

Table of Contents

Answer 1.....	1
Answer 2.....	3
References	6

Question 1

Once the damage is caused by any wrongdoing there need to be liabilities. Here Joanne's liability is associated with the aspect where she took a cricket bat from her house and went to the local park. She accosted Sam and told her to hand over everything or else she will hit him on his head, frightened Sam handed him \$45 which he had in his wallet. Thus the entire situation leads to a consequence and criminal charges will be applied to Joanne. Liability here is determined by the procedures and laws of the state in which the particular injury occurred. In this specific case, the major focus will be applied to Sam and this is important to remember that the actions of the accused need to be judged properly so that specific information about the entire situation can be managed and followed. Here, in this case, physical assault takes place and it is intentional torts that mean that civil lawsuits of the UK need to look into the matter and demanding compensation in the specific form of money-related damages that occurred to the other person (Sam) required to access. This situation can result in prosecution by the state and the accused found guilty on the same and court case by Sam will be legal. This kind of civil and criminal assault shares largely specific conduct and intent necessary to constitute a criminal act. Joanne's threatened Sam and this involved apprehension of imminent harm on the body and in the frightening situation Sam takes out his money (which is applied under pressure). In this context, a tort which is committed by Joanne caused monetary damage to Sam.

The incident in the neighbor's flat happened the next day when Joanne jumped from the balcony of her flat to the balcony of her immediate neighbor and went through the unlocked balcony of her neighbor. She entered the house and not finding anything she came out empty-handed. Here trespass committed by Joanne and is civil wrongdoing in the UK and it also constitutes a criminal offense as breaching this law leads to a judgment on this kind of action by Joanne. Now, the major consideration here generates from the intention of that individual as Joanne entered into that neighbor's house with the intention to steal money but she has not got any. In the UK not all property accessible to the government is accessible by the public so here Joanne was found guilty. There is no right to enter into a person's house and Joanne has broken the rule and the current circumstances related to this aspect bring several rights on the part of the neighbor and Joanne's act falls into the breach of civil rights. Access to private property in the UK without

permission is an illegal act and it is constrained by reasonable place, manner, and time having other restrictions in these specific circumstances¹.

Next, the day after this incident Joanne found out that a bank card was on the floor of her building and she took that bank card and visited a local supermarket and proceeded to buy some spirits and beer by using the facility of contactless payment feature on the card during the checkout procedure. Using this bank card illegally associates with credit card fraud and typically leads to security breaches and unauthorized charges will be applied to Joanne. The UK law specifically connects with the liability for having authorized credit cards and any kind of fraudulent transaction incorporates different difficulties in this aspect. The fraud card usage by Joanne for the transaction can lead her to several difficulties and this aspect is illegal in this prospect. The rules related to liability are specifically dictated by the credit card network from where the transaction has been done and this fraud by Joanne will lead her to the criminal offense. Liability in this prospect connects with the criminal act by Joanne and this created a major scam and this aspect generated fraudulent presence by the side of Joanne. The unauthorized payment here by the bank credit card can lead to criminal actions and Joanne is highly accused of this crime. The security of the card is at stake and this aspect can generate various challenges as no reasonable grounds support the action, Joanne. If further investigation is done, Joanne will be held accountable for this as injustice prevailed in this aspect and she has not done any kind of authorized actions as a part of the overall actions.

From the above discussion of the several incidents done by Joanne, it has been seen that he is involved in different criminal cases along civil injustice has also occurred in this aspect. She is guilty of a crime and she needs to get punished. It can be further said that when a defendant like Joanne goes on a trial for allegedly committing crimes, then the court needs to establish appropriate judgment where Joanne is guilty. On the other hand, Joanne can create a defense of her activities as she gets threatened by Andrew after receiving a text reminding her of the deadline for repayment, or else Andrew will take action against Joanne and Jill. So, in order to repay that money, Joanne took this step as illegally Andrew also threatened them. Here, we need

¹ Ryder, N., 2018. 'Too Scared to Prosecute and Too Scared to Jail?' A Critical and Comparative Analysis of Enforcement of Financial Crime Legislation Against Corporations in the USA and the UK. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 82(3), pp.245-263.

to remember that Joanne should take help from the legal support instead of doing some wrong actions and her part of criminal and civil liability is quite high as she cannot totally defend herself in this matter. The category of defenses that are available to the criminal defendant here is quite arguable for Joanne and from different grounds she was found guilty of doing some crimes on people and money. The defense regarding insanity requires the defendant to prove depending on the current state of actions, but here Joanne is highly guilty in this part and it has made the entire thing quite incapable of her past to present her defenses. Some of the violent impulses and insanity have been generated on her part and this made the entire aspect quite challenging to process.

Question 2

Yes, Mogg may have intended to murder Rory. The three other gang members have in their own statements and in this segment, they have also proposed the intentions of murdering Rory in this aspect as three people made up three stories in these circumstances. Here, one thing is prominent which is that Mogg was drunk extensively (from the statement of his other gang members) but still with one shot he has killed Rory. The set of the murder happened in the early hours of the morning and this can be a questionable situation here as at the early morning what were the Brexit Gang doing and if the entire murder was not planned then how Mogg get the perfect chance to murder Rory at one short without having a single person on road seeing this incident. As this incident was planned they were well-known of the fact that nobody will be there on the road during that early morning time so it can be a clear attempt to murder Rory. On the other hand, police can check the fingerprint on the gun as Mogg said the leader of that gang Boris has goaded him into shooting but he is unaware of the entire incident as he has been heavily under the influence of drugs. This statement also leads to the point where it can be stated why the leader of the Brexit gang suddenly plans to kill Rory without discussing the same with the other gang members and it is not convincing.

If Boris had seen that Mogg had a gun and he is highly drunk and he can do anything then why has he not stopped Mogg and snatch the gun from him thinking that Mogg can do any criminal act using that gun? He also stated that Mogg's eyesight was bad so he can take the action by stopping Mogg from shopping which he has not done and this action leads to this crime that

Mogg has done. The issue regarding criminal liability for encouraging or any kind of assistance to Mogg to commit this crime is an offense and this aspect generates a difficult aspect to state the current practices related to this particular situation. In the Common Law stated in the UK, it can be presented that the persons present at the place are the second most common offender in any case and any crime committed in this place needs to get a response from that person. The current aspect can be judged as the situation which connects with the encouragement or assistance so that specific action assistance gets followed and proposed. It reflects the common law profile connected with procuring or abetting another person to commit an offense and this brings the same guilt to that specific crime that has happened².

Jeremy said that he was not aware of the fact that Mogg has a gun but he only knew that Mogg has a screwdriver. He has not inquired about the existence of this screwdriver and this creates a situation where it can be asked why he has not asked him about this thing. One of his gang members Boris said that he knows Mogg has a gun so Jeremy's statement is quite questionable. The evidential advantages present by the gang members become quite hazy in this aspect as no one is clearly stating anything and majorly they have not stopped Mogg from doing this crime. The Common Law also represents the statement where one person has not checked the condition of the criminal and this segment generates various challenges to the other person as the criminal is not guided by this person. It can be seen that committing any crime is illegal but if this happens in front of a person then the person needs to get into this matter and solve this.

Consciously accepting the risk and bringing a solution can lead to major support for the other person. As a matter of policy, it can be stated that the other person is found guilty and he has not got any support from the other person, and imposition of liability can be seen in this prospect.

On the other hand, Andrea's liability for the death of Rory generates from the aspects where Andrea has informed the police that he does not know that Mogg carried any weapon and only thought that they are going to frighten Rory. In this statement, he himself stated that they were all prepared to threaten Rory and this situation is itself a criminal offense. Rise to liability in tort either alone or doing it together with actions, because of the situational falsity. The actions previously planned in this aspect connect with provocation and the primary aspect in this aspect imposes the measure of different challenges as the gang has planned to threaten Rory. The early

² Hendry, J. and King, C., 2017. Expediency, legitimacy, and the rule of law: A systems perspective on civil/criminal procedural hybrids. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 11(4), pp.733-757

English Law in this prospect connects with the hostile situation generation and creates the existence of public terror. The major primary aspect in this segment concentrates on the measure of appropriate action imposed by other people and present appropriate safeguard approaches to stop any kind of violence. The hostile contact needs to mitigate so that supportive and clear specification of ideas and related approaches can be maintained and followed. The other person that is Andrea needs to encourage in stopping any kind of violence initiate by Mogg and this situation purely can connect with the mental reaction. A sufficient deterrent to the physical violence can be stopped by Andrea but he has not generated any kind of support in this aspect and apprehends imminent violence against Rory. This specific condition of proscribing threats of violence generated expression not only in the action for specific assault but state the rule that stopping any kind of civil and criminal injustice can prevail. This law particularly states the idea regarding appropriate defense only happen when both the persons will be aware of the justified actions and the other person will refrain from any kind of criminal action encouragement³.

³ Islam, B.A., CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT TO COMBAT WHITE COLLAR CRIME: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

References

Hendry, J. and King, C., 2017. Expediency, legitimacy, and the rule of law: A systems perspective on civil/criminal procedural hybrids. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 11(4), pp.733-757.

Islam, B.A., CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT TO COMBAT WHITE COLLAR CRIME: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.

Ryder, N., 2018. 'Too Scared to Prosecute and Too Scared to Jail?' A Critical and Comparative Analysis of Enforcement of Financial Crime Legislation Against Corporations in the USA and the UK. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 82(3), pp.245-263.