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*Criminal law — Trial — Judgments — Reasons for judgment — Sufficiency of reasons — Accused convicted of sexual interference — Accused arguing on appeal that trial judge failed to resolve critical inconsistency in complainant’s evidence and failed to explain why he accepted complainant’s evidence and rejected accused’s evidence — Court of Appeal holding that trial judge’s analysis reflected careful and sensitive approach to evidence as a whole and that trial judge’s reasons were responsive to live issues in case and to parties’ key arguments — Conviction upheld.*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Gillese, Huscroft and Trotter JJ.A.), 2017 ONCA 714, 355 C.C.C. (3d) 400, [2017] O.J. No. 4772 (QL), 2017 CarswellOnt 14114 (WL Can.), affirming the conviction entered by Tausendfreund J., 2015 ONSC 7494, [2015] O.J. No. 6791 (QL), 2015 CarswellOnt 19536 (WL Can.). Appeal dismissed, Gascon J. dissenting.

Howard L. Krongold, for the appellant.

Rachel Young and Alexander Alvaro, for the respondent.

The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

1. Moldaver J. — A majority of the Court would dismiss the appeal, substantially for the reasons of the majority of the Court of Appeal. Justice Gascon, dissenting, would have allowed the appeal for the reasons of Justice Trotter.

*Judgment accordingly.*
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