TC CR 97002

ORIGINAL

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

JEANNIE FLORENCE GAGNON

Transcript of the Sentencing Hearing held before The Honourable Chief Judge R.W. Halifax, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday, the 19th day of June, A.D., 1997.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. M. Nightingale: Counsel for the Crown

Ms. S.A.E. Kay:

Counsel for the Defence

THE CLERK: Jeannie Florence Gagnon.

THE COURT: This is a matter for sentencing.

It has been adjourned. You will have to bear with me.

It is all in my own handwriting and sometimes I do not read it very well.

This is a matter for sentencing of the accused on a charge of theft over a value of \$5000 contrary to Section 334(a) of the Criminal Code.

Basically, the circumstances are that the accused, as part of her employment, entered into a lease purchase arrangement for a house with her employer at the rate of \$2000 per month. If the accused exercised the option to purchase, a certain amount of the lease payments would be applied to the purchase price together with a deposit.

The accused, as the accounts receivable clerk for the business, was responsible for receiving funds and posting the same to the accounts of customers.

Further, the accused was responsible for depositing the monthly lease payment and keeping the account for this up to date.

Due to financial hardship, the accused diverted funds from the other customers' accounts to the lease account, which shortages were discovered by another person who was carrying out these duties in the accused's absence. The employer then had to have an audit done to ascertain the extent of funds diverted

and brought in the RCM Police to investigate.

The accused was eventually interviewed by the police and fully admitted and had explained what she had done. There is an indication she was very remorseful and was cooperative with the police. The total amount diverted was \$7,507.58 of which \$6000 had been repaid at the time of the hearing. The accused was an eight-year employee of the business.

She is married with four children of her own and two other children for which she has responsibility. It is a first offence, and a guilty plea was entered soon after disclosure was provided. The accused's income from her employment was around \$40,000 a year, and her husband was earning over 100,000 a year. As a result of her actions, she has lost that employment. The accused seems to be the main person meeting the day-to-day needs of her family as her husband works seven days a week.

The reason behind the accused's actions seems to be that she was trying to help other members of the extended family which resulted in no money being left to cover the lease payments. It is this good samaritan approach to life that got her into this trouble. She expected to be able to pay the money back in the future; however, she was caught before that could be done.

The accused is obviously remorseful and sorry for

her actions which are just the opposite to what she demands of her own children. Her family has remained supportive of her throughout this difficult period.

It should be noted that there was more than one incident of rerouting customers' payments to the lease account. Although the process was not very sophisticated, there was some pre-planning and was continued on more than one occasion. This is a breach of trust situation being a theft from an employer.

Generally, the main principle of sentencing in this case is deterrence, not only deterrence of this accused but also general deterrence of the public at large. The sentence must be such that the message is clear that theft from your employer is serious. These types of offences occur to a large extent because the person is trusted by the employer and is therefore in a position to be able to commit the offence. This type of trust must be maintained to allow businesses to operate at a reasonable footing, and it is very difficult to protect against thefts from within by trusted employees. It is for that reason that jail terms tend to be the norm in disposing of cases of this nature.

The Crown has asked for a term of imprisonment and takes the position that a conditional sentence in these circumstances is not sufficient to meet the deterrence aspect of sentencing. Counsel for the accused has

argued for a conditional sentencing or alternatively, for an intermittent sentence which, of course, then presupposes a sentence of 90 days or less.

There are a number of cases which were provided to the Court regarding sentencing and breach of trust cases and particularly conditional sentencing in such cases. There are a number of cases from this jurisdiction which deal with this type of case and the principles of sentencing including R. v. Johnson,

R. v. Wyness, R. v. Doyle, and R. v. Rogers. All of these cases have set the standard that generally a term of imprisonment is imposed except in exceptional cases. This case is not exceptional in its circumstances. Basically, the accused was living beyond her means and diverted money from her employer for her own benefit to protect the lease purchase arrangement.

Most of the cases in this jurisdiction were before the conditional sentencing provisions were enacted in the Criminal Code. The Court must consider whether a conditional sentence is appropriate in these circumstances.

Now, Section 742.1 of the Criminal Code provides for conditional sentencing, and the provisions really basically come down at the end of the day to setting out three prerequisites for a conditional sentence.

Namely, they are that there is no minimum term of

imprisonment which in this case, of course, there is not; that the sentence is less than two years; and thirdly, that the Court must be satisfied that the serving of the sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community.

If these prerequisites are met, the offender may be considered for a conditional sentence; however, this does not mean that the offender has an absolute entitlement to a conditional sentence. The sentencing judge must consider whether a conditional sentence is appropriate in all the circumstances of the specific case. This involves consideration of the principles and objectives of sentencing provided for in the Criminal Code and the case law.

The Criminal Code in Section 718.2 establishes that a breach of trust is an aggravating circumstance when considering an appropriate sentence; however, all the aggravating and mitigating components of the specific case and as set out in the Criminal Code must be considered.

In cases of this nature, the Courts have consistently indicated that deterrence is a very important objective, and I refer to R. v. Pierce and R. v. J. (W.). In most cases, deterrence of the offender is not as important as general deterrence as generally persons who have committed this type of offence, once caught, are not likely to commit further

offences; however, general deterrence is very important in that the general public and people who may be of like mind as the accused realize there will be consequences for this type of behaviour.

There must be a message that theft from an employer is serious in order to protect employers and others who must put people in positions of trust and authority. If the public arrives at the view that such offences are treated lightly and there is no real sanction, one would expect that the risk factor would be viewed as substantially reduced and people would be more inclined to take the chance of breaching that trust if they do not perceive any real consequence.

The Court must be mindful of the new approach to sentencing established by Parliament and not be a slave to the view that certain offences result in institutional incarceration. A conditional sentence is a sentence of imprisonment which sentence is served in the community under prescribed conditions set out in the conditional sentencing order.

The option of a conditional sentence should not be excluded for any particular type of offence where imprisonment is to be imposed as Parliament has not set such a limit, and for the Court to do so would be to circumvent the conditional sentencing regime. Even in breach of trust situations where terms of institutional incarceration are generally imposed, the Court should

consider the new conditional sentencing option together with other possible dispositions in the circumstances of the case.

In the past, sentences other than imprisonment have been imposed for this type of case based on the particular circumstances, although this has been somewhat exceptional. In my view in the circumstances of this case, a term of imprisonment should be imposed. There are no exceptional circumstances that take this case out of the normal result for a breach of trust. Granted, the accused is a first offender, but previous good character is one of the reasons she was in the position of trust and able to commit the offence. The fact that she is suffering some embarrassment and has disappointed people close to her is also the norm for this type of case.

The good samaritan motive does not justify the accused's actions. One cannot justify this type of offence by laudable motives. The fact is that the accused and her husband had an income of over \$140,000 per year and the fact that choices were made that put a financial burden on the family, regardless of what those choices were, does not change the situation. The Court cannot send the message that it is not serious or it is okay to steal from your employer if you have good motives or the fruits of the offence are put to good use.

Given that a term of imprisonment is to be imposed, the Court must then consider if a conditional sentence is appropriate. This is not a case where a minimum sentence is provided and, in my view, not one in which the sentence should be more than two years imprisonment. Therefore, the first two prerequisites of Section 742.1 have been met.

The last prerequisite is that the Court must consider and be satisfied that the serving of the sentence in the community will not endanger the safety of the community. The accused, being a first offender, was cooperative, is remorseful, and has repaid the majority of the funds. She has entered an early guilty plea which is an indication of accepting responsibility for her actions.

Obviously removing the accused from her family who depend on her very much in the normal course will have a devastating effect upon the accused. The rehabilitation process is already commenced, and institutional incarceration will do nothing but retard that process, in my view. It is very unlikely that this accused will reoffend in the future as normally people in her position seldom reoffend. I get the impression that the accused has a deep sense of disappointment in herself for her behaviour which is opposite to the principles she has instilled in her children.

I am satisfied that the safety of the community is not endangered in the sense that this offender is not likely to reoffend.

I am satisfied that in all the circumstances, this is a case where a conditional sentence is appropriate and consistent with the fundamental purposes and principles of sentencing as set out in Section 718 to 718.2 of the Criminal Code.

It should be made very clear that a conditional sentence is a sentence of imprisonment which is being served in the community under strict conditions. If the offender breaches any of the terms of the conditional sentence order, she is subject to serving the balance of the sentence in jail. Further, the conditions included in the conditional sentence can be very onerous and restrictive in themselves.

In conclusion, it will be a conditional sentence order for a term of nine months. The statutory conditions provided for in Section 742.3 are to be included, which are that the accused will keep of peace and be of good behaviour. Secondly, the accused will appear before the Court when required to do so. Thirdly, the accused will report to a supervisor within seven days from today and thereafter as directed by the supervisor but at least twice per month.

Further, there will be the additional conditions:
That the accused carry out 100 hours of community

service work within six months; that the accused remain in her residence from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. daily except for the purposes of employment or carrying out the community service ordered above for a period of four months from today; and finally, that the accused shall carry with her a copy of this conditional sentence order and produce it on request for identification by a peace officer.

You should understand, Ms. Gagnon, any breach of those conditions can subject you to spending the balance of the term in jail. I think you should also recognize that this is, in my understanding, the first conditional sentence that has been given in this jurisdiction for a breach of trust so to some degree, you carry the load for the future on your shoulders here. If it does not work, judges may be less inclined in the future giving this type of order. I do not wish to load that on you, but I think you should recognize that this is the first time, to my knowledge, that this has happened. There will be a conditional order produced. Just have a chair in the courtroom.

- MS. NIGHTINGALE: Sir, I wonder if the Court would address the remaining money outstanding.
- 24 THE COURT: Yes. That is the other one thing
- I wanted to consider.
- MS. NIGHTINGALE: Apparently, there --
- 27 THE COURT: I wanted to know, has anything

```
further been paid over the $6000?
 1
                                No, there hasn't, Sir.
       MS. KAY:
                                That leaves us then $1507.58.
       THE COURT:
           There will be a further condition of the order. How
           long do you think you are going to need, Ms. Gagnon, to
           pay the balance at 1507.58?
                                Sir, in the range of six months.
       MS. KAY:
           She is agreeable if the Court wishes a specific amount
           to be paid each month, though.
                                What is the Crown's position?
       THE COURT:
10
                                That's fine, Sir.
       MS. NIGHTINGALE:
11
                                       There will be one further
                                Okay.
       THE COURT:
12
           condition then that she will make restitution to the
13
           Clerk of the Court in the sum of $1,507.58 for
14
           distribution to Robinsons' Trucking Limited within six
15
           months from today. I would suggest to you, Ms. Gagnon,
16
           that you make the payments monthly so you do not wind
17
           up at the end of the six months not being able to do so
18
          because then you are leaving yourself open to going to
19
20
           jail for three months.
                               It will be done.
       THE ACCUSED:
21
                                Okay. That will be all.
22
      THE COURT:
                                Thank you, Sir. Those are all of
23
      MS. KAY:
           the matters I have before the Court this morning.
24
                                Very well. You will have your
25
      THE COURT:
26
          client wait and receive the copy of the conditional
27
          sentence order.
```

-	1	MS.	KAY:		Yes.
	2				
-	3	ADJO	URNED	GENERALLY	
-	4				
	5				Certified pursuant to Practice
	6				Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987.
	7				
	8				
	9				Dara Daglo
	10				Tara Taylor, CSR(A), Court Reporter
	11				
	12				
	13				
	14				
	15				
	16				
	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				