

Mr. Martin Minuk
Crown Attorney,

Dear Sir,

We know you're aware that we are very unhappy about the excessive should provide a little justice and relief to us as victims. So, frustration This additional delay should have been just a few months, perhaps six is truly absurd. At the very least, we hope this delay was worthwhile in obtaining more evidence. Certainly substantial evidence must have investigation before Mr Zenk could have been suspended from his job long delay, he is free to go about his business, even to continue drivr system's reliability has proven so low, what guarantee is there that he

We were also most distressed by your accounting of the many difficulties in proving dangerous driving. Certainly when someone ploughs headlong into a bright yellow car that is stopped at a red light with such force as to totally crumple that car, driving the car in front of it clear across the inter-section, sending things flying in all directions, fracturing the skull and breaking the neck of the driver of the first car, that is dangerous driving. One report even stated that our daughter's body was hurled up into the air, and she was known for wearing her seatbelt. For anyone to suggest that this could be considered a simple misdemeanor because of some distraction, especially some frivolous distraction caused by the perpetrator himself, is very demeaning. The dictionary describes the meaning of the word dangerous as unsafe. Everyone would agree that performing all sorts of actions that distract one's attention from controlling the 2 or 3 ton heap of metal he is propelling would be unsafe and there fore dangerous. If our courts have become completely mechanical like some unfeeling computer and only process so called facts that are fed to them, then there is no hope of arriving at true justice. One has to wonder why we need human judges! Why not just use computers which would certainly be less costly? But computers cannot provide fair decisions. Surely, some common sense still prevails.

You also informed us that the courts are very fond of precedents. Therefore, the enclosed newspaper article reports a case that should be very beneficial in that regard. Simply not stopping at a Stop Sign was ruled as dangerous driving even though there was no evidence of any impairment or speeding. Surely then, not stopping at a red light that is preceded by blinking amber lights with cars lined up at that red light, but still ploughing headlong into one of those stopped car is most assuredly dangerous driving and /or criminal negligence. Considering such actions lightly promotes the view that safety is not a requirement for drivers. These extremely lenient sentences that our courts have been handing out along with the excessively long delays have only served to down play the most serious nature of careless or dangerous driving. That is verified clearly in this article. This person did not consider his actions to be criminal even though he killed three people! In an attempt to escape responsibility (and his sentence was just a conditional one), he appealed to get his offence lowered to a simple misdemeanor claiming his actions were normal and common to all drivers. That certainly indicates the very real need for drastic changes to the bad attitudes of many regarding the dangers of driving a 2 or 3 ton vehicle that becomes a lethal weapon when not properly controlled. And the statement implying that this person showed remorse is truly laughable. Real remorse is a regret brought on by guilt, accepting responsibility for one's actions and feeling sorry for them, not trying to justify those actions and manipulating others to feel sorry for him. How could he regret actions that he does not consider to be wrong? Also, viewing victims as some abstract far of in the background is a huge part of the problem. Keeping victims under the proverbial carpet means that no one needs to deal with them. "Out of sight " is certainly "out of mind." It reminds us of the complaints made by some who are involved with child abuse cases. Their complaint was that some judges refused to view the videos presented as evidence of the crime. How can any judge hand down a fitting sentence to any crime when he refuses to look at the evidence that shows how horrific that crime truly was? Any who think feelings have no place in these decisions are unequivocally wrong. Being totally objective and

Letter to
Martin
Minuk

Sept /2006
after hearing
when Prelim.
hearing
delayed to
July 16, 2007

that
in.
year
ful
s
r

8.
Mr. Martin Minuk
Crown Attorney,

Dear Sir,

We know you're aware that we are very unhappy about the excessive delay in this case, a case that should provide a little justice and relief to us as victims. So, frustration compels us to tell you again. This additional delay should have been just a few months, perhaps six, but a delay of well over a year is truly absurd. At the very least, we hope this delay was worthwhile and you have been successful in obtaining more evidence. Certainly substantial evidence must have been uncovered by a police investigation before Mr Zenk could have been suspended from his job without pay. And during this long delay, he is free to go about his business, even to continue driving impaired. Also, since our system's reliability has proven so low, what guarantee is there that he hasn't skipped the country?

We were also most distressed by your accounting of the many difficulties faced in proving dangerous driving. Certainly when someone ploughs headlong into a bright yellow car that is stopped at a red light with such force as to totally crumple that car, driving the car in front of it clear across the intersection, sending things flying in all directions, fracturing the skull and breaking the neck of the driver of the first car, that is dangerous driving. One report even stated that our daughter's body was hurled up into the air, and she was known for wearing her seatbelt. For anyone to suggest that this could be considered a simple misdemeanor because of some distraction, especially some frivolous distraction caused by the perpetrator himself, is very demeaning. The dictionary describes the meaning of the word dangerous as unsafe. Everyone would agree that performing all sorts of actions that distract one's attention from controlling the 2 or 3 ton heap of metal he is propelling would be unsafe and therefore dangerous. If our courts have become completely mechanical like some unfeeling computer and only process so called facts that are fed to them, then there is no hope of arriving at true justice. One has to wonder why we need human judges! Why not just use computers which would certainly be less costly? But computers cannot provide fair decisions. Surely, some common sense still prevails.

You also informed us that the courts are very fond of precedents. Therefore, the enclosed newspaper article reports a case that should be very beneficial in that regard. Simply not stopping at a Stop Sign was ruled as dangerous driving even though there was no evidence of any impairment or speeding. Surely then, not stopping at a red light that is preceded by blinking amber lights with cars lined up at that red light, but still ploughing headlong into one of those stopped car is most assuredly dangerous driving and /or criminal negligence. Considering such actions lightly promotes the view that safety is not a requirement for drivers. These extremely lenient sentences that our courts have been handing out along with the excessively long delays have only served to down play the most serious nature of careless or dangerous driving. That is verified clearly in this article. This person did not consider his actions to be criminal even though he killed three people! In an attempt to escape responsibility (and his sentence was just a conditional one), he appealed to get his offence lowered to a simple misdemeanor claiming his actions were normal and common to all drivers. That certainly indicates the very real need for drastic changes to the bad attitudes of many regarding the dangers of driving a 2 or 3 ton vehicle that becomes a lethal weapon when not properly controlled. And the statement implying that this person showed remorse is truly laughable. Real remorse is a regret brought on by guilt, accepting responsibility for one's actions and feeling sorry for them, not trying to justify those actions and manipulating others to feel sorry for him. How could he regret actions that he does not consider to be wrong? Also, viewing victims as some abstract far of in the background is a huge part of the problem. Keeping victims under the proverbial carpet means that no one needs to deal with them. "Out of sight " is certainly "out of mind." It reminds us of the complaints made by some who are involved with child abuse cases. Their complaint was that some judges refused to view the videos presented as evidence of the crime. How can any judge hand down a fitting sentence to any crime when he refuses to look at the evidence that shows how horrific that crime truly was? Any who think feelings have no place in these decisions are unequivocally wrong. Being totally objective and

unfeeling is just as prejudicial as allowing only emotions to determine guilt and pronounce sentences, except in the opposite direction, just like reverse discrimination. Our courts appear to be completely oblivious to the horrific consequences off these crimes. This was a crime committed against us, — the victims, not against the courts. We cannot imagine anything worse that anyone could have done to us aside from deliberate murder or torture. Our daughter, who was stolen from us by a reckless criminal drunk, was also a mother, a wife, a sister, an aunt, a niece, and a cousin, indicating the vast number of victims left devastated in the aftermath of each one of these crimes. In fact, charges in many of these impaired or dangerous driving causing death cases should actually be manslaughter or vehicular homicide if true justice was really the objective. After all, those actions killed another human being!! Whether it was carelessness, recklessness, impairment or whatever another person's life was destroyed — permanently! Surely, there should be some accountability for that! Some would say "There are no accidents". To illustrate, I could wildly fire a gun near a crowd of people arguing that "I didn't intend to kill anyone, I was just blowing off steam." Then I only get charged with a simple misdemeanor, like possession of a firearm? That is how ridiculous the attitudes toward impaired and dangerous driving have become. Also, refusing the breathalyzer should invoke a charge like obstruction of justice instead of an offence that can be simply disposed of with a fine. Especially in this case. As a police officer, this person would have been fully aware of how the lack of a breath sample could significantly affect the prospect of proving impaired driving. Tampering with any other type of evidence would certainly trigger such a charge. The breathalyzer would only bring the truth to light. Whether an alleged offender was impaired or not, that would be affirmed by this test. So his refusal should actually attest to his guilt! An offender's attitudes influencing his actions should surely contribute to determining his guilt and to the severity of his sentence. Again, this person would have been fully aware of the horrors that result from impaired or reckless driving either by his training and/or his duties as a police officer. He very likely charged others with this very same offence. Therefore, his actions betray a complete disrespect for the laws he was paid to uphold, and for the sanctity of another's life. It is totally perverse that so many of those who make and enforce our laws betray such an utter disrespect for life and appear only to be able to empathize with or relate to the criminals, only providing lip service to the victims. Such views can never produce an equal balance of justice. We know that no one can truly empathize with victims or even wants to fully relate to them, as that is just too unpleasant an experience to imagine. But, shouldn't that difficulty in itself make us all very acutely aware of how horrific these crimes truly are and why no one grasps the concept that this can happen to me? But doing that would be the only way true justice could ever be done. When we see M.P.s revealing that their main concern is whether the poor criminals get to go out for Halloween, it's no great wonder that true justice is never provided to victims. When our courts impose next to nothing sentences and that is what the house arrest sentences really are when a life is involved, they betray victims and victimize them again and again. Such "nothing" sentences only serve to portray to us that our stolen loved one's life is seen as some unimportant triviality by those in authority and her life is not considered anywhere near as important as the life of the person who recklessly and wantonly destroyed her along with the lives of numerous others of whom she was a part. This betrayal is quite synonymous with the type of betrayal an abused child would feel toward a parent who refuses to even acknowledge, let alone seek retribution for a crime that was committed against that child by the other parent or by another family member. Justice is supposed to be fair and righteous. Therefore, it can never be arrived at without feeling. True justice must have the consequences fit the crime, and that would require a full and total comprehension of the horrors of that crime. When the pendulum is allowed to swing in the complete opposite direction because unfeeling objectiveness has become a "God", there could never be that equal balance that the Scales of Justice presume to represent. Justifying the actions, and thereby condoning the crimes of impaired and /or dangerous drivers, as our courts have been doing, has only served to reaffirm to them that their actions are not very serious, as was most clearly revealed in this enclosed newspaper article. In fact, such rulings give impaired or reckless drivers a "legal license to kill". We very sincerely pray that this case will not contribute to the "engraving" of this most ludicrous precedent "in stone."