2003 NUTTEAT

T-3-CR-2002001328

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -



ALBERT JOHNNY KOE

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment delivered by The Honourable Judge R.M. Bourassa, sitting in Fort McPherson, in the Northwest Territories, on the 30th day of April, A.D. 2003.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J. Burke:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd:

Counsel for the Defendant

(Charges under s. 267(b), 264.1(1)(a), 145(5.1) x2, and 92 of the Criminal Code of Canada)

THE COURT: Well, after listening to the evidence carefully, I conclude that Mr. Koe is not a very good witness.

The only sober witnesses I hear from were the police constables. With respect to the police constable: Strowbridge, was clear that of the two, Albert Koe was the drunkest. He would have arrested Albert Koe for being drunk in a public place had he found him in that situation. He was familiar with Albert Koe drunk and sober. He's had extensive dealings with Albert Koe, and in his opinion, Albert Koe was incoherent and highly intoxicated. Of course that dramatically contrasts with Mr. Koe's evidence.

I thought that Mr. Koe tried to down-play anything that even smelled of a negative influence on his case. His evidence was all over. At one point he invites his spouse to kindly come down to the cabin; at the next point, "no", he never invited her to come to the cabin, she just jumped on the snowmobile and wanted to come of her own accord even though her nose is broken.

He didn't know the gun was there. Here's a small cabin. Look at the photographs. It's tiny. The man has been living in the cabin full-time for a week, although at first his evidence was that he was there all the time. To say he had to knowledge that the rifle was under the bed, in my view, is -- can't

seriously be maintained. I have no doubt that he knew the gun was there.

Listening to all of his evidence, it's contradictory. It's inconsistent. I don't believe him.

Looking at Norma Norman's evidence very carefully, as I must, as well as the other Crown evidence, to determine where or not the case has been proven beyond a reasonable doubt: Her state of sobriety was such that while Constable Strowbridge admitted that he would pull her over if he thought she was driving for a drinking and driving offence, he wouldn't arrest her for being drunk in a public place. He said that she had been drinking. He has had extensive experience with her, knows her drunk, knows her sober, and had seen her more heavily intoxicated and didn't think that she was that intoxicated, if I can summarize his evidence.

Her evidence, I thought, was very straightforward. She's not a particularly voluble witness and I don't think she was anxious to give her evidence. She gave no indication of bias or a great desire to hang Mr. Koe, figuratively speaking. She said very clearly that he came to her house in the afternoon and said come to the cabin. She went. They were in the cabin for a few moments. He accused her of infidelities, punched her in the face, and broke

her nose. After a little while, he took her back to her house. A little while later he picked her up again and told her to come with him. And she said she knew he'd signed a paper that he was not to see her but that they were seeing each other. She stated that why she went with him was that she was scared.

She was adamant that she was punched the first time they were at his house, and that Colin Andrew, who was also present, observed this situation and asked if Albert "was fighting you". She said, "Yeah." "I was so scared of him," she said, "so I just went." "Too scared" to say anything. I don't find that reaction or evidence unreasonable or a stretch by any means.

I don't think anything comes of the fact that he took her home right under the shadow of the police detachment buildings.

The man, in his drunkenness, was supremely confident in what he was doing and had no fear from this woman.

I accept her evidence. In my view, her alcohol consumption wasn't such as to compromise the essential thrust of her evidence that she was punched in the face by this man, that he broke her nose, that he threatened to kill her, and I convict him on the charge of assault causing bodily harm, on the charge of uttering a threat to cause death.

1.8

He was also on an undertaking on Count 3 to abstain from communicating with Norma Norman, and obviously that was breached. The fact that she may have contacted him first, while I don't have that before me, if that's a fact, that goes to sentence but not to liability.

With respect to the 117 matter, possession can be inferred. To have possession, a person has to have knowledge and he has to have control. I've concluded on the evidence that there can be no question but that Koe had knowledge that the gun was there. I suppose the knowledge that the gun was there, and his occupancy of the cabin, would give control to Koe, but it would give control to anyone who was in the cabin knowing it was there. The gun is engraved with his brother's name. The accused knew it was there. Surely there must be a distinction between possession and access. No law was quoted to me. I'm reluctant to convict on the evidence that I've got. In my view, it may come close but it's just a shade short of possession as I would understand it in the law. Although he may have had access to the gun, I have nothing before me to indicate what he did with that gun or what he had with respect to that gun was more than access, and I don't have any law before me that would indicate that access can be equated to possession. So I'm going to acquit him on Count 4.

1

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	(CONCLUSION OF REASONS FOR JUDGMENT)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
7	of the Rules of court
8	Jane Romanowich,
9	court Reporter
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	