

*Case Name:*  
**R. v. Singh**

**Between**  
**Regina, and**  
**Manmeet Singh**

[2013] B.C.J. No. 1632

2013 BCSC 1336

2013 CarswellBC 2270

108 W.C.B. (2d) 162

Docket: X075906-3

Registry: New Westminster

British Columbia Supreme Court  
New Westminster, British Columbia

**M.A. Maisonville J.**

Heard: June 10, 2013.

Oral judgment: June 21, 2013.

(67 paras.)

*Criminal law -- Sentencing -- Criminal Code offences -- Offences against person and reputation -- Homicide -- Second degree murder -- Particular sanctions -- Imprisonment -- Parole ineligibility -- Prohibition orders -- Firearms -- DNA sample -- Sentencing considerations -- Aggravating factors -- Mitigating factors -- Submissions -- Joint submissions -- Victim impact statements -- No previous record -- Guilty plea -- Remorse -- Seriousness of offence -- Domestic abuse -- Age of accused -- Sentencing of Singh for second degree murder -- Victim was Singh's estranged wife -- Victim impact statement revealed loss to victim's family -- Mitigating factors were no prior record, guilty plea, youth, remorse and rehabilitation efforts -- Aggravating factors were premeditated and brutal nature of crime against spouse, Singh's belief he was entitled to take revenge on spouse, crime committed in public and second person injured -- Singh's upbringing in patriarchal India not*

*mitigating factor -- Joint submission appropriate -- Singh sentenced to life imprisonment, 16 years' parole ineligibility, DNA order and lifetime weapons prohibition -- Criminal Code, ss. 235, 718 and 745.*

Sentencing of Singh for second degree murder. Singh attended at the workplace of his estranged wife and stabbed her to death in a brutal attack which also injured a second individual who attempted to intervene. Singh pled guilty to second degree murder which carried a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment. The issue for sentencing was the appropriate period of parole ineligibility. A joint submission proposed a period of parole ineligibility of 16 years. A victim impact statement revealed the extent of the loss suffered by the victim's family. The mitigating factors were Singh's lack of a prior criminal record, guilty plea, youth, remorse and efforts at rehabilitation. The aggravating factors were the fact that the crime took place in the context of a spousal relationship, the brutal nature of the crime which was carried out with considerable forethought, Singh's personal belief that he was entitled to take revenge on his spouse who wished to end their marriage, the fact that the crime was committed in a public place and the fact that a second person was injured while trying to assist the victim. Singh's upbringing in India where woman were considered to be unequal to men was not a mitigating factor.

HELD: Singh was sentenced to life imprisonment, 16 years' parole ineligibility, a lifetime weapons prohibition and a DNA order. The joint submission was comparable to sentences imposed in similar cases and would not bring the administration of justice into disrepute. Sentence: Life imprisonment; 16 years' parole ineligibility; DNA order; lifetime weapons prohibition -- Criminal Code, s. 235.

**Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:**

Corrections and Conditional Release Act, S.C. 1992, c. 20,

Criminal Code of Canada, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 109, s. 235, s. 487.051, s. 718, s. 718.2(a), s. 745, s. 745.01, s. 745.6

**Counsel:**

Counsel for the Crown: C. McPherson and R. Khangura.

Counsel for the Accused: B. Mohan and S. Kalkat.

**Reasons for Sentence**

**1 M.A. MAISONVILLE J.** (orally):-- On June 10, 2013, Manmeet Singh pleaded guilty to the

second degree murder of Ravinder Kaur Bhangu. At the hearing of this matter, the Crown read to the Court the Agreed Facts for Sentencing.

**2** On July 28, 2011, Mr. Singh brutally murdered his estranged wife, Ravinder Kaur Bhangu. At about 7:00 o'clock that morning, Ms. Bhangu had gone to work as an administrative assistant at the Sach di Awaaz Punjabi language newspaper located in Surrey, British Columbia. She worked at that newspaper three days a week.

**3** At approximately 11:30 a.m., Mr. Singh walked into the office where Ms. Bhangu was working alongside other employees. He had brought three weapons: a Rapala filet knife, a Starfrit knife, and a Fiskars hatchet. Five other employees were working there at the time: Mr. Vijay Kapoor; Khushpal Gill; Narinder Nayar; Mr. Gurnam Sanghera; and Ms. Shallu Sapple.

**4** Mr. Singh entered and immediately approached the victim, Ms. Bhangu, who was seated at her desk. She was struck in the head at least twice with the Fiskars hatchet. The blows were of such a force that they caused her skull to crack. She tried to defend herself by raising her arms. Mr. Singh then dropped the hatchet and produced the Starfrit knife, stabbing Ms. Bhangu repeatedly in the torso and limbs including wounds to her trunk, her heart, lung, liver, spleen, trachea, and kidney. She also suffered a gaping wound at the front of her neck. Her carotid artery, jugular veins, trachea and esophagus were transected in the attack.

**5** While he was committing this savage and brutal attack, Mr. Singh told the others present she was his wife; she was unfaithful to him and she cheated on him. Both Gurnam Sanghera and Mr. Narinder Nayar tried to intervene and help during the attack. Mr. Singh struck Mr. Nayar on the shoulder with the hatchet when he tried to save Ms. Bhangu. At this time they left and on the request of Mr. Singh, 9-1-1 was called by Mr. Kapoor.

**6** When the RCMP arrived at the scene, the 9-1-1 call was still taking place. Mr. Singh was still holding the Starfrit knife, standing next to his wife's body when the police arrived. Officers ordered him to the ground and he was arrested for murder.

**7** Mr. Singh used the Starfrit knife and the hatchet to commit the murder which, when retrieved on Ms. Bhangu's body, were covered with blood. Later, the police executed a search warrant on his home and found the receipt for the Rapala filet knife not used in the attack but brought there by Mr. Singh. Video surveillance taken from the Canadian Tire Store disclosed Mr. Singh purchasing the hatchet on July 12th of that same year.

**8** Following the attack and after asking someone to call 9-1-1, Mr. Singh did not leave. He waited there for the police to arrive. He has remained in custody and was seen by a psychiatrist whose report was tendered into evidence.

**9** I am told in the weeks leading to the guilty plea, after a review of all evidence, that counsel has arrived at a joint submission on sentence.

**10** It is important to note at the outset that this plea is to second degree murder. Second degree murder carries a sentence of life imprisonment. While there may be an application made for parole, there is absolutely no guarantee that such parole will be granted and the sentence remains life. Parole ineligibility, however, sets the earliest period at which a person may try to make such an application which again, it is to be emphasized, does not mean that parole will be granted.

### **THE VICTIM RAVINDER KAUR BHANGU**

**11** Only 23 years old at the time of her death, she was a lovely and talented young woman. Ms. Bhangu was born in India and newly immigrated to Canada. Ms. Bhangu was part of a troupe of dancers. She herself was a talented dancer. In addition, she was educated, having spent time at college in India. She had family in India, a mother, father, and brother that loved her and cared for her very much. They supported her in her move to Canada thinking that she was embarking on a better life where she could achieve all her dreams and lead a full life. She wanted to work here and had started her job as an administrative assistant at the newspaper where she worked three days a week.

### **VICTIM IMPACT STATEMENT**

**12** Ms. Bhangu's family were unable to travel to Canada from India where they live. On their behalf, however, was entered a victim impact statement revealing the extent of their loss of their beautiful caring daughter and sister. For her parents, who raised her with love and affection and ensured her good education, when they were told of the news of their daughter's murder, their world came crashing down around them. Their lives are forever changed and they cannot but help but think of the pain endured by their daughter in her last moments. They state: "We miss our daughter with every breath we inhale". They speak to the Court of how the crime has further jolted the entire Punjabi community in Canada, raising doubts about the safety of other Indian daughters living miles away from the land where they say "remnants of feudal practices still bar them to lead a life full of self-respect". They continue: "Life shall always miss the sweet smile of our beautiful daughter. We might meet our daughter in the next birth. We pray for safe life of our daughters at foreign shores. We pray for her soul to rest in peace. We pray for justice".

**13** The background leading up to this tragic and senseless death of Ms. Bhangu was explained to the Court.

**14** Mr. Singh and Ms. Bhangu met in India while attending the same college. Ms. Bhangu as well as Mr. Singh were born and grew up there. Mr. Singh has a brother. Both his parents were in Court when submissions were made. Mr. Singh's father had been a police officer in Punjab, India. He immigrated to Canada in 2002 and took up residence in Surrey, British Columbia.

**15** Back in India, after meeting in college, Ms. Bhangu and Mr. Singh began a romance. Initially cautious, both families grew happy with the match and by the time Mr. Singh left to immigrate to Canada in early 2008, the couple were formally engaged. They were fully supportive of the match.

**16** When Mr. Singh arrived in Canada, he worked first as a labourer with a cabinet company as well as doing deliveries. He learned in the factory a bit of the craft as well. Ms. Bhangu and Mr. Singh stayed in contact daily by webcam and cell phone. He left the cabinet company to start work for a grocery store as a general labourer and stock person.

**17** While Mr. Singh became a permanent resident March 31, 2008, he never became a Canadian citizen. I note that not having Canadian citizenship status means he will be deported should he ever be allowed to be paroled.

**18** In November 2008 along with a number of members of his extended family, he travelled back to India. He and Ms. Bhangu were formally married in December in a happy, grand occasion and he stayed there with her until mid-February 2009 before he returned to Canada. He sponsored her to come from India and she arrived in August 2009. When she arrived, he rented a large basement suite with three bedrooms and three bathrooms. Ms. Bhangu seemed to be adjusting well and was happy. His family doted upon her and I am told are here in Court to show their respect and caring for her as well as to share in the sorrow of her family.

**19** Mr. Singh at this time was working for a window manufacturer and he worked installing windows for \$12.00 an hour working five to six days a week.

**20** Dr. Lamba, the psychiatrist seen by Mr. Singh. In his report, Dr. Lamba states that Mr. Singh told him that he did not want Ms. Bhangu to work outside of the home. His family however was supportive of her efforts to get work outside and indeed one of his aunts would show her ads that would be for jobs that she could apply for. Mr. Singh would go with her to the employers and fill out the application forms but in such a manner that she was sure not to get the job. She, however, did manage to get a position at Diversity, a group that helps new immigrants to Canada. This is reflective of her disposition to help others. She travelled back to India with Mr. Singh's grandmother within a few months of having first come to Canada and she stayed there with her parents until February 2010. She returned to Canada and stayed with Mr. Singh until February 2011 when, together with Mr. Singh, she travelled to India staying with her parents until mid-April. While there, Mr. Singh states he was introduced to an individual, Gurinder Singh, who was said to be part of the extended family.

**21** In April 2011, when they returned from India, Ms. Bhangu seemed distant and changed. They would spend their time at home in separate rooms, he watching television and she on her laptop. They decided a move further away from his family would help their relationship. They rented a suite from a family friend of Ms. Bhangu for which they were set to move in on May 1, 2011.

**22** Mr. Singh described to Dr. Lamba an incident in which his wife and he had a serious argument. She called her mother in India who advised her to leave and stay with her family friend and to take her passport and permanent resident card. She left and the next day returned with the family friend to gather her belongings. She then went to Denver for a cultural singing and dancing competition. When she returned, she went to live with her family friend. Mr. Singh called her and

asked her to move to their new home as they had planned, but she refused. She told him he could move there if he wanted but that she was not going to and that she wanted a divorce.

**23** At this time, he told Dr. Lamba that it was as if "the ground slipped away from underneath him". He was in a daze and did not understand what was occurring as he loved her more than he loved himself. He called his wife's parents and the family friend she was living with to learn why she had left but it became evident that the separation was final. He quit his job.

**24** As a child he had suffered two head injuries resulting in epilepsy. He quit taking his medication. He was preoccupied with trying to get back together with his wife. He did not sleep or eat. He would revisit places where they had gone together as a couple. He would sit at home and stare at her picture having imagined conversations with her. He had a constant death wish, I am told, and thought his life was over, that he was dead as he could not live without her.

**25** The morning of the murder he showered, then watched television with his grandmother who was listening to hymn singings and reading of the scripture Gurbani. He had a drink. He only slept intermittently the night before and then he decided that he would go to his wife's place of work and beg her to come back. That is not what happened. He instead brutally murdered his wife in circumstances where she had no possibility of escape.

#### **CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ACCUSED**

**26** Mr. Singh was born on September 24, 1984. He is now 28 years of age. He was 26 years of age at the time of the murder. His family has come to Court. Eighty-one letters of support were tendered to the Court. All speak of a quiet, kind individual and that they have difficulty understanding how this came about. He has no history of violence and no criminal record.

**27** His counsel, Mr. Mohan, urges the Court to consider in this matter Mr. Singh's upbringing in India where women are not equal to men, but he states adamantly this was not an "honour" killing but rather the actions of a man out of control, despondent and depressed. I will return to this submission.

**28** The sentence for a second degree murder is life in prison. The only issue before the Court in respect of Mr. Singh is the period to be set for parole ineligibility and that is whether the Court should accept a joint submission of Mr. McPherson for the Crown and Mr. Mohan for Mr. Singh of a 16-year period before Mr. Singh can apply for parole.

**29** Both parties, Mr. McPherson for the Crown and Mr. Mohan for the defence, acknowledge that the sentence for a second degree murder which must be imposed by the Court is a life sentence pursuant to s. 235 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*. It is further agreed that Mr. Singh had the requisite *mens rea*, a guilty mind, and that he committed the act resulting in Ravinder Bhangu's death. Again, the only issue before the Court is the period before which Mr. Singh will be eligible to apply for parole.

**30** Section 745 of the *Criminal Code* provides:

745. Subject to section 745.1, the sentence to be pronounced against a person who is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life shall be

...

(c) in respect of a person who has been convicted of second degree murder, that the person be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole until the person has served at least ten years of the sentence or such greater number of years, not being more than twenty-five years, as has been substituted therefor pursuant to section 745.4....

**31** The issue accordingly in plain English is the period of parole ineligibility to be considered for Mr. Singh. Both Mr. McPherson and Mr. Mohan concur in a joint submission to the Court that in the circumstances before the Court in the case at bar, a 16-year period before Mr. Singh can apply for parole is the appropriate measure for this Court.

**32** The Crown, Mr. McPherson, submits that the sentence that is appropriate in the circumstances, is that of life imprisonment and 16 years of parole ineligibility. He noted that there is no other provision for a sentence for second degree murder and that while the joint submission proposes that it be possible for an application for parole at a time period within the provisions of the *Criminal Code* in 16 years, that that is absolutely no guarantee that parole will be granted.

## **LEGAL PRINCIPLES**

**33** The *Criminal Code* dictates that the court pronouncing sentence must consider the following factors. Respecting the purpose and principles of sentencing the most important are those captured by s. 718 of the *Criminal Code* as set out by Parliament as follows:

718. The fundamental purpose of sentencing is to contribute, along with crime prevention initiatives, to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by imposing just sanctions that have one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) to denounce unlawful conduct;
- (b) to deter the offender and other persons from committing offences;
- (c) to separate offenders from society, where necessary;
- (d) to assist in rehabilitating offenders;
- (e) to provide reparations for harm done to victims or to the community; and

- (f) to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders, and acknowledgment of the harm done to victims and to the community.

**34** Additionally, the principle of parity is important. What that means is that the sentence should be similar to other sentences imposed on similar offenders for similar offences committed in like circumstances. As well, the Court must consider the personal circumstances of Mr. Singh.

**35** In addition, the *Criminal Code* in 718.2(a) requires this Court to consider any relevant aggravating or mitigating circumstances relating to the offender and the offence. I have reviewed some of those that have been particularly outlined to the Court.

**36** The decision in *R. v. Cerra*, 2004 BCCA 594, was cited to the Court for general principles applicable in such cases. Mr. Justice Donald for the majority of our Court of Appeal held:

It has often been said that sentencing is an individualized process and comparisons with other cases are difficult. But difficult as they may be, comparisons must be made when reviewing sentences for fitness. Patterns may emerge from an examination of sentencing decisions. I have discerned [continues Mr. Justice Donald] a pattern from the decisions of this Court suggesting in broad terms the following: parole eligibility greater than ten years is justified when there is some particularly aggravating feature. For a penalty greater than 15 years, egregious circumstances of a higher order of moral culpability are present. So in this case [continued Mr. Justice Donald in connection with the case before him] the savage and prolonged beating weighs the penalty above ten years eligibility. That much is conceded by Mr. Sara's counsel who urged us to go no higher than 15 years in adjusting the penalty. The key issue is whether there is something more in this case looking at a still higher degree of blameworthiness.

**37** At para. 20 His Lordship noted:

[20] However, discretion must be exercised on a principled basis. As the potential range of ineligibility is realistically between ten and 20 years (only a few cases have exceeded 20 years) and as each year must be fully served, subject to the 15-year review process, some points of reference must be identified in order to avoid arbitrariness resulting from a sentencing judge's subjective reaction of the circumstances of the offence. In my view, the primary point of reference is a pattern of penalties in similar cases. I have been provided with a number of similar cases. Although each case is unique it is important to bear in mind.

**38** The Court was provided with a copy of *R. v. Atwal*, 2005 BCSC 940. In that case, the accused was convicted following a jury trial of having murdered his 17-year-old daughter who was having a relationship with an individual outside of his Sikh community. He had at first pretended to go along



with supporting her decision but then agreed to drive her to see her boyfriend. He stabbed her 17 times. Mr. Atwal was sentenced to imprisonment for life with no eligibility for parole before 16 years.

**39** I was also provided the decision in *R. v. Bhullar*, 2008 BCSC 1897. There the accused was found guilty by a jury of having murdered his 22-year-old nephew and adopted son. As noted by Fisher J.:

In assessing this, s. 745.4 of the *Code* requires that I have regard for the character of the offender, the nature of the offence, the circumstances surrounding its commission, and to the recommendation, if any, made by the jury under s. 745.2.

**40** In that case, the Court imposed a sentence of life with no eligibility for parole before 16 years.

**41** I was also referred to the decision in *R. v. Panghali*, 2011 BCSC 421. The accused in that case had murdered his pregnant wife and later set her body on fire and abandoned her remains in a lonely place. Stating that in the circumstances the aggravating factors called for the strongest message of condemnation and deterrence, Holmes J. set the period of time for ineligibility for parole at 15 years.

**42** *R. v. Mou*, 2012 BCSC 1984, also provided to the Court was also a case of spousal murder. There had been spousal violence and the victim had left in fact to go to a women's shelter. The accused during an access visit had asked his wife to go to his home. There he murdered her and put her body in a suitcase and attempted to dispose of it in the Fraser River. Parole eligibility was set at 14 years.

**43** Lastly, the case of *R. v. Ninderjit Singh*, 2013 BCSC 709, was placed before the Court. In that case the accused pleaded guilty to second degree murder on the first day of trial. He had been in a relationship with the deceased who began to pull away from him. He began stalking her and beat her on one occasion, but on the day of the murder he drove around until he found her. He then asked her to come into the car to talk to her. There, he shot her in the head. He fled to the United States where he hid for 12 years. Mr. Justice Butler set the period of parole ineligibility at 16 years.

## **MITIGATING AND AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES**

**44** In the case at bar, the Court must consider the mitigating and aggravating circumstances.

**45** I find the aggravating circumstances to be as follows. This was committed in the course of a spousal relationship. It arose from the personal belief of the accused that he was entitled to take revenge. It was committed in a public place. A second person was seriously injured trying to help. This was extraordinarily brutal. The injuries included hatchet wounds to the victim's head, cracking her skull, and the wounds on her neck transected her trachea. There were 30 other stab wounds. There was considerable forethought that went into this act including buying the hatchet and the

knife.

**46** Mr. Mohan on behalf of his client draws to the Court's attention Mr. Singh's family's despair at this and their support and desire to share the sadness and sorrow of the Bhangu family. I accept that submission. He urges the Court to consider this was not committed as an honour killing but only from a place of profound depression. Mr. Mohan spoke to the Court of the importance of considering this crime in the context of his upbringing in a different society. I reject that submission.

**47** Justice in Canada does not permit the viewing of a crime of violence against women and the vulnerable as anything other than abhorrent and to be denounced in the strongest terms possible. Women in Canada, and indeed in any civilized society, are equal persons to be afforded the full protection of the law, and have the corresponding rights and privileges including the complete liberty to make their own choices as human beings in accordance with the freedoms available to all.

**48** I turn to the mitigating factors. Those are: the plea of guilty; his youth and no history of violence; he has no record; he has embarked on trying to adjust his way of thinking, taking courses in custody that will prepare him to be a better human being and to prepare for better human interactions. He is remorseful which is displayed in his plea of guilty and in his comments to the Court this morning.

## **POSITION OF THE PARTIES**

**49** This is a joint submission for a 16-year period of parole ineligibility. Respecting joint submissions, the Court is mindful of the decision of our Court of Appeal in *R. v. Grimsson* (1997), 100 B.C.A.C. 253. This Court is not bound by the provisions of a joint submission but must give such a submission appropriate weight.

**50** As summarized by Madam Justice Daphne Smith in *R. v. Olson*, [2011] B.C.J. No. 472, a 2011 decision of the B.C. Court of Appeal, it is common ground that a joint submission is not binding on a sentencing judge who retains his or her discretion to impose a fit sentence that may differ from the joint submission. However, a joint submission should not be rejected lightly and a sentencing judge should give full reasons for doing so. In support of that, she cites *Grimsson*, *R. v. Bezdan*, 2001 BCCA 215, *R. v. Pretty*, 2005 BCCA 52, *R. v. Fuller*, 2007 BCCA 353, *R. v. Furey*, 2007 BCCA 395, and *R. v. Penney*, 2010 BCCA 307.

**51** In *R. v. Fuller*, the decision noted above by Smith J.A., the Court of Appeal had considered whether the sentencing judge erred in failing to effect to a joint submission of counsel recommending a particular sentence. The Court stated at para. 17:

[17] In considering whether the sentencing judge erred in principle as alleged, it is important to start from the proposition that a sentencing judge is the ultimate arbiter of a fit sentence and is not bound to give effect to a joint submission. It is

also important to note, however, that where counsel have made a joint submission resulting from a plea bargain, sentencing judges are required to view those submissions with considerable deference [and [*Bezdan* is cited in support of that].

**52** In the *Bezdan* decision, Madam Justice Prowse writing on behalf of the Court of Appeal approved of the comments of Mr. Justice Finlayson of the Ontario Court of Appeal in respect of joint submissions. Mr. Justice Finlayson speaking for the Court stated in *R. v. Cerasuolo*, [2001] O.J. No. 359:

This court has repeatedly held that trial judges should not reject joint submissions unless the joint submission is contrary to the public interest and the sentence would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.... This is a high threshold and is intended to foster confidence in an accused, who has given up his right to a trial, that the joint submission he obtained in return for a plea of guilty will be respected by the sentencing judge.

The Crown and the defence bar have cooperated in fostering an atmosphere where the parties are encouraged to discuss the issues in a criminal trial with a view to shortening the trial process. This includes bringing issues to a final resolution through plea-bargaining. This laudable initiative cannot succeed unless the accused has some assurance that the trial judge will in most instances honour agreements entered into by the Crown. While we cannot over emphasize that these agreements are not to fetter the independent evaluation of the sentences proposed, there is no interference with the judicial independence of the sentencing judge in requiring him or her to explain in what way a particular joint submission is contrary to the public interest and would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

**53** I note that these comments of Mr. Justice Finlayson underscoring the deference to be applied to joint submissions were recently applied again in the Ontario Court of Appeal decision of *R. v. Thompson*, [2013] O.J. No. 1546 (O.C.A.), where the Court of Appeal states:

While a sentencing judge is not bound by a joint submission, the jurisprudence is clear that he or she should not depart from such a submission unless satisfied that the recommended disposition would be contrary to the public interest and would bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

**54** I am told this sentence and the plea will serve the public interest. Experienced counsel have come to Court and submitted the sentence proposed will meet the principles of sentence.

**55** I have carefully considered all of the case law filed in which sentences similar to that of the

joint submission have been tendered. I have also considered the report filed, the submissions in this case, the victim impact statement, and the circumstances of Mr. Singh. I am mindful of the pain that the Bhangus endure and will continue to endure for the rest of their lives. Nothing that Mr. Singh can do will alter that. I am mindful of the circumstances of him however as well as his youth and of the guilty plea.

**56** I must also bear in mind that Crown and defence counsel, senior and experienced counsel, come to this Court both submitting a 16-year period for ineligibility for parole is appropriate in these circumstances. I must bear that in mind and accord that submission considerable weight but also ensuring that this sentence does not bring the administration of justice into disrepute and is not contrary to the public interest. I am so satisfied given the precedents in this case and all of the facts that I have outlined. I have carefully considered the submission that similar cases have imposed similar periods of parole ineligibility.

**57** Mr. Singh, will you please stand.

**58** I sentence you to a term of imprisonment for life. There will be no eligibility for parole until you have served at least 16 years of your sentence.

**59** I am required by the provisions of the *Criminal Code* to tell you as follows: pursuant to s. 745.01 I tell you that you have been found guilty of second degree murder and sentenced to imprisonment for life. You are not eligible for parole until July 28, 2027. However, after serving at least 15 years of the sentence you may apply under s. 745.6 of the *Criminal Code* for a reduction in the number of years of imprisonment without eligibility for parole. If the jury hearing the application reduces the period of parole ineligibility, you may then make an application for parole under the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act* at the end of that reduced period.

**60** There will as well be ancillary orders.

**61** Pursuant to the provisions of 487.051 of the *Criminal Code*, I order that there be taken samples of your bodily substance for the purposes of forensic DNA analysis.

**62** I also order that pursuant to s. 109 of the *Criminal Code*, that you are prohibited for life from possessing any firearm, crossbow, prohibited weapon, prohibited device, ammunition, prohibited ammunition and explosive substances.

**63** Counsel, is there anything else?

**64** MR. McPHERSON: Not from the Crown, thank you.

**65** MR. MOHAN: Nothing from us.

**66** THE COURT: Thank you. This Court is adjourned.

M.A. MAISONVILLE J.