Prince George Registry No. 8243/86

## IN THE COUNTY COURT OF CARIBOO

Prince George, B.C.

August 20, 1986

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN)

AGAINST
)
PETER ROY CROOT
)

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT
OF THE HONOURABLE

JUDGE LOW

G. KELT, Esq.

appearing for the Crown

D. BYL, Esq.

appearing for the Accused

THE COURT: (Oral) The accused is charged with one count of sexual assault causing bodily harm and one count of confinement.

The charges arose out of an incident which occurred in the early morning hours of November 7, 1985, in the accused's pick-up truck in a darkened church parking lot in Prince George. The previous evening, the accused and the complainant were at the Rock Pit cabaret. They did not meet until the accused joined up with the complainant's group outside the cabaret about 2:30 a.m. The complainant, Miss Langlois, was with her good friend, Miss White.

Miss White had met two male friends of hers, both employees of the C.N.R., in the cabaret. The party of five

COPY

people went to the room of one of the C.N.R. men at the Goldcap Motel where all smoked some hashish.

Later, the two women needed a ride to the home of
Miss White's sister where they were staying. Miss Langlois
had arrived in Prince George only the day before and had
never been in the city previously. She knew only that
Miss White's sister lived in the vicinity of 5th Avenue
and Tabor Boulevard. Somehow it was arranged that
Miss Langlois would ride with the accused and Miss White
with her two friends, one of whom was to be taken to a
C.N.R. work train. The two vehicles were to travel together
to drop the two women, but while the C.N.R. truck was being
warmed up, the accused left with Miss Langlois.

The accused drove three blocks past 5th Avenue and Tabor Boulevard and drove into the church parking lot. He admits his intention was to have sexual intercourse with Miss Langlois. He did this without any suggestion or announcement and despite, as I find occurred, an earlier rejection by her of a mild pass made by him.

When he turned into the church parking lot, the accused had known Miss Langlois perhaps one and a half hours. In the circumstances, I find this to be a sexually aggressive act, consistent with the state of mind involved in carrying out the sexual assault Miss Langlois complains of.

Miss Langlois' evidence is that she thought the accused was pulling into the area where she was staying

W-33

because she remembered that there was a church close to Miss White's sister's place. I conclude that she was, therefore, not on her guard when the accused stopped the vehicle and pulled her to him. Her evidence is that he tried to kiss her, she pulled away and he persisted; that he put his hand inside the front of her shirt and she resisted; that he became progressively aggressive and violent. He pulled her hair and held her by the hair to control her. One time this caused her head to hit the steering-wheel. Early in the struggle she tried to get out the passenger door but he went around her, shut the door and told her not to try that again.

Miss Langlois says that the accused got her pants undone at the top, but she kept her legs tight and would not let him continue. He still held her hair. He got angry and said, "I'm going to do this whether you like it or not."

She says she continued to struggle, but he hit her a couple of times. I gathered that she meant he slapped her. The accused told her to get her pants off and she began to think that she should co-operate to avoid more violence. She took one boot off so that one pant leg came off as well as one leg of her panties. She had the presence of mind to tell him that she had Herpes, but he seemed not to believe her, although he did hesitate. He still could not overcome her resistance to sexual intercourse, although he attempted to enter her.

\_

Finally, the accused said, "If you won't do it that way, then you'll do it this way." He forced her head down to his lap and she said she would bite it off. He rsponded, "If you do, you'll get this." She was unable to see what he was referring to, but presumably, it was his fist. His penis was against the side of her face and within ten seconds, he ejaculated over her face, hair and shirt.

Miss Langlois says the accused did not want her to throw up in his truck as she seemed to be on the verge of doing. He went out the passenger door and said, "Don't puke in my truck, you fucking bitch." She got out and he drove off in the truck. She tried to raise help at two houses, but was not successful. Then she was helped by a passing motorist who managed to assist her to find the place she was staying.

Fifteen minutes to half an hour later, Miss White called the police who arrived at 5:10 a.m. in the person of Constable Townsley.

Miss Langlois' evidence is that the accused, during the course of the events in the truck, said the following things or words to similar effect:

"Stop being a goody two shoes and co-operate."

"Goody two shoes, what's the matter? Have you been raped before?"

"You're lucky anybody would want to screw you."
He also called her a "stupid bitch".

It is common ground that earlier in the evening, the accused gave Miss Langlois his business card. When he told her to get out of the truck, he demanded the card back and insisted she not leave until she produced it. She managed to locate it and give it to him.

The accused's story is that he made sexual advances to Miss Langlois in the parking lot and she responded. He said they kissed and petted for some time, but she would not let him remove her pants although he made several attempts to do so. He says that after some time,

Miss Langlois performed an uninvited act of fellatio on him for five to ten minutes. He believes that she undid his pants at some point. He says that he ejaculated in her mouth. He told her to smarten up and not puke in his truck.

He got out of the vehicle, pulled up his pants and told her to get out. He says he demanded return of the business card so that the lady with whom he lived would not find out about the incident. He denies holding and pulling Miss Langlois by the hair and says he used no force on her at all.

I believe the evidence of Miss Langlois; I disbelieve that of the accused.

I found Miss Langlois to be a very forthright 29
year old woman whose demeanour on the stand, particularly
in resisting suggestion in cross-examination, was
consistent with her resistance of the accused and her
presence of mind in telling him she had Herpes and would

W-33

bite his penis. There was no hint of posturing or fabrication in her demeanour or in the content of her evidence. She resisted obvious opportunities to embellish her story. No hint of motivation - hysterical, malicious, or otherwise - was detectable in my observation of her. I found her to be a very impressive witness who presented a credible story with extreme clarity.

The evidence of Miss Langlois is supported by several other features of the evidence. She arrived at the place she was staying visibly upset. Miss White said her friend was frightened and stayed that way for some time.

Miss White said that Miss Langlois showed signs of soreness in the ensuing days. She arrived at the house with her clothes in disarray and her brassiere bunched up. Her hair was a mess, and most significantly, Miss White saw the complainant remove a clump of hair from her head. That is consistent with her assertion that the accused pulled her hair and controlled her in that manner for a considerable period of time. I found Miss White to be an objective and credible witness.

The accused was not an impressive witness. I thought him shifty and somewhat evasive in his answers in cross-examination. At times I detected a smirk on his face which seemed to go beyond nervousness arising out of his present predicament. From his answers and his demeanour I got the distinct impression that the accused thought on the night in question, and perhaps still thinks, that Miss Langlois

W-33

was fair game for a sexual predator.

The accused's story by itself would be hard to credit.

He suggests that a lady who was a virtual stranger to him was sexually responsive to him on a cold, early winter night in a location completely unknown to her, and further, that she performed an uninvited act of fellatio on him. That scenario is possible but somewhat unlikely. Its falsity is demonstrated by the balance of the evidence.

It is significant that the accused gave no evidence of conversation between them while this sexual activity was going on for some 45 minutes or more. I suspect that he could not make up evidence of conversation to counter the abusive things he in fact said to his victim. I am satisfied that the accused simply tailored his evidence as best he could in a desperate attempt to meet the damning and truthful allegations made against him.

The quality of the accused's evidence is further made apparent by what he said to the police on November 8, 1985. Constable Fraser asked him if he had used force with respect to the act of fellatio, and the accused said, "Not really". At trial, he testified that to him, that expression means "No". "Not really", may mean different things to different people, it being an expression indicating a matter of degree, but "No" is not what the expression means.

Constable Fraser raised that matter later in the interview and asked the accused if he had used force. The accused replied that he couldn't remember if he had used

force or not because he was pretty drunk. These are the responses of a man hedging with the police, and later, at trial, taking the high road and denying a matter about which he was earlier evasive.

In his interview with Constable Fraser, the accused two or three times, perhaps more, said that Miss Langlois had acted as a bitch. The use of that word is notably consistent with her evidence about the things her attacker said to her and demonstrates the attitude of the accused to the lady on the night of the incident and subsequently.

Much has been said about the element of time in this case. Miss Langlois thinks they were in the parking lot for about 30 minutes; the accused says it was 45 minutes to an hour. Either of them may be right, but I am inclined to think that the complainant's estimate is closer to the mark. In any event, I do not see any importance in determining how long the assault lasted. The fact is that it did take place.

In her interview with Constable Townsley later the same morning, he recorded the complainant as saying that the accused's penis was actually in her mouth and he ejaculated there. She never signed her statement, and I think it is unlikely that she read it or had it read to her. She corrected the error when she received a typed copy of the statement in Edmonton. Either Constable Townsley recorded that portion wrong or Miss Langlois, in her agitated state of mind, told it wrong. It is not a matter telling against her credibility. To the contrary, it is to her credit that

W-33

she made the correction and eliminated the harsher circumstances when reviewing the matter in her mind at a time of calmer reflection.

I am satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused did the acts complained of by Miss Langlois. They amount in law to sexual assault.

I am not persuaded that there was bodily harm as defined in Section 245(2) of the Criminal Code and commented upon in Regina v. McNamara (1979) 48 C.C.C. (2d) 201 and Regina v. Dupperon (1984) 16 C.C.C. (3d) 453.

The complainant had some soreness and discomfort for a few days and she lost some hair. It is marginal, but I am not sure that this amounts to bodily harm in the absence of a deeper inquiry into how the assault affected her physically.

Confinement is proved by the complainant's evidence that when she opened the truck door to leave, the accused closed it and told her not to try it again. She was afraid and remained under his control and confinement in the truck until he was finished with her. He must have known that he was keeping her against her will.

Confinement is not an essential ingredient of sexual assault. Therefore, the principle enunciated by the Supreme Court of Canada in <u>Kienapple v. The Queen</u> (1975) 1 S.C.R. 729 does not apply.

On Count 1, I find the accused guilty of the included

W-33