

SUPREME COURT OF YUKON

Citation: *R v Shaw*
2024 YKSC 62

Date: 20241107
S.C. No. 23-01500
Registry: Whitehorse

BETWEEN

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

AND

RALPH BERNARD SHAW

Publication, broadcast or transmission of the names of the children is prohibited pursuant to s 486.5 of the *Criminal Code*.

Before Justice E.A. Hughes

Counsel for the Crown

Kathryn Laurie and
Thomas Lemon

Counsel for the Defence

Kevin Drolet and
Amy Steele

This decision was delivered in the form of Oral Reasons on November 7, 2024. The Reasons have since been edited for publication without changing the substance.

REASONS FOR SENTENCING

[1] HUGHES J. (Oral): On October 26, 2021, Mr. Shaw murdered his estranged wife, Saengduean Honchaiyaphum, at her new home in Faro and wounded her partner, Joseph Gilbert Boudreau, by shooting him a total of seven times, both at the new home and another neighbour's home where Mr. Boudreau had fled for safety. Then, Mr. Shaw travelled to a third location in Faro, the home of Patrick McCracken, some two kilometres away, where Mr. Shaw murdered Mr. McCracken, an acquaintance.

[2] After murdering Mr. McCracken, Mr. Shaw travelled to a fourth location, the rural home of Keith and Deborah Carreau, a further 10 kilometres away, where, after setting up his hunting rifle, he began to shoot at the house, calling for Mr. Carreau to come out. Mr. Carreau, another acquaintance, was not home but his wife was.

[3] Mr. Shaw was arrested by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (“RCMP”) at this location. These four acts took place in about a one-hour time period.

[4] Mr. Shaw pled guilty to the first-degree murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum, a tragic and senseless death that left their daughters without their mother. Their victim impact statements are heartbreaking. Because the *Criminal Code*, RSC 1985, c C-46 (“*Criminal Code*” or “*Code*”), mandates I must sentence Mr. Shaw to life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for 25 years, I will speak little about Ms. Honchaiyaphum and her murder in these reasons.

[5] Mr. Shaw also pled guilty to aggravated assault on Mr. Boudreau and the second-degree murder of Mr. McCracken. The *Criminal Code* mandates again that I must sentence Mr. Shaw to life imprisonment for the second-degree murder of Mr. McCracken. However, I must decide the period of parole ineligibility, a period between 10 to 25 years: see s. 745(c) of the *Criminal Code*. In making this determination, I must consider the nature of the offence and the circumstances surrounding its commission, the character of Mr. Shaw, the purpose and principles of sentencing, and relevant case law. I must also sentence Mr. Shaw for the aggravated assault upon Mr. Boudreau, taking into account similar factors.

[6] The Crown submits a fit period of parole ineligibility for the murder of Mr. McCracken is a concurrent period of 25 years, and a concurrent sentence of 14

years for the aggravated assault upon Mr. Boudreau. Fourteen years is the maximum sentence for aggravated assault.

[7] The defence position is that, while Mr. McCracken's murder is a tragic loss of life, neither the circumstances of the offence nor the offender, Mr. Shaw, are the worst and a fit period of parole ineligibility is 15 years. The defence also submits that a fit sentence for the aggravated assault is a sentence in the range of eight to 10 years.

[8] I do sentence you, Mr. Shaw, first, to life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for 25 years for the murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum. Second, I sentence you to life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for 17½ years for the murder of Mr. McCracken. The law requires that this sentence run concurrently to the sentence I have imposed for the murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum. Third, I sentence you to 10 years for the aggravated assault upon Mr. Boudreau. Again, the law requires that this sentence run concurrently to the two periods of life imprisonment I have sentenced you to for the murders of Ms. Honchaiyaphum and Mr. McCracken. The following are my reasons.

The Nature of the Offences and the Circumstances surrounding their commission

[9] The facts are fully set out in seven exhibits in this matter: Exhibits 1, 3 to 7, and 30. It is my intention to refer only to the facts that are necessary to provide context for these reasons.

[10] By the summer of 2021, Mr. Shaw and Ms. Honchaiyaphum's marriage had ended, and Ms. Honchaiyaphum had met Mr. Boudreau. Ms. Honchaiyaphum left the family home with the parties' two daughters, aged 15 and 12, on August 6. Upon separating, Ms. Honchaiyaphum obtained a restraining order against Mr. Shaw.

Ultimately, Ms. Honchaiyaphum remained living in Faro with the two girls and Mr. Shaw moved to a hotel in Whitehorse.

[11] On October 26, 2021, at approximately 6:45 a.m., Mr. Shaw left his hotel in Whitehorse in his truck with a .300 calibre Remington 700 tactical rifle he had purchased approximately three weeks prior, and drove to Faro, 350 kilometres away. After he arrived, he re-purchased a .45 calibre handgun, magazines, and ammunition he had previously sold, at approximately 12:30 p.m. This handgun was later analysed and described as a Colt U.S. Army semi-automatic .45 calibre pistol that meets the *Criminal Code* definition of a firearm, a handgun, and a restricted weapon. Needless to say, it was not registered to Mr. Shaw.

[12] Mr. Shaw then drove to Ms. Honchaiyaphum's new home at 9 Harper Street. There, he saw Ms. Honchaiyaphum and Mr. Boudreau, and a new couch which required moving into the residence. Mr. Shaw got out of his truck with the loaded handgun on his person and came up the stairs to the back balcony of the residence. He argued with Ms. Honchaiyaphum and was angry that she was moving into the residence with Mr. Boudreau.

[13] During the argument, Ms. Honchaiyaphum told Mr. Shaw she did not love him anymore. About this time, Mr. Boudreau's friend, Tyler Frampton, arrived at the home to assist his friend to move the couch into the home. Mr. Frampton observed Mr. Shaw and Ms. Honchaiyaphum to be standing on the back balcony of the residence and Mr. Boudreau to be standing next to his truck on the driveway. Ms. Honchaiyaphum asked Mr. Shaw to leave several times but he did not; instead, Mr. Shaw asked Mr. Frampton to leave. The next thing Mr. Frampton heard was Mr. Shaw saying, "OK then", and gunshots. Mr. Shaw murdered Ms. Honchaiyaphum at approximately 1 p.m.

by shooting her in the back with the handgun as she ran down the stairs of the back balcony. Mr. Shaw then shot Mr. Boudreau six times with the handgun when Mr. Boudreau tried to go to Ms. Honchaiyaphum's aid. With the assistance of Mr. Frampton, Mr. Boudreau and Mr. Frampton fled 9 Harper Street and sought refuge in a home at 24 Harper Street.

[14] Before Mr. Shaw followed Mr. Boudreau and Mr. Frampton, he was observed by Mr. Frampton and others going to his truck and reloading the handgun.

[15] Mr. Shaw followed the two men to 24 Harper Street and began shooting at the residence. A number of bullets entered the home, including the seventh bullet to hit Mr. Boudreau. The resident of the home and her neighbour, who came to assist her, attempted to administer first aid to Mr. Boudreau as well as divert Mr. Shaw away from the house, saying "the guy [Mr. Shaw] was looking for had left the house." I infer Mr. Shaw began to look in the vicinity of 24 Harper Street for Mr. Boudreau during which he fired into a building where a person from 24 Harper Street was hiding.

[16] Mr. Shaw returned a second time to 24 Harper Street and fired two more shots into the house and then entered it. Again, he shot at one of the individuals in the residence, and, again, Mr. Shaw was told that the man he was looking for had left and to leave them alone.

[17] Mr. Shaw left this time, albeit Mr. Boudreau was lying on the floor in the kitchen of the residence and could not be seen by Mr. Shaw

[18] Mr. Shaw returned to his vehicle and began to drive away. However, before he left the area, Mr. Shaw stopped his truck where a neighbour was standing, rolled down the window, pointed the handgun at him, and asked the man, "Do you want to die too?"

The man, Mr. Lewis, put his hands in the air and Mr. Shaw left the area and drove to Mr. McCracken's home, about two kilometres away.

[19] There, he went to the front door with the handgun on his person. Mr. Shaw knocked, and Mr. McCracken spoke to Mr. Shaw at the open door, with his wife behind. The conversation was recorded. One can hear Mr. Shaw accusing Mr. McCracken of "Shitting on him and calling him down all these fucking years" in a loud voice to which Mr. McCracken replied he had not. Mr. Shaw continued to accuse Mr. McCracken of "calling him down". Then there is silence for a second or two during which time Mr. Shaw walked out of Mrs. McCracken's sight, and she perceived he was about to leave before Mr. Shaw next yelled in a loud voice, "You wanna laugh? You don't? You understand now?" Immediately after, a loud gunshot is heard.

[20] Mr. Shaw killed Mr. McCracken by shooting him in the back through the closed exterior glass door. Seconds later, Mr. Shaw's truck can be heard, and then seen, accelerating away from the scene at a high rate of speed. It appears the exchange between Mr. McCracken and Mr. Shaw lasted all of two minutes.

[21] When Mr. Shaw left the McCracken residence, he drove to the Carreau residence, a rural home about 10 kilometres away. Mr. Carreau had worked with Mr. McCracken in the past and both were part of a group of men in Faro who met occasionally and talked. Mr. Shaw believed that Mr. Carreau, like Mr. McCracken, was "calling him down."

[22] There, Mr. Shaw parked his truck behind sheds on the property, set up the rifle on a bipod on the back of his truck, and began to fire at the Carreau residence. Mrs. Carreau, upon hearing "popping sounds", began to investigate and saw Mr. Shaw firing a gun from his pickup truck. She called 9-1-1. Mr. Shaw continued to shoot at the

house with both the rifle and the handgun and shouting, “Come out and fight me like a man you son of a bitch” and “Get out here.”

[23] The RCMP arrived and set up to arrest Mr. Shaw about 10 to 13 minutes after Mrs. Carreau first called 9-1-1. Using a loudspeaker to announce their presence, the RCMP advised Mr. Shaw he was under arrest for murder, ordered him to put down his weapons, and walk towards the police with his hands up. At 1:56 p.m., Mr. Shaw was taken into police custody.

The Circumstances of Mr. Shaw

[24] Mr. Shaw was born in Prince Edward Island in September 1960. He was 61 years old at the time of these offences and had no prior criminal record.

[25] Mr. Shaw graduated from the University of Prince Edward Island with his Bachelor of Arts in 1983, and then went on to obtain his teaching credentials. While Mr. Shaw did teach for a period of time, he has not been able to teach since 2006 and has been on a disability pension since then.

[26] Mr. Shaw has suffered physical and mental health issues for many years. For example, he has been treated for depression since 2006. His physical health issues have included asthma, prostate cancer in 2012, hypertension, and, more recently, osteoarthritis which causes pain while sitting. Mr. Shaw is also an individual who has been socially isolated most, if not all, of his life. His sole long-term relationship of any sort was his marriage to Ms. Honchaiyaphum. It is clear from the victim impact statements that Mr. Shaw has destroyed his relationship with his daughters because of his murder of their mother.

[27] In September 2021, Mr. Shaw was hospitalized for five days for his worsening mental health issues. This is not to suggest, however, that Mr. Shaw did not have the requisite intent for these three offences; he has admitted he did.

Victim Impact Statements

[28] Twenty-two victim impact statements were entered into the record. Twenty-one of the statements are from affected individuals and one was a community victim impact statement from the Town of Faro. Twenty victim impact statements were read into the record by the victims themselves or on their behalf by members of the Victim Services Unit in the Yukon.

[29] Faro itself is a small town with approximately 440 Faroites. Its RCMP detachment has two members. Most people who live there are at least acquainted with almost all of the other residents. The community victim impact statement as well as the individual victim impact statements describe how Mr. Shaw's actions traumatized the entire community as well as shattered the community's sense of peace and security. The community has also experienced loss and grief with the deaths of Ms. Honchaiyaphum and Mr. McCracken.

[30] The individual victim impact statements describe poignantly and eloquently how Mr. Shaw's actions destroyed their lives as they knew them and the grief, tragedy, trauma, fear, and immense loss all experienced after the events. Many also described how these feelings continue to haunt them to this day.

Law and Analysis

[31] Prior sentencing decisions help inform a sentencing judge's analysis of a fit sentence in any particular case. However, the Supreme Court of Canada has said on many occasions that sentencing is an individualized process, and proportionality is the

organizing principle for a fit, fair, and principled sentence. This means a sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of an offender. A period of parole ineligibility is a “sentence”: see s. 2 of the *Criminal Code*.

[32] In coming to my decision in this case, I have considered s. 745(c) and the jurisprudence which has interpreted this section; the principles and purpose of sentencing in ss. 718, 718.1, and 718.2; as well as the principles and ranges from the cases submitted by counsel to the Court.¹

[33] In addition, parole ineligibility is part of an offender’s punishment. As explained by the Supreme Court of Canada in *R v Bissonnette*, 2022 SCC 23 at para. 58:

The length of parole ineligibility is part of an offender’s punishment (*Shropshire*, at para. 23; see also *Zinck*, at para. 31). It is a consequence of conviction and has a significant impact on the offender’s interests in liberty and security of the person. What is more, the parole ineligibility period furthers the objectives of denunciation and deterrence that underlie a sentence (*Shropshire*, at paras. 21-23; *M. (C.A.)*, at para. 64; *R. v. Simmonds*, 2018 BCCA 205, 362 C.C.C. (3d) 215, at para. 10). ...

[34] Any sentence I impose in this case, as I have said, must be proportionate to the gravity of the offences and the degree of responsibility of Mr. Shaw. The gravity of the two offences - the second-degree murder of Mr. McCracken and the aggravated assault upon Mr. Boudreau, are both very high. Only a conviction for first degree murder is more serious than that of second-degree murder. The continued shootings of Mr. Boudreau by Mr. Shaw at 9 Harper Street as well as his continuing attempts to wound Mr. Boudreau at 24 Harper Street, and his complete recklessness and/or indifference to the safety of others in the houses and neighbourhood again place the

¹ See Appendix A

gravity of this offence at the high end of the scale. His responsibility is also very high in that he continued to use the handgun and rifle at the Carreau residence after he murdered his second victim.

[35] Deterrence and denunciation are the primary sentencing objectives to be considered in this case in light of the nature of the offences, and the offences having been committed with two firearms.

[36] The victim impact statements make clear that many people in the Yukon hunt for legitimate purposes, and thus own firearms for lawful purposes. Individuals who hunt know firsthand the destruction any firearm can cause, and that great care must be taken so that firearms are not used for unlawful purposes, as in this case. Firearm violence does need to be deterred.

[37] Two other sentencing objectives, separating offenders from society and rehabilitation, are also relevant. The sentence imposed by the *Criminal Code* for murder - life imprisonment, deals with the first objective, separation from society. Rehabilitation cannot be ignored, but I find it plays a minor role in light of the minimum sentence Mr. Shaw will serve for the first-degree murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum, as well as his age, and that prior to these events he had no criminal record.

Aggravating and Mitigating Factors

[38] I next turn to consider the aggravating and mitigating factors in this case, understanding that aggravating factors may increase a sentence while mitigating factors may decrease a sentence.

[39] The mitigating factors are these:

1. Mr. Shaw's guilty pleas, even though they were not entered at an early date. A guilty plea is an indication of remorse. His guilty pleas spared

many people from testifying and having to relive the trauma of that day in court, especially his two daughters and Mrs. McCracken. In addition, the guilty pleas bring a finality to the matter, more so than after a trial. Trial verdicts in murder trials are often appealed; an appeal lengthens the judicial process before family, friends, and the community have that finality they seek. The guilty pleas in these circumstances brings finality today.

2. Mr. Shaw had no prior criminal record when he committed the offences at age 61.
3. Mr. Shaw's health history.

[40] Of these, I place the greatest weight on his guilty pleas and much lesser weight on the other two factors.

[41] The aggravating factors are much more numerous:

1. The aggravated assault upon Mr. Boudreau followed Mr. Shaw murdering his estranged wife at her new home. This offence occurred in the context of intimate partner violence; and Mr. Boudreau was merely attempting to aid Ms. Honchaiyaphum when he was first shot.
2. Mr. Boudreau was shot at his new home, and the offence was committed in front of his friend, an innocent bystander.
3. Mr. Shaw shot Mr. Boudreau six times and then continued to chase him down to inflict more harm when Mr. Boudreau and Mr. Frampton tried to flee. Mr. Shaw shot Mr. Boudreau in the second location where he fled for safety.

4. The number of shots Mr. Shaw fired at 24 Harper Street as well as in the area. These actions demonstrate his complete indifference to the safety of any other person in the area.
5. Mr. Shaw did not stop but continued to the home of Mr. McCracken where Mr. Shaw murdered Mr. McCracken, his second murder in approximately 15 minutes.
6. Mr. McCracken was murdered in his own home, a place where he should have been safe, and in front of his wife. The trauma Mrs. McCracken continues to experience today was evident from her victim impact statement as well as her reaction in the courtroom when Exhibit 30, the audiotape from the event, was played.
7. Mr. Shaw murdered Mr. McCracken for some perceived slight in the past and/or because Mr. McCracken laughed at Mr. Shaw.
8. This murder was not related in any way to the murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum. This is a very different factor than seen in most of the other multiple murder cases, where the victims are related.
9. Again, Mr. Shaw continued his criminal activity by going to the Carreau home, some 10 kilometres away, and shooting it up until he was arrested by the police.
10. The shooting of the firearms at 24 Harper Street and area, and the Carreau residence demonstrates a high level of gratuitous violence.
11. Mr. Shaw's criminal acts only ended because he was arrested by the RCMP.

12. The trauma he caused to so many individuals as well as the Town of Faro as a whole.

[42] While the gravity of these two offences and Mr. Shaw's moral blameworthiness are very high, I am unable to accede to the Crown's submission to impose the maximum period of parole ineligibility on Mr. Shaw as well as the maximum sentence for aggravated assault on Mr. Boudreau. First, Mr. Shaw is not the worst offender. In addition, I find that his guilty pleas, albeit late, are entitled to weight as a mitigating factor. From the case authorities provided by both counsel, as well as the above aggravating factors, I find the range of parole ineligibility for the murder of Mr. McCracken to be in the 20-year or 20-year plus range, primarily because he committed two unrelated murders in a 15-minute time period. However, due to Mr. Shaw's guilty pleas, I set the period of parole ineligibility at 17½ years.

[43] Lastly, I turn to the aggravated assault sentence. The cases of *R v Harrison*, 2024 ONSC 3272, and *R v Tuel*, 2023 YKSC 73, set the range for sentencing in this case, 7 to 11 years. I find Mr. Shaw's moral blameworthiness to be very high, as is the gravity of the offence, because of:

1. the number of shots Mr. Shaw fired at Mr. Boudreau and the life threatening and life altering injuries he caused him;
2. the fact he continued to actively pursue Mr. Boudreau and inflict more harm on him after Mr. Boudreau attempted to leave; and
3. this aggravated assault occurred in the context of intimate partner violence, a form of violence that must be deterred.

[44] Thus, taking into account Mr. Shaw's guilty plea, I sentence Mr. Shaw to 10 years' imprisonment.

Sentence

[45] In conclusion, Mr. Shaw, first, I sentence you to life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for 25 years for the murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum.

[46] Second, I sentence you to life imprisonment with no eligibility for parole for 17½ years for the murder of Mr. McCracken. The law requires this sentence run concurrently to the sentence I have imposed for the first-degree murder of Ms. Honchaiyaphum.

[47] Third, I sentence you to 10 years for aggravated assault upon Mr. Boudreau. Again, the law requires that this sentence run concurrently to the two periods of life imprisonment I have sentenced you to for the two murders.

[48] Lastly, I make these ancillary orders:

1. there will be DNA samples taken, in that all three offences are primary designated offences under the *Criminal Code*, and this is a mandatory order;
2. there is a weapons prohibition order pursuant to s. 109(2)(a);
3. in light of Mr. Shaw' circumstances, I am waiving the victim fine surcharges; and
4. a copy of these reasons will be forwarded to the Correctional Service of Canada pursuant to s. 743.2.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[49] MS. LAURIE: So, under s. 109(1), that is the section that dictates that a prohibition order is mandatory and then the duration of the order for a first offence, which is the case, is specified in 109(2).

[50] THE COURT: Yes.

[51] MS. LAURIE: And 109(2)(a) says that for those types of firearms and weapons appearing in that section it is 10 years.

[52] THE COURT: You are right, (a) is 10 years for the rifle; and (b) is dealing with the handgun, which is life.

[53] MS. LAURIE: Yes, but it is actually because the weapons prohibition order is imposed because of what was done with the rifle and the handgun. However, it applies to a broader category. So, Mr. Shaw, per 109(2)(a), shall be prohibited for a period of 10 years from possessing any firearm other than a prohibited firearm or restricted firearm, et cetera.

[54] THE COURT: Yes. And then he is further prohibited for life for any prohibited firearms, restricted firearms, et cetera.

[55] MS. LAURIE: Yes, that's correct.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[56] MR. DROLET: Your Honour, my friend advised that the Crown would be seeking an endorsement on the warrants of committal prohibiting Mr. Shaw from contacting certain individuals. We'd ask that that be dealt with. The remaining matters are more procedural in nature and Mr. Shaw could then be excused and I can appear for him, but the prohibition should be made while he is still present.

[57] MS. LAURIE: So, this would be a non-communication order while Mr. Shaw is in custody pursuant to s. 743.21. The names, Your Honour, are, that Mr. Shaw should be prohibited from contact with: Barbara McCracken, Monique Larocque-Michell, Kara Went, Tyler Frampton, Deborah Carreau, Joseph Gilbert Boudreau, Bertrand Roussin-Provencher, Lorri-Anne Michell-Ayotte., T.S., and S.S.

[58] MR. DROLET: Those orders are consented to by Mr. Shaw. He agrees that they are appropriate. My friends and I had discussed that the prohibition on contact or communication with Mr. Shaw' daughters should be except as initiated by them.

[59] THE COURT: I agree.

[60] MR. DROLET: Very unlikely, but best to address it now.

[61] THE COURT: No, I think that that is the best way of dealing with it.

[62] That order will go. It gives the two girls control over their life.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[63] MR. LEMON: Another order I'd ask Your Honour to make is an order permitting the RCMP to destroy both firearms, ammunition, and accessories related to the pistol and the rifle, just out of an abundance of caution after the expiration of 30 days.

[64] MR. DROLET: That's consented.

[65] THE COURT: That order will go as well. So, it is for the two firearms: the rifle and the handgun, all of the ammunition, and accessories.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[66] MR. LEMON: It's going to deal with some property that was seized. I have already asked for a separate order for the destruction of the firearms. Those are the ones used — anything used and seized during the commission of the offences. But I'll also ask, as part of this order, that the prescription medication seized from the Family Hotel be destroyed.

[67] The balance of this order will be the release of all seized exhibits and property — authorizing the RCMP to release all exhibits and seized property to their rightful owner and, if not claimed within 90 days, to destroy anything that has not been — that they may destroy anything that has not been returned to the owner.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[68] There's some other property, maybe not of great value, but it could be sold. It has some value. Mr. Shaw has designated Mrs. McCracken to receive that as sort of a restitution — or anyone designated in writing by her could go to the RCMP and get it.

[69] Anybody who can establish by this release or whatever that they're the rightful owner, the RCMP will release it to them.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[70] We'll make it 60 days, if that's okay to the Court, and then the RCMP are authorized that they may destroy it.

[DISCUSSIONS]

[71] THE COURT: That order will go.

HUGHES J.

APPENDIX A

R v B(D), 1997 CarswellBC 1502

R v Bennight, 2012 BCCA 461

R v Chizanga, 2024 ONCA 545

R v Douglas, 2007 ABCA 321

R v Edgar, [1988] YJ No 11

R v Geetah, 2015 NUCJ 10

R v Harrison, 2024 ONSC 3272

R v Itturiligaq, 2020 NUCA 6

R v Machell, 2003 BCCA 688

R v McCotter, 2014 BCCA 27

R v MTP, 2004 BCCA 264

R v Mucpa, 2022 NUCJ 25

R v Mucpa, 2024 NUCA 15

R v Nash, 2009 NBCA 7

R v Omar, 2018 ONCA 975

R v Omar, 2019 SCC 32

R v Ookowt, 2020 NUCA 5

R v Rushton, 2000 YTCA 5

R v Ryan, 2015 ABCA 286

R v Salehi, 2022 BCCA 1

R v Tuel, 2023 YKSC 73

R v Wareing, 2024 BCSC 1985

R v Willis, 2024 NSSC 222

R v Yalahow, 2024 ABKB 328