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 The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

[1] The Chief Justice — This appeal as of right comes to us based on the dissent of Berger J.A. in the Court of Appeal of Alberta. The learned Justice of Appeal was of the view that trial counsel’s conduct of the case (not counsel before us) was “woefully incompetent” and that “it cannot be safely concluded that the appellant received a fair trial”: reasons on appeal, at para. 153 (2015 ABCA 141, 600 A.R. 66).

[2] We are all of the view that the appeal must be dismissed. To succeed in setting aside a trial verdict on the basis of the ineffective assistance of counsel, the appellant must show “first, that counsel’s acts or omissions constituted incompetence and second, that a miscarriage of justice resulted”: *R. v. G.D.B*., 2000 SCC 22, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 520, at para. 26. Aside from finding that “[c]ounsel’s ineffectiveness pertains to critical aspects of the trial”, the learned dissenting Justice did not indicate how the instances which he identified of counsel’s incompetence had occasioned a miscarriage of justice: reasons on appeal, at para. 153.

[3] As this Court noted in *G.D.B.*, miscarriages of justice may take many forms in the context of ineffective assistance of counsel. While the Court of Appeal addressed a wide range of issues, we need comment only on one: we are not persuaded that there was any miscarriage of justice in any of its forms in this case.

[4] The appeal is dismissed.

 *Judgment accordingly.*
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