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*Criminal law — Evidence — Admissibility — Defence evidence — Accused charged with first degree murder — Accused bringing pre-trial application to introduce deceased’s criminal record consisting of three firearms offences — Trial judge dismissing application on grounds that probative value of evidence was significantly outweighed by prejudicial effect of its admission — Accused convicted of second degree murder — Trial judge making no error in excluding evidence.*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Rosenberg, Sharpe and Gillese JJ.A.), 2013 ONCA 632, 301 C.C.C. (3d) 358, 311 O.A.C. 121, [2013] O.J. No. 4677 (QL), 2013 CarswellOnt 14119, upholding the accused’s conviction for second degree murder. Appeal dismissed.

Catriona Verner and Corbin Cawkell, for the appellant.

M. David Lepofsky, for the respondent.

The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

1. Abella J. — We do not, with respect, see any basis for interfering with the reasons of Gillese J.A. and, in particular, with her conclusion that the trial judge made no error in determining that the minimal probative value of the proposed evidence was substantially outweighed by its prejudicial effect.
2. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

*Judgment accordingly.*
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