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*Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 273.2.

 APPEAL from a judgment of the Court Martial Appeal Court of Canada (Bell C.J. and Bennett and Trudel JJ.A.), 2018 CMAC 1, [2018] C.M.A.J. No. 1 (QL), 2018 CarswellNat 234 (WL Can.), setting aside the acquittal of the accused and ordering a new trial. Appeal dismissed.

 Mark Létourneau, Jean-Bruno Cloutier and Francesca Ferguson, for the appellant.

 Dominic G. J. Martin, Bruce W. MacGregor and Anthony T. Farris, for the respondent.

 Kelly McMillan and Shaun O’Brien, for the intervener.

 English version of the judgment of the Court delivered orally by

[1] The Chief Justice — We are all of the opinion that the appeal should be dismissed, substantially for the reasons of the majority of the Court Martial Appeal Court of Canada.

[2] However, with respect, on the record before us, we are of the opinion that there was no evidence from which a trier of fact could find that the appellant had taken reasonable steps to ascertain that the complainant was consenting.

[3] In so concluding, we are also of the view that the principles enunciated in *R. v. George*, 2017 SCC 38, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 1021, are of no assistance in applying s. 273.2 of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46.

[4] It follows that the defence of honest but mistaken belief should not have been put to the panel.

 *Judgment accordingly.*
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