79812-1 Kamloops Registry

In the Provincial Court of British Columbia (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE BLAIR)

Kamloops, B.C. October 18, 2006

REGINA

٧.

GAIL BOYETCHKO

PROCEEDINGS AT SENTENCING

ORIGINAL

Crown Counsel: A. Janse

Defence Counsel: C. Thompson

INDEX

	EXHIBITS
NIL	
	RULINGS
[REASONS AT SENTENCE]	

Proceedings

```
1
                                Kamloops, B.C.
2
                                October 18, 2006
3
4
    MS. JANSE: Your Honour, if we can call the Gail
5
         Boyetchko file, 79812, please.
6
    THE CLERK: Gail Boyetchko.
7
    MS. JANSE: It's going to be for disposition.
8
    MR. THOMPSON: Your Honour, my name is Thompson,
9
         initials C. I appear with Ms. Boyetchko. Which
10
         count?
11
    MS. JANSE: Two or three.
12
    MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Just let me have a look.
              I would say Count 2, Your Honour, please.
13
14
    THE COURT: You wish that read to Ms. Boyetchko?
15
    MR. THOMPSON: Just a moment, Your Honour.
16
    THE COURT: They're all --
17
    MS. JANSE: Oh, sorry, I said the wrong one.
18
    MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.
19
    MS. JANSE: That's my mistake, Your Honour. One
20
         moment. Count 1.
21
    MR. THOMPSON: Count 1, please, Your Honour.
22
    THE COURT: You wish that read to Ms. Boyetchko?
23
    MR. THOMPSON: No, I'll waive formal reading, Your
24
         Honour, thank you.
25
    THE COURT: This is an offence under the Provincial
26
         Cruelty to Animals Act. Do you understand that?
27
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
28
    THE COURT:
                That you've just pled quilty to?
29
    THE ACCUSED: Yes.
30
    THE COURT: Have a seat, listen to the circumstances.
31
    MS. JANSE: I think my friend and I have spent too much
32
         time talking about this file.
33
    MR. THOMPSON: Yes, we have.
34
    MS. JANSE: We're getting confused.
35
    MR. THOMPSON: And I've passed a booklet up to Your
36
         Honour. It's --
37
    MS. JANSE: And I have -- my friend provided that to me
38
         quite some time ago. I have had an opportunity to
39
         read it.
40
41
    SUBMISSIONS BY CROWN:
42
43
    MS. JANSE: Your Honour, the circumstances are that on
44
         February 24th, 2006, Debbie Marsall of the
45
         SPCA -- she was a special provincial constable at
46
         the time -- was contacted by Michelle Mcquire
```

[phonetic] from Kamloops Veterinary Clinic

Submissions by Crown

regarding a cat in distress at 932 Pine Springs Road in Kamloops, B.C.

Ms. Marsall attended the premises and was given consent to enter by the accused's daughter, Stephanie [phonetic]. Ms. Marsall could hear a cat yelling loudly from upstairs. She was led upstairs and observed a cat lying on its side on a folded blanket on the kitchen floor. She was told that the cat had been given a human anti-anxiety drug the previous evening. She could see the cat was breathing very slowly and it would lift its head and yowl. It's eyes were open and appeared glassy. She was told this cat had been in this state since 11 p.m. on February 23rd. The owner of the cat could not be contacted and Ms. Marsall took the cat into custody for critical distress under s. 14 of the **PCA**. The cat was taken to Central Animal Hospital for examination. Upon examination, it was determined to be in critical distress and euthanized.

Just -- and then when Ms. Marsall proceeded with her investigation, she took a statement from Ms. Mcquire at the veterinary clinic, stated that she had been contacted by Stephanie Boyetchko about a cat that had been given human sleeping pills, was not doing very well and possibly had a broken leg. She advised that the cat was having difficulty breathing, that she was only 16 years old and had no means to get the animal to a registered veterinarian.

She told -- sorry, the lady from the vet clinic told Stephanie that she could bring the cat in and she wouldn't have to pay and they could euthanize it. Initially, Stephanie had been asking what she could give the cat to euthanize it at home. She told Michelle Mcquire that her mum had given it a bunch of sleeping pills. The cat went to sleep for a while, woke back up and wasn't doing very well. Ms. Mcquire could hear the cat over the phone yowling, took down her name and phone number, said that she would call her back after speaking to the vet.

Dr. McKelvey told Ms. Mcquire that Stephanie should get the cat there as soon as possible and they wouldn't charge her for euthanasia and that they could bill her parents when they returned. She called Stephanie back, told her this, but then

Submissions by Crown

she changed her story and said that her parents were in town, but that they couldn't afford to bring their cat to the vet. She was then told that if they couldn't afford the care for the cat, they needed to surrender it to the SPCA. She agreed that the cat was suffering, but didn't want to give it up to the SPCA and after getting off the phone with her, Ms. Mcquire considered all the facts she had and contacted the SPCA and provided a statement.

With regards to the state of the cat at the time it was seized, Your Honour, there's medical records from the veterinarian who had to put the cat down. When the cat was brought in, he was in a semi-comatose state, stared straight ahead taking no notice of his surroundings. His physical exam revealed a body condition score of 1.5 to 2. That's out of nine, Your Honour. That's considered very thin. The only one worse than that is one, obviously. There was a large amount of wet, sandy-looking diarrhoea caked around the rectal area, marked dehydration was apparent, the eyes were sunken, the temperature was below normal and the left cranial cruciate ligament of the stifle was torn. It was unlikely that the cat could bear weight on the limb given the injury.

A euthanasia recommendation was made and authorization was given by the SPCA officer in attendance. Post-mortem revealed constipation, dehydration and swollen failing kidneys. It was the opinion of Dr. Lewis that the renal disease exhibited was not sufficiently severe to induce the mental state observed and that he believed it was more likely due to an outside source.

Eventually a statement was taken from the accused, Gail Boyetchko, by Ms. Marsall. In her statement she told Ms. Marsall that the cat, whose name was Bailey, had been moving slower and had increasing difficulty climbing the stairs for one or two months prior to February 23rd and would stop on the lower stairs and have to be carried up after going down to use the litter box. The litter box was never moved upstairs for easier use by Bailey.

Bailey had not been seen by a veterinarian after he started having difficulty climbing the

Submissions by Crown

stairs. He had stopped grooming himself one month prior to the date in question. His legs would collapse under his own weight at times. He had started vomiting one week prior to February 23rd, had not been seen by a veterinarian after he started vomiting.

Ms. Boyetchko had contacted the regular veterinarian on Monday, February 20th, to say it was time to put Bailey down and to get the cost. She wanted to wait until her payday on Thursday, February 23rd, or Friday, 24th, to have Bailey euthanized. She administered one milligram of lorazepam, also known as Ativan, a human antianxiety medication orally to Bailey at approximately 11 p.m., February 23rd. She stated that she was a nurse and did not contact a veterinarian prior to administrating [sic] the drug to Bailey.

Those are the circumstances, Your Honour. will say I have had a chance to review my friend's materials. I certainly don't think that Ms. Boyetchko is, you know, some sort of animal abuser. I think the problem is -- what we have here is a case of not doing the responsible thing with your pet when it gets ill, allowing it to remain in distress for quite some time. She told Ms. Marsall, and it may not be her story now, but she told Ms. Marsall that she wanted to wait until she had money. In Crown's submission, that's unacceptable. That's what the SPCA is for. You can take your cat there at any time and have it euthanized for free. Providing human medication to an animal without consulting a veterinarian is also irresponsible, and as a nurse she should know better, and that also caused distress to the animal.

That said, Your Honour, she has no record. The Crown's recommending a -- well, basically, what we're recommending, we would like restitution to the SPCA. That's permitted under s. 20(1) of the **PCA**. The total cost to the SPCA in treating Bailey was \$270.04. I have a copy of the receipt which I will pass up.

THE CLERK: Thank you. [Inaudible/not near microphone]. THE COURT: Please.

MS. JANSE: So we're seeking an order for restitution to the SPCA of that amount and we're also seeking

Submissions by Crown

a fine. My friend and I have discussed it. I think perhaps a total in the range of \$500 would be appropriate. So another \$230 fine. Subject to any questions Your Honour might have, those are the Crown's submissions.

SUBMISSIONS BY DEFENCE:

MR. THOMPSON: Your Honour, the difficulty with this matter is the following. I know Your Honour have [sic] seen this before. We have somebody who desperately loves the cat. The cat's 19 years of age -- old. The cat is dying. Ms. Boyetchko, despite what she said about -- to the SPCA, I -- it is my submission that what has happened here is that she just couldn't face putting her cat down. She just couldn't face it and it was very difficult for her. She's been devastated about it.

She has herself some difficulties. She's off on leave from her job and she does have some difficulties herself. She has been completely mortified by all of this and completely, severely affected by this. I've had -- spoken to several of her friends who have brought her to my office and I've spoken to her at length about this.

I supplied to you the veterinary clinic documents, and Your Honour doesn't have to go through them. They're just a record as a person -- I'm a non-pet owner, but as a person who, for instance, takes care of the car and has records, this is a record of all the things she's done with her pet, and she has really taken care of her pet. If you look on page 10, this will give you some indication -- page -- I'm sorry, number nine. This is the -- from her daughter and it gives you some indication about how -- what she felt like -- what she felt about Bailey and then she's still affected by it, and her daughter's trying to help console her about it. She is deeply affected. I've also passed up to you her history, I won't go into detail, some letters from her friends and other people.

What happened was that the cat was sick. She had the cat in a very nice fur blanket rug in -- the cat was in distress. She did give the cat that hoping that that would help the cat get

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

Submissions by Defence

through it. She went to Vancouver never thinking, of course, that the cat would be in such distress as it was. Whether or not the doctor is accurate about the situation of the cat, I can't make any comment about, but I can just say this to you; there was no intention and this count does not call for intention, but there was never any intention to do the cat harm. It happened as a by-product of what she did. I can tell Your Honour that having a criminal record would severely affect her ability to pay, but it's a Provincial court matter and we've discussed that so that takes that out of play, and so she's relieved about that. This lady, Your Honour, and it's -- it's an odd situation because just looking on the face of it, you wonder, "Ah, this is a cat file or a dog file, and, you know, what is it doing in court?" But all these -- all these files have their place here in some context and this one has, too. But Ms. Boyetchko is an honourable person who has suffered quite substantially for the mistake that she made. THE COURT: How did the cat break its leg? MR. THOMPSON: How did the cat break its leg? THE ACCUSED: As far as I --MR. THOMPSON: Stand up. THE ACCUSED: Sorry. It was a ligament, apparently, what the autopsy said. My daughter misunderstood what I had said. He had turned his paw in a funny manner and --THE COURT: Because of the arthritis and everything? MS. JANSE: It was a torn ligament, Your Honour. THE COURT: It was a torn ligament? THE ACCUSED: Yeah, it was --THE COURT: It was not a broken leg. THE ACCUSED: -- in his back left knee and my comment to her was because his paw had turned funny. In passing I said something about a broken leg as I was feeling his front paws for any breakage. I never . . THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Thompson? MR. THOMPSON: No, Your Honour. You've [indiscernible] the materials. THE COURT: Ms. Boyetchko, come up to the counsel table, please. Ms. Boyetchko, is there anything

you'd like to say before I pass sentence upon you?

Submissions by Defence

THE ACCUSED: I'd just like to say that Bailey was part of our family --THE COURT: Mm-hmm. THE ACCUSED: -- and in no way when I gave him the medication did I think that that would happen. was like one of the kids. It doesn't mention anywhere in the SPCA's notes at all -- I know that in court you deal with black and white, but nowhere does she mention that both my husband and I were in tears before the end of the interview. We were both totally in tears. My husband is a truck driver and he's not common to tears, but both of us were in tears. This has been terrible for us. [REASONS AT SENTENCE] MS. JANSE: Your Honour, the Crown enters a stay of proceedings on Counts 2 and 3, and I thank my friend for acknowledging the importance of these cases. MR. THOMPSON: Okay. THE COURT: They are important. They're truly important. You are free to go for now. THE ACCUSED: Thank you. MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Your Honour. THE CLERK: What section was the --THE COURT: 20(1) of the Prevention of Cruelty Act -- Prevention of -- the **Prevention of Cruelty** to Animals Act. There it is right there. There's the number right there, too. (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)

Submissions by Defence

File No: 79812-1 Registry: Kamloops

In the Provincial Court of British Columbia

REGINA

٧.

GAIL BOYETCHKO

REASONS FOR SENTENCE
OF
THE HONOURABLE JUDGE W.A. BLAIR
COPY

Crown Counsel: A. Janse

Defence Counsel: C. Thompson

Place of Hearing: Kamloops, B.C.

Date of Judgment: October 18, 2006

Boyetchko RFS.doc

- [1] THE COURT: Well, you are wrong about one thing, Ms.

 Boyetchko. We do not just deal with black and white in the court. We empathize with people who have made mistakes. It is almost like Bailey was killed with kindness and out of love. He was to die, it was destined to happen and you did not want that to happen. That is an understandable state to be in, but you have to be more realistic. We all have to on occasion. We do not want to look forward to living without an animal. Animals become like part of the family, but they suffer and Bailey truly did suffer.
- [2] I know that you did not give Bailey human medication with the thought that it would not assist him, you thought it would. Clearly, it made or exasperated [sic] or exaggerated or -- the difficulties that he was having. They were just worse.
- [3] What is proposed here makes imminent good sense to me. But act responsibly with your next pet. Realize that the time has come because it will come for all of us, especially our pets earlier than us, generally, unless you got a bird that might last for a hundred years or a turtle that might last for a hundred years.
- [4] I am satisfied that there shall be a \$200 fine with the victim fine surcharge that comes to \$230. Pursuant to s.

- 20(1) of the Provincial **Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act**, make an order for compensation and restitution to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Kamloops office, in the amount of \$270.04.
- [5] How much time do you need to make that restitution order?
- [6] MR. THOMPSON: Six months [indiscernible], Your Honour, please.
- [7] THE COURT: By April 15, 2007, and with regard to the fine, how much time do you need to pay that?
- [8] MR. THOMPSON: Six months the whole thing, Your Honour.
- [9] THE COURT: Same time?
- [10] MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
- [11] THE COURT: April 15, 2007 to pay that.

(REASONS CONCLUDED)