R. v. Hayward, 2012 NWTTC 01

T-1-CR2011000292

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

## TRENT HAYWARD

Transcript of the Decision of The Honourable Chief Judge

R. D. Gorin, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on December 13th A.D., 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_

## APPEARANCES:

 $\label{eq:mr.n.sinclair:} \text{Mr. N. Sinclair:} \qquad \qquad \text{Counsel for the Crown}$ 

Mr. R. Gregory: Counsel for the Accused

\_\_\_\_\_

Charge under s. 253(1)(a) Criminal Code of Canada

Official Court Reporters

1 THE COURT: Trent Ronald Hayward is 2 charged that on or about the 13th day of November, 2010, at or near the city of 4 Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, 5 while his ability to operate a motor vehicle was impaired by alcohol, did operate a motor 6 vehicle contrary to Section 253(1)(a) of the Criminal Code. 8 Due to rather unusual circumstances, the 9 10 accused did not provide a breath sample into 11 an actual breathalyzer machine, and I have no 12 evidence as to his blood alcohol level at or 13 around the time that he was driving. Consequently, the accused is charged only with 14 driving while his ability to do so was 15 16 impaired by alcohol. He is not charged with 17 driving while his blood alcohol level exceeded the legal limit of 80 milligrams percent. 18 19 While, as I have said, the circumstances 20 are unusual, the evidence I have before me is 21 what it is. I draw no inference one way or another as a result of the unavailability of 22 evidence concerning the accused's blood 23 24 alcohol level. My role here today is to 25 examine the evidence presented in this case 26 and determine whether or not all of the 27 elements of the sole offence alleged by the

1 Crown have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

3 For the benefit of the public, I will note at the outset that Constable Hayward is not 5 charged with "driving under the influence of alcohol". Driving under the influence of alcohol may be an offence in American law. However, that is not how the Canadian version 8 of the offence is worded. In order to commit the offence which is proscribed by 10 11 Section 253(1)(a) of the Criminal Code, a person must operate a motor vehicle while his 12 or her ability to do so is impaired. For 13 reasons on which I will elaborate, this is a 14 15 distinction with significance.

This case is relatively simple. There are no complex legal issues. The Crown argues that all of the elements of the offence alleged have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt. The defence, on the other hand, states that it has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that there was actual impairment of the accused's ability to operate a motor vehicle at the time that he was driving. He refers me to the well known cases of Stellato 1994 SCR 478 Supreme Court decision and Andrews (1996) 104 CCC (3d) 392

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 (Alta. C.A.) leave to appeal to the Supreme 2 Court of Canada refused 106 CCC (3d) vi.

In Stellato, the Supreme Court of Canada held that since the Criminal Code does not proscribe any special test for determining impairment such as "marked departure" from normal behaviour, if the evidence of impairment establishes any degree of impairment beyond the de minimus level, ranging from slight to great, the offence is made out.

However, in Andrews, the Alberta Court of Appeal qualified the Supreme Court of Canada's pronouncement in Stellato. The Court held that Section 253(1)(a) requires impairment of the ability to drive as an element of the offence as opposed to any impairment of the accused's functional ability.

The Court further stated that it cannot be assumed that where a person's functional ability is affected in some respects by the consumption of alcohol, it necessarily follows that his ability to drive is also impaired.

Where proof of impairment consists of observations of conduct, in most cases, if the conduct is a slight departure from normal conduct it would be unsafe to conclude beyond

a reasonable doubt that the ability to drive
was impaired by alcohol.

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Put another way, simply being "under the influence of" or "affected by alcohol" is not in and of itself enough. An essential element of the offence charged, which must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, is impairment of the ability to drive.

I agree with Mr. Gregory that, to a large extent, this case boils down to what is often referred to as a credibility contest. On the one hand there is the evidence of the accused that his ability to operate the motor vehicle was not impaired through the consumption of alcohol. On the other hand, there is the evidence of the arresting officer, Corporal Matt Hare, that the accused was quite intoxicated throughout his dealings with him. Then there is the evidence of the others who testified: Kiera Powder, Constable David Sullivan, Sergeant Dennis McLeod, and Shane Thompson - all of whom provided corroboration to one version or the other to varying degrees.

I must also consider the other evidence which was entered, including the video evidence of Constable Hayward's conduct when

he was at the detachment, the patrol unit

history, and the photographs of certain text

messages sent to Corporal Hare.

The case law, dealing with how to approach the contradictions between Hayward's evidence and the other evidence I have heard and seen, is very well established. It is not simply a case of deciding who is more likely telling the truth. I have to approach the evidence as follows:

First of all, if I believe the accused's testimony that his ability to operate a motor vehicle was not impaired by alcohol, I must find him not guilty. Secondly, even if I don't believe him but his evidence leaves me in reasonable doubt as to his guilt, I must find him not guilty. And thirdly, even if I reject his evidence to the extent that it does not leave me in reasonable doubt, I must examine all of the evidence which I do accept and determine whether, based on that evidence, it has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty of the offence that he is charged with.

I think it appropriate to review the evidence to some extent. While I do not intend to repeat all of the evidence, I will

say that I have reviewed it extensively during
the course of my deliberations and if I do not
mention a particular piece or portion of
evidence, it does not mean that I have not
considered it.

Corporal Hare was the first witness called by the Crown. He testified that during the course of his career he has been involved in excess of 200 investigations having to do with impaired operation of a motor vehicle or driving over 80.

His testimony was that he was working the shift that began at 7 p.m. on November 12th, 2010, and ended at 7 a.m. the following day. He walked through the Gold Range bar in Yellowknife at approximately midnight. He saw Constable Hayward, who was off duty, seated with four to six other people. He saw that Hayward was with his girlfriend April Bell, who is also an RCMP constable. Four years earlier, Hare and Constable Bell were in a relationship. He said that another person at the table where Hayward was seated joked that Corporal Hare should take Constable Hayward away. However, Corporal Hare testified that he noted nothing unusual about Hayward's behaviour at the time.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

He testified that at one point that
evening he observed Hayward's truck by Boston
Pizza, across from the Joe Tobie building.

Corporal Hare testified that sometime after observing Hayward at the Gold Range, he parked in the empty lot by the Raven Pub on the same block and side of the street that the Gold Range bar is located. At about 1:50 a.m., he saw Constable Bell walking from the Gold Range in the direction of the Raven Pub. A short time later, he saw Constable Hayward following her.

He said that he could tell that Hayward was intoxicated just from looking at him. He stated Hayward was walking oddly and stumbling slightly with very rigid legs. He described Hayward was walking in a "funny rigid" manner. He had never seen Constable Hayward walk like this previously. He was unaware of Hayward having a limp. However, earlier in his testimony he stated that he has never worked at the same detachment at the same time as Constable Hayward. When he saw Constable Hayward, he said 'hi' to him and Hayward then waved back.

Corporal Hare testified that he then received a number of telephone calls from

Constable Bell. She requested a ride to
locate Hayward so that she could get the keys
to the house where she lived. Corporal Hare
picked her up. She was quite intoxicated and
quite upset. He drove her about a block and
let her out. He went back to the spot by the
Rayen where he had had previously been parked.

He said that while he was there, he was approached by Hayward and the two of them had a 15 to 20 minute conversation. This would have been between 2:10 a.m. or 2:20 in the morning. He said that at this point Constable Hayward was significantly intoxicated. His speech was very slurred. He kept repeating himself. He would stop in mid sentence. His balance was very unsteady. He had a swayed stance. At one point he fell and used the front of Hare's police truck to hold himself up. Hayward's eyes weren't red but they were very glassy. He says that there was no doubt in his mind that at that point Constable Hayward was just plain intoxicated and drunk. He testified that he has seen Hayward on a number of occasions when he is sober at work and his behaviour was far different on this occasion. He described Hayward as being eight or nine on a scale of sobriety with ten being

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 passed out or falling down drunk.

The conversation ended when a fight

erupted close by, to which Corporal Hare

responded.

Hare testified that at 2:24 a.m., he received a text from April Bell stating that the accused was driving his truck and that he was going to Behchokò. This is corroborated through a photograph of the text message on Hare's cell along with the timestamp which was entered as evidence on consent. The text stated that Mr. Hayward had just left BPS. Hare responded, and he noted that Hayward's truck was gone from in front of Boston Pizza.

Corporal Hare then contacted Sergeant
McLeod who was, at the time, Constable
Hayward's superior in the community of
Behchokò. A plan was formed in which Hare
would proceed towards Behchokò and McLeod
would proceed from Behchokò towards
Yellowknife so that one of them would be sure
to encounter Hayward. The two proceeded
accordingly and ultimately met up about 30
kilometres from Behchokò without encountering
Constable Hayward. Hare, at the point,
proceeded back towards Yellowknife and at
around 3:30 or 3:40 a.m., he encountered

1 Hayward who was on his way to Behchokò.

2 Hayward drove over on the other side of the

3 road so that his wheels straddled the fog line

on his side of the road while Hare passed by.

5 Hare estimated that the vehicle being driven

by Constable Hayward was proceeding at around

80 kilometres per hour. From Hare's

8 testimony, it would appear that it was the

manner in which the vehicle was being driven

10 which attracted his attention.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

After passing Hayward, Hare turned around and, as he approached Hayward's vehicle, from behind noted that it was driving down the centre of the right-hand lane but then moved to the right so that once again Hayward's vehicle was overtop of the fog line.

Assuming for the sake of analysis that
Hare's description of Hayward's driving is
accurate, I don't think that it can be
characterized as erratic. In fact, I'm not
sure it can even be characterized as bad
driving. According to Hare, Hayward was
driving under the speed limit but not unduly
so. It may be that Hayward pulled away from
Hare when Hare passed him from the other
direction. However, as Corporal Hare stated
in his testimony, this highway is one on which

intoxicated people often drive. I also do not
think it at all unusual that Hayward would
straddle the fog line on his side of the road
after seeing an RCMP vehicle turn around and
follow him.

Hare testified that he followed Hayward for about ten seconds and pulled Hayward over. He testified that when he first observed Hayward he immediately noted that his eyes were still glassed over. They now appeared slightly bloodshot. He said that Hayward fumbled with his vehicle documents and dropped them in his lap. He noticed what he described as a slight odour of alcohol. The only other observations of intoxication which he noted were that Hayward's stance was "staggered". He clarified that by using this term, he meant that Hayward's legs were quite far apart side to side — to maintain his balance.

Corporal Hare testified that he then lodged Hayward in the back seat of his police vehicle. He said that Hayward was initially calm but then became upset after he provided Hayward with his Charter warning. Hayward said that the last time he had seen Hare was three hours ago. According to Corporal Hare, Constable Hayward then said a number of other

things. He asked Hare why he thought that he
was impaired. He told him that he would be
close to the limit but he also said that he
would not be over the limit. Hare testified
that during this conversation, he noticed an
odour of stale alcohol coming from Hayward
becoming stronger.

Hare testified that Constable Foley arrived soon after in order to assist.

Constable Foley was not called upon to testify. I don't know how good of a position Constable Foley would have been to observe Hayward at the time and I am not going to speculate. However I will note that aside from Corporal Hare, all of the witnesses called by the Crown, observed Hayward some time later.

In any event, Corporal Hare and Hayward ultimately proceeded back to the Yellowknife RCMP detachment, a distance of approximately 35 to 40 kilometres from where Hare had pulled over Hayward. This drive would have taken about 25 minutes give or take five minutes or so. Corporal Hare arrived at the detachment at 4:59, some 80 to 90 minutes after pulling Constable Hayward over.

Corporal Hare described Constable Hayward

as being very upset. He described Hayward's
mood as "not angry" but rather as "a placid,
pleading, upset". He said that Hayward told
him that he had only had six drinks and that
he knew that it took him more than 12 doubles
to get him over the legal limit. Hayward told
him that he had gone to the Long Lake area on
the outskirts of Yellowknife to sober up prior
to embarking on the trip from Yellowknife to
Behchokò.

Hare stated that Constable Sullivan was called in as a breathalyzer technician.

Sullivan introduced himself to Hayward and left to prepare the breathalyzer. Sullivan then discovered that the solution necessary to run the breathalyzer machine had expired.

Sometime later he discovered that there was no unexpired solution whatsoever in the detachment.

For the benefit of the public and to avoid any confusion, I am going to explain that there are two different types of instruments referred to in the Criminal Code that measure blood alcohol which are referred to in the evidence of Corporal Hare and Constable Sullivan. One is an instrument which is often located in police detachments and which

obtains accurate readings of blood alcohol
levels which can actually be used as evidence
on charges of impaired driving or driving over
for this judgment, I am going to
refer to this type of instrument as a
"breathalyzer".

The other type of instrument is a portable device which police officers will often have with them while they are on patrol. This portable instrument can be employed by the police at roadside in order to determine whether or not to demand that a suspect accompany them to the police station to provide a breath sample into a breathalyzer.

I am going to refer to this instrument as an "ASD", which is an acronym for "approved screening device".

Sergeant McLeod eventually arrived at the detachment. Hare and McLeod then discussed taking Hayward to Behchokò to conduct a breathalyzer test due to the unavailability of a properly working breathalyzer in Yellowknife. However, Hare and McLeod elected not to do so since by the time they got to Behchokò what Hare described as the "three hour limit" would have expired.

I pause to note that Section 254(3) of the

Criminal Code provides that if a peace officer has reasonable grounds to believe that an accused has committed the offence of impaired driving, within the preceding three hours, the peace officer may then make a demand - as soon as practicable - requiring the accused to provide - as soon as practicable - breath samples and to accompany the peace officer for that purpose.

So if, as Corporal Hare clearly maintains, he had the necessary grounds to make the breathalyzer demand while within three hours of the time that he observed Hayward driving, he could have made a valid breath demand. As long as the test was then carried out as soon as was practicable under the circumstances, the breath demand would still have been valid - even if the samples were ultimately provided outside of three hours from the time of driving.

Once Corporal Hare found out that the breathalyzer in Yellowknife was not operable, he could have had the test administered in Behchokò. He could have required Hayward to accompany him for that purpose. It is true that because the test, or tests, would have been performed outside the two hour limit (I

am referring to the two hour limit set out in Section 258) there would not have been the legal presumption that the blood alcohol level was the same at the time of driving as at the time that the tests were carried out. But, it would still have been open to the Crown to call a toxicologist, or other expert, as a witness to provide evidence concerning the accused's blood alcohol level at the time of driving.

Such evidence may have simplified these proceedings greatly. However, I will once again state that I draw no inference one way or another as a result of the failure to carry out the breath test. I will simply apply the evidence that I have before me to the charge that I have before me and determine whether or not the accused's guilt on that charge has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Corporal Hare testified further that when he told Constable Hayward that there would be a charge of impaired operation of a motor vehicle, Hayward became very upset. Hayward was ultimately released at around six in the morning when his father came to pick him up.

Corporal Hare stated that during the time
Hayward was standing at the release counter of

the cellblock, he could not work his cell

phone properly. He said that there was one

point where he hit two keys on his cell phone

at once. He said that Hayward's fine motor

skills were impaired.

During cross-examination Hare provided further important evidence. He confirmed that when Hayward was placed in custody, he was initially calm. He stated that Hayward's speech was "slightly slurred". He stopped Hayward on the highway at around 4:03 a.m., and Hayward was in Hare's vehicle by 4:14, and that he would have arrested Hayward somewhere between those two times. He testified that it was at 5:30 a.m. that he was advised by Sullivan that there was no suitable solution for the breathalyzer.

He confirmed that Behchokò is 120 kilometres away from Yellowknife and that he had a breath technician with him.

I note that, actually counting Sergeant

McLeod who resides in Behchokò, he would have
had two breathalyzer technicians with him.

Corporal Hare reiterated that in his opinion
he would have been outside the three hour time
limit he thought applied to the actual taking
of the breath samples by the time that he

1 would have arrived in Behchokò.

During cross-examination, Hare stated that

at the detachment he gave Hayward the

opportunity to blow into an ASD. Hare said

that he gave Hayward the opportunity to do

this since Hayward kept stating that he wasn't

drunk. Hayward then voluntarily blew into an

ASD provided by Constable Sullivan.

I have not been provided with the results of the ASD test. I should note for the benefit of the public that there are very sound legal reasons for my not having such evidence placed in front of me. Simply put, ASDs are roadside screening devices and are to be used only as an aid to allow a peace officer to form the reasonable grounds required to make a demand that the accused accompany him and provide breath samples into a "breathalyzer" machine. They do not have the necessary accuracy and reliability to be used in court as evidence of the accused's blood alcohol level.

Corporal Hare confirmed that at the time of Hayward's detention, he made notations respecting Hayward's level of intoxication on a document called a C-13 prisoner's report.

He noted that Hayward's balance was fair. He

also noted that his state of mind was placid,
and that his speech was clear. However, in
his actual testimony Corporal Hare did not
adopt the entirety of what he had written in
the C-13 report without qualification.

During Corporal Hare's cross-examination a number of video recordings of the cellblock area, which depicted Hayward and others with him, were played in court and admitted into evidence. While there was no sound, and Corporal Hare and the others who were actually present would have had a better opportunity to observe Hayward's behaviour, I must say that from what I saw of the video alone, I am unable to conclude that there was any impairment on the part of Hayward. Rather, what I saw appears to be more consistent with him being sober. There was one point where I saw some unevenness in his gait when he was putting on his coat over his head while he was walking. However, in my experience, less than perfect balance would not be unusual in a sober person carrying out the same sort of activity. This is especially so, if Hayward's testimony as to his knee injury is accurate.

From Hayward's body language in the video, he did not appear to be behaving aggressively

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

towards Hare as they were discussing the

charge. However, Corporal Hare maintains that

Constable Hayward was "verbally aggressive" at

this point.

Kiera Powder testified next. She is a civilian who works with the RCMP as a cellblock matron. She was working at the RCMP detachment in Yellowknife when Constable Hayward was brought in. Although she was only professionally acquainted with Hayward at the time, she is now friends with both him and his partner, Constable Bell. She confirmed that she was the person sitting at the booking table in the video which shows Hayward when he was at the detachment in the early morning of November the 13th. She testified that at the time she was able to detect a moderate odour of alcohol coming from Hayward. She recalled Hayward and Hare arguing about a 24-hour driving suspension. She said that Hayward was not yelling but that he was argumentative and louder than usual. On cross-examination she confirmed that she had no difficulty understanding Hayward and that although he was agitated, his voice was clear. She does not recall his voice being slurred. She observed no difficulty with his walking. She testified

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

that his speech and what he was saying seemed

perfectly clear. Other than the smell of

alcohol, she did not notice any signs of

impairment whatsoever.

Next to testify on behalf of the Crown was Constable David Sullivan. He testified that at 4:39 in the morning he was requested to come into the detachment to conduct breath tests as a breathalyzer technician. Upon his arrival at the detachment, he noted Constable Hayward sitting on a bench opposite Hare. He noticed a strong odour of alcohol emanating from Hayward. He introduced himself to Hayward and noted that Hayward had red glossy eyes. In attempting to prepare the breathalyzer machine, he discovered that the solution which is necessary to administer the test had expired. He then found that there was no unexpired solution available in the detachment. He had some further face-to-face contact with Hayward when he administered the ASD. Sometime later, he had a conversation with Hayward wherein Hayward said that he had had only six beers. He says that Hayward also said that after consuming the beers, he went to his business and waited there for about three hours and then drove.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Sergeant Dennis McLeod was the next witness called by the Crown. He was and is the commanding officer at the Behchokò detachment and, as such, was Constable Hayward's superior at the relevant time. said that he worked with Hayward from September 2009 up until the date charged. Sergeant McLeod has investigated over 200 impaired driving charges and is, as I have already noted, a qualified breathalyzer technician and was so qualified on the date charged.

His testimony from the time that he received the telephone call from Corporal Hare about Constable Hayward largely agrees with that of Hare.

After driving to the point on Highway 3 where he met Hare and returning to Behchokò, he heard Corporal Hare on the radio running a license plate check on Hayward's vehicle. He drove to the Boundary Creek area, checked the scene, and then drove to the Yellowknife detachment where he observed Hayward. When he was about a metre from Constable Hayward, he noticed, as did Sullivan, a strong odour of liquor coming from him. He testified that he noticed that Hayward's eyes were glassy and

bloodshot. He also noted that his speech was

lurred and louder than normal. He observed

that when Hayward was using his cell phone, he

hit two keys at once. While he observed

Hayward standing, Hayward's hand was on the

counter.

Sergeant McLeod testified that although he had seen Hayward during stressful situations in the past, he had never seen Hayward speaking so loudly or for that matter slurring his speech. He said that Hayward's demeanour was different than what he is used to seeing from Constable Hayward. He came to the opinion that Hayward was impaired. He described Hayward as being a four, maybe a five, on a scale of one to ten. He stated that Hayward was not drunk or intoxicated but that he was impaired. He observed Hayward for a period of no longer 15 minutes.

Constable Hayward testified in his own defence. He said that he had been working in Behchokò on the morning of November the 12th. He decided to come into Yellowknife to go out to dinner with his girlfriend April Bell. He probably left Behchokò just after 5 p.m. and he estimated that he would have gotten into Yellowknife around 6 or 6:30. He went to

Constable Bell's house and then went to Boston
Pizza at around 7 or 7:30. He parked his
vehicle outside the Joe Tobie building. At
Boston Pizza, he had dinner and two pints of
beer. Three other people joined them while
they were at Boston Pizza. He said that while
he was at Boston Pizza, everybody else was
drinking more than he was.

At around 10:30 in the evening, all of them left to the Gold Range bar a couple of blocks away. He said that while at the Gold Range, he had two Corona beers from typically sized bottles. Later on, Corporal Hare came through the bar. He recalled that Hare may have said 'hi' to him. In his testimony he recalled that one of the people whom he was with, Shane Thompson, joked with Hare about removing him - that is Constable Hayward - from the bar. He just thought of it as joking around and didn't say anything to Corporal Hare.

While still in the bar at around 12:30 a.m., he and April Bell had an argument. She wanted to go to another bar, and he wanted to go home. At around 12:45 to 1 a.m., two of the people that he was with headed towards a different bar, as did Constable Bell.

1 Constable Hayward testified that a number of people were on the street and that at one 3 point he began talking to an informant from Behchokò. He walked around and talked with 5 him. The two of them walked up and down the strip which runs by the Gold Range several times. Hayward says that he was trying to obtain information from this individual. 8 While they were walking, he was phoned several times by Constable Bell. He turned off his 10 11 cell phone. The third time he and the 12 informant walked down the strip, he saw 13 Corporal Hare who asked him if he had gotten "good information". He replied that he had 14 got "great information". He testified that it 15 16 was obvious that Hare knew with whom he was 17 speaking, and estimated that this interaction occurred at around 1:30 in the morning. 18 19 According to Constable Hayward, Corporal 20 Hare's description of the conversation that the two of them had around this time is 21 completely inaccurate as is Hare's description 22 of his apparent state of sobriety. 23 24 Constable Hayward testified that after his

Constable Hayward testified that after his interaction with Corporal Hare, he went to a store that he co-owns with his father a short distance away. He first dropped in to see his

25

26

1 father who tends bar at the establishment

located in the same building as the store.

3 When he found that his father wasn't there, he

4 went into the store.

He said that he went in to check things out - to see how sales had been and to look at new products. He stated that he tried on clothes since he often gets his clothes from inventory. He puttered around the store for some time during which time Constable Bell sent him some text messages. He replied that he was at the store and that he didn't want to fight. At one point he and Bell had a telephone conversation. He stated that he thought that she was intoxicated from what he heard and he told her that he was going to go back to Behchokò.

He testified that he stayed at the store until 3:45 in the morning. He then left and got some gas and departed on the highway to Behchokò. On his way there, he saw the vehicle that Corporal Hare was driving towards Yellowknife. He saw the vehicle turn around behind him. He immediately pulled over to the side of the road and the truck came up behind him. He testified that he was driving at about 100 to 110 kilometres per hour. He

stated that he pulled over because he thought
that the vehicle was being driven by an RCMP
member from Behchokò who wanted to talk.

He further testified that when Corporal Hare asked him to step out of the vehicle, he and Corporal Hare got into an argument. He denied ever being requested by Hare to provide his documents. He testified that he never told Hare that he was going to be close to the legal limit for blood alcohol.

He stated that Constable Foley arrived at the scene and that he heard Corporal Hare contacting Sergeant McLeod and asking for a tow truck as well. He denies that he ever told Corporal Hare that he had stopped at Long Lake.

He testified that he was not impaired by alcohol but that he was upset at being accused of something that he did not do.

He also stated that he had previously torn an anterior cruciate ligament in his knee and that this injury causes him significant difficulty especially when he has been on his feet for extended periods of time. A photograph of his knee in a swollen state was provided to the court in evidence.

During cross-examination he was unshaken

as to his version of events. He was asked
whether he took a nap on the mattresses that
are located in the store. He testified that
he could have done so but that he did not. He
said that because he was up all day and had
been dancing his knee was swollen. He said
that on occasions he limps as a result of his
knee injury.

He denied telling Constable Sullivan that he had six beers to drink. He denied telling Corporal Hare that he was close to the line. He also testified that his vehicle had been parked in the same location that Hare said that he had observed it by the Joe Tobie building. He said that he walked back to his truck after leaving his store and then drove to get gas before he left to go to Behchokò.

Shane Thompson also testified for the defence and was the last witness who I heard from in this case. He corroborated Constable Hayward's version of events. However, he denied that he himself had anything to drink at Boston Pizza although he admitted to drinking four Caesars at another bar prior to coming to Boston Pizza. During cross-examination, he said that these drinks were bottled Coronas that he poured into a

glass. He then had a few drinks later when
they went to the Gold Range. He saw Constable
Hayward have two beers while at Boston Pizza
and estimates that Constable Hayward had about
five drinks the whole evening when he was with
him.

Mr. Thompson described Hayward as being "pretty straight". He also described the argument between Constable Hayward and April Bell in the same manner it was described by Hayward. Mr. Thompson remembered joking with Corporal Hare about taking Constable Hayward and Constable Bell away. He recalls Corporal Hare laughing. During cross-examination, he confirmed he saw Constable Hayward drink a maximum of five or six drinks.

Mr. Thompson, as I have indicated, was the last witness to testify.

One of the further pieces of evidence, which was entered by consent as a business record, was a patrol unit history. This document indicates that Corporal Hare was at another part of town from 1:51 to 2:06 a.m. on November the 13th of last year. The defence has used this evidence to challenge the accuracy of Corporal Hare's testimony that he first observed Hayward briefly on the street

1 at about 1:50 a.m. Corporal Hare states that the patrol unit history is incorrect in this regard and that they are often not completely accurate.

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

I accept Corporal Hare's testimony as to the inaccuracy of the log. Hayward himself admitted to having had a brief, albeit somewhat different, interaction with Hare at around 1:30 a.m. on the street that runs by the Gold Range.

Obviously it is the later and lengthier interaction described by Hare, which Corporal Hare maintained occurred at 2:10 to 2:20 a.m., in which Constable Hayward says did not occur, that is in question. The portion of the log referred to by Mr. Gregory doesn't really assist me one way or the other resolving that factual dispute.

As stated, I agree with Mr. Gregory that to a large extent the evidence presented in this case boils down to a credibility contest between Constable Hayward and Corporal Hare. There are certain portions of other evidence which are confirmatory of Hare's testimony and other portions of the evidence which I think are confirmatory of Hayward's testimony.

27 The text messages on Hare's cell phone and the timestamps on them corroborates his

version of events when it comes to the

messages received by Constable April Bell as

well as their timing. Because these texts are

hearsay, I am not allowed to consider them as

evidence for the truth of what was actually

said in them. Constable Bell, the author of

these texts, was not called upon to testify.

Constable Sullivan's testimony as to what he was told by Hayward corroborates Hare's version that Constable Hayward told him he had six drinks as opposed to four. It is also, I think, further evidence that this is actually how much Hayward had to drink. On the other hand, what Constable Hayward told Constable Sullivan about where he went and what he did after leaving the Gold Range was not in contradiction of Constable Hayward's testimony in court.

I have Corporal Hare's testimony on the accused's state of sobriety. On the other hand, there were the notations made by Hare that recorded that Hayward's balance was fair. He noted that Hayward's state of mind was placid and that his speech was clear.

Shane Thompson's testimony on Hayward's apparent state of sobriety corroborates

Hayward's evidence on this point concerning
the time that he left the Gold Range and to
some extent Hayward's evidence in general.

Kiera Powder's testimony on Hayward's apparent state of sobriety at the detachment also appears to be somewhat confirmatory of Hayward's. Other than a moderate odour of alcohol she didn't really note any other physical signs of impairment. In fact I think that her testimony can be considered as evidence that Hayward was sober.

Constable Sullivan interacted with Hayward at the Yellowknife detachment and other than a strong odour of alcohol emanating from Hayward, the only indicia of intoxication that he noted were red and glossy eyes.

Sergeant McLeod's evidence concerning intoxication was more supportive of the Crown's theory than the evidence of Kiera Powder or Constable Sullivan. As noted, he stated that he detected a strong odour of alcohol. He also said that he noted that Hayward's speech was slurred and louder than usual. I have borne in mind that he certainly would have known how Hayward usually behaves. He says that Constable Hayward's demeanour was different from how he had observed him in the

1 past. However, I must also consider that Constable Hayward under the circumstances, 3 even if not intoxicated, may have been quite emotional. As well, it is important that 5 Sergeant McLeod clearly stated that Hayward was not drunk or intoxicated. He said that Hayward was a four or maybe a five on a scale of intoxication on a scale of one to ten. 8 He described Hayward as being "impaired". Given what he said about Hayward not being 10 11 intoxicated, I take him to mean that in his 12 view Hayward was under the influence of 13 alcohol or, put another way, that there was some impairment of Hayward's functional 14 15 ability.

His testimony agreed with Hare's in that he also observed Hayward hitting two keys at once on his cell phone. However I don't place a great deal of weight on this particular fact. Based on what I observe on a day-to-day basis, this is a problem that sober people often experience.

Of all the witnesses I heard, Sergeant
McLeod's evidence concerning Hayward's state
of sobriety was the most supportive of
Corporal Hare's assessment. That said,
Sergeant McLeod's evidence was quite

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 qualified.

2

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

As stated, the offence that Hayward is 3 charged with requires impairment of the ability to drive and not impairment of any functional ability on his part. As Parliament has worded the offence, simply being under the influence of alcohol is not enough to make it out. I must respect what is clearly the will of Parliament in determining whether or not Constable Hayward is quilty.

> At the end of the day, in order to convict Constable Hayward I must find that I am sure that there was actual impairment of the ability to drive.

> There were certain aspects of Constable Hayward's evidence that I found and still find troubling. I agree with Mr. Sinclair, who appeared for the Crown, on a number of points.

> I find Constable Hayward's testimony that following his departure from the Gold Range he was engaged in the conversation with the confidential informant for a significant length of time to be somewhat convenient. And as I have also noted, I find there are portions of the evidence that I find to be corroborative of Corporal Hare's testimony.

But, as to the lengthy interaction between

1 the two of them which Corporal Hare says occurred outside of the Gold Range, I have 3 only their conflicting testimony. While I have the text message and the time it was sent 5 to Corporal Hare by Constable Bell, I can't use it for the truth of its contents. Constable Bell was not called upon to testify. I can use it to corroborate Hare's version on 8 the timing of his departure from Yellowknife and what he saw, but I am still left with the 10 11 conflict between Hare and Hayward's testimony 12 on when Hayward moved his vehicle from where he had initially parked it that evening. 13

I have observed Constable Hayward closely a number of times on the video recording entered as evidence; and, other than a rather moderate deviation in his walking while he was putting a coat over his head, I didn't observe anything about his behaviour that I felt was unusual. I do not think that his pattern of walking would necessarily be unusual in a sober person doing the same thing.

I also have to consider the evidence that

I have heard and seen concerning the condition

of Hayward's knee. I have to consider the

photograph which was entered and

uncontradicted which, I think, shows the

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

extent of the injury and shows the extent of the swelling which occurs on occasion.

I have considered that Corporal Hare was tested thoroughly during cross-examination and that his testimony remained in my assessment, for the most part, unimpeached; however, I find that by and large the same thing can be said of Constable Hayward's testimony.

I have also closely considered the evidence of Corporal Hare on what he observed of Constable Hayward's driving.

As urged by Mr. Sinclair, I have considered all of the witnesses's possible motivations to testify as they have but I think that I can only go so far with such an approach before seriously undermining the onus and standard of proof.

While I found Corporal Hare's testimony to be believable, I remind myself that the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt is high. Simply believing that Constable Hayward's ability to drive was impaired is not enough. Even if I find it probable that Hayward's ability to operate a motor vehicle was impaired, that in and of itself is not enough to find him guilty.

Certainly the Crown is not required to

1 prove the guilt of Constable Hayward to an absolute or scientific certainty. However, 3 the Supreme Court of Canada has clearly stated that the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt lies closer to that of scientific 5 certainty than it does to mere probability. As a number of authorities suggest, including most recently the English Court of Appeal in 8 the 2009 case of Majid, the ultimate question that I should ask myself is whether or not, on 10 11 the evidence that I have heard, I am sure of 12 the accused's guilt. Am I sure that each and 13 every element of the offence of impaired driving has been made out? Am I sure that 14 15 Hayward's ability to operate a motor vehicle was impaired by alcohol? 16 17 I have applied the three part test I earlier referred to. I have applied it in the 18 19 order set out by the Supreme Court of Canada 20 in R v. W. D., I have considered the evidence 21 in its totality at length, and I find that this is a close case. 22 However, when I ask myself whether I am 23

However, when I ask myself whether I am able to say I am sure Hayward's ability to operate a motor vehicle was impaired, based on all of the evidence that I have heard, or otherwise observed, and after applying the

24

25

26

1	test set out in Stellato and Andrews, the
2	answer is no. Therefore, I must find him not
3	guilty. An acquittal will be entered.
4	I believe that that deals with everything.
5	THE CLERK: Yes, sir.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
12	to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
13	Supreme Court Nuies,
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter
19	Could Nepoleci
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	