**Scenario #1**

 Jury trial of B on charges of robbery, kidnapping, and aggravated assault. The Crown brought a pre-trial application to admit similar fact evidence showing that B had participated in two similar robberies shortly before this incident. The Crown proposed to prove these earlier incidents by calling two accomplices.

 One of the prior incidents involved inflammatory details that are not probative of the issues in the current trial. These include an intellectually disabled victim being confined in a dog cage for more than a day, and physically and psychologically tormented by B.

 During the similar fact evidence application, the Crown agreed not to adduce these inflammatory facts. The Crown conceded that these facts had prejudicial effect that outweighed any probative value, and they should not be heard by the jury.

 The similar fact evidence application was granted, on the basis that the Crown would not adduce the inflammatory facts.

 During trial, one of the accomplices was giving evidence. When asked whether the victim was kept in the car or the house, he answered, "In the dog cage."

 Defence applied for a mistrial, arguing that inadmissible and highly prejudicial evidence had been heard by the jury.

 **Scenario #2**

 OCJ trial of B on domestic assault charges. B was charged with 3 different incidents against the same victim. Each incident was separately charged and had a separate trial.

 Trial #1 happened last week. The victim recanted and there was no KGB statement. The accused was acquitted.

 The Crown is now prosecuting trial #2. The victim again recants, but this time there is a KGB statement. The Crown pursues a 9(2) application, with the intent of bringing a KGB application.

 During the 9(2) cross, the Crown was questioning the victim about her motive to protect the accused, and asked her about the fact that she had recanted during another trial only a week earlier. Defence applies for a mistrial, arguing that the trial judge has heard inadmissible and prejudicial evidence about another trial.

**Scenario #3**

Jury trial of B on a charge of first degree murder. During the trial, two jurors submit a note to the judge stating they are concerned because members of the accused family and associates have followed jurors to their cars on two occasions.

Defence applies for a mistrial, arguing reasonable apprehension of bias.