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**Statutes and Regulations Cited**

*Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, ss. 276.1, 683(1), 686(1)(b).

APPEAL from a judgment of the Alberta Court of Appeal (Slatter, Bielby and O’Ferrall JJ.A.), 2020 ABCA 76, 457 C.R.R. (2d) 223, 453 D.L.R. (4th) 387, [2020] A.J. No. 235 (QL), 2020 CarswellAlta 330 (WL Can.), affirming the conviction entered by Goss J., 2017 ABQB 593, [2017] A.J. No. 1026 (QL), 2017 CarswellAlta 1808 (WL Can.). Appeal dismissed.

*Deborah R. Hatch*, for the appellant.
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The following is the judgment delivered orally by

[1] The Court — We would dismiss the appeal. The parties did not dispute that the trial judge erred in dismissing the accused’s application under s. 276.1 of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, to cross‑examine the complainant. In our view, this error did not lead to a miscarriage of justice and falls within the curative proviso under s. 686(1)(b) because the evidence was otherwise overwhelming and a conviction was inevitable.

[2] We do not endorse Slatter J.A.’s application of s. 683(1). Neither party sought this remedy before the Court of Appeal, and in this Court, both parties as well as the intervener urged us to reject his approach.

*Judgment accordingly.*
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