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 APPEAL from a judgment of the Alberta Court of Appeal (Berger, Wakeling and Martin JJ.A.), 2017 ABCA 223, [2017] A.J. No. 1006 (QL), 2017 CarswellAlta 1756 (WL Can.), affirming the convictions of the accused. Appeal dismissed.

 Peter J. Royal, Q.C., and *David N. B. Sims*, for the appellant.

 Troy Couillard, for the respondent.

 The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

1. Rowe J. — We all agree that, read fairly, the trial judge’s reasons make clear that the alibi evidence was neither credible nor reliable. We are also of the view that the trial judge’s reasons were sufficient.
2. Accordingly, we are all of the view that the appeal should be dismissed.

 *Judgment accordingly.*

 Solicitors for the appellant: Royal & Company, Edmonton.

 Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Alberta, Edmonton.