



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

Law **LAW04**
**Criminal Law (Offences against the
Property) or Tort AND Concepts of Law**

Unit 4

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

LAW04

Assessment Objectives One and Two

General Marking Guidance

You should remember that your marking standards should reflect the levels of performance of candidates, 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 candidates 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 candidate'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 candidate's answer does not deserve credit, then no marks should be given.

Citation of Authority

Candidates 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

- 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

Maxima for Substantive Law questions

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. The references above to explanation only are to be understood as explanation without application. The quality of treatment of these two components, in combination, determines whether the treatment overall for that PC element is sound, clear or some. In determining the overall quality of treatment, descriptions of the quality of treatment of the individual components should be combined as follows:

sound/sound	- sound
sound/clear	- low sound
sound/some	- clear
clear/clear	- clear
clear/some	- low clear
some/some	- some

Descriptors for Substantive Law questions

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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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('s) 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 candidate will have demonstrated ability to use appropriate authority at some point in the answer to the question, albeit not in the element in issue).

Section A: Criminal Law (Offences against Property)

Scenario 1

Total for this scenario: 50 marks

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | Discuss Eddie's possible criminal liability for property offences arising out of his activities in connection with the football stadium. (25 marks) |
|---|---|---|

Potential Content

- (A) Burglary issues. Building. Trespass (intention to exceed implied permission). Application of s.9(1)(a) - possible intention to commit GBH. Application of s.9(1)(b) on the basis of possible GBH and theft of the wallet.

NB Credit should be given for the argument that, since Eddie obviously had the foreign coin with him, he may have intended to commit theft with it before entering the stadium for the purposes of s.9(1)(a). Credit should also be given for a reference to the possible attempted theft of the chocolate for the purposes of s.9(1)(b)

- (B) Theft issues relating to the wallet. Appropriation through momentary possession, belonging to another, dishonesty, intention to permanently deprive. Robbery issues in relation to the wallet. Was there force? Was it used in order to steal? Theft only – **max clear**.

NB Consideration of theft in relation to the vending machine only – **max clear** (since there is obviously no appropriation). Such a consideration can also enhance a discussion of theft of the wallet.

- (C) Fraud by false representation issues in relation to the vending machine. Representation (implied representation of having the means/intention to pay), falsity, no requirement of human intervention (s.2(5) FA). Mens rea issues: dishonesty, intention to make a gain for himself or another/cause risk of loss. No requirement for intention to succeed.

NB Consideration of the implied representation of Eddie in "pretending to help" Dan only can be awarded full credit or can enhance a consideration of fraud by false representation in relation to the vending machine.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 2 | Discuss Colin's possible criminal liability for property offences arising out of his activities in connection with the restaurant and the van. (25 marks) |
|---|---|---|

Potential Content

- (A) Making off without payment issues. Making off, the spot, service done, payment required or expected. *Mens rea* issues: intention to permanently avoid payment, knowledge that payment was required, dishonesty.

Fraud by false representation issues – possible argument based on continuing representation as to payment.

Dishonestly obtaining services issues – should conclude that there is no liability because no dishonesty until after services obtained.

Theft of food issues – should conclude that there is no liability because no dishonesty until after food is consumed.

NB Making off without payment - **max sound**

OR Fraud by false representation – **max sound**

OR Obtaining services dishonestly – **max weak clear**

OR Theft – **max weak clear**

Any combination which includes making off and/or fraud by false representation – **max sound**

Combination of obtaining services and theft only – **max clear**

- (B) Criminal damage issues. Basic criminal damage. The meaning of ‘damage’ in relation to the consequent functioning of the vehicle through loosening the wheel nuts and in relation to the possible physical damage to the van. Mens rea issues. Aggravated criminal damage issues. Intention/recklessness to endanger life, and to endanger life ‘thereby’.
- (C) Defence of intoxication. Recognition of voluntary intoxication. Distinction between specific/basic intent crimes. Is mens rea negated? (Unlikely on the facts)

Scenario 2**Total for this scenario: 50 marks**

0	3
----------	----------

 Discuss the possible criminal liability for **property** offences of the following:

- Tom in connection with the mobile phone
- Fez in connection with the car. *(25 marks)*

Potential Content

- (A) Theft issues : - appropriation, belonging to another (unlawful possession of Luke is sufficient), dishonesty, intention to permanently deprive (possible relevance of s.6). Robbery issues. Was there force? Was it used in order to steal? Theft only – **max clear**.
- (B) Consideration of the defence of duress: threat of death/serious personal injury? The subjective element (threat of imminent harm/opportunity to avoid the harm?) The objective element (relevance of Tom's age). Possible effect of Tom's association with a person with a reputation for violence.
- (C) Criminal damage issues in relation to the windscreen. Basic criminal damage. The meaning of damage. Mens rea elements. Aggravated criminal damage issues. Intention/recklessness to endanger life, and to endanger life 'thereby'.

0	4
----------	----------

 Discuss the possible criminal liability for **property** offences of the following:

- Luke in connection with the tickets and the £300
- Pierre in connection with his threat to Luke. *(25 marks)*

Potential Content

- (A) Either or both:
- (1) Theft on the initial dishonest appropriation of the £300 (because of Gomez, consent irrelevant, Luke dishonest from the outset);
- (2) Theft on the subsequent dishonest appropriation (if not initial dishonesty) when Luke uses money to pay for holiday (utilising s5(3) to deal with "property belonging to another")
- NB if subsequent appropriation only (and therefore s5(3) but no indication of why no initial theft eg no initial dishonesty) then **max clear**.
- (B) Fraud by false representation. Luke's representation that he would obtain/supply the tickets (ie representation as to his state of mind), falsity. Mens rea issues. Dishonesty, intention to make a gain and/or cause a loss.
- (C) Blackmail issues. Demand, menaces, with a view to gain or intent to cause loss. Unwarranted demand -D's belief as to reasonable grounds for making the demand (arguable) and that the demand is a proper means of reinforcing it (less arguable).

Section B: Tort

Scenario 3

Total for this scenario: 50 marks

0	5
---	---

Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of the following:

- Fred against Galid, in connection with the late-night parties
- Galid and his guests against Fred, in connection with the bonfires
- Will against Galid, in connection with the destruction of the shed.

(25 marks)

Potential content

- (A) In relation to the late-night parties: possible liability of Galid in the tort of private nuisance. The need for an unreasonable interference with enjoyment of land and a consideration of possible relevant factors, especially location, duration, and generally excessive annoyance. The requirement of damage. The remedies of injunction and damages.

In relation to the bonfires: possible claim of Galid in private nuisance based on the importance of malice and intention to cause annoyance. Remedies. In relation to a claim by Galid's guests: the requirement of an interest in land by the claimant excludes a possible claim in private nuisance. Possible reference to public nuisance.

- (B) In relation to Will: possible liability in *Rylands v Fletcher*. The need for a 'thing liable to do mischief...', accumulation, non-natural user, escape, damage, remedy of damages. Possible alternative in negligence.

0	6
---	---

Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Galid against Abbas in connection with his financial loss and against Electrofix in connection with his injury. (25 marks)

- (A) In relation to Galid and Abbas: the tort of negligence in relation to misstatements. The distinction between acts and words, the need for a special relationship/proximity, in particular, the issues of Abbas's expertise and whether Galid's reliance was reasonable. The issue of breach of duty and standard of care in relation to professionals. Damages.
- (B) In relation to Galid and Electrofix : possible claim in the tort of negligence (duty, breach, damage, remoteness). *Res ipsa loquitur* to be credited, although not required. Possible alternative claim under the Consumer Protection Act 1987 (damage, defective product, producer, strict liability). Damages. Either or both of the above approaches can achieve maximum marks (with an obviously more limited treatment where both elements are considered).

Scenario 4**Total for this scenario: 50 marks**

- | | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| 0 | 7 | Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Yvonne and of Matt against Karl in connection with their injuries at the health club. (25 marks) |
|----------|----------|--|

Potential Content

- (A) In relation to Yvonne: relevant requirements of the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957. Elements which must be proved to establish the duty, nature of the duty and breach of duty, with particular reference to s.2(4)(b). Damages. Potential alternative in common law negligence. Duty of care, breach of duty. Remoteness. Damages.
- (B) In relation to Matt : relevant requirements of the Occupiers' Liability Act 1984. The need for a danger due to the state of the premises (s.1(1)). Requirements for the duty to arise (s.1(3)). Nature of the duty (s.1(4)). Warnings (s.1(5)). Consideration of possible contributory negligence/volenti. Damages.

- | | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| 0 | 8 | Consider the rights and remedies, if any, of Karl, of Becca and of Liz against Dr Casey in connection with the harm they suffered. (25 marks) |
|----------|----------|--|

Potential Content

- (A) In relation to Karl and Dr Casey : elements of the tort of negligence. Duty of care. Breach of duty in relation to medical professionals.). *Res ipsa loquitur* to be credited, although not required. Causation/remoteness. Remedy of damages.
- (B) In relation to Becca and Liz: possible claim in the tort of negligence for psychiatric injury. Need for recognised psychiatric injury, distinction between primary and secondary victims in terms of test(s) for distinction and in terms of control factors. Application to Becca and Liz (secondary victims, consideration of control factors). Damages.

Maxima for LAW04 Concepts essay questions

The candidate deals with (A) and (B) as follows:

- Max 30:** two sound
- Max 27:** one sound, one clear
- Max 23:** one sound, one some **or** two clear
- Max 19:** one sound **or** one clear, one some
- Max 15:** one clear **or** two some
- Max 10:** one some
- Max 5:** fragments **or** substantial error or incoherence
- 0:** no relevant information

Descriptors for Concepts of Law questions (Section C)

Level	Explanation	Analysis/Evaluation
sound	The answer presents a strong explanatory framework, correctly identifying and accurately and comprehensively explaining, say, relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theories in the central aspects of the potential content. Where appropriate, the explanations are supported by relevant examples and illustration (which is adequately developed where necessary to further elucidate the explanations). Where there are more marginal aspects of the potential content, there may be some minor omissions or inaccuracies in the explanation and/or in the treatment of the supporting examples and illustration.	Arguments are developed perceptively and coherently, making careful use of framework explanations, examples and illustration, and are directly related to the thrust of the question. Summaries and conclusions are sustainable, and demonstrably emerge from the supporting explanations and arguments.
clear	The answer presents an explanatory framework, correctly identifying and accurately explaining significant parts of, say, relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory in the central aspects of the potential content, though there are omissions in the explanations of some parts of the rules, procedures, institutions, and theory or errors or some confusion in the explanation, in those central aspects. There may be a little overemphasis on marginal aspects at the expense of some of the more central aspects. In the higher part of the level, relevant examples and illustration are used but there may be a little confusion and error in selection and/or explanation or the explanation may be limited. At the lower end of the level, there may be little evidence of relevant examples and illustration or more evident inaccuracies.	Appropriate arguments are introduced but may not be fully developed, or may be restricted in range. Alternatively, the arguments suffer from a little inaccuracy or confusion. The arguments make use of framework explanations (including any relevant examples and illustration) but do not always succeed in incorporating them in a fully coherent way or in demonstrating their full relevance. Summaries and conclusions may be a little tentative and may not fully address the thrust of the question. Though broadly based on the supporting explanations and arguments, summaries and conclusions may not be closely and carefully related to them in the discussion.
some	The answer presents an explanatory framework which correctly identifies and accurately explains a very limited part of, say, relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory in the central aspects of the potential content. There may be a very evident imbalance between explanation of central and of more marginal aspects of the potential content. Alternatively, the answer attempts explanation across a much broader range of relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory in the central aspects of the potential content but the explanations suffer from significant omission, error or confusion. Explanations may emerge only out of attempts to introduce relevant examples and illustration. If introduced at all, examples and illustration may be of marginal relevance or their treatment may be highly superficial or subject to significant inaccuracies or not properly used to support the explanation of the relevant rules, procedures, institutions, and theory.	There are relevant arguments but they are undeveloped and may tend to consist of simple assertions or assumptions. Alternatively, arguments may be characterised by evident confusion which significantly impedes coherence. Very limited use is made of framework explanations and any examples and illustration. Summaries and conclusions may be absent. Where present, they may barely address the thrust of the question, and be only imprecisely related to any supporting explanations and arguments.

Total for this question: 35 marks

0	9	Discuss the meaning of justice. Critically analyse the extent to which the law is successful in achieving justice, and discuss the difficulties which it faces in seeking to do so. <i>(30 marks + 5 marks for AO3)</i>
----------	----------	--

Potential Content

- (A) Discussion of the different possible meanings ‘of justice,’ for example, justice in terms of basic fairness, equality of treatment, distinction between different aspects of justice, for example, distributive/corrective, substantive/procedural, or formal/concrete justice etc. For a sound answer, there should be some treatment of the important philosophical theories of justice eg utilitarianism, Rawls, etc. Use of case law/examples.
- (B) Analysis of the extent to which law does or does not, achieve justice in the context of the discussion in (A)

Analysis of relevant rules of the substantive law and/or aspects of the legal system eg aspects of justice in relation to procedure, evidence, natural justice, treatment of suspects, methods of correcting injustice etc.

Evaluation of the difficulties the law faces in seeking to achieve justice eg the problems in connection with ‘access to justice’ (cost/funding in relation to the provision of advice and representation, the problem of lack of public understanding of the legal process etc), the difficulty of balancing competing interests satisfactorily in a pluralistic and complex society(eg in relation to sentencing and procedure, state security) etc.

NB answers which contain no ‘evaluation of the difficulties’ – **max clear**.

AO3

- 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

Total for this question: 35 marks

1	0
---	---

Consider the view that there is a close relationship between law and morality. Examine the debate as to whether the law **should** reflect moral values, and discuss issues which show the continuing importance of that debate.

(30 marks + 5 marks for AO3)

Potential Content

- (A) Explanation of the meaning of law and morality. Consideration of the relationship between law and morality – use of pertinent case law/examples to illustrate areas of overlap and divergence. Conclusions as to whether the relationship can be said to be ‘close.’
- (B) Examination of the debate referred to by reference to eg the Hart-Devlin arguments, the Hart-Fuller debate, the possible conflict between ‘libertarians’ and legal moralists, the ‘harm principle’ and debates as to its meaning etc. Better candidates will probably recognise that even libertarians acknowledge the need for some morality as the basis of law (eg Hart’s ‘minimum content of natural law’). Candidates should be given credit for linking the positivism/natural law debate to the relationship between law and morality.

Credit will be given for any relevant examples which highlight the ‘continuing importance’/current topicality of the debate eg issues relating to conception, death etc.

NB answers which contain no examples which highlight the ‘continuing importance’ / current topicality of the debate – **max clear**.

AO3

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

Total for this question: 35 marks

1	1
---	---

Analyse the extent to which judges are able to develop the law through the operation of the doctrine of judicial precedent and in the interpretation of statutes. Discuss whether judges **should** be able to develop the law.

(30 marks + 5 marks for AO3)

Potential Content

(A) Analysis in relation to development through the operation of judicial precedent.

Explanation of the doctrine of precedent (the judicial hierarchy, the distinction between ratio and obiter, binding and persuasive precedents etc). Its characteristics of flexibility which provide the potential for legal development eg distinguishing/issue of determining material facts, flexibility available to the HL due to the Practice Statement, flexibility due to the possible vagueness of a ratio, overruling/not following etc.

Identification and analysis of relevant examples and case law instances of judicial development in practice (eg the mens rea of murder, the duty of care in the tort of negligence, either in general and/or in specific contexts eg misstatements, psychiatric harm etc, judicial development of assault/ABH/GBH, aspects of formation of contracts etc).

Discussion of whether judges should have this ability. Evaluation of relevant arguments against judicial lawmaking (these can include such issues as the haphazardness of the judicial process/the need for relevant cases and issues to arise, constitutional issues (eg that judges are unelected), inappropriateness of the courts as a forum for law reform (eg lack of research material available to judges), issues of justice (eg the problem of retroactivity of judicial decisions, the costs issue etc). Views of individual judges to be credited.

Evaluation of arguments in favour of judicial lawmaking and development eg the need for the courts to deal with omissions in the law, the fact that judges are not constrained by Parliamentary problems (eg party politics), speed. Views of judges to be credited.

NB no evaluation – **max clear.**

(B) Analysis in relation to statutory interpretation.

Explanation of the approaches to statutory interpretation (eg the literal, golden and mischief 'rules, and the increasing importance of the purposive/contextual approach etc). Analysis of the flexibility available to judges in statutory interpretation (eg are there binding 'rules' of interpretation?, the uncertainty of the meaning of language etc). Identification and analysis of relevant examples/ case law. Discussion of the extent to which judges should be able to develop the law through statutory interpretation (eg problems associated with language). Views of judges to be credited.

NB no evaluation – **max clear.**

AO3

- 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

ASSESSMENT GRID**A Level Law (LAW04)****(One question from *either* Section A or Section B, *and* one question from Section C)**

UNIT 4	AO1	AO2	AO3
Section A			
Question 01	10	15	
Question 02	10	15	
Question 03	10	15	
Question 04	10	15	
Section B			
Question 05	10	15	
Question 06	10	15	
Question 07	10	15	
Question 08	10	15	
Section C			
Question 09	15	15	5
Question 10	15	15	5
Question 11	15	15	5
Total marks	35	45	5

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion