



**SUPREME COURT OF CANADA**

**CITATION:** R. v. P.B., 2025 SCC 8

**APPEAL HEARD:** March 21, 2025  
**JUDGMENT RENDERED:** March 21,  
2025  
**DOCKET:** 41422

**BETWEEN:**

**P.B.**  
Appellant

and

**His Majesty The King**  
Respondent

- and -

**Attorney General of Ontario**  
Intervener

**CORAM:** Rowe, Martin, Kasirer, Jamal and Moreau JJ.

**UNANIMOUS** Rowe J.  
**JUDGMENT READ**  
**BY:**  
(paras. 1 to 2)

**NOTE:** This document is subject to editorial revision before its reproduction in final form in the *Canada Supreme Court Reports*.

---

**P.B.**

*Appellant*

v.

**His Majesty The King**

*Respondent*

and

**Attorney General of Ontario**

*Intervener*

**Indexed as: R. v. P.B.**

**2025 SCC 8**

File No.: 41422.

2025: March 21.

Present: Rowe, Martin, Kasirer, Jamal and Moreau JJ.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR SASKATCHEWAN

*Criminal law — Trial — Judgments — Reasons for judgment — Sufficiency of reasons — Evidence — Assessment — Credibility and reliability — Accused convicted of sexual assault at trial — Accused appealing conviction on basis that trial judge failed to give sufficient reasons with respect to factual findings about complainant's evidence and erred in assessing credibility and*

*reliability of complainant's evidence — Majority of Court of Appeal dismissing appeal — Conviction upheld.*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal (Jackson, Barrington-Foote and Kalmakoff JJ.A.), *2024 SKCA 77*, 500 D.L.R. (4th) 586, [2025] 2 W.W.R. 175, [2024] S.J. No. 232 (Lexis), 2024 CarswellSask 330 (WL), affirming the conviction of the accused for sexual assault. Appeal dismissed.

*Brady Knight and Catriona Kaiser-Derrick*, for the appellant.

*Erin Bartsch*, for the respondent.

*Elise Nakelsky and Adrianna Mills*, for the intervener.

The judgment of the Court was delivered orally by

[1] ROWE J. — The accused appeals as of right a decision by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal relating to his conviction for sexual assault. Justice Kalmakoff, for the majority, dismissed the appeal and affirmed the conviction. Justice Barrington-Foote, dissenting, would have ordered a new trial.

[2] Before this Court, as before the Court of Appeal, counsel for the accused submitted that the trial judge erred by failing to provide sufficient reasons for the verdict, and erred in law in

assessing the complainant's evidence. We would dismiss the appeal, substantially for the reasons of the majority of the Court of Appeal.

*Judgment accordingly.*

*Solicitors for the appellant: Knight Law, Saskatoon.*

*Solicitor for the respondent: Ministry of Justice and Attorney General, Regina.*

*Solicitor for the intervener: Ministry of the Attorney General, Toronto.*