IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and
HANK MARK LAFFERTY

JUN 1 1995

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment delivered by the Honourable Judge R. M Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on January 30, A.D. 1995.

APPEARANCES:

MR. L. ROSE

MR. J. TARLTON

On behalf of the Crown

On behalf of the Defence

THE COURT: Okay. I will start with my assessment of the evidence first. The evidence of Ms. Cardinal and the evidence of Mr. Berg doesn't dovetail, it doesn't fit, it doesn't even come close to the evidence of Mr. Lafferty. Mr. Lafferty in his evidence-in-chief denIed that the complainant was even in the bathroom; that was a flat-out denial. THE COURT: Ms. Cardinal, as drunk as she was,

remembers Ms. Bealieu being in the bathroom and thumping or banging noises in the bathroom. Mr. Berg says he was never in the bathroom. At no time did he ever go near the bathroom. Mr. Lafferty says that after Ms. Beaulieu took off Mr. Berg came into the bathroom.

The evidence of John Berg is a waste of time and that is putting it charitably. He's playing word games, "I didn't see anything, there was nothing to see." His evidence deserves no credit, no weight. He is simply playing games with the Crown and games with the Court. Ostensibly, he was the only sober one there, and he is very much like the three monkeys - hear no evil, see no evil, do no evil.

The evidence of the second defence witness Lisa Cardinal is of marginal or minor assistance. She too remembers very little, saw very little and admits that she was very drunk. She has refused to cooperate in any way, not that much turns on that, I just note

that. But she was clear, she said all I know is they were in the washroom together, that is Lafferty and Beaulieu, and that there was yelling and banging, and that after the yelling and banging Beaulieu came running out to call the cops. She said she went down to the washroom and told Mr. Lafferty that Verna was calling the cops. There are other conflicts, but all it points out is that she and Berg are of very little assistance, Berg even less than little really.

That leaves me then with the evidence of Mr. Lafferty and the evidence of the Crown witness. Of course the three questions are before me, do I believe the accused, and if I believe the accused, that is the end of it and I must aquit. I don't. Does the evidence or the cross-examination raise a reasonable doubt, and I think that is where I have to examine the evidence carefully.

What happened for twenty minutes while the police were knocking on the door, and trying to get a key, and what was going on in that apartment? The people in the apartment, some of them, although they all denied it, knew the police were at the door. One of the constables, I think MacDonald, I could be corrected there, testified that someone came to the door and asked who was there when they started knocking. They replied, "police" and then nothing. Then they knocked and they knocked and heard no

response until finally someone came back with the key. Constable Isiah estimated that to be 20 minutes. Why are these people hiding out for 20 minutes behind a closed door?

When the police finally get in, they have to knock and knock at the bathroom door where Mr. Lafferty is and Mr. Latimer, I think the name is. Mr. Lafferty, twenty minutes after he was splashed with cold water he says, is still splashing hot water on himself to warm up so he doesn't catch a cold. About all I can say, I am not saying it is impossible - peculiar - but that doesn't condemn it. What are the two men doing in a locked bathroom for twenty minutes? I don't know.

When the police constables, and no one was examined or questioned about it and I assume they were sober, intervened and made some observations, two constables I think it is, both indicated that Mr. Lafferty appeared to be spaced out I think one said. Both constables had dealt with Mr. Lafferty in the past, and one in detail commented that he was peculiar, he was unfocused, or staring somewhere else, that he was subdued and quiet which is contrary to the normal way they have to deal with him. At the police station he went through some kind of seizure and ha to be taken to the hospital. Mr. Lafferty's response was that while he was in the bathroom splashing hot

water on himself he took four pills - some kind of cocaine substitute - and that this gave him the seizure. He took them knowing that they were not to be mixed with alcohol. On his evidence he said he only consumed two bottles of beer some ten to twelve hours earlier. He came home at 2, 2:30 and passed out. He had two beers earlier that evening and this event, as best as I can tell, occurred somewhere between, well I am being generous, 11 and 2 o'clock. So nine, ten, twelve hours after two bottles of beer, he has this reaction because of taking the so-called cocaine substitute pills.

In addition Mr. Lafferty would have us believe, or at least the evidence would seem to be, that not only did Mr. Berg, on his evidence for whatever it's worth, try to wake him up, that didn't work, and one of the women tried to wake up him up before a pitcher of water was poured on him. It seems to be an awful lot to wake up someone who is not suffering from intoxication of any kind, but again who is to say, some people may be very difficult to wake up.

There are many frailties in the defence's evidence, in Mr. Lafferty's evidence. One of the major problems in contradiction with another defence witness was that she was in the bathroom with Mr. Berg. Now, I don't question that Mr. Lafferty believes what he is saying here today, and I deal with

a very peculiar kind of truth. It's not an absolute truth that is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. But with all of the frailties in Mr. Lafferty's evidence, and the inconsistencies, and the aspects of it that just don't make any sense at all, I just don't believe it. Whether it was from consumption of alcohol or something else, Mr. Lafferty's belief is not one founded on facts.

It leaves me with the Crown's evidence. satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt on the Crown's evidence? I don't really disagree with the characterization Mr. Rose placed on the Crown witness. It's a strange world we live in when she goes to the jail the night before trial to talk with him. obviously feels some affection towards him. anything she would come to court today, if he were going to suggest that she was lying, that she would come to court today and change her story or use the shield used by so many "I don't remember, I don't remember". But she came and gave straightforward evidence, and again I agree with what Mr. Rose said, without embellishment, without a little extra added to help the case along. Finally I ask why would she go to the police any way? Was it an argument over cocaine? Mr. Lafferty was adamant that the argument wasn't over cocaine, it was over something else, but wouldn't tell us what it was over.

1

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

On what I have before me today in my view an 1 assault occurred. In my view, and the extent of the assault that I can determine, or I feel confident to determine is that she was pushed against the wall in the hallway, and she was pushed into the bathtub as she relates in the bathroom. She had, as I understood it, that she was going to get tossed out of the window was a fear she had, it wasn't as a result of actions by Mr. Lafferty other than Mr. Lafferty pursuing her and following her down the hallway as she left. She 10 left and called the police, and I convict the accused. 11 (AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER WAS ADJOURNED FOR SENTENCING) 12 13 14 Certified a correct transcript, 15 16 17 Loretta Mott Court Reporter 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27