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on appeal from the court of appeal for british columbia

 *Criminal law — Motor vehicles — Failure to provide breath sample — Burden of proof applicable to demonstration of “reasonable excuse” for refusal to provide breath sample — Accused bears persuasive burden of proving excuse — Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 794(2).*

**Statutes and Regulations Cited**

*Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 794(2).

 APPEAL from a judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal (Newbury, Frankel and Garson JJ.A.), 2014 BCCA 80, 307 C.C.C. (3d) 1, 64 M.V.R. (6th) 254, 10 C.R. (7th) 188, [2014] B.C.J. No. 347 (QL), 2014 CarswellBC 490 (WL Can.), setting aside the accused’s acquittal and reinstating his conviction. Appeal dismissed.

 Amandeep Jaswal, for the appellant.

 Mary T. Ainslie, Q.C., and John Caldwell, for the respondent.

 Philip Perlmutter and Karen Papadopoulos, for the intervener the Attorney General of Ontario.

 Matthew David Dalidowicz, for the intervener the Attorney General of Alberta.

 The following is the judgment delivered orally by

1. The Court — In our view, the British Columbia Court of Appeal correctly concluded that s. 794(2) of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, properly interpreted, imposes a persuasive burden on the accused to prove an “exception, exemption, proviso, excuse or qualification prescribed by law”. We do not think it appropriate to deal with the new issues raised by the interveners.
2. The appeal is dismissed.

 *Judgment accordingly.*
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