anyone. If he was drinking to the degree that he says he was drinking, it is not suprising that he shouldn't recollect some events. 10

Certainly, Mrs. Sangris' injuries didn't occur out of the blue, and I don't have a direct denial by Mr. Sangris. As I say, I have what I perceive to be a clumsy attempt to skate around the main issue and to leave the door open for reasonable doubt by the accused. I don't have any doubt, and there will be a conviction for both Count One and Count Two.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER PROCEEDED TO SENTENCING.) THE COURT: Morris Sangris is convicted of two counts of assault causing bodily harm. Both offences occurred on a Saturday afternoon when the accused was drinking or drunk: At first, he confronted his wife in a bar, and be it whether it was arguments over where he spent his money or what happened to the groceries or what is unimportant. He took his cigarette and burned her twice, once close to the corner of her eye and once on the cheek.

Sometime later, he went down to the house occupied by his wife and went into the house and there

27

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

assaulted his wife, twisting her arm, attempting to--in her words--sprain it, knocking her to the floor, pulling her hair kicking her in the face; and I think it is important to point out that Mrs. Sangris was worried that this was going to happen, throughout the twelfth and thirteenth, that she has given evidence about, and she took active steps to hide--and I have to use that word--to hide from her husband by going to other people's houses and wandering around to stay away from her house, all this notwithstanding the fact that the accused had been put on a peace bond under Section 745 in July of 1983.

I want to point out to you, Morris, something that is very clear to me. If you had lived up to the promise you made me in Court in July to stay away from your wife, none of this would have happened, and you wouldn't be in Court today; but for one reason or another the you were unable to live up to your promise, unable to live up to the bond you were subject to, and you assaulted your wife.

I note that the accused and his wife are no longer living together. I note as well that the victim has been in fear of her husband for a lengthy period of time; although, I certainly caution myself that I am not sentencing the accused on the Section 745 matter, nor am I sentencing him for anything that might have occurred in the past. I am, and I only can, sentence him for the facts before me today.

The accused is apparently now separated from his spouse. I don't have any certainty that this is a

situation that is going to continue. Surely if there is one right Mrs. Sangris has, it is the right to live her life free from worrying about this man coming after her, drunk or sober. And as far as the Court can attempt to protect Mrs. Sangris, I think it should. I am going to do that by way of a probation order; however, I want to make it very, very clear to Mr. Sangris if he breaks this probation and goes back and bothers his wife again that the consequences are going to be serious, very serious, and I think the best way of doing that is to suspend the passing of sentence on the first count, and to place the accused on probation for two years. The term of that probation is that the accused is to keep the peace and be of good behav-That simply means not to get into trouble. And secondly, the accused is to have no contact, direct or indirect, with Theresa Sangris, nor is he to be anywhere within one hundred yards of her house. With respect to Count Two, I think a term of

With respect to Count Two, I think a term of imprisonment is justified for these assaults. As I say, I am using my sentencing powers on Count One in an effort to keep the accused from the victim so she can have a measure of certainty of safety in her life. The offence is a serious one. I note that the accused has no previous criminal record, and the Courts have said time and time again when a person does have a criminal record, that can be used in a reverse way, to eliminate mitigation that is otherwise available if a record is not present, and certainly the fact that this man

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

2

4

6

.

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

has lived the years that he has without ever being in confrontation with the law operates in his favour. It is something I can and I must take into consideration, and I do. I have to weigh that with the importance or the significance of the assault. I have to weigh the concerns that the Court has for the individual against the concerns that society has generally. I believe that in this particular instance the most important concern must be that of deterrence, that this individual clearly understand that the Courts will not tolerate him beating up his wife, or anyone else for that matter. Closely following that concern, of course, must be one for the individual. He is still at the point where one would hope that he will learn a lesson, and that lesson is very simply to stay away from his wife.

As I have indicated, I am satisfied and I believe that a jail term is appropriate, but taking into account what has been said on behalf of Mr. Sangris by his Counsel, the fact that he has virtually no criminal record that is available in substantial mitigation.

Mr. Sangris, would you stand, please? On this charge I am going to impose a jail term of thirty days. That is consecutive to any other time you are now serving. I want to point out to you, Mr. Sangris, under the terms of the Criminal Code, I am obliged to point out some provisions to you. I've suspended passing of sentence and placed you on probation for two years under certain conditions. If you don't comply with those conditions, you may be charged with

\_ 7

11

13

16

17

18

an offence known as breach of probation and upon conviction be subject to a sentence of a maximum of five hundred dollars or six months in jail, or both. In addition to that, if you are convicted of any criminal offence while you are on probation, which includes breach of probation, you can be brought back to this Court, and I can sentence you on the original charge of assaulting your wife by burning her with a cigarette. Do you understand that?

THE ACCUSED:

(Nods head.)

10 THE COURT:

Is that everything, Ms Boillat?

MS BOILLAT:

Yes, sir.

THE COURT:

Mr. Rogers?

MR. ROGERS:

Yes, sir.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER WAS CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript

Edna Thiessen, Court Reporter

21

20

22

23

24

25