IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

GRANT WALTER GIROUX

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Judge R.D. Gorin, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 23rd day of June, A.D. 2009.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Himmelman: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. S. Shabala: Counsel for the Accused

(Charge under s. 348(1)(b) of the Criminal Code of Canada)

1	THE	COURT: Well, certainly I take into
2		account, as I always must, the facts of the
3		offence. Mr. Himmelman is quite correct, it is
4		an aggravating factor where an individual is
5		convicted of breaking and entering a dwelling
6		house and knew or was reckless as to whether the
7		dwelling house was occupied and used violence or
8		threats of violence to a person or property.
9		Clearly, that occurred in this particular
10		situation.
11		The violence may not have been especially
12		aggravating, but, nonetheless, there was
13		violence. He went into that dwelling house, in
14		this case a hotel room. I find that he knew that
15		someone was there. Immediately asked where the
16		drugs were, asked where the money was, and once

aggravating, but, nonetheless, there was violence. He went into that dwelling house, in this case a hotel room. I find that he knew that someone was there. Immediately asked where the drugs were, asked where the money was, and once the wallet was provided to him, left. To make matters worse, he came back. He came back and tried to negotiate with his victim, told his victim that he would return his passport to him if his victim gave him the pin number for the bank card he had taken. So the facts are indeed aggravating.

There is no guilty plea. The absence of a guilty plea, as counsel are very well aware, is not an aggravating factor, but at the same time it is indeed the absence of a highly mitigating

factor. Had there been a guilty plea in relation
to this charge, I would have been inclined to
reduce the sentence which I am about to impose by
at least a factor of one-third.

There is as well the fact that the victim was vulnerable, had poor eyesight. He is now, he advises, in a chronic condition of pain. He was in a condition like that before this incident, but the incident in question appears to have aggravated this condition. He also has nightmares as a result.

I agree with the Crown that a substantial term of imprisonment is required and that that imprisonment should be, before taking into account the pre-trial detention, in the penitentiary range. There is also the criminal record which I have to consider, and the criminal record shows that there have been prior convictions or findings of guilt for crimes of violence and also prior convictions in relation to breaking and entering and committing indictable offences. At least three such convictions. There is also a conviction for being unlawfully in a dwelling house. I note as well that in November of 2005, Mr. Giroux received 12 months' imprisonment after being convicted of assault with a weapon, and

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

approximately one week later was convicted of three counts of breaking and entering and committing an indictable offence for which he received four months less one day on one of the break and enter convictions and eight months on the other. Total being consecutive. The total cumulative sentence being about two years less a day.

There will be a firearms prohibition order. In my view, it is mandatory. This was a crime of violence, and it is a crime of violence for which the maximum period of imprisonment exceeds ten years. So there will be the required firearms prohibition pursuant to Section 109 of the Criminal Code. Mr. Giroux will be prohibited from having in his possession any firearm, prohibited device, ammunition, prohibited ammunition, and explosive substance for the entire period of ten years. The Crown has not filed a notice of intention to seek greater punishment, so it will not be for the lifetime period that would otherwise be applicable. He does have a prior conviction which also led to a mandatory prohibition pursuant to Section 109 of the Criminal Code.

There will also be a DNA authorization.

This is a primary designated offence. And there

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

will be no victims of crime surcharge given the
hardship.

Were it not for the pre-trial detention, I

would be imposing a jail term of three and a half

years. That is 42 months. But I do take into

account the pre-trial detention. I give him

10 months' credit for it. There will be 32

months. Thirty-two months of jail for the

conviction of breaking and entering and

committing robbery. That is taking into account,

as I have said, the pre-trial detention.

My understanding, Mr. Shabala, is that although I have imposed federal time, that the local - that is, the territorial - department of corrections has an agreement with the federal department whereby individuals who are sentenced to less than three years may be allowed to serve their sentences in the North. I will endorse the Warrant of Committal to that effect. I will recommend that he be allowed to serve the jail term that I have imposed here at the North Slave Correctional Centre in Yellowknife, but that is the best that I can do. Obviously, where he serves his sentence is up to the federal department of corrections.

Anything else in relation to this matter?

MR. HIMMELMAN: Not from the Crown, Your

1		Honour.	Thank y	ou.			
2	THE	COURT:		Mr. Sha	abala?		
3	MR.	SHABALA:		Nothing	g further,	Your	Honour
4	THE	COURT:		Thank y	ou, Couns	el.	
5							
6							
7							
8				rtified Pu			723
9			OI	the Rules	s of Court		
10							
11			_	_		- \	
12				ne Romanow urt Report		A), RI	2R
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							