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| JUGEMENT  L’appel interjeté contre l’arrêt de la Cour d’appel du Québec (Québec), numéro 200-10-003920-217, [2023 QCCA 358](https://citoyens.soquij.qc.ca/php/decision.php?ID=3E24BE0FD392342AFD129D705DFC4F94&captchaToken=03AFcWeA7XXuefgbskdholF5-eWKrTt_stu4l-tHz6mL-DvwujRahPEhb22SCw200Dvy7FIHX6q1_NUdKkU7pXZxCDWFXArTTtgHthrnmfu9ius2ke5Kowhc2eOPtyYQwfPWdmcEf7GPKRtHwrawcrnwX6r9YtJy6gGITi_Z8237v-i6qA-EsYrsQmyGu_oU2L5RdA39WD12x7gt0NdDLc5wiepIp2VxtiHWC2q7-nwhpQY8YEKW9WGlJn0pyI_O_3MwX5lSvsCDKzP8JmghFeLqCtL150lHHy72l4aFnFci5MF2V2DMz3RO54nSb76ej9cqTyPVPgySmhmn_YVD30N4JzERuY2meGZ7oeBz1wfQ5DUU-j5nDRqmfbsfMLVYRH6kteoKRq_NXZXUQk8nTzJ5cNPL_EAEef8kc2UrBD7cX0h5u8aPxr9kGQL30K5yO5wjeEQGiP9dJ-Eufy4GhXD3v9_bBO4Jo2TPi4O1Vjtz65EEQeMVqfLFpJMxXVGAvto8c7KbUNI1bypta5hpjqsGvVoR7JZrhkOrcFzS1CiQ3VK5_AdkmFzmekB9athno1WyE6dKqY5ADgvxVfD41KihBjY_0nf7bWs4Vbv6x5PY9h8KbNxg_jCDe_DeTW3thO38g-uEd1xXdvv3cuXJ7HUsAhvhmJ-3GDN_B2bQaBW-CDl8aliaibJiY), daté du 16 mars 2023, a été entendu le 20 mars 2024 et la Cour a prononcé oralement le même jour le jugement suivant :  La juge Côté — Ayant examiné les motifs, rendus oralement, de la juge du procès pour déterminer si le verdict a été vicié par un raisonnement illogique ou irrationnel au sens des arrêts *R. c. Beaudry*, 2007 CSC 5, [2007] 1 R.C.S. 190, et *R. c. Sinclair*, 2011 CSC 40, [2011] 3 R.C.S. 3, nous sommes d’avis de rejeter l’appel. Avec égards, même si la juge aurait pu s’exprimer plus clairement par moments, l’appelant ne fait pas voir une erreur révisable, car l’inférence de la juge repose sur toute la preuve. En particulier, il n’y a pas d’erreur révisable à l’égard du témoignage de la plaignante quant à la position de sa voiture au moment de la collision. Ainsi, et essentiellement pour les motifs de la majorité de la Cour d’appel, nous rejetons unanimement l’appel. |  | JUDGMENT  The appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Quebec (Québec), Number 200-10-003920-217, [2023 QCCA 358](https://citoyens.soquij.qc.ca/php/decision.php?ID=3E24BE0FD392342AFD129D705DFC4F94&captchaToken=03AFcWeA7XXuefgbskdholF5-eWKrTt_stu4l-tHz6mL-DvwujRahPEhb22SCw200Dvy7FIHX6q1_NUdKkU7pXZxCDWFXArTTtgHthrnmfu9ius2ke5Kowhc2eOPtyYQwfPWdmcEf7GPKRtHwrawcrnwX6r9YtJy6gGITi_Z8237v-i6qA-EsYrsQmyGu_oU2L5RdA39WD12x7gt0NdDLc5wiepIp2VxtiHWC2q7-nwhpQY8YEKW9WGlJn0pyI_O_3MwX5lSvsCDKzP8JmghFeLqCtL150lHHy72l4aFnFci5MF2V2DMz3RO54nSb76ej9cqTyPVPgySmhmn_YVD30N4JzERuY2meGZ7oeBz1wfQ5DUU-j5nDRqmfbsfMLVYRH6kteoKRq_NXZXUQk8nTzJ5cNPL_EAEef8kc2UrBD7cX0h5u8aPxr9kGQL30K5yO5wjeEQGiP9dJ-Eufy4GhXD3v9_bBO4Jo2TPi4O1Vjtz65EEQeMVqfLFpJMxXVGAvto8c7KbUNI1bypta5hpjqsGvVoR7JZrhkOrcFzS1CiQ3VK5_AdkmFzmekB9athno1WyE6dKqY5ADgvxVfD41KihBjY_0nf7bWs4Vbv6x5PY9h8KbNxg_jCDe_DeTW3thO38g-uEd1xXdvv3cuXJ7HUsAhvhmJ-3GDN_B2bQaBW-CDl8aliaibJiY), dated March 16, 2023, was heard on March 20, 2024, and the Court on that day delivered the following judgment orally:  [translation]  Côté J. — Having examined the trial judge’s reasons, delivered orally, to determine whether the verdict was vitiated by illogical or irrational reasoning within the meaning of *R. v. Beaudry*, 2007 SCC 5, [2007] 1 S.C.R. 190, and *R. v. Sinclair*, 2011 SCC 40, [2011] 3 S.C.R. 3, we would dismiss the appeal. With respect, even though the judge could have expressed herself more clearly at times, the appellant has not shown a reviewable error, because the judge’s inference was based on the whole of the evidence. In particular, there is no reviewable error with regard to the complainant’s testimony about the position of her car at the time of the collision. As a result, and substantially for the reasons of the majority of the Court of Appeal, we unanimously dismiss the appeal. |
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