IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

2000 NUTTO 4

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- V-

W.H.W.

(A Young Person)



Transcript of the Reasons for Judgement of The Honourable Judge R.M. Bourassa, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 24th day of March, A.D. 2000.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J. O'Halloran:

Counsel for the Crown

Ms. K. Payne:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Well, the law is quite clear in terms of how a Court is to dispose of a case.

First of all, if I believe the evidence of the accused, that means his evidence and other defence evidence, then that's the end of the case because the accused said it was consensual sex.

Even if I don't believe the accused, I have to ask myself if his evidence raises a reasonable doubt. If it does, I have to acquit.

Even if his evidence doesn't raise a reasonable doubt, I have to ask myself, Has the Crown proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt. If the Crown hasn't, I have to acquit. The law is quite clear. Better guilty men go free than one innocent man be imprisoned.

The obligation is totally on the Crown to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. However, the Crown does not have to prove every single minute detail beyond a reasonable doubt. My obligation is to find, on all of the evidence, whether or not the case has been proven.

I have evidence from Crown and defence. The evidence from the various witnesses is problematic in different ways.

The issue before me is very simply put: Was there consensual sex or was there not? It was

admitted at the opening of the trial that sexual activity described in the evidence as attempted or full intercourse took place between both boys and this victim. Was it consensual or not, that's the issue, it's not complicated.

There are discrepancies here and there but I don't think they amount to much and I don't think anything turns on them regarding what transpired up until the time the party broke out.

Essentially what happened is this, in my view.

The accused and his roommate, after playing pool, getting snacks, going to the bank, walked by the alleged victim and her girlfriend, both of whom who had been drinking. There was flirting. They struck up a conversation. There was repartee back and forth. The girls were interested in more alcohol, the boys were interested in providing it. So they went back to W 's apartment to "party."

They were smoking. At one point the windows were opened because there was too much smoke. They were closed - too cold. There was chit-chat going on and they played cards: Uno and another game; and then the girls decided, on their own, that it was time to go and they left.

The two girls, more intoxicated now than they were when they first went to the apartment, met up with three other girls, one of whom is looking for a

"party."

Looking for a party at 3 o'clock in the morning is nothing new in this jurisdiction.

So the five girls decided they'll go back to the W apartment because the two occupants that they're aware of are ready and willing to "party," so they went back. They threw stones on the windows, the two boys come down, although there is a contradiction in their evidence there, and they let them in. The five girls go up and help themselves to C 's beer or W 's beer and party on.

The party gets boisterous, and at least one neighbor comes to the door and complains. The windows are opened and shut for smoke. One of the girls ends up with a jacket on - one of the boy's jacket - because it's cold in the room. The girls are drunk.

Whas no respect for these two girls, the first two. Looked at in a variety of ways, not exclusively, but one can understand his lack of respect. Two girls, very young, on the streets of Yellowknife, late at night, early in the morning, half-drunk looking to party with strangers, he has no respect for them.

By this time I'm convinced on the evidence that

A N is quite drunk. She goes into the bathroom

and she can't get out. It appears that it's a

straightforward knob with either a push button or a push and twist button on the inside. Those door locks have a hole on the outside through which you can push a nail or a pin of sufficient strength and pop the lock. Y knew that, and she knew how to get her out. It may take some jiggling because one has to hit the inside mechanism right on-end. It doesn't just pop open automatically.

In any event, by this time the two boys are getting disenchanted with the girls. They are drinking their beer, they are causing trouble with the tenants, they are kicking on the bathroom door, one is locked in the bathroom. For some reason, one picks up a T-shirt, puts it in a bag, and the two boys decide "that's it, party is over," and start shepherding the girls out.

N said to the three girls they met on the street that the guys looked like "rapists." I don't think that that was a momentous statement or that much turns on it. I think it's another way of her saying, They look like creeps or they look weird. It was a detrimental negative reference to the two boys, but more important to her and her friends was they had alcohol and they were willing to party.

She said in her own evidence, "There was five of us, what have I got to be afraid of?"

I'm convinced on the evidence that when N was

in the bathroom, she was too drunk to open the door. It's as simple as that. The door was openable, I don't know why we spent so much time on the door. I don't think there is any plan by either of the boys to coral and rape anyone at this stage or anything similar. She got locked in because she was too drunk to unlock it. The girls on the outside were banging around and everything came to a head and it was at that point the boys said, That's it, out you go and they left.

Yvonne, at the last minute, thrusts a hair pin or a bobby pin, I'm not sure which, into C 's hands and tries to explain to him how to open the door so her friend can get out.

The sad thing about it is that the girls are so drunk that when they get to the Corner Mart, I think it was, or Country Corner, they phone the police to say that their girlfriend is locked in a bathroom somewhere, they don't know the address, they don't know where it is, and they don't have the presence of mind to stay wherever they were so the police could come find out where the girls were and then locate where N was locked up.

Now, what happens after this, in my view, is what's critical. I find it peculiar that neither

C nor W were in the least concerned or took any steps to get this girl out of their bathroom. She is

silent in the bathroom. Perhaps she's passed out. She indicated that she might have slept or blacked out. She's in there for the 45 minutes approximately it took them to clean up the apartment, and they write her off. I just find that surprising. Perhaps it's a reflection of the little respect they had for her, I don't know.

In any event, the two boys decide they're going to bed and that's it, and when she's sober she can get out and do her own thing and leave.

Now, this is where, of course, everything changes. The issue is did she have sex with both of those boys on consent or not?

To try and answer that question I look at a variety of factors because clearly one is either lying or very very seriously mistaken because the stories diverge so dramatically.

I've already indicated that I believe, and I find, that A N was drunk. She was in the bathroom for about an hour, an hour and 45 minutes. From drinking at the hotel her girlfriend's mother's beer, from drinking at her two visits to the apartment, she was drunker than when the night started. And, in my view, her drunkenness is what explains her lack of recall on a lot of particular points.

Her evidence is that she was taken to the

bedroom, she was held down, and both boys had intercourse with her. Saranwrap was used as some kind of condom to protect her. Then she was taken to the shower, told to shower and watched, and then allowed to leave. What she says or her evidence, in my view, is not something that's, on its face, incredible. Looking at the photographs, a twin-sized bed which is big enough for two adults, I suppose, who are well acquainted with each other, but barely.

If she's on the bed with two boys, I can't help but believe that there would be a tangle of arms, hands, and legs. It may very well be that she perceived some of the tangles as holding her down and it may very well have happened.

She says that one of the two boys put his hand in her mouth, which would explain the blood at the corner of her mouth that she described.

Two young men taking advantage of a drunk girl, it is not unheard of. I only say that to mean that it's not beyond the realms of possibility.

The use of Saranwrap: It's so peculiar I have difficulty in understanding how someone could make that up. And, in my view, I can't understand how two young men picking two girls up off the street, drunks, without one of them at least having a particular positive view of them, would be content to have intercourse without a thought to AIDS,

chlamydia, and who knows what else is around these days.

Now, I look at the evidence of the two young men and I have to look at both their evidence because they're both describing the same situation, particularly the witness C . I'd comment that I found him to be very careful, very precise, calculating even, artful in his evidence. Everything was done through a translator on -- and yet I was intrigued to see C correcting the translator on his translations when the translator was speaking in English.

The room in which this activity took place is, by any of our standards, small. Looking at the photographs, there is a bed, there is a desk, and that's it. The bed, width-wise, and the desk take up all of one wall. I don't know how anything could go on in that room without everybody in the room knowing. It's just too small.

Essentially W says, "I was sleeping." He heard her footsteps. The photographs show a rug floor and she's bare naked according to the evidence. "I could hear her foot steps," he said. "I realize that she's naked." She woke him up. So if they're both there at the same place at the same time, C has had intercourse with her, both him on the top and her on the top and back and forth and cuddling and

1.3

necking and taking clothes off, all the time W is asleep on the floor. She gets up and she goes down and wakes him up, yet he says he never heard a thing.

When pressed he said he heard a little bit of their conversation, even though he said he was asleep and didn't know what they were saying.

In cross-examination, he went on and then backed up and said that she only woke him up after she went to C 's bed. Well, it appears his evidence is essentially that he woke up when she walked down the hallway. He fell asleep. He woke up again when she was talking on the bed, fell asleep, and then woke up again when she tapped him on the shoulder.

C testifies that the three of them were lying down like three sardines in a can, and he's lying there while his friend and roommate is attempting to have intercourse with her. He sees nothing, essentially hears nothing other than to mumble, "You know, You're a man, you know what to do."

I just find it extraordinary and very difficult to believe that all of this could be going on in such a short time frame, 15, 20 minutes and they're not both wide awake and knowing what's going on.

This business of in and out of consciousness and being totally blank and ignorant as to what's going on in the rest of the room is very hard to conceive.

And, of course, C I think said that he

went -- there is all this traffic over W who's at one point asleep at the foot -- on the floor at the foot of the bed. Again, looking at the photographs of the room, I have to admit it's probably possible by some great means, but the light of the bathroom is on. There is light coming through the blinds. There is N and C stepping over W, and everybody is in their own little reality watching their own TV screen, as it were, and not aware of anything else that is going on. I really find that difficult to accept.

Defence, in discussion with the Court, was asked defence to comment about the Saranwrap. Defence says, Well the Saranwrap wasn't seized. I can see that from the exhibits but that doesn't assist me. Kitchen plates weren't seized either and I'm sure there is kitchen plates in that apartment.

I come to the conclusion that the evidence of

C is unreliable and I don't believe him. I come

to the conclusion that W 's evidence, once we come

to the morning -- the end of the party and he goes to

bed is unreliable, I don't believe him.

That still leaves me with the issue of whether or not their evidence raises a reasonable doubt? And the issue following that is whether or not the Crown has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

I don't believe their version of the events. I

don't believe that that girl, on the evidence that's before me, voluntarily got into bed and had intercourse with both those boys. Any doubt that is to be raised has to surround that issue.

I have difficulties with her evidence. As the Crown says, no witness is perfect and everyone has to come to court with their own personalities and their own attitudes. I found her less than articulate, but that's part of her character, she can't be faulted. I can only rely on the evidence and I can't fault someone for being inarticulate unless their inability to articulate leaves gaps in the evidence.

I find the way this all ended up curious. She says -- the two boys made her have a shower and watched her. She got dressed. She left, and got their phone number. I don't know what to make of that, if anything.

I'm going to recess for ten minutes.

(ADJOURNMENT)

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel, I just wanted to review some of the evidence.

Well, in answer to the question does the evidence raise a reasonable doubt? The issue is sex with or without consent and the circumstances surrounding the sexual activity, and I'm of the view that their evidence does not raise a reasonable doubt.

I still have to be satisfied on the Crown evidence that the case is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. I've come to the conclusion, as I indicated earlier, that A N was drunk. She blacked out, passed out, or slept however -- whatever word we want to use while she was in the bathroom.

I make no finding as to how she got out of the bathroom. I don't think it's critical for where I'll go. Whether she opened the door herself or whether C opened the door, sexual activity between her and both boys took place and she was drunk.

Her evidence is that she did not consent. Her evidence is that she, as best she could, resisted. Her evidence is that C put his hand in her mouth and that's what cut -- or the inside of her mouth or the edge of her mouth which resulted in blood at the corner of her mouth.

They told her you have to have a shower and then she collected her clothes and was free to go. She said, I asked for the phone number because I was afraid they wouldn't let me go. She said, I didn't leave when Chan went for the Saranwrap because I was scared.

On all of the evidence before me, I come to the conclusion that the sexual activity between \mathbb{W} and the victim did not take place with her consent. Thus a conviction follows.

```
I take it you're going to want a predisposition
   1
   2
              report, Ms. Payne?
   3
         MS. PAYNE:
                            Yes, Sir, and a transcript, Madam
              reporter.
   5
        THE COURT:
                            I'll direct the preparation of a
   6
             predisposition report, and set the matter over until
   7
             April 17th or no, April -- no April 17th might be too
  8
             soon. Well, April 17 at 1:30.
  9
        MR. O'HALLORAN:
                        Just a moment, please. I would like
 10
             to be here if that's possible, I'm just checking my
 11
             schedule, Sir. I see that I'm in Fort Providence and
 12
             Hay River that week, but available the next week.
 13
        THE COURT:
                            That's fine. April -- well, the 24th
 14
             is Easter Monday. April 25 at 1:30, the Tuesday?
 15
       MR. O'HALLORAN:
                            Thank you.
 16
       MS. PAYNE:
                           Sorry, Sir, what date is that?
 17
       THE COURT:
                          Tuesday, the 25th of April.
18
       MR. O'HALLORAN:
                          All right. At 1:30 p.m.?
19
       THE COURT:
                           Yes.
20
       MR. O'HALLORAN:
                       Thank you.
21
       THE COURT:
                          Thank you, counsel.
22
       (COURT ADJOURNS TO APRIL 25, 2000 AT 1:30)
23
24
25
26
27
```

	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #2 dated December 28, 1987. Sandra Burns C.S.R. (A), R.P.R Court Reporter	0
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11		
	12		
	13		
	14		
1	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
1	20		
	21		
1	22		
1	23		
1	2.4		
İ	2.5		
l	:6		
2	7		