

**SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA**

**Citation:** *R. v. Geizer*, 2026 NSSC 76

**Date:** 20260306

**Docket:** CRH-539729

**Registry:** Halifax

**Between:**

His Majesty the King

v.

Shawn Stephen Geizer

**DECISION ON SENTENCE**

**Judge:** The Honourable Justice Joshua Arnold  
**Heard:** March 6, 2026, in Halifax, Nova Scotia  
**Oral Decision:** March 6, 2026  
**Written Decision:** March 13, 2026  
**Counsel:** Maile Graham-Laidlaw, for the Federal Crown  
Alexander MacKillop, for Shawn Geizer

## Overview

[1] Following plea negotiations, Shawn Stephen Geizer pled guilty to possession of cocaine for the purposes of trafficking. Crown and defence jointly recommend that he be sentenced to two years less a day in custody, to be served in the community, followed by one year of probation. For the reasons that follow, I agree with the joint recommendation.

## Facts

[2] The agreed statement of facts states the following:

On March 7th, 2024, Cst. MACDONALD was conducting proactive patrols on the Highway 102 inbound. Cst. MACDONALD did police checks on a gold/gray Honda sedan, NSLP GZY406. Police checks showed that the NSLP was listed as “MR THIEF” which signals to police that the NSLP was stolen.

At approximately 3:21pm, Cst. MACDONALD conducted a traffic stop with the said vehicle. Cst. MACDONALD approached the vehicle and observed 2 male occupants. Cst. MACDONALD requested to the driver that he exit the vehicle and told him that he was under arrest. The male driver was identified as Shawn GEIZER by his driver’s license. Cst. MACDONALD searched GEIZER incidental to the arrest and located a bag with a small amount of cocaine from his sweatshirt pocket. GEIZER told Cst. MACDONALD that the substance was cocaine.

Cst. MACDONALD then walked up to the passenger and told the male that he was under arrest and to exit the vehicle. The male was identified as Eric SMITH (formally known as Rickey COOPER) by mug on the police system. Cst. MACDONALD, searched SMITH incidental to arrest and removed a substantial amount of cash from SMITH’s pocket along with a flip cell phone.

Cst. MACDONALD believed that GEIZER and SMITH were involved in the illegal drug trade due to the circumstantial evidence at the scene including the packaged drugs seized, the amount of loose cash seized, the stolen NSLP, and the cell phones constantly ringing.

Cst. TALWAR and Cpl. MCLEAN arrived on the scene. Cst. MACDONALD placed SMITH in the back seat of Cpl. MCLEAN’s vehicle to separate the males. Cst. MACDONALD searched the floor of the driver seat of the vehicle and observed a plastic bag with crystal like white substance (believed to be crack).

Cst. MACDONALD read GEIZER his charter rights.

GEIZER told Cst. MACDONALD that he believed there to be approximately 45-50 grams of crack in the bag that was located.

Upon arrival at the detachment, both individuals were provided their right to counsel and contacted legal aid.

Both GEIZER and SMITH were released on undertaking documents.

The crack cocaine located in the vehicle was approximately 76 grams.

### **Statutory Considerations**

[3] Section 5(3)(a) of the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 19, sets out the punishment for the crime of possession for the purpose of trafficking in cocaine:

**5 (3)** Every person who contravenes subsection (1) or (2)

(a) if the subject matter of the offence is a substance included in Schedule I or II, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life...

[4] Section 742.1 of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, sets out the crimes that are eligible for a conditional sentence:

#### **Imposing of conditional sentence**

**742.1** If a person is convicted of an offence and the court imposes a sentence of imprisonment of less than two years, the court may, for the purpose of supervising the offender's behaviour in the community, order that the offender serve the sentence in the community, subject to the conditions imposed under section 742.3, if

(a) the court is satisfied that the service of the sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community and would be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing set out in sections 718 to 718.2;

(b) the offence is not an offence punishable by a minimum term of imprisonment;

(c) the offence is not an offence under any of the following provisions:

(i) section 239, for which a sentence is imposed under paragraph 239(1)(b) (attempt to commit murder),

(ii) section 269.1 (torture), or

(iii) section 318 (advocating genocide); and

(d) the offence is not a terrorism offence, or a criminal organization offence, prosecuted by way of indictment, for which the maximum term of imprisonment is 10 years or more.

[5] Possession for the purposes of trafficking in cocaine therefore allows for the imposition of a conditional sentence.

[6] Sections 718, 718.1, and 718.2 of the *Criminal Code* state:

**Purpose**

**718** The fundamental purpose of sentencing is to protect society and 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 and the harm done to victims or to the community that is caused by 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 or to the community.

...

**Fundamental principle**

**718.1** A sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

**Other sentencing principles**

**718.2** A court that imposes a sentence shall also take into consideration the following principles:

- (a) a sentence should be increased or reduced to account for any relevant aggravating or mitigating circumstances relating to the offence or the offender, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing,
  - (i) evidence that the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression, or on any other similar factor,
  - (ii) evidence that the offender, in committing the offence, abused the offender's intimate partner or a member of the victim or the offender's family,
    - (ii.1) evidence that the offender, in committing the offence, abused a person under the age of eighteen years,
    - (ii.2) evidence that the offender involved a person under the age of 18 years in the commission of the offence,

(iii) evidence that the offender, in committing the offence, abused a position of trust or authority in relation to the victim,

(iii.1) evidence that the offence had a significant impact on the victim, considering their age and other personal circumstances, including their health and financial situation,

(iii.2) evidence that the offence was committed against a person who, in the performance of their duties and functions, was providing health services, including personal care services,

(iv) evidence that the offence was committed for the benefit of, at the direction of or in association with a criminal organization,

(v) evidence that the offence was a terrorism offence,

(vi) evidence that the offence was committed while the offender was subject to a conditional sentence order made under section 742.1 or released on parole, statutory release or unescorted temporary absence under the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, and

(vii) evidence that the commission of the offence had the effect of impeding another person from obtaining health services, including personal care services,

shall be deemed to be aggravating circumstances;

(b) a sentence should be similar to sentences imposed on similar offenders for similar offences committed in similar circumstances;

(c) where consecutive sentences are imposed, the combined sentence should not be unduly long or harsh;

(d) an offender should not be deprived of liberty, if less restrictive sanctions may be appropriate in the circumstances; and

(e) all available sanctions, other than imprisonment, that are reasonable in the circumstances and consistent with the harm done to victims or to the community should be considered for all offenders, with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.

[7] Section 10 of the *CDSA* addresses the purpose of sentencing for drug offences:

**Purpose of sentencing**

**10 (1)** Without restricting the generality of the *Criminal Code*, the fundamental purpose of any sentence for an offence under this Part is to contribute to the respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society while encouraging rehabilitation, and treatment in appropriate circumstances, of offenders and acknowledging the harm done to victims and to the community.

**Factors to take into consideration**

(2) If a person is convicted of a designated substance offence, the court imposing sentence on the person shall consider any relevant aggravating factors including that the person

- (a) in relation to the commission of the offence,
  - (i) carried, used or threatened to use a weapon,
  - (ii) used or threatened to use violence,
  - (iii) trafficked in a substance included in Schedule I, II, III, IV or V, or possessed such a substance for the purpose of trafficking, in or near a school, on or near school grounds or in or near any other public place usually frequented by persons under the age of 18 years, or
  - (iv) trafficked in a substance included in Schedule I, II, III, IV or V, or possessed such a substance for the purpose of trafficking, to a person under the age of 18 years;
- (b) was previously convicted of a *designated substance offence*, as defined in subsection 2(1) of this Act, or a *designated offence*, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the *Cannabis Act*;
- (c) used the services of a person under the age of eighteen years to commit, or involved such a person in the commission of, the offence.

**Reasons**

(3) If, under subsection (1), the court is satisfied of the existence of one or more of the aggravating factors enumerated in paragraphs (2)(a) to (c), but decides not to sentence the person to imprisonment, the court shall give reasons for that decision.

**Drug treatment court program**

(4) A court sentencing a person who is convicted of an offence under this Part may delay sentencing to enable the offender

- (a) to participate in a drug treatment court program approved by the Attorney General; or
- (b) to attend a treatment program under subsection 720(2) of the *Criminal Code*.

**Presentence Report**

[8] A presentence report was prepared in relation to this matter. The report describes Mr. Geizer’s personal circumstances as follows:

**FAMILY BACKGROUND**

...

The Subject reported he is currently single and has been residing in a friend's warehouse in the community of Bedford for approximately one and a half years...

...

The Subject reported he was previously married to Ms. Michelle Geizer nee Kenny, for 15 years. He described the relationship as positive, stating the marriage ended due to financial difficulties and his substance abuse. Mr. Geizer reported they share two sons, and he has maintained a strong relationship with both children since their childhood. He stated his eldest son resides in Alberta with his family, while his youngest son resides within the Halifax Regional Municipality.

The Subject reported police were not involved during or following the separation, stating, "We went our separate ways after the divorce and shared custody of the kids amicably with no issues." He further acknowledged responsibility for the breakdown of the marriage, stating, "I screwed up in the relationship, and I got into using cocaine and the cocaine eventually took over." He added he continues to have a positive relationship with his former spouse and described them as remaining satisfactory friends.

...

Mr. Justin Geizer, son of the Subject, was listed as a collateral reference for the purpose of this Presentence Report. Mr. Geizer stated he is aware of his father's current matters before the Court, stating, "I am shocked. I feel like he is in an unfortunate circumstance. His health is bad and I don't want to see him die in jail; his heart is bad." Mr. Geizer expressed frustration around the current situation with his father's matters.

Mr. Geizer described his father as, "He is a fun, good going guy. He is a good guy with a bad habit. Nothing makes him angry; he is chill and laid back. He is living in a warehouse, and he is currently stressed about Court." Mr. Geizer acknowledged he is aware of his father's substance abuse stating, "It has been at least 30 years with crack-cocaine and he has no concerns with alcohol."

In speaking of recommendations to the Court, Mr. Geizer advised he would attend Court with his father to provide him support. Mr. Geizer offered, "This is his first offence. He is not a drug dealer, but he is an addict. I don't want to see him spend his last years behind bars; I want him to spend his last years with me. His health is so bad."

...

### **EMPLOYMENT**

Mr. Geizer reported he is currently unemployed and receiving benefits from Workers' Compensation due to a workplace injury. Previously, he was employed by Leon's Trucking, where he operated a dump truck for approximately one year.

He stated he did not enjoy this position, describing the work as repetitive. He added, "I did long-haul for some time and did not enjoy this entirely either."

The Subject further reported he owned the family business, Geizer & Son, for approximately 20 years and described it as very successful. During this time, he managed a workforce of approximately 50 employees before selling the company in 2004. Additionally, he reported working for PML Transport for two years as a mechanic and stated he has held multiple positions as a self-taught mechanic throughout his career.

...

### **HEALTH AND LIFESTYLE**

Mr. Geizer reported himself to have unsatisfactory overall physical health as he experienced four separate cardiac arrests; the first at age 47, and the last three within the last two years. The Subject explained he required surgery to have stints placed in his heart and takes prescribed medication daily. He added he continues to have visits with his family doctor regularly, and at times struggles with inflammation and is required to remain in hospital. Mr. Geizer mentioned he has quit smoking cigarettes due to his heart condition and is making attempts to alter his diet to the best of his financial means.

When speaking of mental health, Mr. Geizer offered, "I feel isolated, alone, depressed and experience negative thoughts at times. I have spoken to my family doctor about these feelings, and I am prescribed medication for anxiety which does calm me down and I feel it works." The Subject explained he has never had any thoughts of suicide or self-harming behavior, adding, "It has crossed my mind, but I am not focused on it. I spend a lot of time alone. I don't drive and don't have money to get places." Mr. Geizer informed he does not access any support services for programming or counselling at present. He advised he is connected with a support worker through the Beacon House in Sackville, whom he meets every second week at the Sackville library. Mr. Geizer highlighted his support worker is assisting him with applications for housing and other resources.

Mr. Geizer acknowledged he first experimented with alcohol when he was 14 years of age which consisted of consuming alcohol on weekends with his peers. The Subject revealed he felt alcohol has never been problematic for him and identifies himself as being an occasional drinker, never to excess. Pertaining to drugs, Mr. Geizer acknowledged he first experimented with cannabis at 16 years of age. He recalled "smoking hash" for the majority of his life and was introduced to cocaine in his late 20's, stating, "I didn't like snorting it, so I switched to the pipe. I had a period of six years clean but then I went back to it. It is always on my mind. I slipped and used it seven months ago. Now I am on my own. All my friends and acquaintances were users. Every day is a battle, and I want to get support now to attend groups. Now I have no friends and I am alone."

...

**OFFENDER PROFILE**

...

Mr. Willie Cooper, friend of the Subject, was listed as a collateral reference for the purpose of this Presentence Report. Mr. Cooper informed he is aware of the Subject's current matters before the Court, stating, "Shawn did tell me about what happened. I am shocked and surprised to see this happen considering his health situation." Mr. Cooper mentioned he has known the Subject for the past five years describing him as, "He is a really nice guy. He has a calm demeanour and very easy to talk to and never expresses any concerns with anger." Mr. Cooper admitted he is aware of substance abuse concerns with drugs, however noted alcohol to be a nonissue.

...

Mr. Larry Snair, friend of the Subject, was listed as collateral reference for the purpose of this Presentence Report. Mr. Snair indicated he is aware the Subject has current matters before the Court, stating, "I am kind of shocked. I know he's an addict, but I guess at some point it could happen and you get in trouble." Mr. Snair disclosed he has known the Subject for the past four-to-five years, describing the Subject as, "He is a polite, kind fella who is easy going and easy to talk to. He is a loner really and does keep to himself. Definitely not an angry individual." Mr. Snair acknowledged he is aware of substance abuse concerns with drugs, stating, "I am not sure what type of drugs. With alcohol he may have a beer on a hot summer day. He is not really a drinker at all."

...

**Aggravating and Mitigating Factors**

[9] The parties agree on the following as aggravating and mitigating factors, as set out in a joint submission:

**Aggravating Factors on Sentencing**

9. The aggravating factors present are the seriousness of the charge, trafficking cocaine, which is a Schedule I drug.

**Mitigating Factors on Sentencing**

10. We have the benefit of Mr. Geizer's Pre-Sentence Report ("PSR") dated December 19, 2025. Mr. Geizer comes before the court at age 64, with a dated and unrelated criminal record.
11. Mr. Geizer has a grade 7-9 education, as he dropped out of school in grade 9 to pursue employment with his father, as outlined on page 4 of his PSR.
12. Mr. Geizer is remorseful and regretful for his actions. Mr. Geizer has entered early guilty pleas, taking responsibility for his actions (also indicated on page 6

of his PSR). This has saved the Honourable Court and Crown a substantial amount of time and resources.

13. Furthermore, by accepting responsibility, Mr. Geizer is saving the witnesses from having to testify in court and be subjected to cross-examination.
14. As recently stated by your Lordship in *R. v. Borden*, 2025 NSSC 32, at paragraphs 20-25, individuals charged who are cooperative and enter a guilty plea at an early opportunity can be entitled to a discount of one-third on their sentence. As such, it is submitted that Mr. Geizer should be entitled to such a discount.
15. Mr. Geizer was married for 15 years and has two children from this marriage. Unfortunately, the marriage broke down due to financial difficulties and substance abuse. Mr. Geizer acknowledges on page 3 of the PSR that he was responsible for the breakdown of the marriage, stating, “I screwed up in the relationship, and I got into using cocaine and the cocaine eventually took over.”
16. Mr. Geizer still shares a positive relationship with his former spouse and is close with his two sons.
17. Mr. Geizer is currently unemployed, receiving benefits from Workers’ Compensation due to a workplace injury. Mr. Geizer previously operated a very successful family business for over twenty years, with over fifty employees, until he sold the business in 2004.
18. Mr. Geizer has a history of drug addiction (crack cocaine). As stated throughout the PSR by numerous sources, including himself, Mr. Geizer has struggled with his addiction to crack cocaine for approximately the last 30 years. Mr. Geizer is an addict, and selling drugs was a way for him to feed his drug addiction. It is counsel’s position that Mr. Geizer’s drug addiction directly contributed to his decisions, which resulted in him coming before the court for these matters. This contributes in particular to the Crown’s consideration, and while it does not detract from the seriousness of the offences, it warrants consideration from the perspective of rehabilitation.
19. Since this incident, Mr. Geizer has had no further involvement with the criminal justice system. As stated on page 7 of the PSR, Mr. Geizer recognizes his struggle with addiction and appears to be in a contemplative state and motivated for change.
20. Mr. Geizer is connected with a social worker through Beacon House, who is assisting him with housing applications and other resources.
21. Individuals contacted for the purposes of the PSR spoke highly of Mr. Geizer and most echoed his struggles with drug addiction.
22. As noted throughout the PSR, and specifically on pages 4 and 5, Mr. Geizer has numerous health issues, including injuries sustained in a workplace accident noted above.

23. Furthermore, Mr. Geizer has suffered four separate cardiac arrests, three of which have occurred over the past two years. Due to his heart issues, Mr. Geizer required surgery to have stents placed in his heart and takes prescribed medication daily. As highlighted by his son, Justin Geizer, on page 4 of the PSR, “This is his first offence. He is not a drug dealer, but he is an addict. I don’t want to see him spend his last years behind bars; I want him to spend his last years with me. His health is so bad.”

### Range of Sentence

[10] Counsel jointly provided a number of cases that support the proposed sentence, including: *R. v. White*, 2025 NSSC 54; *R. v. Mombourquette*, 2024 NSPC 14; *R. v. Kleykens*, 2020 NSCA 49; *R. v. Livingstone*, *R. v. Lungal*, *R. v. Terris*, 2020 NSCA 5; *R. v. Taylor*, NSPC, January 28, 2020; *R. v. Chase*, 2019 NSCA 36; *R. v. Christmas*, 2017 NSPC 48; and *R. v. Masters*, 2017 NSPC 75.

[11] In addition, the comments of Beveridge J.A., for the majority, in *R. v. Scott*, 2013 NSCA 28, are instructive:

[7] It cannot be gainsaid that appellate courts are required to defer to a lawful sentence imposed by a trial judge. Sentencing a particular offender is a highly individualized process. It requires a judge to be alive to all of the relevant facts, circumstances and, applying the legislated framework that defines the objectives and principles of sentence, arrive at a disposition that she in the exercise of her discretion, considers the best to try to achieve those objectives. The problem is that these are frequently in contraindication. The trial judge is undoubtedly in the best position to strike the appropriate balance. He hears the case firsthand, and has an opportunity to observe the offender. He usually presides in the community where the offence occurred and has a better appreciation of the appropriate balance that must be struck.

...

[53] There is no question that this Court has long stressed the need to emphasize deterrence and denunciation for those that traffic in cocaine, and depending on the circumstances of the offence and of the offender, may well mean that a sentence of federal incarceration is called for. With all due respect, what I cannot accept is that these or any other cases make a federal prison term mandatory – to be avoided only if an offender can demonstrate “exceptional circumstances”.

...

[59] As already explained, it is the selection of any sentence of less than two years that the Crown says is simply not allowed in this case because of what this Court, as interpreted by the Crown, has said in previous decisions about the

mandated sentence for all cocaine traffickers. My colleague has accepted this premise. However, even if one accepts that two years is the minimum starting point for all who traffic or possess cocaine for the purpose of trafficking, the selection of a lesser sentence is not *per se* legal error. This was clearly explained by Sopinka J. in *McDonnell*. Deviation from starting point sentences set by an appellate court is not an error in principle...

...

[63] The only basis for the Crown’s suggestion that the sentence was unfit was because it was less than two years incarceration. For the same reasons he found an error in principle, my colleague concludes the sentence is unfit. With respect, I am unable to agree. A sentence of less than two years incarceration is, for this offender and in the circumstances of this offence, not outside the range of sentence.

### **Joint Recommendation**

[12] Crown and defence have agreed to a true negotiated plea and joint recommendation. In *R. v. Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43, [2016] 2 S.C.R. 204, Moldaver J., for the court, set out the test for following joint recommendations:

[32] Under the public interest test, a trial judge should not depart from a joint submission on sentence unless the proposed sentence would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or is otherwise contrary to the public interest. But, what does this threshold mean? Two decisions from the Newfoundland and Labrador Court of Appeal are helpful in this regard.

[33] In *Druken*, at para. 29, the court held that a joint submission will bring the administration of justice into disrepute or be contrary to the public interest if, despite the public interest considerations that support imposing it, it is so “markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the case that they would view it as a break down in the proper functioning of the criminal justice system”. And, as stated by the same court in *R. v. B.O.2*, 2010 NLCA 19, at para. 56, when assessing a joint submission, trial judges should “avoid rendering a decision that causes an informed and reasonable public to lose confidence in the institution of the courts”.

[34] In my view, these powerful statements capture the essence of the public interest test developed by the Martin Committee. They emphasize that a joint submission should not be rejected lightly, a conclusion with which I agree. Rejection denotes a submission so unhinged from the circumstances of the offence and the offender that its acceptance would lead reasonable and informed persons, aware of all the relevant circumstances, including the importance of promoting certainty in resolution discussions, to believe that the proper functioning of the justice system had broken down. This is an undeniably high threshold — and for good reason, as I shall explain.

...

[44] Finally, I note that a high threshold for departing from joint submissions is not only necessary to obtain all the benefits of joint submissions, it is appropriate. Crown and defence counsel are well placed to arrive at a joint submission that reflects the interests of both the public and the accused (Martin Committee Report, at p. 287). As a rule, they will be highly knowledgeable about the circumstances of the offender and the offence and the strengths and weaknesses of their respective positions.

[13] The disposition of two years less a day in custody to be served in the community, followed by one year of probation, being jointly recommended for Mr. Geizer is the result of a true negotiated plea, is within the range for similar offenders having committed similar crimes of possession for the purpose of trafficking in cocaine, and is in accordance with the range of sentence for this crime as set out by other courts in this province.

### **Conclusion**

[14] The sentence as set out by Parliament for possession for the purpose of trafficking in cocaine allows for the imposition of a conditional sentence. The following factors are set out in s. 742.1 of the *Criminal Code*: the parties are jointly recommending a sentence of less than two years; the parties jointly propose, and I agree, that allowing Mr. Geizer to serve his sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community; and a CSO is consistent with the fundamental purposes and principles of sentencing as set out in the *Criminal Code*.

[15] The court sentences Mr. Geizer to imprisonment for two years less a day followed by one year of probation and is satisfied that his serving the sentence in the community will not endanger its safety and is consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing. He shall serve this sentence in the community under the following conditions:

- Keep the peace and be of good behaviour;
- Appear before the court when required to do so by the Court;
- Report to a supervisor at 1256 Barrington Street, Suite 200, Halifax, Nova Scotia on or before March 9, 2026 and as directed;
- Remain in the Province of Nova Scotia unless written permission is obtained; and

- Notify promptly the court or the supervisor of any change of name, address, employment or occupation.

In addition he shall:

- Not own, possess or carry a weapon, ammunition or explosive substance;
- Attend for substance abuse assessment and counselling as directed by his supervisor;
- Attend for assessment, counselling or a program as directed by his supervisor;
- Participate in and co-operate with any assessment, counselling or program directed by his supervisor;

- House Arrest:

To remain in his residence at all times beginning at 8:00 p.m. on March 6, 2026 and ending at 11:59 p.m. on November 6, 2026 (except as indicated below).

- Curfew:

Remain in his residence from 9:00 p.m. until 6:00 a.m. the following day, seven days a week beginning on November 7, 2026 and ending at 6:00 a.m. on July 8, 2027 (except as indicated below).

Exceptions:

- (a) when at regularly scheduled employment, which his supervisor knows about, and travelling to and from that employment by a direct route;
- (b) when attending a regularly scheduled education program, which his supervisor knows about, or at a school or educational activity supervised by a principal or teacher, and travelling to and from the education program or the activity by a direct route;
- (c) when dealing with a medical emergency or medical appointment involving him or a member of his household and travelling to and from it by a direct route;

- (d) when attending a scheduled appointment with his lawyer, his supervisor or a probation officer, and travelling to and from the appointment by a direct route;
- (e) when attending court at a scheduled appearance or under subpoena, and travelling to and from court by a direct route;
- (f) when attending a counselling appointment, a treatment program or a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous, at the direction of or with the permission of his supervisor, and travelling to and from that appointment, program or meeting, by a direct route;
- (g) when in a residential treatment program if his supervisor is told, in advance, where he will be and he agrees that the facility can tell his supervisor if he is there, should his supervisor inquire; and
- (h) for not more than four (4) hours per week, approved in advance by his sentence supervisor, for the purpose of attending to personal needs.

- Compliance:

Prove compliance with the curfew/house arrest condition by presenting himself at the entrance of his residence should his supervisor or a peace officer attend there to check compliance.

[16] The terms and conditions of his one year of probation are as follows:

- Report to probation services as and when directed.
- Keep the peace and be of good behaviour.
- Attend court as and when directed.
- Advise the court of any change to your name, address, or occupation.
- Do not possess any weapon as defined by section 2 of the Criminal Code.
- Remain within Nova Scotia unless written permission is obtained from the court.
- Attend for programming and counselling as directed by his supervisor.

[17] The ancillary orders are:

- Firearms Prohibition Order for 10 years beginning March 6, 2026.
- Order for Forfeiture of the following:
  - \$4,195 in Canadian currency;
  - Cellular phone - ZTE Cymbal Phone;
  - Cellular phone - LG V40 ThinQ;
  - Baking powder;
  - Medication/pill bottle.

Arnold, J.