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 APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Laskin, Feldman and Blair JJ.A.), 2018 ONCA 16, [2018] O.J. No. 140 (QL), 2018 CarswellOnt 227 (WL Can.), affirming the convictions of the accused. Appeal dismissed.
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 The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

1. Côté J. — In our view, having regard to the principles set out by this Court in *R. v. Villaroman*, 2016 SCC 33, [2016] 1 S.C.R. 1000, at para. 55, it was not unreasonable for the trial judge to conclude that the evidence as a whole excluded all reasonable alternatives to guilt, especially given the presence of Mr. Youssef’s DNA on two different pieces of evidence, one of which was connected to the scene of the bank robbery, and the other to the getaway car. When the trial judge’s reasons are read as a whole, and in the context of the evidence and the arguments at trial, we are not persuaded that the trial judge ignored other potential explanations.
2. We would therefore dismiss the appeal.

 Judgment accordingly.
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