



A-LEVEL

Law

LAW03 Criminal Law (Offences against the Person)
or Contract Law

Mark scheme

2160
June 2016

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

Assessment Objectives One and Two

General Marking Guidance

You should remember that your marking standards should reflect the levels of performance of students, mainly 18 years old, writing under examination conditions. The Potential Content given in each case is the most likely correct response to the question set. However, this material is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive and alternative, valid responses should be given credit within the framework of the mark bands.

Positive Marking

You should be positive in your marking, giving credit for what is there rather than being too conscious of what is not. Do not deduct marks for irrelevant or incorrect answers, as students penalise themselves in terms of the time they have spent.

Mark Range

You should use the whole mark range available in the mark scheme. Where the student's response to a question is such that the mark scheme permits full marks to be awarded, full marks must be given. A perfect answer is not required. Conversely, if the student's answer does not deserve credit, then no marks should be given.

Levels of Response for Essay Marking

When reading an essay, you must annotate your recognition of the achievement of a response level. This will help the Team Leader follow your thought processes. Levels of response marking relies on recognition of the highest level achieved by the student. When you have finished reading the essay, therefore, think top-down, rather than bottom-up. In other words, has the student's overall answer met the requirements for the top level? If not, the next level?

Citation of Authority

Students will have been urged to use cases and statutes whenever appropriate. Even where no specific reference is made to these in the mark scheme, please remember that their use considerably enhances the quality of an answer.

Assessment Objective Three**Quality of Written Communication**

- Level 3** Moderately complex ideas are expressed clearly and reasonably fluently, through well linked sentences and paragraphs. Arguments are generally relevant and well structured. There may be occasional errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. **4-5 marks**
- Level 2** Straightforward ideas are expressed clearly, if not always fluently. Sentences and paragraphs may not always be well connected. Arguments may sometimes stray from the point or be weakly presented. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling, but not such as to detract from communication of meaning. **2-3 marks**
- Level 1** Simple ideas are expressed clearly, but arguments may be of doubtful relevance or be obscurely presented. Errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive, sufficient to detract from communication of meaning. **1 mark**
- Level 0** Ideas are expressed poorly and sentences and paragraphs are not connected. There are errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling, such as to severely impair communication of meaning. **0 marks**

Mark bands (3 potential content) – list of maximum marks

25	two sound, one clear
23	two sound, one some or one sound, two clear
21	two sound or one sound, one clear, one some or three clear
19	one sound, one clear or one sound, two some or two clear, one some
17	one sound, one some or two clear or one clear, two some
14	one sound or one clear, one some or three some
13	two sound explanation only
11	one clear or two some
09	one sound explanation only or two clear explanation only or three some explanation only
07	one some or one clear explanation only or two some explanation only
05	one some explanation only
04	fragments or substantial error/incoherence
00	completely irrelevant

Mark bands (2 potential content) – list of maximum marks

25	two sound
23	one sound, one clear
20	one sound, one some or two clear
17	one sound or one clear, one some
13	one clear or two some or two sound explanation only
11	one sound explanation only or two clear explanation only
08	one some or one clear explanation only or two some explanation only
06	one some explanation only
05	fragments or substantial error/incoherence
00	completely irrelevant

Note:

In *substantive* law questions, the two components are explanation and application. In evaluative questions, the two components are explanation and evaluation. The references above to explanation only are to be understood as explanation without application for substantive law questions, and as explanation without evaluation for evaluative questions. The quality of treatment of these two components, in combination, determines whether the treatment overall for that Potential Content (PC) element is sound, clear or some. In determining the overall quality of treatment, descriptions of the quality of treatment of the individual components (whether explanation or application/evaluation) should be combined as follows:

sound/sound	- sound
sound/clear	- weak sound
sound/some	- clear
clear/clear	- clear
clear/some	- weak clear
some/some	- some

LAW03 Descriptors

Level	Description
Sound	Accurate and comprehensive explanation and application, so that the answer reveals strong knowledge and understanding of the correct (or sustainable) analysis, leading to satisfactory conclusions. There may be some omission, error, or confusion but it will be insufficient to undermine the basic characteristics of the answer.
Clear	<p>Broadly accurate and relatively comprehensive explanation and application, though a little superficial in either or both, and with some error and/or confusion that begins to affect the quality of the analysis.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Accurate explanation and application over a narrower area, omitting some significant aspect(s) of the analysis, so that an answer emerges which reveals knowledge and understanding of the broad framework of the analysis, or of some of its detailed aspect(s).</p>
Some	<p>Explanation and/or application in relation to relevant aspects but characterised by significant omissions and/or errors and/or confusion.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Explanation (including definitions of relevant offences/defences) and/or application which is generally accurate but confined to a limited aspect, so that, at best, a very superficial or partial analysis emerges.</p>
Fragments	<p>Isolated words or phrases, including case names and statutes, which have potential relevance but remain entirely undeveloped.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Mere identification of relevant offences/defences.</p>

Use of case authority

1. It is usually sufficient to associate a relevant case with an explained/applied rule. Further explanation of cases is required only where necessary to elucidate the rule or its application.
2. An answer in relation to any PC should not be described as 'sound' unless some relevant authority appears, where appropriate. However, where there is appropriate use of authority in relation to the other PC in the mark scheme for the question, an answer in relation to a PC where no authority appears may be given a 'lower' sound (the student will have demonstrated ability to use appropriate authority at some point in the answer to the question, albeit not in the element in issue).

Criminal Law (Offence against the Person)

0 1 Discuss the possible criminal liability of Adam for the injuries to Brandon and to Calvin.
Discuss the possible criminal liability of Calvin arising out of his shouting at Adam.

[25 marks + 5 marks AO3]

REMEMBER TO ALLOCATE MARKS FOR AO3 SEPARATELY

Potential Content

(A) Adam’s liability in relation to Brandon:

- possible offence of assault (battery) occasioning abh – actus reus and mens rea of battery
- additional requirements for abh (essentially, causing more than merely trivial hurt or injury)
- issue of consent in context of rough and undisciplined play (or within the rules and spirit of a tennis match) if injury amounts to abh (otherwise, consent to battery).

sound	battery + abh (ie additional requirements) + consent
clear	battery + abh <u>or</u> battery + consent
weak clear	abh (without battery framework) + consent

(B) Adam’s liability in relation to Calvin:

- the offence of unlawful and malicious infliction of gbh (s20) based on the initial push injury
- the offence under s20 based on the subsequent paralysis (raising issues of causation)
- the offence of unlawful and malicious causing of gbh with intent under s18 arising out of the above
- the offence of assault (battery) occasioning abh under s47 as an alternative if gbh cannot be established.

sound	gbh (s20) based on the analysis of both actus reus possibilities
weak sound	gbh (s18) based on the analysis of both
clear	gbh (s20) based on one actus reus possibility
weak clear	gbh (s18) based on one actus reus possibility

Note: Discussion of abh in addition to the above may raise weak sound to sound and weak clear to clear; discussion of abh only (based on the initial push) merits **max some**.

(C) Calvin’s liability in relation to Adam:

- actus reus of the offence of assault – issue of causing fear of immediate personal violence (the threat can be by words alone; does Adam consider it as a serious threat, given that it comes from Calvin; is the threat of ‘immediate’ personal violence);
- mens rea of the offence of assault – issue of intention or recklessness as to causing fear of immediate personal violence – does Calvin intend it to be taken seriously or is he aware that it may be.

sound	all issues
weak sound	actus reus + mens rea but reference to words alone omitted
clear	actus reus + mens rea but reference to either Adam’s perception of threat or ‘immediacy’ of violence threatened is omitted

0 2 Discuss the possible liability of Deon for the murder of Ella. Discuss the possible liability of Felipe for gross negligence manslaughter in relation to the death of Ella.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) Deon’s possible liability for the murder of Ella:

- actus reus of murder – focusing on the causation issue (including possible coincidence of actus reus and mens rea aspect)
- mens rea of murder – intention to kill or cause gbh.

sound actus reus + mens rea issues, with particular focus on causation/coincidence

clear actus reus and mens rea addressed more generally, with little exploration of causation/coincidence

(B) Deon’s possible defence to a murder charge

Note: there are three possibilities – diminished responsibility, automatism/intoxication, insanity. A successful plea of either of the first two will result in a conviction for manslaughter, a successful plea of insanity will result in a technical acquittal but compulsory detention. Students should discuss any one defence. Discussion of two permits a little less detail for either or both. Discussion of all three requires less detail for any or all.

Diminished responsibility as reducing murder to voluntary manslaughter:

- basic requirements – abnormality of mental functioning, recognised medical condition, substantial impairment, causal explanation
- issue of relationship between diminished responsibility and intoxication – brain damage or addiction as recognised medical condition, extent to which conduct attributable to effects of either.

sound basic requirements + intoxication aspect

clear basic requirements **or** focus on intoxication aspect + weaker basic framework

Automatism/intoxication as reducing murder to involuntary manslaughter:

- voluntary intoxication as bearing on voluntariness of conduct or on mens rea;
- murder as specific intent offence, manslaughter as basic intent offence.

sound all issues

clear weaker explanation/application in one of the issues

Insanity as entitling Deon to technical acquittal:

- defect of reason due to disease of mind – issue of significance of alcohol addiction
- effect on appreciation of nature and quality of act/knowledge of ‘wrongness’.

sound all issues

clear weaker explanation/application in one of the issues

(C) Felipe's possible liability for gross negligence manslaughter:

- requirement for duty and breach (eg on simple Donogue v Stevenson notions)
- causation – could Ella's life have been saved or was it already too late
- 'gross' negligence – conduct 'so bad in all the circumstances'.

sound all issues

clear duty and breach established + causation **or** 'gross' negligence

weak clear any two of duty, breach, causation and 'gross' negligence

0 3 The law on the non-fatal offences against the person has been subjected to frequent criticism but little reform has been attempted. Evaluate the current law and suggest what reforms may be desirable.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) Structure, language and antiquity issues:

- 1) maximum sentences and the hierarchy of offences; organisation/structure of the 1861 Act
- 2) antiquated and ambiguous language – eg ‘malicious’, ‘grievous’, ‘actual’, and the problems with the use of the term ‘assault’.
- 3) nature of “harm”/”injury” arising out of term, ‘bodily’- need for case law development eg psychiatric harm, transmission of disease, abh via eg cutting hair

(B) Specific actus reus and mens rea issues, including issues with a defence of consent:

- 1) assault/battery as a requirement of liability for non-serious injury
- 2) definition of actus reus of assault
- 3) mens rea and the principle of correspondence
- 4) definition of ‘wound’ and implications for hierarchy of seriousness of offences-battery, abh,gbh
- 5) the consent framework and the nature of the exceptions
- 6) nature of “harm”/”injury” arising out of term, ‘bodily’- need for case law development eg psychiatric harm, transmission of disease, abh via eg cutting hair

sound actus reus and mens rea issues **or** consent issues (or a combination)

(C) Proposals for reform – appropriate suggestions for reform in relation to (A) and/or (B). These should be related to the evaluation (and especially to any criticisms advanced) and should, where possible, draw on substantial proposals (such as those made by Law Reform bodies and/or expert commentators).

Note: In general, sound in (A), (B) and (C) requires comprehensive discussion of at least two aspects, or a little less detailed discussion of three.

(A)(3) and (B)(6) are the same. Allocate either to (A) or to (B) as is most appropriate for the benefit of the student

Credit any other relevant argument as (A)(4), (B)(7) etc.

0 4 Discuss the possible criminal liability of Genna and of Helen arising out of the incidents in the flat.

[25 marks + 5 marks AO3]

REMEMBER TO ALLOCATE MARKS FOR AO3 SEPARATELY

Potential Content

(A) Genna’s liability in relation to Helen:

- actus reus issues in assault – fear of immediate personal violence
- mens rea issues in assault – Genna’s intention in making her statement.

sound	actus reus + mens rea issues
clear	weaker explanation/application in either actus reus or mens rea issues

(B) Helen’s liability in relation to Genna:

- battery in relation to the kick – actus reus of inflicting personal violence; mens rea of intention
- unlawful and malicious wounding (s20)/wounding with intent (s18) in relation to pushing face into mirror – issues in relation to intention and recklessness.

sound	battery + s20/s18
weak sound	battery + s20
clear	battery + s18
weak clear	s20 and/or s18
some	battery

(C) Helen’s possible defence of self-defence:

- necessity for use of force – threat from another, imminence of threat, mistake issues
- proportionate force – distinction between kick and face injury.

sound	necessity + proportionate force (including battery and s20/s18 distinction)
clear	necessity + proportionate force (s20/s18 only)
weak clear	necessity + proportionate force (battery only)

0 5 Discuss the possible liability of Jayson for the murder of Ivo. Discuss the possible liability of Lucas for the involuntary manslaughter of Ivo.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) Jayson’s prima facie liability for murder:

- actus reus issues – omission/duty (creation of dangerous situation?), causation
- mens rea issues – direct or oblique/indirect intention to kill via omission.

sound	actus reus + mens rea issues
clear	actus reus (but little on omission/duty or on causation) + mens rea or actus reus + mens rea (but little on oblique intention issue)

(B) Jayson’s possible defence of loss of control:

- loss of self-control (not ‘considered desire for revenge’?)
- qualifying trigger – sexual fidelity issue (other factors?), grave character/justifiable sense of being seriously wronged
- reaction of person of normal degree of tolerance and self-restraint (objective test).

sound	all three elements
clear	qualifying trigger + one other element
weak clear	loss of self-control + objective test + identification of qualifying trigger

(C) Lucas’s liability for involuntary manslaughter:

- unlawful act as assault (actus reus and mens rea)
- ‘dangerousness’ of the threat of violence, given the attempted escape close to the canal
- causation issues – escape and slip reasonably foreseeable, Jayson’s failure to attempt a rescue is an omission, so not a novus actus interveniens.

sound	all three elements
clear	two elements

Note: max **weak clear** for gross negligence manslaughter as alternative to unlawful act manslaughter- negligence is as to the chase along the canal, not as to the failure to help Ivo out of the canal.

0 6 The law on the non-fatal offences against the person has been subjected to frequent criticism but little reform has been attempted. Evaluate the current law and suggest what reforms may be desirable.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) Structure, language and antiquity issues:

- 1) maximum sentences and the hierarchy of offences; organisation/structure of the 1861 Act
- 2) antiquated and ambiguous language – eg ‘malicious’, ‘grievous’, ‘actual’, and the problems with the use of the term ‘assault’.
- 3) nature of “harm”/”injury” arising out of term, ‘bodily’- need for case law development eg psychiatric harm, transmission of disease, abh via eg cutting hair

(B) Specific actus reus and mens rea issues, including issues with a defence of consent:

- 1) assault/battery as a requirement of liability for non-serious injury
- 2) definition of actus reus of assault
- 3) mens rea and the principle of correspondence
- 4) definition of ‘wound’ and implications for hierarchy of seriousness of offences-battery, abh,gbh
- 5) the consent framework and the nature of the exceptions
- 6) nature of “harm”/”injury” arising out of term, ‘bodily’- need for case law development eg psychiatric harm, transmission of disease, abh via eg cutting hair

sound actus reus and mens rea issues **or** consent issues (or a combination)

(C) Proposals for reform – appropriate suggestions for reform in relation to (A) and/or (B). These should be related to the evaluation (and especially to any criticisms advanced) and should, where possible, draw on substantial proposals (such as those made by Law Reform bodies and/or expert commentators).

Note: In general, sound in (A), (B) and (C) requires comprehensive discussion of at least two aspects, or a little less detailed discussion of three.

(A)(3) and (B)(6) are the same. Allocate either to (A) or to (B) as is most appropriate for the benefit of the student

Credit any other relevant argument as (A)(4), (B)(7) etc.

Contract Law

0 7 Discuss Owen's possible rights and remedies against Nirmal in connection with Nirmal's failure to go on supplying the 'free gifts'.

[25 marks + 5 marks AO3]

REMEMBER TO ALLOCATE MARKS FOR AO3 SEPARATELY**Potential Content**

Note: The answer to this question may be approached in three different ways: (1) as a combination of formation and misrepresentation issues; (2) as formation issues only; (3) as misrepresentation issues only.

Combined formation and misrepresentation issues:

(A) Intention to create legal relations:

- presumption in business contracts
- the 'free gift' as part of the consideration.

sound both elements
clear one element

(B) The structure of the contract(s):

- offer and acceptance including the possible collateral contract for the supply of the 'free gift'/entire model aeroplane
- unilateral contracts and termination before acceptance/performance complete
- possible remedy in damages.

sound all three elements
clear two elements

(C) Misrepresentation:

- nature of misrepresentation
- kinds of misrepresentation (fraudulent, negligent, innocent)
- remedies.

sound all three elements
clear two elements

Formation issues only:

(A) intention to create legal relations – presumption in business contracts; the 'free gift' as part of the consideration

(B) the structure of the contract(s) – offer and acceptance including the possible collateral contract for the supply of the 'free gift'/entire model aeroplane

(C) unilateral contracts and termination before acceptance/performance complete; possible remedy in damages.

Misrepresentation issues only:

- (A) the nature of misrepresentation – false and material statement of fact; induces innocent party to enter contract/reliance
- (B) the kinds of misrepresentation – fraudulent, negligent, innocent
- (C) remedies – rescission; damages.

0 8 Discuss Pavel's possible rights and remedies against Owen in connection with the lawnmower. Discuss Owen's possible rights and remedies against Ray in connection with the garden shed.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) Pavel's rights and remedies against Owen:

- consideration: the requirement for consideration; past consideration as insufficient; request and implied prior promise as an exception to past consideration
- intention to create legal relations in domestic/social agreements.

sound consideration (all three elements) **or** consideration (any two elements, including past consideration as insufficient) + intention to create legal relations

clear consideration (any two elements, including past consideration as insufficient) **or** consideration (any aspect) + intention to create legal relations

weak clear intention to create legal relations

(B) Owen's rights against Ray:

- implied terms in the Sale of Goods Act 1979 s14(2) and s14(3), as to satisfactory quality and fitness for purpose or the equivalent terms in the Supply of Goods and Services Act, 1982 s4(2) and s4(5)
- implied term in the Supply of Goods and Services Act, 1982 s13 as to reasonable care and skill

sound both elements

clear (SGA s14(2)/SGSA s4(2) **or** SGA s14(3)/SGSA s4(5)) + SGSA s13

weak clear SGA s14(2)/SGSA s4(2) + SGA s14(3)/SGSA s4(5)

some SGA s14(2)/SGSA s4(2) **or** SGA s14(3)/SGSA s4(5) **or** SGSA s13

(C) Owen's remedies against Ray:

- the remedies available consequent upon breach of either (or both) satisfactory quality/fitness for purpose terms (SGA s14(2)/SGSA s4(2) and SGA s14(3)/SGSA s4(5)) – breach of condition: rejection and loss of the right to reject; repair, replacement, reduction in price; damages
- the remedies available consequent upon breach of reasonable care and skill term (SGSA s13) – innominate term: rescission; damages
- the operation of the Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 s2/s3 and s6, and of the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999 in relation to attempt to restrict liability.

sound all three elements

clear remedies for breach of satisfactory quality/fitness for purpose terms + reasonable care and skill term

weak clear remedies for breach of satisfactory quality/fitness for purpose terms + UCTA/UTCCR **or** remedies for breach of reasonable care and skill term + UCTA/UTCCR

some any one of the three elements

0 9 How satisfactory is the current law on contractual terms? Consider what reforms might improve the law.
You may relate your answer to terms in general, or to terms excluding or limiting liability, or to a combination of both.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) Issues concerning terms in common law:

- express and implied terms
- classification of terms as conditions, warranties, and innominate terms

or

- incorporation and interpretation of terms excluding and limiting liability.

(B) Issues concerning statutory terms and the statutory control of terms:

- terms implied into contracts for sale of goods
- terms implied into contracts for the sale and supply of goods and services

or

- the control of terms excluding and limiting liability by the Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999.

(C) Appropriate suggestions for reform in relation to (A) and/or (B). These should be related to criticisms advanced and should, where possible, draw on substantial proposals (such as those made by Law Reform bodies and/or expert commentators).

Note (1): The descriptions above assume that the answer will discuss terms in general **or** terms excluding or limiting liability. Where the answer deals with a combination, the alternatives in (A) and (B) will instead form composite descriptions of each of (A) and (B), discussion of a reasonable part of which will merit sound.

Note (2): In general, sound in (A), (B) and (C) requires comprehensive discussion of at least two aspects, or a little less detailed discussion of three.

1 0 Consider the rights and remedies of Aisha and of Bilal against Campstore in connection with the work boots.

[25 marks + 5 marks AO3]

REMEMBER TO ALLOCATE MARKS FOR AO3 SEPARATELY

Potential Content

(A) Aisha's/Bilal's rights against Campstore:

- implied term as to satisfactory quality in Sale of Goods Act 1979 s14(2) (sale price, use to which Bilal puts boots)
- implied term as to fitness for purpose in Sale of Goods Act 1979 s14(3) (sale price, use to which Bilal puts boots).

sound	both elements
clear	both elements but weaker treatment of one
weak clear	one element

(B) Remedies available for breach, and impact of exclusion clause:

- rejection and the loss of the right to reject; repair, replacement, reduction in price; damages
- common law requirements for incorporation of exclusion clause
- ineffectiveness of exclusion clause by virtue of Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 s6.

sound	all elements
clear	remedies + common law control of exclusion clauses or remedies + statutory control of exclusion clauses

(C) Privity of contract and Bilal's rights and remedies:

- general notion of privity
- provisions of the Contract (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999
- benefit of rights and remedies (including restrictions on exclusion).

sound	all elements
clear	focus on C(RTP)A

1 1 Discuss the rights, duties, and remedies arising between David and Campstore, and between Campstore and Safehands in connection with the events surrounding the re-opening of the superstore.

[25 marks]

Potential Content

(A) The rights and duties between Campstore and David:

- termination of the contract by frustration – non-availability, fault
- termination by breach.

sound	both elements
clear	breach
weak clear	frustration

(B) The rights and duties between Campstore and Safehands:

- termination of the contract by frustration – destruction of common venture
- termination by breach.

sound	both elements
clear	frustration
weak clear	breach

(C) The remedies available in (A) and (B):

- remedies for termination by frustration – Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943 (adjustment of losses under s1(2) and s1(3))
- remedies for breach – rescission and damages (measure of damages).

sound	both elements
clear	one element

- 1 2** How satisfactory is the current law on contractual terms? Consider what reforms might improve the law.
You may relate your answer to terms in general, or to terms excluding or limiting liability, or to a combination of both.

[25 marks]**Potential Content**

- (A) Issues concerning terms in common law:
- express and implied terms
 - classification of terms as conditions, warranties, and innominate terms
 - or**
 - incorporation and interpretation of terms excluding and limiting liability.
- (B) Issues concerning statutory terms and the statutory control of terms:
- terms implied into contracts for sale of goods
 - terms implied into contracts for the sale and supply of goods and services
 - or**
 - the control of terms excluding and limiting liability by the Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977, and the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999.
- (C) Appropriate suggestions for reform in relation to (A) and/or (B). These should be related to the criticisms advanced and should, where possible, draw on substantial proposals (such as those made by Law Reform bodies and/or expert commentators).

Note (1): The descriptions above assume that the answer will discuss terms in general **or** terms excluding or limiting liability. Where the answer deals with a combination, the alternatives in (A) and (B) will instead form composite descriptions of each of (A) and (B), discussion of a reasonable part of which will merit sound.

Note (2): In general, sound in (A), (B) and (C) requires comprehensive discussion of at least two aspects, or a little less detailed discussion of three.

ASSESSMENT GRID

(to show the allocation of marks to Assessment Objectives)

A Level Law (LAW03)**(One question to be answered from 4)**

UNIT 3	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 01	10	15	5
Question 02	10	15	
Question 03	10	15	
Question 04	10	15	5
Question 05	10	15	
Question 06	10	15	
Question 07	10	15	5
Question 08	10	15	
Question 09	10	15	
Question 10	10	15	5
Question 11	10	15	
Question 12	10	15	
Total marks	30	45	5