

CANADA / JUDGMENT

R. v. R.P.

2025 ONCA 847

COURT

Court of Appeal for Ontario

DECIDED

3 December 2025

Source: norma.lexum.com · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

R. v. R.P. Collection Decisions of the Court of Appeal Date 2025-12-03 Neutral citation 2025 ONCA 847 Docket numbers COA-22-CR-0059 Judges Tulloch, Michael H.; Coroza, Steve A.; Madsen, Lene Subject Criminal Decision Content COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO CITATION: R. v. R.P., 2025 ONCA 847[1] DATE: 20251203 DOCKET: COA-22-CR-0059 Tulloch C.J.O., Coroza and Madsen JJ.A. BETWEEN His Majesty the King Respondent and R.P. Appellant R.P., acting in person Nicholas Hay, for the respondent Heard: December 1, 2025 On appeal from the conviction entered by Justice Jennifer A. Crawford of the Ontario Court of Justice on August 2, 2018. REASONS FOR DECISION

- [1] The appellant appeals his convictions for sexual assault, assault with a weapon, uttering threats, possession of a prohibited weapon, and possession of a weapon while subject to a prohibition order. He submits that the verdicts were unreasonable, that the trial judge failed to apply the proper legal principles, and that he received ineffective assistance of counsel. We do not accept these submissions and as such dismiss the appeal.
- [2] The record amply supports the trial judge's findings. The complainant gave a detailed account of being confined in the appellant's room for an extended period, during which she was repeatedly assaulted, shot with a BB gun, and sexually assaulted. Her evidence was corroborated by several independent sources: the roommate heard a woman crying and repeatedly saying "please stop"; the complainant's mother observed fresh injuries immediately after the complainant left the appellant's residence; a physician described her injuries as recent; the complainant's blood was located on the appellant's bedding; and BB gun pellets were recovered from the appellant's room. Photographs taken shortly after the incident depicted extensive injuries consistent with the complainant's account. The trial judge found the complainant to be a credible and reliable witness. These findings were open to her on the evidence.

- [3] The appellant has not demonstrated that the trial judge misapplied the governing legal principles. The reasons reflect a correct understanding and application of *R. v. W.(D.)*, the presumption of innocence, and the Crown's burden of proof. The trial judge carefully reviewed the evidence, addressed the defence submissions, and provided clear, logical reasons for her conclusions. No error of law or misapprehension of the evidence has been shown.
- [4] The appellant's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel is also without merit. Many of the factual assertions on which he relies are unsupported or directly contradicted by the record, including allegations regarding unproduced cell phone records, an alleged video recording, and statements attributed to witnesses. Trial counsel's strategic decisions were reasonable and well-explained, and there is no basis to conclude that his conduct fell outside the range of competent professional assistance. Moreover, in light of the overwhelming evidence against the appellant, he has not established any prejudice capable of undermining the reliability of the verdict.
- [5] In these circumstances, there is no basis upon which to interfere with the trial judge's findings or the resulting convictions. The appeal is dismissed. "M. Tulloch C.J.O." "S. Coroza J.A." "L. Madsen J.A."
- [1] This appeal is subject to a publication ban pursuant to s. 486.4 of the Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46.

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://norma.lexum.com/coa/coa/en/item/23768/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/r-v-r-p-2025>

Prepared on 26 October 2026 · Esheria