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APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Hoy A.C.J.O. and Paciocco and Nordheimer JJ.A.), [2020 ONCA 392](https://www.ontariocourts.ca/decisions/2020/2020ONCA0392.htm), 388 C.C.C. (3d) 435, 454 D.L.R. (4th) 54, [2020] O.J. No. 2656 (QL), 2020 CarswellOnt 8270 (WL), affirming the convictions of the accused for incest and sexual interference. Appeal dismissed.
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The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

[1] Côté J. — We are all of the view that the appeal should be dismissed, substantially for the reasons of Hoy A.C.J.

*Judgment accordingly.*

*Solicitors for the appellant: Bottomley Barristers, Toronto.*

*Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Ontario, Toronto.*