

CANADA / JUDGMENT

R. v. Larsen

2021 BCSC 1910

COURT

Supreme Court of British Columbia

DECIDED

7 September 2021

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

2021 BCSC 1910 R. v. Larsen IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA Citation: R. v. Larsen, 2021 BCSC 1910 Date: 20210907 Docket: 108530 Registry: Kamloops Regina v. Trent Alan Larsen Restriction on publication: A publication ban has been imposed under s. 486.5 of the Criminal Code restricting the publication, broadcasting or transmission in any way of evidence that could identify a victim/witness/undercover officer, referred to in this judgment by initials. This publication ban applies indefinitely unless otherwise ordered. Before: The Honourable Madam Justice B.J. Brown Oral Reasons for Sentence Counsel for the Crown: N. Wiberg Counsel for the Accused: T.D. Anderson A. Lagemaat Place and Date of Hearing: Kamloops, B.C. September 7, 2021 Place and Date of Judgment: Kamloops, B.C. September 7, 2021

- [1] THE COURT: I am satisfied that the proposed sentence is appropriate. These are very tragic circumstances. I am certain that they were driven by alcohol, drugs, and mental illness. There are many aggravating circumstances as are set out in the agreed statement of facts. This was a couple. Ms. Fehr was pregnant with Mr. Larsen's child. In the course of some sort of a struggle where Ms. Fehr had a knife, Mr. Larsen grabbed a lamp and struck her in an effort to get the knife away. He was not successful but ended up strangling her with the cord of the lamp. He then put her body into a barrel with cement. He took the barrel to a friend's house in the 100 Mile area, I believe, and the barrel was buried. Then, for the next 19 years, although police were suspicious of what had happened, they were not able to prove that Mr. Larsen had caused Ms. Fehr's death.
- [2] There are a number of aggravating factors which the Crown and defence have alluded to. The first is that Ms. Fehr and Mr. Larsen were in a trust relationship and that she was pregnant; the second is that Mr. Larsen was on probation at the time; and the third is the length of the time that he strangled her. Five minutes is a long period of time.
- [3] There are mitigating factors. As I understand it, there was a focused preliminary hearing. The plea will save considerable court time, months of court time, that would have been spent proving this case, the prosecution may not have been successful. Mr. Larsen is very remorseful.

- [4] I have reviewed the cases that the parties have provided to me with respect to the appropriate range of sentence and, as has been indicated in court today, generally speaking, for an offence of this nature, it would be in the six to seven-and-a-half-year range. Mr. Larsen will be sentenced to eight years on the manslaughter charge and three-and-a-half years on the charge of offering indignity to a body.
- [5] As the Supreme Court of Canada has said in *R. v. Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43, there are real benefits that are provided to society and to those who are affected by these sorts of crimes when a guilty plea is entered and when there is an agreed sentence that is fixed. It provides not only efficiency with respect to the judicial system, it provides closure for everyone who is involved, and it provides a result that may not have been achieved if this matter went to trial. So I am satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstance that I accept the joint submission with respect to sentence.
- [6] I will impose the two corollary orders that are sought. Those are a DNA order and weapons order for life. Both of those are mandatory, as I understand it, so I will impose those orders.
- [7] With respect to the application of time served, I will direct that that is applied to the offering indignity to the body portion of the sentence.
- [8] There is one other matter because this indictment was just sworn today, we have to deal with the fact that Mr. Larsen is in custody on the previous indictment. So how do I deal with that?
- [9] CNSL N. WIBERG: My submission, first of all, I just confirm the two sentences are consecutive?
- [10] THE COURT: Yes, they are consecutive. Yes.
- [11] CNSL N. WIBERG: Yes. I would just suggest that the record reflect the sentence you imposed and you are able to on this indictment, I submit, declare what the time in custody would be and just declare that that would be removed. I think my friend's calculation which I accept is it was three years on the grossed-up model, 700 and --
- [12] THE COURT: It is three years and a few days, I thought.
- [13] CNSL T. ANDERSON: Six days.
- [14] CNSL N. WIBERG: Three years and six days, that that three years and six days be removed from the 11-and-a-half years. So that would leave eight-and-a-half years minus the six days remainder to serve.
- [15] THE COURT: Right. I need to be specific as to which particular sentence I am applying --
- [16] CNSL N. WIBERG: Yes, yes.
- [17] THE COURT: -- those days to? I agree.

- [18] With respect to Count 1, that is the manslaughter count, I am sentencing Mr. Larsen to eight years. With respect to Count 2, that is improperly or indecently interfering with or offering indignity to a dead human body, I am sentencing him to three-and-a-half years. The time served, which is three years and six days, will be deducted from three-and-a-half years which leaves -- how many days left to serve on that?
- [19] CNSL N. WIBERG: That would be six months minus six days.
- [20] THE COURT: All right. Is that sufficiently precise, Madam Clerk, or do we need to be more precise with that?
- [21] CNSL N. WIBERG: I think that is enough precision.
- [22] THE COURT: I am not sure about that.
- [23] CNSL T. ANDERSON: I was going to say five months and 24 days.
- [24] CNSL N. WIBERG: Oh.
- [25] THE COURT: Five months --
- [26] CNSL N. WIBERG: Yes.
- [27] THE COURT: -- and 24 days.
- [28] CNSL N. WIBERG: That is fine.
- [29] THE COURT: Let us do that.
- [30] CNSL T. ANDERSON: Thank you.
- [31] CNSL N. WIBERG: Yes.
- [32] THE COURT: So five months and 24 days remain to be served on Count 2 and, Count 1, it will be eight years.
- [33] CNSL N. WIBERG: One other housekeeping item, My Lady, is that there was a one-count indictment before the court. The Crown directs a stay of proceedings on that one-count indictment.
- [34] THE COURT: Is that right? Okay.
- [35] CNSL N. WIBERG: Yes, so it is not floating around. It is --
- [36] THE COURT: All right, anything further?
- [37] CNSL N. WIBERG: Nothing from my perspective, My Lady.
- [38] CNSL T. ANDERSON: No, My Lady, thank you.
- [39] THE COURT: Thank you. "B.J. Brown 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/21/19/2021BCSC1910.htm>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/r-v-larsen-2021>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria