R. v. E., 2006 NWTTC 06 Y-2-Y0-2006-000018

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

O. N. E.

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Decision on an Amendment Application by The Honourable Judge R.D. Gorin, sitting in Hay River, in the Northwest Territories, on the 30th day of March, A.D., 2006.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. Gaunt: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. M. Hansen: Counsel for the Young Person

1	THE	COURT:	This is my decision on the
2		Crown's applic	ation to amend a Youth Justice
3		Court Informat	ion which contains four counts,
4		each of which	alleges an offence contrary to
5		Section 137 of	the Youth Criminal Justice Act.
6		Approxima	tely three weeks ago the accused
7		pleaded guilty	to all four counts. The accuse

d now opposes the Crown's application.

First of all, as to the fact that the dates charged straddle the six-month limitation period, I agree with the Crown that the case law is quite clear that under circumstances such as these, the Information can and should be amended to cover only those portions of the dates charged which fall within the limitation period respecting summary conviction matters.

However, as noted by Mr. Hansen, the charges are still defective in that it is not alleged that Mr. E. was, on the dates charged, a young person, as that term is defined in the Youth Criminal Justice Act. Moreover, all four counts misstate the requisite elements of the offence in their particulars; each count alleges that Mr. E. failed to obey the probation order in question "without reasonable excuse."

Section 137 of the Youth Criminal Justice Act provides that the young person, or accused,

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

charged with a breach of a probation order made

by the Youth Justice Court must "wilfully fail or

refuse" to comply with such an order in order for

an offence to have occurred.

It is well established that wilfully failing or refusing to do something is quite distinct from failing to do something without reasonable excuse. The elements of the offences with which Mr. E. is charged are therefore incorrectly particularized.

The Crown concedes that point and asks that

I make the necessary amendments in order to

properly set out the charges. Mr. Hansen, as

counsel for Mr. E., opposes the Crown's

application. He correctly, in my view, points

out that the problems which exist in respect to

Mr. E.'s charges, for some reason, often occur in

this jurisdiction, and one of his arguments, as I

understand it, is "enough is enough."

For some reason the individuals who are framing charges contrary to Section 137 of the Youth Criminal Justice Act are continually using the wording "without reasonable excuse." That wording would be correct if the accused were an adult charged with a breach of probation contrary to Section 733.1 of the Criminal Code.

27 As pointed out by Mr. Gaunt, Section

2.1

2.6

1	601(3)(b)(i) states:
2	
3	(3) Subject to this section, a court
4	shall, at any stage of the
5	proceedings, amend the indictment or
6	a count therein as may be necessary
7	where it appears
8	(b) that the indictment or a count
9	thereof
10	(i) fails to state or states
11	defectively anything that is
12	requisite to constitute the
13	offence.
14	
15	In the present case it is clear that the
16	Information both fails to state and also states
17	defectively certain things which are necessary to
18	constitute the offence as charged.
19	In my view, within the provisions of
20	subsection 601(3)(b)(i), the word "shall"
21	requires that I make the amendments sought by the
22	Crown. This Court must follow the law, just as
23	everybody, including members of the public and
24	the police must follow the law.
25	If I were to refuse the Crown's application,
26	I have no doubt that a judge of the Supreme Court

27 would order a writ of mandamus requiring that I

allow the requested amendments, upon application,
of course, by the Crown. Clearly the Supreme
Court would be correct in making such an order.

Moreover, even if I had the discretion to refuse the Crown's request, I would not do so under the circumstances which are presently before me. Mr. E. was represented by, in my view, a very capable lawyer when he entered his guilty pleas to all of the charges that I have before me.

This Court undoubtedly entered into some form of the necessary inquiry which is set out in Section 606 of the Criminal Code before taking the guilty pleas, and therefore there would have been confirmation, that is the necessary confirmation, that the guilty pleas taken were voluntary and that Mr. E. knew that the guilty pleas were admissions of all of the essential elements of each offence he is currently charged with.

I say this appreciating that both the defence and Crown failed to bring the defects to the Court's attention on the date that the pleas were taken. That particular date was also Mr. E.'s first appearance on all of these charges.

However, as I have indicated, I am confident

2.1

2.6

that Mr. E.'s counsel knows what the elements of the offence prohibited by Section 137 of the Youth Criminal Justice Act are. I am satisfied that she would have explained them to her client and that she would not have represented him in entering his guilty pleas if there were any doubt that he was not prepared to admit the necessary elements of each of the offences being charged.

I say this, as I have already indicated, notwithstanding her failure to spot the defects in the charges, and I am sure that both she and the Crown would have brought these defects to the Court's attention had they noticed them back on March the 8th of this year.

In conclusion, because of the guilty pleas and the fact that Mr. E. was represented by capable counsel and the fact that the necessary inquiry was undoubtedly made at the time that the pleas were taken, I am of the view that Mr. E. has not been misled or prejudiced by the defects in the charges against him. As stated, I am of the view that I have no option but to make the requested amendments. However, for the reasons I have provided, even if the requested amendments were not mandatory, I would still make them under all of the circumstances.

Now, Mr. Gaunt, on this circuit I have

2.1

2.4

2.6

1	arready pointed out the problems the court is
2	having with the way charges against young persons
3	are being drafted. These problems have been
4	present in a large number of charges against
5	other young persons during this court circuit.
6	The problem has been ongoing, and it has wasted a
7	significant amount of court time. So with
8	genuine respect, I would ask that the Crown take
9	the necessary steps in order to rectify the
10	problem, please.
11	
12	
13	Certified to be a true and accurate transcript, pursuant
14	to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules.
15	Dapreme Court Nates.
16	
17	Joel Bowker, CSR(A) Court Reporter
18	Court Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	