

Court File No. CR-22-00000484

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

5

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

10

v.

15

JACK DENSMORE

20

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE J. KRAWCHENKO
on May 28, 2024 at HAMILTON, Ontario

25

INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN CANNOT BE PUBLISHED,
BROADCAST OR TRANSMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 486.4
AND 278 OF THE *CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA* BY
ORDER OF THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRAWCHENKO,
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

APPEARANCES:

30

B. Sosa

Counsel for the Crown

M. Fahmy

Counsel for Jack Densmore

(i)
Table of Contents

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

5	<u>Exam.</u>	<u>Cr-</u>	<u>Re-</u>
<u>WITNESSES</u>	<u>in-Ch.</u>	<u>exam.</u>	<u>exam.</u>
Submissions by Mr. Fahmy	13		
Ruling	27		

E X H I B I T S

15	<u>EXHIBIT NUMBER</u>	<u>ENTERED ON PAGE</u>
20	INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN CANNOT BE PUBLISHED, BROADCAST OR TRANSMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 486.4 AND 278 OF THE <i>CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA</i> BY ORDER OF THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRAWCHENKO, SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE	

Legend

25	[sic] indicates preceding word has been reproduced verbatim and is not a transcription error.
	(ph) indicates preceding word has been spelled phonetically
	All spellings of names are transcribed as set out in the reporter's notes unless noted with a (ph)

30	Transcript Ordered August 7, 2024
	Transcript Completed September 16, 2024
	Ordering Party Notified September 16, 2024

1.

R. v. Jack Densmore
In Camera

TUESDAY, MAY 28, 2024

5

10

15

20

25

30

CLERK REGISTRAR: This court has ordered that the identity of the complainant or any information that could disclose the identity of the complainant shall not be published in any document or broadcast in any way, and pursuant to Section 278 there is an order directing that the contents of any application any evidence taken information given submissions made or any decision or reasons provided by the court shall not be published in any document or broadcast or transmitted in any way. Thank you, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. SOSA: Good morning, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SOSA: For the record, Sosa, S-O-S-A, initial B. We are here for the trial continuation of Mr. Densmore. Your Honour, at the last appearance the last exhibit that was filed was the agreed statement of fact. I can confirm Your Honour that is the case for the Crown. There's no further Crown evidence so we close our case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. FAHMY: Good morning, Your....

THE COURT: Defence, are you calling any evidence?

MR. FAHMY: Yes, we will be calling evidence.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FAHMY: And just before we do that, my friend and I would like to address an evidentiary issue with Your Honour and we respectfully ask that this be done in camera because it contains some very

sensitive, well, both of us are asking for that because it contains discussions and perhaps even showing you a video that contains some very, we want to protect the privacy of another individual, Your Honour.

5

THE COURT: All right. Is that....

MR. SOSA: That's agreed, thank you.

THE COURT: And we're going to do this at the outset?

10

MR. SOSA: Yes, please, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Right now?

MR. SOSA: If we can do that right now.

15

THE COURT: All right, we'll go in camera then for that based on the joint request by both defence and the Crown.

CLERK REGISTRAR: Thank you, Your Honour. I'll just direct the people that are asked to leave the courtroom at this time. Thank you.

20

I N C A M E R A

THE COURT: Are we on Zoom?

CLERK REGISTRAR: Your Honour, there's nobody on here. Would you like me to log off?

25

THE COURT: Yes, please.

CLERK REGISTRAR: Thank you.

MR. FAHMY: Okay, my computer is freezing, Your Honour, I apologize, just a moment.

30

THE COURT: While you're doing that, let's just talk, let's have a quick discussion too about our plan. So I understand that we're starting today and we have Wednesday, part of Thursday, I don't

know whether you know about that, but I only have like half of Thursday and then Friday.

MR. SOSA: We were only advised about today's date, tomorrow and Friday.

5 THE COURT: Oh, Friday. Okay, good.

MR. FAHMY: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So then, yes, so Thursday was out then completely?

MR. SOSA: Yes.

10 MR. FAHMY: Yes, that was....

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. So they took that into account rather than doing a half day.

Perfect.

MR. FAHMY: And I could - go ahead.

15 MR. SOSA: So I guess, Your Honour, I mean, I know this was raised by my friend about some month ago or so. We didn't really discuss much about it until this morning when it was raised again.

20 Essentially, there's a piece of video evidence that Mr. Fahmy wants to rely on. I'm opposed. It will require a ruling from Your Honour. The Crown's position in a nutshell is that it is oath helping, it's a prior consistent statement and its only purpose would be to bolster the credibility 25 of Mr. Densmore. I understand Mr. Fahmy has a different position, but just in a nutshell, that is the Crown's position. So we do object to that evidence going in.

30 But Your Honour, again, this is something that really wasn't raised. And I take the position that this does require a ruling from Your Honour.

And if further submissions are required or any case law, then I would require a brief recess to do so.

THE COURT: Okay. You ready to go?

5 MR. FAHMY: No, I just wanted to kind of...

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FAHMY: ...make some submissions, Your Honour, about that.

THE COURT: Sure.

10 MR. FAHMY: So - and the reason why we're in camera. So, obviously, the evidence is, so far, that Mr. Densmore reached for his phone in order to capture the complaint while they were engaged in oral sex. Her evidence was that she said, what are you doing? He said, I'm filming. She says, put it away. He says, sure, no problem. Does that, whatever. Mr. Densmore's anticipated evidence is that he had tried to tell her, well, it's just to kind of get a consent video. She says, I don't want to be on video. So no problem and puts it away.

15

20

Now that opens up the door to my friend then to even - well, first to cross-examine him on that, right? You know, why would you do that, this and that, and you know. And second, even if, without cross examining, you know, it opens up the door to my friend to make like a submission that perhaps along the lines of like, you know, he's trying to do something further criminal or whatever, voyeurism, whatever it is, and that that's a kind of a bad act.

25

30

5

I know there wasn't a distributable conduct application, but it's within the confines of the allegations itself. Like, it's within the confines of what was going on between the two of them. The issue is this, is that my client publicly in October of 2019, in a YouTube video is....

10

THE COURT: When is the offence date?

15

MR. FAHMY: August of 2020, so prior.

THE COURT: 2019, okay.

20

MR. FAHMY: Yes. He's advising the public about, you know, you know, like these like hookups, whatever at SoCo or sorry, HoCo, like the homecomings and whatever the partying, and whatever, you know, make sure you get consent, make sure you're not too drunk and then also make sure you get a consent video. So he's already warning the public about that. And then in March of, and actually there's a woman who he had had a private video with, got her consent on that, and then she is also in the YouTube video with his - with her permission, obviously. Like, there's no nudity or anything like that. It's just she's saying, hey, you know, whatever. And he's kind of using - because she wanted to be in the video for that part of it, and he let her and it's there in that October 2019 video.

25

30

And then in March of 2020, we've got a video of, you know, a different lady. And what the video will depict is her and my client are both naked.

5

10

15

20

25

30

He's lying on the bed. She's kind of sitting on her knees directly in front of him, and then, you know, she's saying, okay, like, what do you want me to say? Whatever. He's like, like, you know, just consent, whatever. Like, they have a brief conversation about - she's like, yeah, I consent, whatever, and something along the lines of like before he could even like continue or whatever, you know, she continues to engage in oral sex. So the oral sex had happened. It stopped while he's filming, and then she continued on, which is kind of bang on to what is happening in our case.

I just don't want it - and it's not my friend's position is that it's a prior consistent statement, which I understand where he might want to say that, but that's not what this is. This is to alleviate the idea that this is like a one off thing. This isn't something that my client has promoted in the past. And in fact, before this incident, months before this incident, there's like the exact same situation where he was trying to do this to kind of protect himself, which is....

THE COURT: Can this not be done, absent this, by way of a further agreed statement of fact, like just to say, look, it exists. The purpose of it is up to the trial judge to decide. But I mean, as a fact, in the universe, these things exist. That in advance of the occurrence that led to this, where it has its own factual matrix to decide consent, not consent, mistaken belief as to

5

10

15

20

25

30

consent, wherever we're going with it, that's, that's over here. But this exists, that he has made a video promoting consent videos, whether or not he followed that is a completely different story, whether that is what occurred there, or whether or not even the timing even makes sense to say after the evidence, again, hearing the evidence of like a series of, you know, sexual acts, now's the time to do a - anyways. But I mean, that's open to be argued. But just the fact that there was, that he has made a video promoting to his followers, get consent on video, and that, in fact, he did, there is one out in the universe where he does practice this technique, and just leave it at that as opposed to introducing that in evidence?

MR. SOSA: Well, Your Honour, I had suggested to Mr. Fahmy something close to what you've just described. The practice that he has in place, whether it applies or whether it's relevant for our purposes, that's fine, that's one issue. I don't see the need to play the video, to in some way seal it and mark it as an exhibit, because that's the way it was presented to me to....

THE COURT: Yes - no, I'm not too keen on that. I mean, because I think that's the purpose of the defence wanting to do it, to say, look, we want to put it in front of the court that in October, the year prior, he was promoting this. In March, prior to this, he actually practiced that technique. Full stop, without saying, because again, it's like past conduct, that - who cares?

5 It's whether or not it sways the day, whether or not, if the anticipated evidence is, well, as per the agreed statement of facts, this is what I believe, I believe, you know, X, Y, and Z should happen and, in fact, I tried to do it at that time, and it's subject to cross-examination.

10 MR. SOSA: So, Your Honour, my only - well, what I should say is, my position is, I have not seen either of those videos that have been referred to. With respect to the open source consent video, once I observe that, I don't see any issue agreeing that it exists.

15 THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

20 MR. SOSA: With respect to the second video, my position would be that it's just as simple as him taking the stand and testifying that he's done it in the past. I don't believe there needs to be an agreed statement of fact. It's simply that he's done this in the past, and then if he wants to say when he did it, that would cover it.

25 THE COURT: Other than - other than for the Crown having this full disclosure. So let's say this stuff ended up in your hands as part of this whole investigation by police. You would have had it, you would have noted it, and you would have said that this exists, right? Just because it either exists or doesn't exist, question one. Relevance is question number two, and that can be...

30 MR. FAHMY: Argued.

THE COURT: Argued subsequently to say, well, yeah, listen. Nobody disputes the fact that, you know, he's said that in the past and maybe done it

5

in the past. But it's kind of like saying, I adhere to the speed laws. I know 100 kilometers means 100 kilometers an hour. And, yeah, and I tell people, follow the speed limit. And, you know, do you always follow the speed limit? No. You know, that kind of argument. But maybe the way around here, just so that we can, you know, navigate through this, is why don't we take - how long does it take to show this video?

10

MR. FAHMY: Oh, it's like four....

THE COURT: I don't want to see it.

MR. FAHMY: No.

15

THE COURT: You guys can look at it. I come back in, what, 10 minutes? We stand down for 10 minutes. You take a look at it. You then come - you decide and you say, this is what the Crown's position is, whether or not we have to argue it fully or not. You may very well say, yeah, open source, no problem. Second one, yeah, I'm persuaded it's okay just to mention, to say that, you know, again, in March or whatever, this - he...

20

MR. SOSA: Right.

25

THE COURT: ...practiced what he was preaching and with the idea that the relevance of that particular information or evidence is going to be determined by me, you know, whether or not that means anything or not.

30

MR. FAHMY: Exactly.

MR. SOSA: So then, with that, Your Honour, I think 10 minutes might be a little tight. Could we get...

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SOSA: Do you want to come back at 11? Because if you look at it and you decide it's okay, then we could do - you could then give a statement of fact. Good? Or do you need longer?

5 MR. SOSA: I think 11 is enough time, Your Honour. That's what you suggested, sorry, right?

THE COURT: Yeah, yeah, no, 11. I'm flexible. Do you want, do you need more - I know it's tough.

10 MR. SOSA: I really need to....

THE COURT: Eleven-fifteen?

MR. SOSA: I need to see it and consider the Crown's position. That's why it's difficult for me to - but I think 11 is enough.

15 THE COURT: You sure? Because I don't want - this is the 7th floor, so I'm going back up and down. I'm being a little selfish.

MR. FAHMY: How about this....

20 THE COURT: Eleven-fifteen, or why don't you contact...

MR. SOSA: Yes.

THE COURT: ...the trial coordinator when you're ready?

MR. SOSA: Sure.

25 THE COURT: So we're - well, this is considered the continuation of our in camera session right now. I'll be recalled when you've had an opportunity to discuss how we're navigating. Good?

30 MR. SOSA: Yes, thank you.

MR. FAHMY: Thank you.

... COURT IS STOOD DOWN.

... COURT RECALLED.

MR. FAHMY: Yes, thank you, Your Honour, first for that time. Unfortunately, my friend takes the position that the private video, along with the YouTube videos, are not relevant, and therefore, he can't agree to an agree statement of fact that I emailed to him, which just outlines the basic existence of these facts. However, I think the issue goes a bit deeper than that, in that if I were to even ask my client about this while he's on the stand, my friend's going to object to say that it's not relevant. So I take the position that not only is it relevant, but it's admissible. My friend takes the position that because it's not relevant, it's not admissible. I take a different view. My view is that there is probative value in it, it's relevant, and it's admissible, but that the weight of its relevance is something that could be argued later on.

What I do suggest is, you know, I've talked to my - and my friend gave me a case, you know, Supreme Court of Canada decision. I don't think it's on point with respect to that, because that's a 276 on its constitutionality. So instead of kind of holding the matter down, us trying to make further submissions or arguments about that, I would like to get started with my client's evidence. I guess we can - perhaps the way the questioning might come out in that my friend won't object if he does object, what I'm going to suggest is that we kind of hold off on this until tomorrow, perhaps.

5

10

15

20

25

30

I have two thoughts, either to ask you to hold this down and we come back at two to make the arguments, and then we've kind of wasted the day on this. Or we can get started, take the rest of the, like, you know, after court's done, to try to come up with some arguments, come back on Wednesday morning to continue with my client's evidence. I'm in your Honour's hands. I'm just trying to think a couple steps ahead.

THE COURT: Yes. No, no, I appreciate that.

MR. SOSA: Your Honour, the position is simple from the Crown's view. It's not relevant. Ms.

[REDACTED] took the stand, was asked, did you agree to this consent video? She said no. There is no consent video.

THE COURT: Well....

MR. SOSA: What is the relevance of prior consent videos?

THE COURT: Well, no, it's - as I understood it, it was, that's the suggestion being posed, the *Browne v. Dunn* kind of suggestion, is to say, was this a, she says no to that, his evidence, I anticipate now is going to be, yeah, the reason why I did that was a consent video. Now it pits the two versions against the other. Not that that's the decisive analysis, but it's, now we have, hold on, she said absolutely not, he says it did, that's why I did this particular thing, and again, I do this all the time, and I preach it.

Okay, well, does somebody's path, as I said, like,

5

10

20

25

30

I mean, that's when the argument comes up, the evidence is there to say, yeah, okay, that's what his practice is, and he didn't do it here. I say that he is not a credible witness, she's a credible witness, this never even came up, this is sort of like *ex post facto* rationalizing of something that occurred. And, you know, just because that's your normal practice doesn't mean that that occurred on that particular day, and there's no evidence to support that, or the evidence supports that it didn't occur, and therefore, it has to be disregarded.

And in fact, that, at that point, can be used as a determination to say that this person shouldn't be believed on that. Like, he's making this stuff up, as opposed to anything else. So, again, I'm kind of urging counsel to consider a way of stick handling this, because like my - if we can't, my preference is that we do these things incrementally. It makes no sense at all to me that at some point, we don't know when it's going to come up, and it could come up quite spontaneously, all of a sudden, you're up, and we're doing this, and it's going to be okay, time out, because it really doesn't make sense to sort of bypass that issue, and then finish, I guess, the exam in-chief, almost, until we have a ruling on this, and then come back and revisit it, at which then it's a second kick at the can. Then you're jumping up and going, well, Your Honour, you already said this, like, why are we doing

this? I think that we have to do it step by step.

5 So, if we cannot come to some kind of consensual agreement about its use, right, and oftentimes we'll do this in pretrial applications anyways, to say, well, yeah, you could do that, but this is as far as it goes. The purpose of it is just to say that it happened, I'm not saying it happened over here. That it happened, not once, but twice.
10 Once to the general public in a YouTube thing, if that's what it was, and once in the circumstances of a private encounter with somebody. And that's it, that this happened. Not to say it happened on this day, leaving it completely open for fruitful cross-examination, and ultimately argument about, you know, what weight, if anything, should be put on that evidence, just saying.
15

20 MR. SOSA: No, I hear Your Honour's point. The challenge, however, is whether it's admissible. It has to be relevant to be admissible. If I agree, if the Crown agrees, yes, that becomes part of the court record.

25 THE COURT: Right.

MR. SOSA: I am agreeing that it can be considered as evidence.

THE COURT: Right.

30 MR. SOSA: So we're opposed because it's not relevant, Your Honour. The fact that he had a practice in place is not what I'm objecting to. What I'm objecting to is the admissibility of those videos. Those videos....

THE COURT: On the basis of relevance only.

5 MR. SOSA: Right. And they do not — they do not advance the truth-seeking function of this court, for all the reasons that you've already identified. And, Your Honour, it's no different than if Mr. Densmore called those ladies here in person and said, well, I consented. How does that assist? It doesn't assist. The fact he had a practice, fine.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. SOSA: The videos, irrelevant.

THE COURT: All right.

20 MR. FAHMY: Again, Your Honour, I mean, it's entirely relevant because she said that he did not ask her about a consent video, which is what my client's evidence is going to be. And the fact that he has preached about it before, that this is something that he has done privately with others, and this is before her. We're trying — I mean, I'm not here to say....

25 THE COURT: Okay, so let me just stop you there.

Let's snowball off of what you're saying.

MR. FAHMY: Yes.

30 THE COURT: If that came to pass and we're not even talking about a agreed statement of fact.

You're putting this to him, you're asking him, you know, what occurred at this particular point, and he said, I asked to make a consent video.

MR. FAHMY: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Then you ask the next question, which is, why would you do something like that?

MR. FAHMY: Mm-hmm.

5

10

15

20

25

30

THE COURT: I guess we're going to be in the same scenario where you jump up and say, relevance, right? So either way you slice it, we're going to come down to an argument about the relevance of that bit of information. If that's the case, I can see that we're at an impasse, and I'm going to say, let us then, I'll give you time, but we'll come back in the afternoon, and I'll hear submissions on the relevance of that. Now, if there's anything else lurking, let's do all of that at the same time.

MR. FAHMY: Sure. But again, Your Honour, all I wanted to say is that my friend's argument really isn't that it's not relevant. My....

THE COURT: That's exactly what he just said.

MR. FAHMY: I understand what he's saying, but what he's actually saying isn't that it's not relevant. What he's saying is that it's not relevant with respect to whether or not he tried to do a consent video at that particular point in time. But that's an argument for weight, not relevance. Because if it wasn't relevant, then the argument that the Crown would be - and again, the Crown is trying to say that it doesn't matter that he did that before. But our argument is that it does matter, and it also matters that he's telling the public to do that, right? Because why else would he be bringing out his phone at that particular moment in time? It's relevant to show that that's why he did it.

THE COURT: Well, that's his - that's his explanation of why he does it.

MR. FAHMY: Exactly. And he's

THE COURT: I'm sure that there's a - I got a - I got a different sense from that witness why that was happening.

5 MR. FAHMY: I got that, and that's why I'm here to, you know, that's part of his evidence, and that's something that we need to be able to tell Your Honour well, no, no.

10 THE COURT: All right. How long do you guys need then to argue the point?

MR. SOSA: Your Honour, my submissions are - I mean, I pretty much already....

THE COURT: You ready to do it now?

15 MR. SOSA: Well, I've already shared them with you, Your Honour. I understand my friend might want to see if there's something more that he can provide the court. If I could, since my friend referenced it, I did provide him with a case.

20 It's a seminal Superior Court case, *Darrach* from 2000, Your Honour.

MR. FAHMY: *Darrach*.

THE COURT: Superior Court or Supreme Court?

MR. SOSA: Supreme Court.

THE COURT: Supreme Court.

25 MR. SOSA: And it's just simply to point out - and I've sidebarred it for Your Honour, at paragraph 24.

THE COURT: Okay, hold on, let me just - para. 24 of *Darrach*.

30 MR. SOSA: And while this is one of the cases that first did a thorough review of 276, Your Honour, at the second half of paragraph 24, specifically

the second half of that paragraph:

Nor is the accused entitled to have procedures crafted that take only his interests into account. Still less is he entitled to procedures that would distort the truth-seeking function of a trial by permitting irrelevant and prejudicial material at trial.

Your Honour, then I ask that you turn to page - sorry, paragraph 37.

THE COURT: Paragraph 37.

MR. SOSA: And the first line, "An accused has never had a right to adduce irrelevant evidence". So while that is in the context, Your Honour, of 276, in this case it's been applied to cases in general. We can't have evidence....

THE COURT: So this is a 276 case, but you're talking - this is more about the law of evidence, relevance,

MR. SOSA: In general.

THE COURT: Lack of relevance.

MR. SOSA: Right. It applies to all cases dealing with evidence. You can't have irrelevant evidence, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SOSA: So that's the Crown's position, really, I mean. I mean....

MR. FAHMY: I....

THE COURT: Are we doing submissions? Is that what we're doing? We're arguing it now? Do you need some time or what do you want?

5

10

15

20

25

30

MR. FAHMY: Well, I would - listen, Your Honour, if - I mean, if this is a situation where the court is like, I don't need to hear it from defence, it's - you know, there is some relevance, let's move forward, I'm happy to do that. If you're not in a position to do that, Your Honour, then, yeah, I'm going to need some time because I'm roping in Section 162 of the *Criminal Code* that this private video serves [indiscernible]. Again, I don't - I don't - just a brief moment. Okay.

As I understand it, right, because I don't want to show the video. You know, decency, whatever, let's - I don't want to show that, right? I want to avoid that. My understanding is that if Your Honour rules that it is relevant, then we can then proceed by way of an agreed statement of fact. So, having said that, if this is a situation where the court requires submissions from the defence, I'm happy to do that, but I'm going to need time. But if you're ready to - if you don't - if this is a situation where it's like I don't need to hear from the defence, I'm ready to say that it's relevant, then I'm happy to do that as well.

THE COURT: Well, this is a situation where I've heard, I think, probably as much as I'm probably going to hear from the Crown on the issue of relevance. They're saying, look, this was - their position was akin to oath-helping and at the very best, irrelevant. So we shouldn't be doing it. That's their position. Your - and he's provided

me a case. So that's what I have. And so it's sort of stacked on his side because I have material from him. I'm happy to give you an opportunity to, you know, and not too long of an opportunity, but you come up with something and then you make your submission on the balance. And then I would like to make a decision quickly on it so that we can move on.

5

MR. FAHMY: Certainly, Your Honour. Can I - well, I used all my time to put the agreed of fact together and all that. So it's 11:41 or 45, Your Honour. If I can also have, you know, an hour and 15 minutes and then maybe we come back for earlier than usual for lunch at 2 o'clock?

10

THE COURT: Okay. So we take our break now. We come back at 2 o'clock for you to make your argument, and then...

15 MR. FAHMY: Yeah.

20

THE COURT: ...I'll hear it. Is that okay with the Crown?

MR. SOSA: Yes, that's okay.

THE COURT: You're pretty well, this is it, right?

MR. SOSA: If something comes up, but I think that's it, Your Honour.

25

THE COURT: Okay, so good. Well, no, I mean if there's something - because you're obviously preparing.

MR. FAHMY: Sure.

30

THE COURT: I don't anticipating there being much more, my position....

THE COURT: No, this is an argument about relevance. So you - we'll come back at 2 o'clock

R. v. Jack Densmore - In Camera
Submissions by Mr. Fahmy

to hear submissions from the defence on this issue of relevance, and then I make a determination, and then we can get started.

MR. SOSA: Yes.

5 MR. FAHMY: Thank you, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Thank you.

R E C E S S

10 U P O N R E S U M I N G:

15 THE COURT: All right, thank you. I've received your material. So I've received it, I've read it, so if you wanted to make submissions to supplement it or not, it's up to you.

20 MR. FAHMY: I'll just be very brief. That was actually going to be the first thing I was going to ask the Court, Your Honour, to make sure that you've gotten it.

25 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FAHMY:

30 So, again, you'll see from the excerpts, there's links to the cases, to the full cases, if Your Honour had need of it. But, you know, essentially this is evidence 101. So, relevance is not a legal concept. It's a test of a matter of logic and human experience, whether the proposition is likely or less likely to be true. This case is about credibility. This case is about credibility. This isn't oath helping, like my friend had alluded to earlier. Oath helping is

R. v. Jack Densmore - In Camera
Submissions by Mr. Fahmy

when we bring somebody to give evidence to say that this person is more truthful, full stop. This is not oath helping.

THE COURT: Well, I think that the suggestion was,
5 look, he's going to say, anticipated in his evidence, that I wanted to do X. Here's a video, or here's an agreed statement of fact, that in the past I have said, I want X. And here's me saying to somebody, I want X. And that's where I think it's either prior consistent statement type analogy, loosely, or there's oath helping, or simply going to relevance.

10 MR. FAHMY: Yes. So, let's unbox that for a moment, Your Honour. I'm going to start with relevance first, because the relevance is there in terms of this key piece of evidence that we're presenting is to suggest that the likelihood that Mr. Densmore had used his phone at that moment in time was for that purpose. It's to help that fact. It's not about his credibility. Sorry. It is about his credibility, which is a material issue in this trial. But it is not to suggest that he is more, as a person, as a character, more truthful than he would have been. It's just helping the fact that he had done it in the past, and that that fact informs the reason why he had his phone at that moment, and informs what he had said to her at the same - it's all part and parcel. It's very logically connected, fact A, fact B, fact C, and you can run that train in terms of relevancy logically. It doesn't have to be directly. And, again, the threshold is bar

minimum.

And there's a wider latitude given to defence evidence, as the case law very clearly states. Of course I'm allowed to introduce evidence to help my client's credibility. Of course I can introduce any fact that helps his credibility. I can introduce a fact if he said something had happened at a different time of day, I can bring somebody in or bring other evidence to show that it happened on that, he was - that it happened on that day or at that time. Of course we are allowed to introduce evidence to show that my client's version of events is more credible.

Absolutely. That's the bedrock of any case, Your Honour, is to - especially when it's a credibility contest, is to show other facts, other things to show.

Like, for example, when I'm cross-examining the complainant, there are several points in her evidence that may not have to do with the exact moment in time when the sexual assault allegation occurred, but it had to do with her credibility in terms of facts that were put to her, propositions that were put to her that could tend to show that she's either not credible or not reliable. That's the basis of any trial. This is not oath-helping. I just cited - I wasn't sure if I should have gone into that one, Your Honour, but with respect to that....

... UNRELATED MATTER SPOKEN TO - NOT REQUIRED.

R. v. Jack Densmore - In Camera
Submissions by Mr. Fahmy

5

MR. FAHMY: So the rule on oath-helping is - or against oath-helping, prohibits the admission of evidence adduced solely for the purpose of proving that a witness is truthful, full stop. The rule applies to evidence that would tend to prove the truthfulness of the witness rather than the truth of the witness's statements. That's the difference. And....

10

THE COURT: I didn't - I didn't - when I said that, I was simply repeating what your friend said.

15

MR. FAHMY: Yes.

20

THE COURT: I don't really think that this is what this turns on.

MR. FAHMY: Okay. I really thought it was just about relevance, and again, whatever's relevant is admissible. Materiality, the relationship between the two, is very thin. It's weight. This is about weight. This is about what to do with that evidence at the end of the day. There actually is no minimum probative value that is required for evidence to be irrelevant. Is it material? Yes, it's material because the issue is credibility. The issue is what my client is going to say happened. And that fact, in the past, supports the fact that he would have done so.

25

30

In the absence of it, it's in a vacuum. It's in a cloud. It has no rational connection to his behaviour, why he would do something like that. It just - it's a - it's an important element with respect to why he would have done something like

R. v. Jack Densmore - In Camera
Submissions by Mr. Fahmy

that. And to prove that what he said to her was, this is for consent, she says, no, okay, no problem, puts the phone away. Because her, and it was put to her, by my client's version of the interaction, and she denied it. My client's going take the stand to do that. So it helps to prove, not the truth, not his truthfulness, but the truthfulness of his statements, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Anything in reply?

MR. SOSA: Just brief, Your Honour. Again, relevance is founded on what the live issue is for this court to decide. As Mr. Fahmy's already noted, these are general principles that are applied in every trial. The fact about him using a phone to obtain consent, Your Honour, can be explored if he wants to say, I have this practice. Again, it's what value do these videos provide to this court. Specifically, when we have one that is explicit in nature, and that opens the door to another wealth of potential issues, Your Honour. So the relevancy is what's the live issue that this court needs to determine, not whether or not these videos, actually, based on what I heard from Mr. Fahmy, his words, to prove that he would have been using it to obtain her consent.

So, it - again, he's trying to bring these in to answer what Your Honour will ultimately determine, which is consent, but based on an irrelevant, around the way - in an around-the-way fashion. And the reason I say that is because I hearken back to my submission as it being akin to oath-

R. v. Jack Densmore - In Camera
Submissions by Mr. Fahmy

helping. It's the same thing, but it's being done by video in this case, that if we were to have those witnesses here, *viva voce*, saying, oh yeah, he's provided me with this same scenario, and I consented. So, yeah, I know he does it. How is that relevant? How is that admissible? It's putting that same type of evidence in, and it's not relevant, and it shouldn't be admitted.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. No sur-rebuttal, that's okay.

5

10

15

20

25

30

27.
Ruling - In Camera
Krawchenko J.

R U L I N G

KRAWCHENKO J. (Orally):

5 Nothing which is not rationally relevant to issues in dispute is admissible. If evidence does not relate to an issue in dispute, then the evidence is inadmissible. The issue in dispute in this trial is that of consent of sexual activity on the
10 date and time at issue.

15 The accused seeks to adduce evidence of past teachings and an act on this issue on a video as evidence of consent. That is essentially what is being proposed, is the teachings, in a general video, and then an actual specific example of what had occurred. This trial does not relate to the complainant's views on consent, or methodology of obtaining same on previous sexual interactions
20 with others, where consent was elicited and recorded. His past practices and experiences are simply not relevant, nor material, and are therefore inadmissible.

25 Now, I am mindful of the fact that this is a request by the accused, and the court must be cautious before excluding evidence that may raise a doubt as to the accused's guilt. Even so, and even on a more relaxed analysis, the evidence proposed does not go to the issue in dispute.
30

Therefore, I find it is not relevant, and
Publication Ban

therefore not admissible.

Additionally, the rules of evidence preclude an accused from eliciting previous self-serving statements. That is excluded under hearsay rules, but for all those reasons, we are not going to go there. It is permissible, obviously, in examination, to deal with this and to get to this issue that Mr. Fahmy has pointed out, about the credibility of the complainant versus the accused, to say, this is what I did. She did not say that. The accused saying, that is what I know to be the way to do it, and that is why I tried to do it. I think that that is fair game.

What we are not going to go is backwards to say, and as evidence of that to support this, I have done it on many other occasions, and there is a handful of them, and I have examples. It is a balance. It is there. It is fair to bring it up.

That is my Ruling on that.

THE COURT: So are we ready then to go back on the record and start the evidence?

5

10

MR. FAHMY: Well, now that I have Your Honour's Ruling, I mean, I just don't want this to kind of delve into further issues, but I don't think - so I just want to understand, because my friend's objection was just the fact of introducing the actual videos into the evidence, not the fact that he had done it in the past, because I'm going to be eliciting evidence from my client, from - he got that advice from college athletes, and that's why he started to do that, and whatever.

15

I don't think that my understanding of my friend's objection was just the actual videos themselves, not the fact, I mean, his submission, he can say that he did all that stuff, it's just that we can't show the video because it's not relevant, is that correct?

20

THE COURT: Well, that's how I'm ruling right now.

MR. FAHMY: Okay.

25

30

THE COURT: I mean, when he's giving his version of the story, whatever his evidence is, then short of maybe, and I don't know but - what he's going to say or how it's going to be approached, but if, like I said, it's fair game to say what happened, like how did you approach this evening and whatever, and if that is what the anticipated evidence is, as we've discussed today, which is, yeah, you know what, I'm very attuned to this, and this is what I did, because I know that this is a big thing, and somebody told me once before, and I

think it's a great idea. I think that that's fair game to have somebody say that in testimony.

MR. SOSA: I don't object, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. SOSA: Like you've noted, it informed why decisions were made at that moment.

THE COURT: At that moment.

MR. SOSA: Right.

10 THE COURT: What we're not going to go in is to say, oh yeah, and by the way, here's a handful of examples of it that I happen to have recorded, and they're on YouTube or whatever, that's my ruling as to those things, they're not relevant, but try to give some guidance so we don't have these little issues as we go along. Does that explain 15 the Ruling a little bit better?

20 MR. FAHMY: Yes. Again, I just - I understood it as their existence is not an issue that Mr. Densmore can't give evidence on, it's just admitting them as...

THE COURT: But we're not even...

25 MR. FAHMY: ...like exhibits or anything like that.

THE COURT: ...going to talk about that. We're not even going to talk about their existence, because that then is through the back door, what I'm saying he can't do through the front door. We're not talking about - he can talk about his belief in what he has to do and what he did that day. What informed that belief...

30 MR. FAHMY: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: ...but what is not admissible, whether

in video form or through the testimony, is to say, oh, I have these examples, this has been my methodology, right? That's the part that has no relevance to this. What's relevant is that I have a thought process, and this is what I did this day, and it's based on really good reasons, because, you know, I've been - I've been sensitized, I'm educated to this. That's okay.

5 MR. FAHMY: Okay.

10 THE COURT: But what happened on that day, that's what's important.

MR. FAHMY: I - I don't disagree with that, Your Honour, I think that's why - yes.

15 THE COURT: Okay?

MR. FAHMY: Okay, I have Your Honour's Ruling.

THE COURT: All right. And we'll take it from there.

MR. SOSA: Yes. Thank you.

20 THE COURT: We're ready to go?

MR. FAHMY: Can I just have a couple minutes with my client before he takes his stand, Your Honour?

25 THE COURT: Okay, I'll give you....

MR. FAHMY: Ten minutes?

THE COURT: Yeah, all right, ten minutes, and then that will give an opportunity then to say, to tell whoever the public is that we're starting up in ten minutes, we're finished in camera. Good?

25 MR. FAHMY: Thank you.

30 THE COURT: All right, ten minutes.

... COURT STOOD DOWN.

... COURT RESUMED.

... EVIDENCE PREVIOUSLY TRANSCRIBED.

32.
Certificate

FORM 3

ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT (SUBSECTION 5(2))

Evidence Act

5

I, Janet Smith, certify that this document is a true and accurate transcript to the best of my skill and ability (and the quality of the copy of the recording and annotations therein) of the recording of Rex v. Jack Densmore in the Superior Court of Justice at Hamilton, ON, taken from Recording No: 4799 700 20240528 094816 10 KRAWCHJ.dcr (excerpt) which has been certified in Form 1.

15

20

September 16, 2024

Date



Signature of Authorized Person
Janet Smith
ACT # 2474492821
Signed in Ontario, Canada

25

A certificate in Form 3 is admissible in evidence and is proof, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that the transcript is a transcript of the certified recording of evidence and proceedings in the proceeding that is identified in the certificate.

30