

CANADA / JUDGMENT

R. v. Antonius

2025 BCSC 2438

COURT

Supreme Court of British Columbia

DECIDED

8 December 2025

Source: bccourts.ca · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

2025 BSCS 2438 R. v. Antonius

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation:

R. v. Antonius,

2025 BCSC 2438

Date: 20251208

Docket: 95310-3

Registry: Abbotsford

Rex

v.

Shiny Christy Antonius

Corrected Judgment: The text of the judgment was corrected at para. 5 on December 16, 2025

Before: The Honourable Madam Justice Fitzpatrick

Oral Reasons for Sentence

Counsel for the Crown:

J. Barbour

Counsel for the Accused:

M. Hauzar

Place and Date of Hearing:

Abbotsford, B.C.

October 28, 2025

Place and Date of Judgment:

Abbotsford, B.C.

December 8, 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction.. 3

Circumstances of the Offence. 3

Circumstances of the Offender.. 6

Positions of Crown and Defence. 9

Principles of Sentencing.. 9

Discussion.. 10

Decision.. 14

Introduction

- [1] On June 18, 2025, after a jury trial, Shiny Christy Antonius was convicted of robbery, contrary to s. 344(1)(b) of the Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46. Ms. Antonius' conviction arose from the Crown's allegation that she had stolen a dog from Monica Clayton and that, in the course of stealing the dog, Ms. Antonius used violence against Ms. Clayton to overcome any resistance or, at the time of the theft, Ms. Antonius struck or used personal violence against Ms. Clayton (ss. 343(a) and (b) of the Criminal Code).
- [2] Essentially, Ms. Antonius participated in a violent swarming attack on Ms. Clayton in a trailer park where they both lived on May 9, 2022 in aid of allowing Ms. Antonius and two fellow assailants to steal Ms. Clayton's dog, Lucy, from her.
- [3] The matter before the Court is the sentencing of Ms. Antonius.

Circumstances of the Offence

- [4] In May 2020, Ms. Antonius purchased a two-month-old beagle/American foxhound puppy-Lucy-for \$560.
- [5] Ms. Antonius and Ms. Clayton lived in the same neighbourhood, being the Ruskin Place residential mobile park in Mission.

- [6] In Fall 2020, Ms. Clayton happened to encounter Ms. Antonius while she was walking Lucy in the neighbourhood. Ms. Clayton admired the dog. Ms. Antonius expressed difficulties caring for Lucy and she offered to give the dog to Ms. Clayton. Later that day, Ms. Clayton returned home and went to Ms. Antonius' residence. Ms. Antonius gave the dog to Ms. Clayton. Although not requested, Ms. Clayton gave Ms. Antonius \$110 for Lucy, which was all the cash she had at the time. Ms. Clayton left with Lucy and all her toys and returned home.
- [7] Some days later, Ms. Antonius went to Ms. Clayton's residence and enquired about Lucy. She had regrets about giving the dog to Ms. Clayton. At some later point, Ms. Antonius stated that she wanted the dog back. Ms. Clayton said she would think about it, but says she made clear that Lucy was now her dog. In the end, Ms. Clayton did not agree to give the dog back to Ms. Antonius.
- [8] In the months that followed, Ms. Clayton and Ms. Antonius fell into a pattern where Ms. Clayton, in an act of empathy, allowed Ms. Antonius to take Lucy out from time to time on an informal and ad hoc basis. This arrangement continued until Spring 2021, after a dispute arose as to Lucy's care after she was spayed. After that time, Ms. Clayton no longer allowed Ms. Antonius to have access to Lucy.
- [9] In the months leading up to May 2022, Ms. Clayton had no contact with Ms. Antonius. Ms. Clayton continued to care for Lucy as any other dog owner would.
- [10] On May 8, 2022, Ms. Clayton was walking Lucy on her leash in the neighbourhood and was close to her home. Lucy was two-years old.
- [11] Ms. Clayton noticed three women coming toward her, being Ms. Antonius, Ms. Antonius' daughter, Rainy (or possibly Raini) Antonius, and another young woman.
- [12] Ms. Clayton says that she was assaulted by all three women as they struck, pushed, kicked and pulled her while grabbing and wrestling Lucy from her arms. At the end of the struggle, Ms. Clayton was on the ground.
- [13] The assailants succeeded in grabbing Lucy from Ms. Clayton's arms. The younger women raced to their SUV, which was parked nearby, and they threw Lucy into the vehicle. Ms. Clayton got up and says she jumped into the vehicle, but was dragged out by some or all three women. Ms. Clayton then ran to the front of the SUV to stop it from leaving while screaming for help. Many neighbours saw the commotion; one made a video of the latter part of the interactions between the women.
- [14] Ms. Antonius came to the front of the SUV and pulled or led Ms. Clayton away to the side of the vehicle after smashing Ms. Clayton's glasses on the hood. The SUV peeled out of the parking spot, with Rainy Antonius and the other young woman inside with Lucy. Ms. Antonius then walked to her own vehicle, which was parked nearby, and got in. Ms. Clayton reached into the driver's window and both women proceeded to strike each other. Ms. Antonius drove away after a neighbour pulled Ms. Clayton away.

- [15] Ms. Clayton never saw Lucy again.
- [16] The defence argued at trial that Ms. Antonius had an honest belief that she legally still owned Lucy. Clearly, the jury rejected that argument and found that Ms. Clayton owned Lucy in May 2022 and that Ms. Antonius had stolen the dog from her. The defence also argued at trial that the physical interactions that occurred between the three women and Ms. Clayton were "minor and incidental" and did not rise to the level of violence required for the offence of robbery. This contention was also clearly rejected by the jury, relying on Ms. Clayton's evidence, or the evidence of a neighbour who witnessed some part of the swarming attack, or both.
- [17] Ms. Clayton spoke to the writer of the Pre-Sentence Report (PSR) about the impact of Ms. Antonius' crime. Ms. Clayton says that she suffered physically, mentally and financially and that she has also suffered a negative impact on her reputation in her community.
- [18] Ms. Clayton describes that she had lacerations and bruises throughout her body. She describes having headaches for about a year, caused by her being kicked in the head during the attack or by the stress of the situation.
- [19] Ms. Clayton also says that the attack re-triggered her PTSD from a previous unrelated incident. She is now fearful of leaving her home. This has in turn resulted in Ms. Clayton feeling that she cannot get another dog, since she would have to take the dog out. She feels the loss of Lucy and the resulting loneliness. Ms. Clayton says she experiences panic attacks, trouble focusing and nightmares, although those symptoms have waned once the court proceedings were underway.
- [20] What is also significant for reasons I will explain below is that Ms. Clayton said to the PSR writer that she did not know what happened to Lucy and the uncertainty had negatively impacted her health. She believed that Lucy was dead.
- [21] Ms. Clayton has also retreated from her community to some extent given the curiosity of her neighbours about the incident and her reluctance to discuss it. Some neighbours were also told that Ms. Clayton was abusing the dog, of which there was no evidence at trial.
- [22] Finally, Ms. Clayton says she has suffered financially. She decided to install security equipment to regain a sense of safety at a cost of \$6,000. She also incurred other expenses, such as replacing her broken glasses, the cost of PTSD medication and travel costs to attend court.

Circumstances of the Offender

- [23] Evidence at this sentencing included the PSR dated September 18, 2025 and a psychiatric/psychological assessment by Dr. John Toma dated September 15, 2025 (the "PPA Report").
- [24] Ms. Antonius is presently 49 years old. She was 45 years old at the time of the offence.

- [25] Ms. Antonius was raised by both parents in a fairly stable home with her younger sister and brother. She also has an older half-sister. Ms. Antonius states that her parents were both positive and supportive, although she says she realized when she was a teenager that her mother abused alcohol and prescription medications. Her father was said to be an alcoholic, but he had stopped drinking either before or shortly after she was born. Her parents also separated at various times. Her family moved frequently during her childhood, seemingly for her father's employment with BC Hydro.
- [26] Ms. Antonius completed high school in 2001 after initially dropping out, but returning as a young adult. She obtained a diploma in machining in 2003 and worked in the area for eight years. She also completed some post-secondary education at the Nicola Valley Institute of Technology in 2015 and worked in the forestry industry until 2023.
- [27] Ms. Antonius is a mother of two children in their 20s, a son, and a daughter, Rainy Antonius, who she says also participated in the attack. Both children were the product of fairly brief relationships and Ms. Antonius gave up custody of Rainy to the father fairly early.
- [28] Ms. Antonius has also struggled with alcohol consumption, which began between the ages of 11-13. She describes herself as a "binge drinker" and that this continued until her late 20s or 30s when she stopped drinking regularly and later decreased her drinking further in 2015.
- [29] Ms. Antonius also became a regular cocaine user in her 20s. She claims to have stopped using cocaine in March 2025.
- [30] Ms. Antonius has been negatively affected by two injuries. In 2015, she was in an accident while driving on the highway and apparently hit her head. In 2023, after the offence, she hit a moose while driving, which caused a second head injury.
- [31] Ms. Antonius has a criminal record. Firstly, when she was 21 years old (1997), she was convicted under the Criminal Code of driving while impaired. She received a one-year driving prohibition and a \$500 fine. Secondly, when she was 22 years old (1998), she was convicted under the Criminal Code of impaired driving causing bodily harm and operating a vehicle while disqualified. She received a two-year driving prohibition and a conditional sentence order (CSO) of 45 days. Finally, when she was 32 years old (2008), she was convicted under the Motor Vehicle Act of driving without due care and attention. She received a four-month driving prohibition and a \$500 fine.
- [32] The PSR writer says that contributing factors to this criminal history-and even the current offence-appear to be Ms. Antonius' substance abuse, family relationships, companions and significant others, behavioral and emotional stability and a pro-criminal attitude.
- [33] Ms. Antonius also has Indigenous heritage through her mother. This background is summarized in the PSR and is also discussed in the Gladue letter dated August 25, 2025.

- [34] Ms. Antonius' heritage comes from the Cree First Nation from Alberta. Ms. Antonius states that she is unable to confirm that any of her family attended residential schools, but her sister says that their mother did. The Gladue letter refers to many applicable Gladue factors, which I have considered, although Ms. Antonius was unable to make any connection between any attendance at residential schools and her difficulties. Ms. Antonius was not raised to have any connection with her Indigenous heritage, although Ms. Antonius wishes to do so now.
- [35] Ms. Antonius states that she is now supported by the government as a person with disabilities. She now lives in Grande Prairie, Alberta with her sister and brother, who also support her.
- [36] Ms. Antonius says that she is willing to attend counselling and programming as may be directed, which she believes will help her emotional regulation.
- [37] Ms. Antonius has been subject to a Release Order since August 9, 2022. There are no reports of any infractions in the release conditions.
- [38] The PSR writer stated that Ms. Antonius may benefit from interventions based on a cognitive behavioral model which aims to address problematic behaviour such as poor problem-solving skills and poor decision making, which are demonstrated by her actions in committing the offence.
- [39] In the PPA Report, Dr. Toma also refers to some difficulties with Ms. Antonius' anxiety and mood arising from the two motor vehicle accidents. He opines that she likely suffers from a Mild Neurocognitive Disorder, Secondary to Brain Injury, with Behavior Disturbance, although no neuropsychological evaluation has been done yet to fully evaluate the possible effects from the head injuries. Dr. Toma opines that Ms. Antonius' difficulties appear to be related to her abuse of drugs and alcohol, and that they are secondary to head trauma.
- [40] Dr. Toma assesses Ms. Antonius' risk of future violent and non-violent offences as low. He also says that, in his view, Ms. Antonius can be safely monitored in the community with appropriate rehabilitation services.
- [41] Ms. Antonius' brother and sister have provided a letter of support for her dated October 27, 2025. They both express their ongoing support for Ms. Antonius and their willingness to care for her in their home in Grande Prairie, Alberta.

Positions of Crown and Defence

- [42] I agree with the Crown's submission that the robbery offence-which involves violence-is a serious one. The defence counsel's attempt to minimize this as a "one off" situation does not detract from that statement.
- [43] The Crown seeks a CSO for 18 months, pursuant to s. 742.1 of the Criminal Code. The CSO would include house arrest for the first six months.

- [44] Defence counsel firstly seeks a suspended sentence. In the alternative, defence counsel agrees that the Crown's position as to the CSO is reasonable.

Principles of Sentencing

- [45] The applicable principles of sentencing include denunciation, deterrence, both general and specific, and rehabilitation.
- [46] Section 344(1)(b) of the Criminal Code provides that the offence of robbery carries a maximum sentence of life.
- [47] The Crown refers to *R. v. Valliers*, 2014 BCPC 78 [Valliers]. In that case, the Court at paras. 4-5 refers to *R. v. Brogan*, 1999 BCCA 278 which summarized the case law as supporting a range of sentencing for robbery of 2-9 years jail time.
- [48] In addition, I have considered s. 718.2(e) of the Criminal Code and Ms. Antonius' circumstances as an Indigenous offender, in accordance with that provision and the well-known jurisprudence. In particular, I have considered the statements in *R. v. Kehoe*, 2023 BCCA 2, referred to by the defence.

Discussion

- [49] I agree with the Crown that the principles of sentencing, being denunciation and deterrence, are relevant sentencing objectives here. As I have said, Ms. Antonius' actions involved violence.
- [50] I also agree with the Crown that various statements made by Ms. Antonius, as set out in the PPA Report, are of particular concern.
- [51] On page 2 of the PPA Report, Ms. Antonius described the offence to Dr. Toma. However, her statement of the facts was completely divorced from reality. She clearly lied to Dr. Toma about the circumstances of her arrangement with Ms. Clayton and how she and her daughter Rainy "took the dog back". She blithely and dismissively referred to Ms. Clayton as an "old lady", while clearly knowing her name, which shows a complete lack of empathy for the effect of her actions on Ms. Clayton. She denied that there was any violence until Ms. Clayton interacted with her in her vehicle. She claimed that Ms. Clayton made the whole story up. Both statements were contrary to the findings of the jury.
- [52] Of further concern is that Ms. Antonius told Dr. Toma that she knew where Lucy was-being with a family on a farm with acreage and "living her best life".

- [53] The Crown asserts-and I agree-that Ms. Antonius' clear defiance in knowing where Lucy is and continuing to deprive the rightful owner-Ms. Clayton-is serious. The Crown describes this as Ms. Antonius continuing the offence of theft. The defence disagrees. In any event, I consider it an aggravating factor. More particularly, it speaks to the fact that specific deterrence is required in this case to bring home to Ms. Antonius that her criminal actions were wrong and will not be tolerated.
- [54] Having said that, the Crown and defence agree that Ms. Antonius' rehabilitation also remains a competing factor.
- [55] The Crown refers to *R. v. Koop*; *R. v. Stoneman*, 2008 BCCA 140. In that case, the appellants had been convicted of robbing a gas station and convenience store. The court discussed the interplay between the sentencing principles of deterrence and denunciation with rehabilitation in respect of a CSO. The court found that a CSO of just less two years appropriately balanced all of the sentencing principles:
- [14] The principles of deterrence and denunciation are important principles to consider when sentencing a person who has committed robbery, and they will usually prevail over other considerations and result in a prison sentence. However, these principles should not be considered to the exclusion of the principle of rehabilitation. A conditional sentence can satisfy the objectives of deterrence and denunciation, and there will be cases where the interests of rehabilitation of the offender will outweigh the additional deterrence and denunciation accomplished by a prison sentence.
- [56] I have considered the defence's first position in seeking a suspended sentence.
- [57] The defence refers to *R. v. Carrillo*, 2015 BCCA 192 [Carrillo], which addressed the sentencing arising from a guilty plea for possession of cocaine. The trial judge imposed a suspended sentence based on what were described as exceptional circumstances. The defence specifically relies on the court's statement:
- [35] Although suspended sentences are primarily rehabilitative in nature, they can also address deterrence because an offender can be punished for repeating his criminal conduct during the period of probation, and face serious consequences from the conviction at hand: Criminal Code ss. 732.2(5) and 733.1(1). This feature of suspended sentences (sometimes referred to as the "Sword of Damocles") represents an underlying but pervasive threat to the offender's liberty.
- [36] Strict conditions, including a substantial deprivation of liberty (e.g. the strict curfew in this case) can also be required by the probation order.

- [37] As previously noted, Proulx distinguished between conditional sentence orders which are jail sentences served in the community, and suspended sentences which are not. Deterrence and denunciation can also be addressed other than through a jail sentence. In *R. v. D.E.S.M.*, [1993] B.C.J. No. 702 (B.C.C.A.), a five-member division of this Court in the context of a Crown sentence appeal for a historical sexual assault said this:
- [20] There is no suggestion that the accused is a danger to anyone so he need not be isolated in order to protect the public. By convicting him, society has already stigmatized him as a person who has committed a serious offence, and has denounced his offence. Quite recently, the Supreme Court of Canada has expressed itself quite strongly on the importance of stigma as a consequence of criminal proceedings. The Court has been saying what most lawyers and criminologists have known all along, that a public charge, trial and conviction for a serious offence brands a person for life, constitutes serious punishment, and is an important part of the way society brings offenders to account for their misconduct.
- [Emphasis added.]
- [38] The Court in *D.E.S.M.* referred to the "stigma" of conviction (para. 23) and to other "restraint upon the liberty" of the accused apart from conventional jail, as having a deterrent effect (para. 26).
- [58] The Crown also refers to *R. v. Shah*, 2023 ABPC 43 in respect of the defence position that a suspended sentence is an appropriate sentence. In that case, a robbery conviction resulted in a CSO, with house arrest for 18 months and the balance under a curfew, followed by probation. The offender was a young man who was extremely remorseful and empathetic to his victim, unlike this case. The offender showed substantial efforts toward rehabilitation.
- [59] As did the court in *Valliers* at para. 34, I find it difficult to see how a suspended sentence can adequately address the principles of denunciation and deterrence, both general and specific, in this case.
- [60] I disagree that the conviction itself, as a stigma, or the "Sword of Damocles" scenario from a suspended sentence, is a sufficient punishment for Ms. Antonius, per Carrillo. Ms. Antonius has left the province to reside far away from the scene of her crime and clearly does not see herself as suffering any stigma at all. Further, imposing strict conditions as part of a suspended sentence while Ms. Antonius retreats to the safety of her siblings in their home does not adequately meet the denunciation and deterrence aspect of this sentencing.
- [61] In the usual case, a jail sentence would be warranted for this offence. I agree with the Crown that the rehabilitative aspects of sentencing and Ms. Antonius' low risk of re-offending move the balance to a CSO, a jail sentence in the community, as being appropriate to address all three sentencing principles. The balance does not swing primarily toward rehabilitation here for the following reasons.

- [62] This was a violent offence. In addition, Ms. Antonius' statements, as described above, clearly indicate that she has no understanding of the consequences of her actions. She is defiantly continuing in possession or control of the stolen property-Lucy. Concerns of specific deterrence and denunciation therefore gain prominence.
- [63] There are no mitigating factors. Ms. Antonius was a middle-aged woman with a decent education and employment background when she committed the offence. Her criminal background was dated and unrelated to the offence. Ms. Antonius completely lacks remorse, as indicated in the PPA Report. There was no guilty plea, consistent with her continuing assertion that she did nothing wrong. While defence counsel attempted to suggest during his submissions that Ms. Antonius was in fact remorseful, I consider this newly emerged empathy to be insincere and clearly only directed toward the result of this hearing.
- [64] I agree that rehabilitation remains a relevant principle. However, I have serious concerns and there is an open question about what that rehabilitation entails, particularly since Ms. Antonius does not see that she did anything wrong.
- [65] In addition, there is no evidence that Ms. Antonius' mental or other difficulties played a role in her offending, so as to stand as a mitigating factor: see for example, R. v. Laforge, 2020 BCSC 1269 at para. 64 and R. v. Doran, 2022 BCSC 1699 at paras. 66-69. Ms. Antonius' claim of having head injuries is entirely based on self-reporting. Even so, she does not give any explanation as to how any injuries, if they exist, contributed to her decision to attack Ms. Clayton. To the contrary, she still claims not to have done so or to have done anything wrong in taking Lucy.
- [66] Dr. Toma states that, at the time of the offence, Ms. Antonius had no substance abuse issues, although she seems to have recently re-engaged in that activity, which is some cause for concern. At the time of the offence, she was also in some form of psychiatric treatment and taking medication.
- [67] Finally, since the offence, I am not aware that Ms. Antonius has undertaken any rehabilitation efforts to address the reasons for her actions in May 2022.
- [68] In summary, I agree with the Crown's position that a CSO is a proper and fit sentence here in balancing the sentencing objectives and that the Crown's proposed CSO terms are reasonable. In the latter respect, the defence agrees.

Decision

- [69] Ms. Antonius would you please stand.
- [70] Both Crown and defence counsel agreed on the appropriate ancillary orders, which will be as follows for the offence.

- [71] Firstly, robbery is a primary designated offence (s. 487.04). Pursuant to s. 487.051(1) of the Criminal Code, I grant an order in Form 5.03 authorizing the taking of samples of bodily substances from Ms. Antonius for the purpose of registration in the DNA National Databank. You must attend at the Mission RCMP detachment at 7171 Oliver Street, Mission, BC on Thursday, December 11, 2025 and submit to the taking of the samples. This order is valid until executed.
- [72] Secondly, the conviction requires a mandatory firearms and weapons prohibition. Pursuant to s. 109(2) of the Criminal Code, you from prohibited from possessing:
- a. any firearm, other than a prohibited firearm or restricted firearm, and any crossbow, restricted weapon, ammunition and explosive substance for a period of 10 years from today, and
 - b. any prohibited firearm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device and prohibited ammunition for life.
- [73] I impose a conditional sentence order (CSO) for a term of 18 months. The conditions of the CSO are:
- a) You must keep the peace and be of good behaviour.
 - b) You must appear before the Court when required to do so by the Court.
 - c) You must notify the Court or your conditional sentence supervisor in advance of any change of name or address and promptly notify the Court or supervisor of any change in employment or occupation.
 - d) You must remain in British Columbia unless you have prior written permission from the Court or your conditional sentence supervisor to leave the province.
 - e) You must live at 10222 107th Avenue, Grande Prairie, Alberta and provide your conditional sentence supervisor with your phone number. You must not change your address or phone number without prior written permission from your supervisor.
 - f) You must report in person to a conditional sentence supervisor at the Abbotsford Courthouse Probation office by 3:00 p.m. today, and after that, you must report as directed by your supervisor.
 - g) You must have no contact or communication, directly or indirectly, with Monica Lynn Clayton.
 - h) You must not go to (or be within 200 meters) of any place where Monica Lynn Clayton lives, works, attends school or worships, or happens to be. If you see her, you must leave her presence immediately without any words or gestures.

- i) For the first six months of your conditional sentence order, you must obey house arrest by being inside your residence 24 hours a day, every day. You must present yourself immediately at the door to your residence or answer the phone when any peace officer or conditional sentence supervisor attends or calls to check on you during the house arrest.
- j) During your six months of house arrest:
 - i. you may be away from your residence during the house arrest with the written permission of your conditional sentence supervisor. Such permission is to be given only for employment or other compelling reasons. You must carry the permission with you when you are outside your residence; and
 - ii. You may be away from your residence during the house arrest while at, or going directly to, or returning directly from a healthcare facility because of a medical emergency. If asked, you must provide your conditional sentence supervisor with proof of your attendance at the facility.
- k) You must not possess or consume alcohol, or controlled substances as defined in the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, or any other intoxicating substance, except with a medical prescription.
- l) You must attend, participate in, and complete any intake, assessment, counselling or education program directed by your conditional sentence supervisor. This may include, but is not limited to, counselling or programming for: a) anger management; b) violence prevention; c) alcohol or drug addiction; and, e) psychiatric or psychological health.
- m) You must not possess, directly or indirectly, any weapon as defined by the Criminal Code, including: a) firearms and ammunition; b) cross-bows, prohibited or restricted weapons or devices, or explosive substances; c) anything used, designed to be used, or intended for use in causing death or injury to any person, or to threaten or intimidate any person; d) any imitation of all of the above, including any compressed air guns or BB/pellet guns; or e) any related authorizations, licenses and registration certificates, and you must not apply for any of these.

[74] I also consider that a restitution order is appropriately part of the sentence being imposed on Ms. Antonius, a general proposition with which defence counsel agreed.

[75] In addition to relevant evidence from the trial, I have considered Ms. Clayton's communication to the PSR writer about her losses and expenses, as above. Given those circumstances, pursuant to s. 738(1)(a) of the Criminal Code, I am ordering restitution of the amounts relating to the replacement value of the items that Ms. Clayton lost or destroyed by Ms. Antonius' actions in committing the offence.

[76] I consider those amounts to be the value of Lucy as paid by Ms. Antonius (\$560), the amount that Ms. Clayton paid to Ms. Antonius in relation to the spaying of Lucy (\$200) and the dog license fee for 2022 (\$36.40). In addition, Ms. Antonius broke Ms. Clayton's glasses which I believe can be readily ascertainable in an amount of at least \$50.

[77] In summary, I order that Ms. Antonius pay restitution in the amount of \$846.40 to Monica Lynn Clayton within one year of today's date. Defence counsel did not refer to Ms. Antonius as having any financial difficulties in paying a restitution order, to the extent that would be relevant to my order.

[78] Ms. Antonius, I sincerely hope that you take this sentence as an opportunity to examine your actions and come to an appreciation of the harm that you inflicted on Ms. Clayton when you clearly had other and legal means of resolving your dispute with her.

"Fitzpatrick J."

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/25/24/2025BCSC2438cor1.htm>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/r-v-antonius-2025>

Prepared on 25 October 2026 · Esheria