

Publisher's Note

An Update has Arrived in Your Library for:

Please circulate this notice to anyone in your office who may be interested in this publication. <i>Distribution List</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

SENTENCING: THE PRACTITIONER'S GUIDE Gary R. Clewley & Lindsay M. Kromm Release No. 1, March 2026
--

What's New in this Update:

This release features updates to the commentary and case law in Chapters 1 (Sentencing Principles), 3 (Terrorism and Weapons Offences), 4 (Offences Against the Administration of Law and Justice), 5 (Sexual Offences, Public Morals and Disorderly Conduct), 6 (Invasion of Privacy), 8 (Offences Against the Person and Reputation), 9 (Offences Related to Conveyances), 10 (Offences Against Rights of Property), 11 (Fraudulent Transactions Relating to Contracts and Trade) 13 (Part XXIII of the Criminal Code – Sentencing) and 14 (Dangerous Offenders and Long-Term Offenders).

Thomson Reuters®

Customer Support

1-416-609-3800 (Toronto & International)

1-800-387-5164 (Toll Free Canada & U.S.)

E-mail CustomerSupport.LegalTaxCanada@TR.com

This publisher's note may be scanned electronically and photocopied for the purpose of circulating copies within your organization.

Highlights:

- Readers will take interest, in the following update, in commentary on the Supreme Court of Canada's recent decision in *Québec (Procureur général) c. Senneville*, 2025 CSC 33, 2025 SCC 33, and in a summary of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal's recent decision in *R. v. I.K.*, 2026 SKCA 7. Both touch on the issue of reasonably foreseeable scenarios in assessing the constitutionality of a mandatory minimum sentence, in different ways.
- The *Senneville* decision, in which the Court split 5-4, reaffirmed the Supreme Court's commitment to the use of reasonably foreseeable scenarios, despite recent criticism of this aspect of the constitutionality assessment. The *I.K.* decision saw the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal discussing the Supreme Court's decisions in *R. v. Lloyd*, 2016 SCC 13 and in *Senneville*, and deciding Superior Court judges do have the discretion to decline to hear constitutional challenges based on reasonably foreseeable scenarios, where the determination would have no impact on the offender before the Court.

ProView Developments

Your ProView edition of this product now has a new, modified layout:

- The opening page is now the title page of the book as you would see in the print work
- As with the print product, the front matter is in a different order than previously displayed
- The Table of Cases and Index are now in PDF with no searching and linking
- The Table of Contents now has internal links to every chapter and section of the book within ProView
- Images are generally greyscale and size is now adjustable
- Footnote text only appears in ProView-generated PDFs of entire sections and pages