

Citation: *R. v. Cletheroe*, 2022 YKTC 10

Date: 20220311
Docket: 20-10020
Registry: Whitehorse

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF YUKON
Before His Honour Judge Chisholm

REGINA

v.

STACEY STANLEY CLETHEROE

Appearances:
Sarah Bailey
Malcolm E.J. Campbell

Counsel for the Crown
Counsel for the Defence

REASONS FOR SENTENCE

[1] CHISHOLM T.C.J. (Oral): Stacey Cletheroe has pleaded guilty to the offence of possessing cocaine for the purpose of trafficking, contrary to s. 5(2) of the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 19 (the "CDSA").

[2] The Crown and the defence have filed an Agreed Statement of Facts. On May 18, 2019, the Watson Lake RCMP executed a search warrant at a Watson Lake residence where Mr. Cletheroe was staying. They arrested Mr. Cletheroe and two other men in the residence. Mr. Cletheroe was charged the following day.

[3] During a search of Mr. Cletheroe's pockets, the police located 1.16 grams of cocaine, a woman's engagement ring, and \$110. In a jacket belonging to

Mr. Cletheroe, police found 19.84 grams of powdered cocaine, 1.07 grams of crack cocaine, and \$150.

[4] In Mr. Cletheroe's backpack, the police located a functioning extendable baton, a scale bearing white residue, a can of butane, a butane torch, numerous bills of sale for vehicles indicating their ownership was being transferred to Mr. Cletheroe, several pieces of jewellery, multiple empty baggies, a cell phone, and some sodium bicarbonate.

[5] In the kitchen of the residence, the police found 0.87 grams of powdered cocaine, a spoon and knife that each contained a white powdery substance, and a dish of sodium bicarbonate. The police also located five cell phones, as well as other items, including, a security camera, a heat-sensing laser, and a night vision device of the sort used for hunting.

[6] One of the other men arrested provided a warned statement in which he stated that he sometimes accompanied Mr. Cletheroe on trips around town to sell drugs, and that Mr. Cletheroe generally carried a "billy club".

Positions of the Parties

[7] The Crown submits that an appropriate sentence in this matter is 14 to 18 months of custody followed by a period of probation. Crown counsel highlights the lengthy and highly related record of Mr. Cletheroe, while acknowledging the work that he has done since this offence to improve himself. The Crown points to the negative impacts of drug

trafficking in a northern community. The principles of denunciation and deterrence are paramount according to the Crown.

[8] The defence maintains that through his rehabilitative efforts, including treatment, Mr. Cletheroe has turned his life around. Based on these exceptional circumstances, the Court should suspend the passing of sentence and impose a lengthy probationary period.

Circumstances of Mr. Cletheroe

[9] The Court has received both a **Gladue** Report and a Pre-Sentence Report (the “PSR”), as well as a number of letters of support. Both reports provide details of Mr. Cletheroe’s background, including the impact of his indigenous heritage on his involvement in the criminal justice system.

[10] Mr. Cletheroe has a lengthy and persistent criminal history, including a 2002 trafficking in a schedule 1 substance conviction for which he received three months’ incarceration plus two years of probation, and a 2011 conviction for possession of a scheduled substance for the purpose of trafficking for which he received 200 days’ imprisonment. Also of note, he has a break and enter conviction from 2007 for which he received a 30-month penitentiary term. He candidly admits in the **Gladue** Report that this crime was to collect a drug debt. Although the perpetrator, he was seriously injured while committing that crime. Finally, in terms of significant offences, he received a custodial sentence of 214 days, time served, plus a one-year probationary term in 2013 for another break and enter offence. Between the 2013 conviction and the present offence in 2019, he had no convictions.

[11] Mr. Cletheroe is 42 years of age. He is a member of the Tahltan First Nation in British Columbia. His parents separated when he was five years old, after which Mr. Cletheroe lived mainly with his mother. His father, who, according to Mr. Cletheroe attended residential school, suffered from addiction issues until 25 years ago when he became sober. Mr. Cletheroe's mother is reported to suffer from a long-term alcohol dependency.

[12] Mr. Cletheroe recounted to the author of the PSR that although he received the necessities of life as a child, he was exposed to excessive alcohol consumption and parties in his home. At the alcohol-fueled parties, he witnessed acts of violence. He also stated that there was verbal abuse in the home. Mr. Cletheroe advised the author of the **Gladue** Report that he felt neglected as a child. On the positive side, as a child, he was particularly close to his maternal grandmother who offered him comfort when needed.

[13] Mr. Cletheroe had difficulty concentrating and focusing in school as a result of, what he believed to be, an undiagnosed learning disability. He reported experiencing racism in school. By the age of 16, he had started to amass convictions for property offences in youth court. He indicated to the author of the **Gladue** Report that he only began to learn about indigenous culture when he attended a healing lodge in Hazelton, B.C., as part of a six-month custodial youth sentence.

[14] Mr. Cletheroe has been involved in two long-term relationships. He had an eight-year relationship with Breann Cole. He explained that the relationship involved highs and lows due to his use of substances, which, along with his behaviour led to their

separation. He and Ms. Cole are parents to 12-year-old twins who live with their mother outside of the Yukon. He last saw his daughters approximately seven years ago. However, since completing treatment in 2020, he reported having regular telephone contact with them. He also reported to the author of the **Gladue** Report that he now pays child support, and through his employer, the twins also receive a monthly clothing allowance and medical coverage.

[15] Mr. Cletheroe's second long-term relationship has been with Sarah Fox. Initially, they were in a common-law relationship between 2011 and 2018. They separated, at which time Mr. Cletheroe moved to Watson Lake where he began using cocaine excessively. Upon his arrest for the offence before the Court, she supported him in obtaining assistance for his addiction. They subsequently reconciled and have been together since that time.

[16] Mr. Cletheroe and Ms. Fox have a 22-month-old daughter together. He also has a positive relationship with Ms. Fox's son from a previous relationship.

[17] Mr. Cletheroe indicated in the **Gladue** Report that he first used crack cocaine in 1999 in northern British Columbia. He became addicted and committed property crimes to support his habit. The author of a 2006 psychological report concluded that Mr. Cletheroe met the criteria for cocaine dependency in partial remission and that he exhibited traits consistent with alcohol abuse. Additionally, the author identified information processing, impulsiveness, and an inability to conform to societal norms as areas of concern.

[18] Since his May 2019 arrest for the matter before the Court, he has made efforts to address his drug addiction and other underlying issues. In August 2019, he commenced counselling sessions with a mental wellness and substance abuse counsellor. Additionally, between January 29 and March 25, 2020, he attended and completed inpatient chemical dependency treatment at the Kapown Treatment Centre in Alberta.

[19] Since April 2020, he has worked for the Teslin Tlingit Council First Nation while pursuing his career goal of becoming a red seal certified carpenter. He is described as punctual, dependable, and hard working.

[20] However, Mr. Cletheroe's difficulties in the classroom portion of his apprenticeship carpentry program identified the need for academic support. He was enrolled in a virtual learning strategist program, which has provided him with supports "to strengthen his in-school capacity". Additionally, in 2021, he began meeting virtually with a registered psychologist who has reported that Mr. Cletheroe suffers from Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder ("ADHD") with "combined features of hyperactivity, impulsivity and inattention". In a letter filed with the Court, the psychologist opines that Mr. Cletheroe's "life history and undiagnosed ADHD have directly contributed to episodes of depression, helplessness, and feelings of worthlessness have caused him to run afoul of the law". The psychologist describes Mr. Cletheroe as very motivated to provide for his wife and children. He would expect Mr. Cletheroe "to continue his current law-abiding behaviour" with improved mental well-being.

[21] Mr. Cletheroe, Ms. Fox, and family attended residential treatment at the Kackaamin Family Development Centre on Vancouver Island on November 10, 2021. Due to the report of a COVID-19 case at that facility, the program was terminated early on November 28, 2021. The family received word that they would be given priority to return to complete the family treatment program at a later time.

[22] The defence has filed letters of support from Teslin Community members.

A Fit Sentence

[23] The starting point in the sentencing process is the principle that a sentence must be "...proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender" (*R. v. Friesen*, 2020 SCC 9, at para. 30). As the Court in *R. v. Parranto*, 2021 SCC 46, at para. 12, recently explained:

As to the relationship of individualization to proportionality and parity, this Court in *Lacasse* aptly observed:

Proportionality is determined both on an individual basis, that is, in relation to the accused him or herself and to the offence committed by the accused, and by comparison with sentences imposed for similar offences committed in similar circumstances. [para. 53]

Individualization is central to the proportionality assessment. Whereas the gravity of a particular offence may be relatively constant, each offence is "committed in unique circumstances by an offender with a unique profile" (para. 58). This is why proportionality sometimes demands a sentence that has never been imposed in the past for a similar offence. The question is always whether the sentence reflects the gravity of the offence, the offender's degree of responsibility and the unique circumstances of each case (para. 58).

[24] In the case of Mr. Cletheroe, I am particularly mindful of s. 718.2(e) of the *Code*, which directs me to consider "all available sanctions, other than imprisonment, that are

reasonable in the circumstances and consistent with the harm done to victims or to the community should be considered for all offenders, with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders".

[25] I am also cognizant of the case law with respect to the application of ***Gladue*** principles, which are to be applied in every case, regardless of the seriousness of the offence before the Court.

[26] As in every case, the goal in sentencing Mr. Cletheroe is to determine "...a fair, fit and principled sanction" (***Parranto***, at para. 10)

Gravity of the Offence

[27] The devastating effect of hard drugs on vulnerable northern communities is well-known and well-documented in the case law (see, for example, ***R. v. Curtis***, [1982] 2 Y.R. 177, (T.C.), at paras. 12-15; ***R. v. Holway***, 2003 YKTC 75, at para. 7; ***R. v. Naiker***, 2007 YKTC 58, at para. 7; ***R. v. Profeit***, 2009 YKTC 39, at para. 39, and more recently, in ***Parranto***, at para. 71).

[28] Courts have consistently held that in sentencing those who are in the business of trafficking, denunciation and deterrence must be a primary consideration. In many instances, the sale of hard drugs exploits those who are already at risk. The far-reaching harm of hard drugs is not only felt by users, but also by their families and their communities.

Degree of Responsibility

[29] As identified, Mr. Cletheroe comes before the Court with a significant criminal history, including offences of a similar nature. This is a substantial aggravating factor. Additionally, the offence of possession for the purpose of trafficking involved cocaine and a small amount of crack cocaine. Mr. Cletheroe's sale of drugs was intertwined with his heavy use of cocaine.

[30] At the same time, Mr. Cletheroe has made significant rehabilitative efforts since incurring this charge. He has attended treatment and has started to become a productive member of society. When **Gladue** principles are applied to his individual circumstances, including the circumstances of this offence, his moral blameworthiness is attenuated.

Sentencing Case Law

[31] The Crown and the defence have filed a number of sentencing precedents. Additionally, I have reviewed other case law. I will set out below summaries of cases that inform both the sentencing range and the positions of each of the parties in the case at bar.

[32] In **R. v. Crompton**, 2009 YKSC 16, after the police observed the offender involved in a hand-to-hand transaction in an alley, a search of his residence revealed 2.4 grams of crack cocaine and trafficking paraphernalia. Six months after his release on bail, Mr. Crompton trafficked approximately 1 gram of cocaine to a police agent. He was 26 years of age and had no prior criminal history. The sentencing judge found it

highly aggravating that after pleading guilty to the first offence, and while bound by a recognizance, he continued to traffic drugs. The Court imposed a global sentence of 18 months' imprisonment.

[33] The Court in *R. v. Asuchak*, 2012 YKTC 15 convicted the offender after trial. In April 2011, the police believed Mr. Asuchak was trafficking in cocaine and attempted to arrest him in his vehicle. However, he drove off, leading police on a chase. While being chased, the offender attempted, without complete success, to dispose of his cocaine out his car window. He was a repeat offender, having similar convictions in 2009 and 2010. The offender was a drug addict. The Court imposed a global term of imprisonment, for the drug offence and two driving offences, of two years less a day.

[34] In *R. v. Bourne*, 2007 YKTC 81, Mr. Bourne pleaded guilty to possession for the purpose of trafficking and possession of prohibited weapons. He was 35 years of age and had a criminal record, including two prior drug possession offences. He had been in possession of what was described as a significant amount of cocaine, most of it in crack form. The total amount of cocaine seized was 40 grams. In addition to drug paraphernalia, the police seized over \$20,000 in cash and an arsenal of weapons. The Court sentenced him to 18 months' imprisonment for the drug offence and 15 months consecutive for the firearm offences.

[35] In *R. v. Campbell*, 2009 YKTC 87, the Court sentenced, after trial, the 40-year-old offender for trafficking in cocaine. Additionally, the offender pleaded guilty to having committed a second trafficking offence. In total, during these two transactions, he sold four rocks of crack cocaine to an undercover officer. The offender had 16 prior criminal

convictions, including one prior drug possession offence. He was a profit-driven trafficker with a drug addiction problem. He was operating at a level above a street-level cocaine trafficker, providing direction and supervision to others. The Court sentenced the offender to 10 months' time served for the first transaction and an additional eight months to be served conditionally for the second offence.

[36] In *R. v. Jimenez*, 2020 YKCA 5, the Court upheld the imposition of a suspended sentence for an 18-year-old offender who pleaded guilty to possession of cocaine for the purpose of trafficking. The offender was involved in a dial-a-dope operation and when arrested was in possession of nine small bags of crack cocaine and one small bag of powdered cocaine. His adult passenger had five bags of cocaine and a 53.43 gram rock of cocaine. More than \$3,500 in cash was located on the passengers. The offender had done well on release, including re-enrolling in school and obtaining his high school diploma, while also distancing himself from negative influences. The offender had entered a guilty plea and had no prior criminal history.

[37] In *R. v. Maynard*, 2016 YKTC 51, a 19-year-old offender, with no criminal history, pleaded guilty to trafficking in cocaine. He sold a street level amount of cocaine to an undercover police officer, and subsequently set up the purchase of a larger quantity of cocaine between an undercover officer and another individual. He had disengaged from the drug trade prior to his arrest. He also had obtained gainful employment. The Court, noting exceptional circumstances, suspended the passing of sentence and placed the offender on probation for 20 months.

[38] In *R. v. Voong*, 2015 BCCA 285, the Court considered whether a suspended sentence with probation was an appropriate penalty for dial-a-dope trafficking offences with respect to four different offenders. In three of the four cases, the Court determined that a suspended sentence with probation was a proper response. In the fourth case, Mr. Taylor's suspended sentence was replaced by six months' imprisonment to be followed by one-year of probation. Mr. Taylor had sold 3.5 grams of cocaine to police as part of a dial-a-dope operation. Upon arrest, he had 9 grams of cocaine packaged in two dozen small packets. He also possessed \$110. Although he had made some progress in terms of rehabilitation, he tested positive for cocaine nine months after his arrest. The Court of Appeal found his efforts, though commendable, did not rise to the level of "exceptional circumstances".

[39] In the case of Mr. Voong, police had been observing him and suspected him of making more than 16 transactions prior to his arrest. The police found him in possession of score sheets, 6.6 grams of cocaine, a small amount of heroine, and \$680. The offence occurred in January 2013. In 1994, he had been convicted of two counts of possession for the purpose of trafficking a narcotic and was sentenced to a \$500 fine on the first count and a suspended sentence on the second count. He was convicted of breaking and entering and theft in 1996, and of breaking and entering in 2002. Between 2002 and 2013 he had no convictions. He was 40 years old when sentenced. He had a significant history of drug use and treatment attempts. He sold drugs to support his addiction. After his charge, he attended a drug treatment program in May 2013 and had not consumed illicit drugs between then and his sentencing more than one year later. The Court of Appeal held that although a custodial sentence in the range of 12 months

would normally have been appropriate, the fact that he was not selling drugs for profit and that he had apparent success in his rehabilitation efforts led to an exceptional circumstance. The Court did not interfere with the suspended sentence.

[40] The Court of Appeal in *R. v. Peters*, 2015 MBCA 119, upheld the imposition of a suspended sentence and probation for an Indigenous offender who pleaded guilty to possession for the purpose of trafficking. The quantity of cocaine involved was 62 one-quarter grams. The offender, who had 54 prior convictions dating back to his youth, was convicted for a similar offence involving cocaine in 2004. The 2004 conviction, for which he received an effective sentence of 26 months' custody plus probation, was his last conviction prior to 2013, when he was arrested for the matter under appeal. At the time of sentencing, he was 31 years of age, had moved from Winnipeg back to his First Nation, and had recently been granted custody of his young children. Although the Pre-Sentence Report deemed him very high risk to reoffend, he had engaged in treatment and counselling. The sentencing judge placed significant weight on *Gladue* principles and the offender's change in lifestyle between his arrest and the time of sentencing. The Court of Appeal agreed that the circumstances of the offender were exceptional and that the long-term protection of the public was better achieved by the imposition of a non-custodial disposition.

Appropriate Sentence for Mr. Cletheroe

[41] As the case law above reveals, most cases of trafficking in hard drugs result in a period of imprisonment. A custodial sentence is necessary, in most cases, to meet the principles of denunciation and deterrence. In this jurisdiction, the range of sentence for

this offence for someone with Mr. Cletheroe's antecedents would appear to be in the range of 18 to 24 months' imprisonment, despite the fact that he had not been in trouble for six years prior to the current offence.

[42] I am cognizant that an offender may fall outside a range of sentence even without demonstrating exceptional circumstances. As summarized by Fitch J.A. in **R. v. Choi**, 2022 BCCA 90, at para. 3:

But sentencing ranges are tools, not judicial straitjackets, and sentencing is an individual process that takes account of the unique circumstances of the offence and the offender, and how the objectives of sentencing can best be achieved in a given case. ...

[43] In terms of mitigating factors, Mr. Cletheroe has entered a guilty plea. Although it cannot be considered an early guilty plea, he is entitled to some benefit. As the Crown fairly concedes, he also deserves credit for the substantial efforts that he has made to rehabilitate himself. He has attended and successfully completed a residential treatment program. Additionally, he has done counselling with a mental health and substance use worker. He and his family commenced residential family counselling which, unfortunately, was cut short due to the global pandemic. He has entered and is progressing in a vocational program to become a journeyman carpenter. He has secured full-time employment and has shown himself to be a dependable and hard worker.

[44] He has expressed remorse for his crime and appears to have insight into the harm done to society as a result of his crime. I would also reiterate that the **Gladue** factors in this case reduce Mr. Cletheroe's moral culpability.

[45] The challenging question is how to balance these mitigating factors with the significant aggravating factors that are present. As the Supreme Court of Canada has said, sentencing is more an art than a science (*Parranto*, para. 10).

[46] There are some similarities between Mr. Cletheroe's circumstances and those of the offender in *Voong* and the offender in *Peters*. However, Mr. Voong had a longer gap between his last conviction and the reoffending in 2011. Second, in contrast to Mr. Cletheroe, Mr. Voong's prior drug trafficking convictions were dated and had resulted in lower end sentences. Third, the facts of the case at bar are objectively more serious than those in *Voong*. As set out in the agreed statement of facts, the information police learned at, and the items seized from, the residence where Mr. Cletheroe was residing lead to the conclusion that he was more actively involved in the drug trade than Mr. Voong.

[47] In the case of *Peters*, the offender was younger than Mr. Cletheroe, and although he had a significant criminal history, the facts provided do not reveal that he was as actively involved in the drug trade, generally, as has been the case for Mr. Cletheroe. Additionally, his trafficking offence before the Court of Appeal did not occur in a remote community.

[48] As such, I do not find Mr. Cletheroe to be on an equal footing with either Mr. Voong or Mr. Peters. Because of the nature of this offence and Mr. Cletheroe's serious antecedents, denunciation and deterrence, both specific and general, require a sentence crafted to reflect the serious nature of this drug, and its impact in a small northern community. In this case, general deterrence is especially important

considering his criminal history. Even though his rehabilitative efforts are commendable, in my view, a suspended sentence and probation would not meet the principles of denunciation and deterrence.

[49] Despite this finding, I have no doubt that Mr. Cletheroe is on a rehabilitative path. In my view, a lengthy period of custody will not enhance that path and may well have the opposite effect. Additionally, it is clear from the letters of support and reports before me that sentencing Mr. Cletheroe to a lengthy jail term will have negative consequences for his children, his current spouse, and his ex-spouse.

[50] The question is how to craft a sentence that is denunciatory and provides deterrence, while at the same time not jeopardizing Mr. Cletheroe's rehabilitative efforts and the protective factors that he has put in place, namely, his employment, his vocational training, his ongoing treatment, his stable relationship, and his sobriety.

[51] In terms of what an appropriate penalty might include, I appreciate that while probation orders are primarily rehabilitative in nature, "...they can also have a deterrent and denunciatory effect, particularly if they contain terms that significantly curtail liberty..." (*R. v. McCrimmon*, 2022 YKCA 1, at para. 61).

[52] Therefore, on balance, I find that a 90-day custodial sentence, to be served intermittently, followed by a three-year probationary period will address both the denunciatory and deterrent requirements, while at the same time allowing Mr. Cletheroe to perfect his path of rehabilitation. The probationary period will include a curfew term for the first year, similar to his bail release, to restrict his liberty. Additionally, he will have restrictions on his ability to use electronic devices.

[53] This sentence, in addition to Mr. Cletheroe's lengthy time on release on strict bail conditions – including a curfew, and a restriction on his use of electronic devices – results in a long-term intervention in his life. It will emphasize denunciation, while also allowing him to continue his rehabilitative efforts under the supervision of the state. In my view, this will achieve a proportionate sentence for Mr. Cletheroe. At the end of the day, as stipulated by s. 10 of the *CDSA*, the sentence will “contribute to the respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society while encouraging rehabilitation, and treatment in appropriate circumstances, of offenders and acknowledging the harm done to victims and to the community”.

[54] This sentence is to be served intermittently as follows:

- To attend the Whitehorse Correctional Centre, 25 College Drive, on Friday March 18, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. for release on Monday, March 21, 2022 at 7:00 a.m., and to attend thereafter on consecutive Fridays at 7:00 p.m. for release on Mondays at 7:00 a.m. until the sentence is served in full.

[55] While Mr. Cletheroe is serving this intermittent sentence, he will be subject to a probation order while not incarcerated. The terms of the probation order are:

1. Keep the peace and be of good behaviour;
2. Appear before the court when required to do so by the court;
3. Notify the court in advance of any change of name or address, and, promptly of any change in employment or occupation;

4. Remain within the Yukon unless you obtain written permission from the court; and
5. Do not consume alcohol during the 24-hour period preceding the time you are to report to the Whitehorse Correctional Centre;

[56] The terms of the three-year probation order are as follows:

1. Keep the peace and be of good behaviour;
2. Appear before the court when required to do so by the court;
3. Notify the Probation Officer, in advance, of any change of name or address, and, promptly, of any change in employment or occupation;
4. Report in person to a Probation Officer upon completion of your intermittent sentence, and, after that, when and in the manner directed by the Probation Officer;
5. Reside at a residence approved by the Probation Officer, and do not change that residence without the prior written permission of your Probation Officer;
6. Not possess or consume illegal drugs that have not been prescribed for you by a medical doctor;
7. For the first 12 months of this order, abide by a curfew by being in your residence or on your property between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. daily except with the prior written permission of your Probation Officer or

- except in the presence of another responsible adult approved in advance by your Probation Officer;
8. For the first 12 months of this order, not possess or use any cell phone, smart phone or other mobile electronic communications device except as required by your employment or education and except with the prior written permission of your Probation Officer; and
 9. Attend and actively participate in all assessment and counselling programs as directed by the Probation Officer, and complete them to the satisfaction of the Probation Officer, for any issues, including but not limited to, psychological issues, and provide consents to release information to the Probation Officer regarding participation in any program you been directed to do pursuant to this condition.

Ancillary Orders

[57] I make the following ancillary orders:

1. Pursuant to s. 109 of the *Code*, I prohibit you from possessing any firearm, ammunition, explosive substance or any of the other items more completely described in s. 109(1). Since this is a subsequent offence, the prohibition is for the remainder of your life;
2. Pursuant to s. 487.051(3) of the *Code*, having considered your criminal record and the nature of this offence, I am satisfied that it is in the best interests of the administration of justice to make an order that you provide samples of

bodily substances, within 30 days, that are reasonably required for DNA analysis and recording; and

3. A forfeiture order with respect to all offence-related items.

[58] I impose a victim surcharge of \$200. It is to be paid in full within three months.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[59] I will make changes to the intermittent sentence as requested. First, as suggested by Mr. Campbell, the time for attending the Correctional Centre will be 8:00 p.m. on Fridays with release Mondays at 6:00 a.m. Second, in order for Mr. Cletheroe and his family to attend the Jackson Lake Treatment Camp, he will not attend the Correctional Centre, as part of this intermittent sentence, during the period of March 25 to March 28, 2022.

CHISHOLM T.C.J.