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on appeal from the court of appeal for ontario

 *Criminal law — Firearms — Elements of offence — Airgun — Accused charged with numerous weapon and firearm offences — Definition of “firearm” and “weapon” in Criminal Code — Trial judge concluding that airgun not weapon and acquitting accused of offences — Court of Appeal finding that barrelled objects that meet definition of firearm need not also meet definition of weapon to be deemed firearm — Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 2.*

 APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Rosenberg, Sharpe, Gillese, Epstein and Strathy JJ.A.), 2013 ONCA 539, 117 O.R. (3d) 171, 309 O.A.C. 311, 305 C.C.C. (3d) 372, [2013] O.J. No. 3918 (QL), 2013 CarswellOnt 12211, affirming the accused’s acquittal on the charge of pointing a firearm and setting aside the acquittals and ordering a new trial on charges of careless handling of a firearm, carrying a weapon for a purpose dangerous to the public peace and carrying a concealed weapon. Appeal dismissed.

 Solomon Friedman, for the appellant.

 John S. McInnes and Roger Shallow, for the respondent.

 The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

[1] The Chief Justice — For the reasons of Justice Rosenberg in the Court of Appeal, we are all of the view that the appeal should be dismissed.

 *Judgment accordingly.*

 Solicitors for the appellant: Edelson Clifford D’Angelo Friedman, Ottawa.

 Solicitor for the respondent: Attorney General of Ontario, Toronto.