R. v. Simon, 2015 NWTTC 10

T-1-CR-2014-001063

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

CHARLIE SIMON

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Judge R. D. Gorin, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on 8th May A.D., 2015.

APPEARANCES:

J. Scott, Ms.: Counsel for the Crown

A. Vogt, Ms.: Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 273 Criminal Code of Canada

Ban on publication pursuant to s. 486.4 of the Criminal Code

```
1
       8th May, 2015
2
       1:30 P.M. Session
 3
       Darlene Sirman, CSR(A) Court Reporter
 5
       THE COURT:
                                   Please be seated.
 6
                Do you wish to have your client seated there
7
           beside you, Ms. Vogt?
8
       MS. VOGT:
                                   Yes, Your Honour.
9
       THE COURT:
                                   Mr. Simon, you can go
10
           ahead.
       MS. VOGT:
                                   Thank you.
11
                                   Charlie Simon is to be
12
       THE COURT:
13
           sentenced for the offence of aggravated sexual
           assault contrary to Section 273 of the Criminal
14
           Code. The maximum penalty for such an offence is
15
           imprisonment for life. Crown and Defence have
16
17
           jointly submitted that a jail term in the range
           of six to eight years would be appropriate under
18
           all of the circumstances. I find their position
19
20
           to be reasonable. Having considered the facts of
21
           this case, the seriousness of the Victim's
22
           injuries, and the overall impact of the offence
23
           on her, the background of the Accused and his
24
           guilty plea, I am imposing a jail term of
25
           seven years. He will receive credit for his
26
           pretrial detention at a rate of 1.5 days for each
27
           day he has been incarcerated up to today. I
```

1 believe that he has spent 160 days in pretrial detention so that will be 240 days' credit 2 3 deducted from the seven years. There will be a Section 109 Firearms Prohibition Order for a 5 period beginning today and ending ten years following Mr. Simon's release from imprisonment. 6 7 This order is mandatory. I am also ordering that 8 he comply with the provisions of the Sex Offender 9 Information Registration Act for the rest of his 10 life following his release from imprisonment. This order is mandatory as well - as is a DNA 11 authorization. I must also impose a Victims of 12 13 Crime Surcharge payable within 60 days following 14 the expiry date noted on the Warrant of 15 Committal. Because the term of imprisonment that I have imposed exceeds two years, probation 16 cannot be ordered. 17

I will now explain my reasons for imposing the seven-year term of imprisonment. There is an Agreed Statement of Facts that has been filed with the court. Its contents have also been read into the court record. I will not go through it in its entirety; however, I think it useful to summarize its content.

On June the 15, 2014, the Victim who was just shy of her 24th birthday, Mr. Simon who was 44 at the time and another person were consuming

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

alcohol around the area of the swimming pool in Yellowknife. While they were drinking Mr. Simon pulled down the Victim's sports bra and looked at her cleavage. The last thing that the Victim can remember following that is drinking a shot of vodka with Mr. Simon and the other individual present. Sometime later the Victim passed out, and the other person left, telling Mr. Simon to take care of the Victim.

Following the departure of the other person, Mr. Simon proceeded to have intercourse with the Victim. He then inserted a cooler bottle into her and stopped when he saw that she was getting hurt. She was asleep throughout, and he went to get a blanket for her. From some distance he saw the police arriving and he left. He then hid out in a tent on the Frame Lake Trail for several months. More than five months later on November the 26th he turned himself into the police.

The Victim sustained the following injuries:
A tear from her vagina to her anus; a complete
tear and severe bruising of her anal sphincter;
extensive bruising to both buttocks and a
12-centimetre laceration of her lower colon. The
septum, in other words the wall of tissue
separating the Victim's vagina and rectum, was

completely disrupted from the perineum to the posterior portion of the vaginal fornix. and spruce needles were found in her pelvic cavity. She underwent over four hours of emergency surgery to repair her injuries. Doctors had to cut through her abdominal wall to gain access to and clean out her abdominal cavity. They repaired the lacerations to her colon, vagina, rectum and anal sphincter with a total of 26 stitches. She was also given an ileostomy; in other words, a surgery to divert her stool to an exterior bag on her abdomen in order to allow her anus to heal. The ileostomy and the regime of powerful antibiotics were necessary in order to prevent an abscess in the Victim's pelvis. She was discharged from hospital two weeks following the sexual assault, but has required ongoing care.

At present it appears quite likely that the ileostomy will be reversed; however, that has not yet occurred due to concerns as to whether her anal sphincter has yet healed adequately to the point it can properly function on its own. If after given more time to heal, its strength and integrity do not sufficiently return another surgery will be necessary before the ileostomy can be reversed. Both surgeons who treated the

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Victim described her injuries as the most

horrific they had ever seen. The Victim would

have died had it not been for the emergency

medical treatment that she received.

It is very likely at this point that the Victim's physical function is permanently affected. It is uncertain whether the contamination in her pelvis has scarred her fallopian tubes and compromised her fertility. If she is able to become pregnant a Caesarean will be necessary in order to avoid repeated trauma to her weakened rectum and anal sphincter. There have been occasions when the ileostomy she underwent has resulted in her experiencing extreme pain.

On the date the conviction was entered and counsel provided their submissions, the Victim indicated that she did not wish to have her Victim Impact Statements read out loud in court. I will therefore not refer to the express contents of those statements in my reasons. Suffice it to say that the psychological effect on the Victim, including her feelings of violation and trauma, have understandably been profound. The extent of the assault and the resulting injuries were, I think, exceptional. The effect that the assault has had on her

1 day-to-day life has been exceptional.

Mr. Simon's crime constituted an extreme violation of the Victim's bodily integrity. The effects of that violation continue to this day and will likely continue well into the future — in all probability, for her entire life. Since the offence she has been impacted by depression. She takes anti-depressant medication on a daily basis. The medication helps, however, there are days when she doesn't get out of bed. She isolates herself from others more often and describes herself as being much easier to anger.

In short, the sexual assault was of an extraordinarily serious nature. It has had life-altering effects on the Victim. It is among the worst of sexual assaults that I have seen come before the courts in my entire legal career. Further aggravating features include the vulnerability of the Victim at the time of the assault. She was asleep. The sexual assault included both intercourse and the insertion of the liquor bottle. The very serious and long lasting physical and psychological harm to the Victim are highly aggravating. As noted already, the overall impact on the Victim has been and will continue to be life altering.

On the other hand, Mr. Simon comes before

the court now at 45 years of age with no prior criminal record. Although he initially hid from the police, he eventually surrendered himself. He has consented to his pretrial detention. He fully cooperated with the police following his surrender. He elected to be tried in this court on February the 3rd effectively waiving his right to a Preliminary Inquiry. He pleaded guilty on that same date, and I'm also informed by the Crown that had it not been for Mr. Simon's cooperation and his guilty plea proving the charge against him would have been highly problematic.

The guilty plea is highly mitigating since it has spared the Victim the anxiety and anticipation of having to testify at either a Preliminary Inquiry or a trial. In my view notwithstanding that the Accused hid out for a number of months following the offence, the guilty plea should be treated as having been entered at an early opportunity. I think based on what I have heard and read in the Accused's Presentence Report that his guilty plea was a genuine expression of his deep remorse.

There is also Mr. Simon's background as an Aboriginal offender which must be considered. He is a member of the G'wichin people and was, for

the most part, raised in the small G'wichin communities of Fort MacPherson and Aklavik here in the Northwest Territories.

As accurately stated by his lawyer Ms. Vogt in her able submissions the life he was born into has been one of poverty, pain, tragedy and extreme violence. Mr. Simon's mother died when he was young. She had left his father due to his abusive behaviour. Mr. Simon and his siblings were living with his mother in Aklavik when she was shot to death. Mr. Simon was then returned to Fort MacPherson to be raised by his alcoholic father who then abused him physically, sexually and mentally. On one occasion when Mr. Simon's father was sexually abusing Mr. Simon his older brother caught him at it and physically assaulted the father. The sexual abuse then ceased, however, other forms of physical abuse continued.

Later when Mr. Simon was 12 years of age the brother who had intervened on his behalf was killed when he was hit by a stray bullet that entered his home. When Mr. Simon was in his early twenties he lost his sister. She was stabbed to death. His father was initially charged with her death but the prosecution did not proceed. Understandably, Mr. Simon found it very difficult losing his sister and suspecting

1 that his father had been the killer.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

A few years later he lost his older sister.

He also lost another brother due to complications from alcohol abuse. His father was ultimately killed by Mr. Simon's nephew who the father had raised. As a result his nephew ultimately received a lengthy custodial sentence.

Mr. Simon has been an alcoholic throughout his adult life. Based on what I have read in the Presentence Report and been advised of by Ms. Vogt, there have been periods in his life when he has been able to maintain sobriety, has been able to stay employed and keep a residence and maintain a degree of stability. However, there have also been periods in-between those positive interludes when he has returned to alcoholism, lost the gains he previously made. In the past few years Mr. Simon has largely resided at the Salvation Army in Yellowknife and completed day jobs as a means of securing income. It would appear that he has never had any form of treatment or therapy. He does not wish to do so because he doesn't want to share his issues with people he doesn't know. Unfortunately, his only strategy for dealing with stress and the negative emotions that result from his past experiences is to consume alcohol.

1 The mitigating factors in this case are 2 quite substantial: his early guilty plea; his 3 cooperation with the police, which was I think essential to the Crown's case. As well, there 5 are the background factors I have referred to. Ι must apply the provisions of Section 718.2(e) of 6 7 the Criminal Code as it has been interpreted by 8 the Supreme Court of Canada in such cases as 9 Gladue and Ipeelee. I must do so regardless of 10 the seriousness of the offence. In the 1999 case of R. v. Gladue the Supreme 11 12 Court of Canada observed that, 13 "Generally, the more violent and serious the offence the more likely it is as a 14 practical reality that the terms of 15 imprisonment for Aboriginals and 16 17 non-Aboriginals will be close to each 18 other or the same, even taking into 19 account their different concepts of 20 sentencing". 21 And I will say at this point certainly there are 22 few cases which equal the offence I am dealing with in terms of their seriousness. 23 24 However, 13 years after Gladue in R. v. Ipeelee the Supreme Court of Canada made it 25 very clear that regardless of the seriousness of 26 27 the offence sentencing courts have a duty to

apply Section 718.2(e) when dealing with
Aboriginal offenders. The Supreme Court further
stated that failure to do so will result in a
sentence that is not fit and not consistent with
the fundamental principle of proportionality.
That principle, the principle of proportionality,
is set out in Section 718.1 of the Criminal Code.
It states a sentence must be proportionate to the
gravity of the offence and the degree of
responsibility of the offender.

The degree of responsibility of Mr. Simon for doing what he did is certainly very high. However, his background factors as an Aboriginal offender must be taken into account. In Ipeelee the Supreme Court of Canada noted that while the difficult background factors that present with many Aboriginal offenders will rarely, if ever, attain a level where one could properly say that their actions were not voluntary and therefore not deserving of criminal sanction, their difficult circumstances may diminish their moral culpability. Put very simply, if one comes from a background such as that of Mr. Simon it is much more difficult to stay out of trouble with the His moral blameworthiness is therefore less law. than would otherwise be the case.

In Ipeelee the Supreme Court of Canada

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

quoted from the judgment of Greckol J. of the
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench in the 2002 case
of R. v. Skani where he stated:

"Few mortals could withstand such a childhood and youth without becoming seriously troubled".

I think those words equally apply in the case of Mr. Simon.

I am of the view that given the very serious nature of Mr. Simon's crime any differences between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal concepts of sentencing do not, practically speaking, make a difference in terms of the sentence that should be imposed. However, that having been said, Mr. Simon's background factors certainly do make a difference. significantly lessen his moral blameworthiness as they would in the case of anyone regardless of their ethnic background. Were I not to take his background into account in such a manner I would be ignoring the unambiguous guidance provided by the Supreme Court of Canada. If I were not to take his background factors into account I would be ignoring a factor very relevant to his moral blameworthiness, his degree of responsibility, and I would, therefore, be imposing an unfit sentence that would fail to properly reflect the

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

overarching principle of proportionality that I have referred to.

Under all of the circumstances, while I find that Mr. Simon's moral blameworthiness remains very high it is significantly diminished due to his extremely difficult past. I have, therefore, found that a sentence significantly less severe than that which I would otherwise impose is appropriate under all of the circumstances.

In this case Mr. Simon comes before the court with no criminal record whatsoever notwithstanding his very difficult past. cases where an Accused commits a crime having previously been convicted and sentenced on other crimes his moral blameworthiness will be higher than would otherwise be the case. That certainly cannot be said in this case. In assessing Mr. Simon's moral blameworthiness I have had regard to a complete lack of a criminal record. In saying this I recognize that not having prior convictions amounts to the absence of an aggravating factor as opposed to a mitigating Nonetheless I find the absence of any past convictions to be very noteworthy in this case given the background factors of Mr. Simon that I have referred to.

Although he lacks insight into why he did

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

what he did other than to say he grew up with this sort of behaviour, Mr. Simon is genuinely remorseful and shameful of the pain that he has caused the Victim. Ms. Vogt advises that Mr. Simon understands the damage he has inflicted and was adamant at the outset that this case would never go to trial. He wanted to take responsibility for his actions and did not wish to prolong any further pain.

As I have said, the case against him may very well have not succeeded had it not been for his cooperation and guilty plea. Were it not for the guilty plea and were I sentencing Mr. Simon following a trial, given the aggravating factors and mitigating factors present in this case, including the background factors I have referred to, and having regard to sentences that have been imposed in comparable cases I would likely have imposed a prison term of 12 years duration. However, due to the highly mitigating effect of the Accused's cooperation with the police and his guilty plea I have found a period of seven years to be appropriate.

Mr. Simon, I anticipate that during your prison term you may well have access to therapeutic programs. I cannot order you to take them but I encourage you to do so.

```
1
                 I thank Ms. Vogt and Ms. Scott for their
           considerable assistance in this matter.
 2
                 Is there anything further, Counsel?
 3
       MS. SCOTT:
                                    Your Honour, briefly was a
            DNA order issued?
 5
       THE COURT:
                                    Yes. A DNA authorization
 6
 7
            is mandatory. It will be issued.
       MS. SCOTT:
 8
                                    Thank you, Your Honour.
 9
       MS. VOGT:
                                    Nothing, Your Honour.
10
      THE COURT:
                                    Thank you.
11
12
13
       PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

1	
2	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
3	
4	
5	
6	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
7	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate transcript
8	of the proceedings taken down by me in shorthand and
9	transcribed from my shorthand notes to the best of my
10	skill and ability.
11	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
12	Alberta, this 20th, May, 2015.
13	
14	
15	
16	(Famal)
17	DAMON
18	Darlene Sirman, CSR(A)
19	A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

———A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc. —