

CANADA / JUDGMENT

R.A. v. Her Majesty The Queen

2018 SCC 13

COURT

Supreme Court of Canada

DECIDED

23 March 2018

Source: decisions.scc-csc.ca · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

R.A. v. Her Majesty The Queen Collection Supreme Court Judgments Date 2018-03-23 Neutral citation 2018 SCC 13 Report

[2018] 1 SCR 307 Case number 37757 Judges Moldaver, Michael J.; Karakatsanis, Andromache; Gascon, Clément; Côté, Suzanne; Rowe, Malcolm On appeal from Ontario Notes SCC Case Information Decision Content SUPREME COURT OF CANADA Citation: R. v. R.A., 2018 SCC 13, [2018] 1 S.C.R. 307 Appeal heard: March 23, 2018 Judgment rendered: March 23, 2018 Docket: 37757 Between: R.A. Appellant and Her Majesty The Queen Respondent Coram: Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Gascon, Côté and Rowe JJ. Reasons for Judgment: (para. 1) Moldaver J. (Karakatsanis, Gascon, Côté and Rowe JJ. concurring) R. v. R.A., 2018 SCC 13, [2018] 1 S.C.R. 307 R.A. Appellant v. Her Majesty The Queen Respondent Indexed as: R. v. R.A. 2018 SCC 13 File No.: 37757. 2018: March 23. Present: Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Gascon, Côté and Rowe JJ. on appeal from the court of appeal for ontario 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. Solicitors for the appellant: Abergel Goldstein & Partners, Ottawa. Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Ontario, Toronto.
-

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/17031/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/r-a-v-her-majesty-the-queen-2018>

Prepared on 28 October 2026 · Esheria