Discrept blow.

Canada

PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

In the Provincial Court of British Columbia

(BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE R. G. FABBRO)

No. 3189 C

Nakusp, B.C. 31 May 2000

REGINA

- V -

WILFRIED HINRICH KRUSE

and

JOCELYN RUTH KRUSE

PROCEEDINGS AT

SENTENCING

APPEARANCES:

Robert G. P. Brown, Stanley J. Tessmer, for the Federal Crown for the Defence

10:PR4 R23 33PT

בים, כמם ים

200 09:01 FROM: TESSMER LAW OFFICES 7623163

FORM/FORMULAIRE 2 PCR 004 O REV/REV. 12/88

INSH IMBIA

INFORMATION/DÉNONCIATION

3189C

COURT FILE NUMBER
NUMERO DE DOSSIER DE LA COUR

POLICE FILE NUMBER
NUMERO DE PROCES-VERBAL

98NAK-717-5

ADA: PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
PROVINCE DE LA COLOMBIE-BRITANNIQUE

Is the information of/Les présentes constituent la dénonciation de

of/de

(the "informant"/le "dénonciateur") Nakusp, British Columbia

informant says that he has reasonable and probable grounds to believe and does believe that/Le dénonciateur déclare qu'il a des se raisonnables et probables de croire et croit effectivement que

COUNT 1

Wilfried Hinrich KRUSE and Jocelyn Ruth KRUSE, on or about the 12th day of April, 1999, at or near Edgewood, in the Province of British Columbia, did UNLAWFULLY produce a controlled substance, to wit: Cannabis (Marihuana)

CONTRARY TO SECTION 7(1) OF THE CONTROLLED DRUGS AND SUBSTANCES ACT.

COUNT 2

Wilfried Hinrich KRUSE and Jocelyn Ruth KRUSE, on or about the 12th day of April, 1999, at or near Edgewood, in the Province of British Columbia, did UNLAWFULLY have in his possession a prohibited weapon, to wit: a P. 38 Handgun, Serial # 8412,

CONTRARY TO SECTION 90(1) OF THE CRIMINAL CODE.

COUNT 3

Wilfried Hinrich KRUSE and Jocelyn Ruth KRUSE, on or about the 12th day of April, 1999, at or near Edgewood, in the Province of British Columbia, did without lawful excuse store, or display a firearm, to wit: a P. 38 Handgun, Serial # 8412, in an unsecured manner,

CONTRARY TO SECTION 86(3) OF THE CRIMINAL CODE AND SECTION 4(1) OF THE STORAGE, DISPLAY, HANDLING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF CERTAIN FIREARMS REGULATIONS, P.C. 1992-1659.

AN BEFORE ME/ASSERMENTE DEVANT MOI

Wan 320

19 7

Prikate Columbia/Colombia-Britannique

(Sphature of informent/Signature lou d

CONFIRMED/

of the Peace in and for the Province of British Columbia

A Justice of the Peace in and for the Province of British Columbia Juge de paiz dans et pour le province de la Calombie-Britishnique Circumstances

47

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Tessmer. MR. TESSMER: Yes, Your Honour, we are here on the Kruse 1 matter. As a result of lengthy discussions with my 2 learned colleague and my clients, Mr. Wilfried 3 Kruse is now wishing to change his plea to the 4 charge of production of cannabis from a plea of not 5 guilty to a plea of guilty, and I have instructions 6 7 That is correct, Mr. Kruse? to do that. 8 That's correct. THE ACCUSED: 9 All right. MR. TESSMER: 10 THE COURT: That's Count --11 MR. TESSMER: Count 1. -- Count 1 of the Information. Mr. Brown? 12 THE COURT: 13 MR. BROWN: Yes, the facts are that --MR. TESSMER: Are you going to stay something? 14 MR. BROWN: Yes, I am going to -- if that plea of guilty 15 16 is accepted. I'll be directing a stay of 17 proceedings against the female accused, and the other charges against both; that is Counts 2 and 3, 18 19 and that's assuming you accept the plea. 20 THE COURT: Go ahead with the circumstances. Yes, on April 12th of last year, Nakusp 21 MR. BROWN: R.C.M.P., a team, did execute on a search warrant, 22 and they did find a hydroponic grow operation at 23 the residence of Mr. Kruse. The grow was located 24 in a detached shed, one part of the grow; and a 25 second part annexed to the residence itself. There 26 are just over five hundred plants, of which -- five 27 28 hundred plants --MR. TESSMER: Three hundred were at one to seven inches. 29 MR. BROWN: Three hundred of those plants were what 30 31 height? 32 MR. TESSMER: One to seven inches tall. MR. BROWN: One to seven inches tall. This is a fully 33 hydroponic grow operation with a two tank -- tanks, 34 approximately thirteen one thousand watt grow amp 35 lamps, blowers and timers -- a fully hydroponic 36 grow operation. Those are the key facts the Crown 37 38 is relying on. THE COURT: Any quarrel with those circumstances, Mr. 39 40 Tessmer? None, except for the use of the word, 41 "Hydroponic." Hydroponic denotes a grow that --MR. TESSMER: 42 where the plants are grown without soil, and that 43 the nutrients are provided through -- in a water 44 tube situation to the roots, but other than that, 45 it was an indoor marijuana grow, but not a 46

43

44

45

46

47

Submissions by Mr. Tessmer

hydroponic grow. Other than that, no quarrel. THE COURT: Okay. 2 MR. BROWN: On sentencing, I simply invite the court to 3 mark the photo booklet, which was marked in the 4 voir dire, but in terms of the grow operation --5 6 THE COURT: Yes. MR. BROWN: -- as qualified by my friend, the bottom 7 line is that the photos speak for themselves in 8 terms of the level of sophistication. I believe 9 they do speak for themselves. 10 THE COURT: I will direct that Exhibit B, then, in the 11 voir dire, will become Exhibit 1 in this sentencing 12 proceeding. 13 I'm sorry, Your Honour, is (indiscernible)? 14 THE CLERK: I've got it here. THE COURT: 15 B? THE CLERK: 16 17 THE COURT: THE CLERK: Okay. 18 THE COURT: I'll need it, yes. 19 THE CLERK: 20 Okay. THE COURT: I've got it. Okay. 21 THE CLERK: Thank you. 22 23 BLUE DUO TANG WITH TABLE OF CONTENTS EXHIBIT 1 -24 1-56 AND 56 COLOURED PHOTOGRAPHS -25 FORMERLY EXHIBIT B ON THE VOIR DIRE 26 27 MR. TESSMER: Can I go first? 28 MR. BROWN: Yes, just one other matter. The Crown is 29 not alleging a record. 30 MR. TESSMER: No. Mr. Kruse has no record whatsoever, 31 Your Honour. He is forty-eight years old. Now, 32 just by way of a background, and I see the officers 33 are sitting here in court, and so I want to take 34 this opportunity to let them know why Mr. Kruse 35 pled not guilty to this, and that is not because of 36 a lack of remorse or regret for his actions, but 37 because we thought there were some serious issues 38 that would be litigated here, pursuant to the 39 Charter of Rights, and ordinarily when police 40 officers conduct a search under the Controlled 41 Drugs and Substance Act, or any other act that

allows for a search, there is -- property is not to

to allow the search to be conducted, and things are

be damaged, unnecessarily, but only to the extent

taken, they are not to be damaged, and ordinarily

not to be (indiscernible), and if they are not

. 9

Submissions by Mr. Tessmer

> if a search warrant authorizes the seizure of score sheets, and we all know what those are, then you are not to seize wallets and other documents that are not authorized.

> And in this case, as well, there were some serious concerns because the major incident flowchart does not indicate anywhere in it who located what, or where, or when, and that is a huge problem when it comes to finding out who searched what, and who seized what. In this case, for instance, the photos that the defence put in showed that there was a search conducted of the kitchen, and yet no officer has admitted conducting a search of the kitchen.

As well, a number of pots were dumped out and seized, and they don't appear -- only some of them appear beyond the flowchart, so I appreciate that Mr. Kruse is pleading guilty, at this point, but I make these comments because in the defence's submission there was a number of serious issues with respect to the manner in which the search was conducted in this case.

Mr. Kruse is forty-eight years old. He is a landed immigrant who came from Germany in 1991, after vacationing in the Nelson area in 1988 and meeting his future wife, Jocelyn. After meeting her, when he was travelling here they went back and lived together in Germany for a year and a half, and the steps were taken so that Wilfried could immigrate to Canada. They came here, both together, then, and resided in the Nelson area for a number of months and then moved to Edgewood, where they have resided ever since.

Now, Mr. Kruse works for the Ministry of Transportation and Highways in the Marine Branch, and he is -- in that capacity he is a -- he operates the ferries that go across -- the Needles-Fauquier ferry -- Fauquier, I suppose it's pronounced -- Arrow Park, the Galena, and the Shelter Bay ferries.

In the summertime, he is what's called a longterm auxiliary. In the summertime he is very, very, busy. In the wintertime, it's part-time hours. He is a graduate of the Ship's College in North Vancouver and also the Ship's College in Hamburg, in Germany. He has -- is what is called a Canadian Master-Minor Water Ticket, the Home Trade

Submissions by Mr. Tessmer

Master Ticket, and the Foreign Going Mate's Ticket, so he is a seaman plain and simple.

Now, through his wife, and illnesses close to home, his father suffered from Parkinson's disease and his wife's sister suffered from cancer, the Kruses became aware of the therapeutic value and the medicinal value of cannabis, and they were ahead of the politicians, it seems, and started to help people who needed cannabis, medically.

I note that Section 56 of the Controlled Drugs and Substance Act recognizes that people may be exempted from that act, if they need one of the Schedule II substances for medical purposes, but although that exception was there, there was no process available for somebody who needed a Schedule II substance to obtain that. There was no source, and nor was there any way to get a license. My client advises that he tried — they tried to obtain a license for this, but there was no process available to obtain such a license. My client is now going through the process of applying — part of a group that's applying, along with the ex-mayor of Grand Forks, to be licensed as a supplier of marijuana to Health Canada.

Now, having said that, my client recognizes that his compassion for others ought to have been tempered by patience in the -- patience for the law and the politicians to catch up with what medical science is now understanding, and he ought to have waited and not attempted to do this without having a license to do it.

My clients applied to the <u>Universal Compassion</u>
Club, and that -- rather, that was the purpose of
this crop that was growing, to supply to the
Universal Compassion Club in Calgary, a sister club
to the Vancouver Compassion Club, and of course
that marijuana was seized and never did make it to
its goal.

The plan was to have this product analyzed by a professor, a scientist from the University of Calgary, to determine the THC level, so that that could be monitored, and so that people dying of cancer, people with MS, Parkinson's disease, glaucoma and the like, who need the product could have a steady and consistent uncontaminated source, because that's a great concern of people, is getting a source that's not been contaminated with

Submissions by Mr. Brown

fertilizers and the like, so they -- my client, as

I say, is completely remorseful.

He recognizes that he ought to have taken steps differently. Now, he's had this over his head now for some fourteen -- I guess it's about fourteen, fifteen months, and has discontinued that activity, of course. He is remorseful and regrets the breach of the law. All the items were seized and, as well, boxes of items were seized that were in fact not being used. My client consents to the forfeiture of the paraphernalia associated with the growing of marijuana.

This was not -- although the size of it makes it clear it was not for personal use, this was not an operation that was motivated by greed, but was motivated by altruism to help fellow man and women

who faced dire medical situations.

In these unusual circumstances, it's my respectful submission that the appropriate discharge is a conditional discharge. My client, aside from his love of his fellow man, also has a love of animals, and if Your Honour sees fit to order community work service to be done, he would ask that he be permitted to perform that work service at the S.P.C.A., locally, and in Edgewood, and that he be permitted to do those hours in the off-season when he has some free time to do some community. Those are my respectful submissions.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Given that it's clearly a commercial grow in nature -- you know, these plants can yield easily three ounces in a controlled environment -- three ounces of plant, clearly it's commercial in nature, and because of that, I can't agree to the suggestion for a discharge. It's certainly therefore Your Honour's consideration, but I can't agree in this type of grow operation.

I do acknowledge that there were two issues evolving in the trial that you can consider, certainly. There was an issue with respect to Section 10(b) that the Crown had to address, and I was confident we could address it to the court's satisfaction, but I can see there certainly was an

issue my friend was developing.

There was an issue on this Section 8 matter that I think is significant, I concede, but again I was confident that the court could consider the

Reasons for Sentence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Crown's case with respect to that. The pictures that my friend had marked, indicate the magnitude of the Section 8 issue, and in particular the manner of search, and certainly that was there, and certainly there's -- it is for Your Honour to say that they could raise the issue.

In the end, I didn't find the particular complaints of -- certainly individually taken, as being an open and shut application for exclusion. The bottom line is, though, that there were issues that the guilty plea does foreclose and end, and that should be recognized, I concede. So, to go back to my original point, there is no criminal record, but the nature of the grow, the pictures that depict -- that are before you, I have indicated my position because of the nature of the grow.

Anything more, Mr. Tessmer? THE COURT:

MR. TESSMER: No, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Thank you. Would your client please come --

MR. TESSMER: Stand up, please, Wilfried.

THE COURT: -- and stand before the court?

William (sic) Hinrich Kruse, you have pled guilty today, through your counsel, to a charge of production of cannabis marijuana on Information 3189C. Yesterday, and partly today, and on a previous day, we were conducting a voir dire with regard to a Charter application to exclude evidence in respect to alleged breaches, pursuant to Section 8, 10, and 24(2) of the Charter. There may have been other sections that the defence may have been advancing.

In any event, there is no further need now to proceed on that voir dire. You have directed your counsel, today, to enter a guilty plea to the charge that I have just mentioned. You are fortyeight years of age. You have no criminal record.

I have heard the background of your coming to Canada, your employment in this community, and your counsel has explained to the court that this activity, illegal as it is, had a medical purpose, and it was the Universal Compassion Centre in Calgary that would have been the recipient of the drugs in question.

There is a decision of our court called Regina v. Marcus Richardson, a decision of the Honourable Judge Paradis, who has dealt with this Reasons for Sentence

1 2

issue, and has referred to a number of other cases. In that decision, he made a number of findings that I am satisfied I can make in this case before me.

He was satisfied that the accused in that case was in possession of the drug for the purpose of providing the Compassion Club Society of British Columbia with a quantity of marijuana. He found that the marijuana would have been beneficial and would have addressed a number of medical concerns. He referred to a number of other cases, two cases in Ontario where the courts have acknowledged that.

While governments have responded to this area in providing exemption under Section 56, and seem to be embarking on legislation and in arrangements which would give effect to the ability of these clubs to find a source of marijuana for medical purposes, they did not and have not, yet, it appears, address the fact that there has to be a source of the drug available to these clubs. I understand that they are now proceeding in that area, and so these clubs cannot secure a source without the involvement of other people.

Additionally, in this case, there is no evidence to suggest that you were involved in the production of this drug for any other purpose. The Crown is opposed to the granting of a discharge and says that this was a large commercial operation. It was commercial in the sense it was large. There is no indication, here, that there was any financial benefit accruing back to you, there is no evidence of that, so what we have here is a sophisticated indoor grow operation.

I am satisfied that it was conducted for the purposes of providing a source of marijuana for a purpose that even government accepts. Now, your mistake, sir, was that you went ahead before ensuring that the government permitted this conduct to take place. I won't argue that you acted out of compassion, nevertheless, you have to respect the

The police are obligated to enforce the law and undertake the procedures that are necessary to this enforcement. This area, as you know, is an area of particular difficulty with regard to grow operations. The police are under a lot of pressure to deal with this problem, and did so, in this case.

Reasons for Sentence

From what I have heard about your personal circumstances, you came from Germany and settled here. You have employment here. I am satisfied it would be in your interest to grant a discharge. The act provides, though, that the discharge can only be granted if it's not against the public interest.

Clearly, this kind of offence, but for the purpose for which you were producing the drug, would bring a very strong deterrent sentence, and that is the question that I have to address. I am satisfied in this case, because of the underlying medical reason for the production of the drug, that a discharge is open to me for consideration.

It's not a small moment here that in this case there were a number of constitutional issues with regard to the manner in which the search warrant was obtained, and the manner in which it was executed. Those issues need not be considered further.

The Crown were not prepared to concede for a moment that the police had acted improperly, or that they had done anything wrong in the manner that they proceeded, but your guilty plea today has brought an end to that further deliberation.

Mr. Justice Ferris (phonetic) in Regina v. Fallofield, when they first dealt with discharges in our Court of Appeal, said that even for offences that require a deterrent sentence -- a general deterrent sentence -- it is open to the court to judicially impose a discharge.

I am satisfied here that because of your personal background, because of the findings that I have made with regard for the purpose for which this operation was conducted, that it is in your interest, and not against the public interest, that you be granted a conditional charge, and I grant such a discharge upon your entering into a probation order for a period of one year.

The conditions of the probation will be that you keep the peace and be of good behaviour, and that you report to the court when required to do so, by the court.

I am going to order that you perform fifty hours of community work service. That work will be donated to the S.P.C.A., locally, and in Edgewood, and it will be performed during the off-season, and

Reasons for Sentence

I suggest that that be done between say September 15th and March 15th of -- September 15, 2000, and March of 2001.

Furthermore, quite contrary to the issue that arose in the <u>Richardson</u> decision, in this case you take no issue with regard to the drug paraphernalia in question, and accordingly the drug paraphernalia that the Crown has seized, will forfeit to the Crown.

I understand that a weapon was seized and found by one of the officers conducting the investigation. That will forfeit to the Crown for ultimate destruction.

I am obliged to impose on you, because of the plea that you have entered today, a prohibition of your right to possess any firearms, ammunition, or explosive substance, including other items named under -- I think it's Section 109, is not?

MR. BROWN: It is.

THE COURT: Section 109 of the Criminal Code, and that will be for a period of ten years. I will give you sixty days to lawfully dispose of any of those items named in that section to a bona fide purchaser for value, and if not, then to be turned over to the R.C.M.P. for their possession an destruction as they see fit.

I should say that this sentence is imposed because of the very unique circumstances that underlie the production of this illegal drug, and that it is for that reason, primarily, although I have mentioned other reasons in my decision, for the granting of the discharge in this case. It can be said that the continuation of this trial would have gone on for some time, and the issues are now resolved. Is there anything more you are seeking, Mr. Brown, in regard to the terms of the probation?

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honour. All the forfeiture orders
I would be seeking, you have made, and the
mandatory prohibition has been made.

MR. TESSMER: That doesn't need to be supervised, does it, or -- or can we -- or I don't know if they need to be supervised?

THE COURT: I think you will have to report to a probation officer in Nakusp, here, within seven days and report thereafter as directed. For the purposes of completing the community work service that will have to be supervised.

10 Reasons for Sentence

MR. TESSMER: Okay. And then any reporting comes to an 1 end once the fifty hours is --THE COURT: Yes. And I guess I will also have to 2 consider a victim fine surcharge, which in this 3 case I believe would be fifty -- is it fifty 4 5 dollars? 6 MR. BROWN: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Any position on that? 8 MR. TESSMER: How much is it? 9 Fifty. THE COURT: 10 Fifty? MR. TESSMER: 11 MR. BROWN: Yes, because it's not a monetary (indiscernible) therefore it's (indiscernible). 12 MR. TESSMER: Is it fifty dollars if there's no monitor? 13 MR. BROWN: Yes, or he can dispense if there's --14 MR. TESSMER: Well, I'd ask you to dispense with that, 15 Your Honour. My clients have been through a great 16 deal of expense in bringing the issues that we 17 thought were important to be brought to the court's 18 19 attention. That's really a financial consideration, and 20 THE COURT: I have not heard any -- anything more you want to 21 say about that? It's a question of hardship. 22 MR. TESSMER: Well, they have divested themselves of all 23 their disposal income in retaining me to be here 24 25 for them. In light of that, I will direct that there 26 be no fine surcharge in the circumstances and, Mr. THE COURT: 27 Brown, you are going to deal with the other matters 28 29 or have you -- the other counts? The other counts I am directing a stay 30 MR. BROWN: Yes. of proceedings. In particular, I am directing a 31 stay -- against both accused, Count 2, I am .32 directing a stay; Count 3, both accused; and I am 33 directing a stay of proceedings, Count 1, against 34 Jocelyn Kruse, the production charge against the --35 36 against her. MR. TESSMER: How about all those books I gave 37 everybody? Can I have those back, because no doubt 38 those cases will come in handy another time. Do 39 40 you need yours? 41 Were they filed --MR. TESSMER: No, we didn't file them as exhibits. THE COURT: 42 THE COURT: Well, they can be returned to counsel, then. 43 44 MR. BROWN: Oh, sure. 45 THE COURT: Thank you, both. 46 MR. TESSMER: Thank you, Your Honour. 47

Proceedings Concluded

THE COURT: Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)

12 June 2000/gel

1 2

3 4

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a complete and accurate transcript of the evidence recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability.

G. E. Lermo, Transcriber for Echo Services Ltd.