NOVA SCOTIA COURT OF APPEAL

[Cite as: R. v. Whynot, 2000 NSCA 15]

Chipman, Bateman and Flinn, JJ.A.

BETWEEN:

WALTER STEVEN WHYNOT) David R. Hirtle) for the appellant	
	Appellant))	
- and -)	
HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN) Dana W. Giovannetti, Q.C.	
Respondent)) for the respondent))		
)) Appeal heard:) January 19, 2000) Judgment delivered: January 19, 2000)	

THE COURT: Appeal dismissed per oral reasons for judgment of Bateman, J.A.;

Chipman and Flinn, JJ.A. concurring.

BATEMAN J.A.: (Orally)

[1] It is our unanimous view that this appeal must be dismissed. The appellant

has not demonstrated that the trial judge erred in permitting the Crown to use a prior

inconsistent statement of the co-conspirator witness in cross-examination of that

witness. The appellant relies upon the decision of the majority of the Alberta Court of

Appeal in R. v. Montoute (1991), 62 C.C.C. (3d) 481 (Alta.C.A.). Without expressing

an opinion about the correctness of that decision, it is our view that this case is not

analogous. There the Crown unsuccessfully sought to tender illegally obtained wiretap

evidence from a co-conspirator as affirmative evidence of the conspiracy. Even

assuming, for the purposes of argument here, that the appellant could have established

that the statement of the co-conspirator witness was obtained in violation of his Charter

rights, it was not being used as affirmative evidence of the conspiracy, but solely to

impeach him as a witness. Accordingly, Justice Hood did not err in permitting the

Crown to use the statement in this manner.

[2] Neither did the trial judge err in her instruction to the jury on the weight to be

accorded the inconsistent statement used in cross-examination nor in her charge to the

jury on the test for determination of the existence of a conspiracy.

[3] The appeal is dismissed.

Bateman, J.A.

Concurred in:

Chipman, J.A.

Flinn, J.A.