

# GCE

## Law

Advanced GCE

Unit G154: Criminal Law Special Study

# Mark Scheme for June 2012

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications PO Box 5050 Annesley NOTTINGHAM NG15 0DL

Telephone:0870 770 6622Facsimile:01223 552610E-mail:publications@ocr.org.uk

G154/01

### Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
2	Unclear
805	Benefit of Doubt
×	Cross
NAME OF THE OWNER	Not answered question
3	Irrelevant
	Repeat
<b>~</b>	Tick (Knowledge A01)
Ve	Vague
SO	Sort of
QUESTION 1 AND QUESTION 3	MEANING
СР	Critical Point identified
AP1	Analytical Point 1 identified
LC	Link Case identified
Conc	Conclusion made (Question 3)
QUESTION 2	MEANING
Def	Definitions (A01)
Def/S	Definitions of statutes (A01)
C1 etc	Case stated but with no facts or development
C1+	Case stated with facts and or development and discussion

Annotation	Meaning	
A02	Comment or analysis	
A02+	Comment or analysis developed	
A02(LTQ) Comment or analysis linked to quote		
A02(LTQ)+ Well developed comment or analysis linked to quote		
LTS Indicates either A01 statement and or A02 comment linked to a correctly referenced Source		

Question	on Answer Marks Gu				
Question 1*	Answer         Potential answers may:         Assessment Objective 2 – Analysis, evaluation and application         CP1 Discuss the fact that the Court of Appeal in Jones reiterated that it was for a jury to decide whether the act was capable of being 'more than merely preparatory'. The question would be decided by a jury in looking at the 'plain natural meaning' of section 1. The trial judge had accordingly rightly left the charge of attempted murder to the jury and the Court of Appeal confirmed this decision         AP1 Identify the major issue in the case that the defendant denied	Marks 12	AO2 Level 5 4 3 2 1 Marks should b	Guidance A02 Marks 11-12 9-10 7-8 4-6 1-3 e awarded as for (s for the Critica	
	<ul> <li>attempted murder because he said he had only intended to kill himself and, in any case, that there were at least three more acts to do before he could have killed anyone ie released safety catch, put finger on trigger and pulled the trigger. The defendant was convicted of attempted murder</li> <li>AP2 Discuss the fact that the Criminal Attempts Act 1981 does not define 'more than merely preparatory' but Jones assists in defining the phrase by reiterating section 4(3) that this is a question of fact in each case. This position is supported by the Law Commission's 1980 report</li> <li>AP3 Discuss how the Court of Appeal, on the facts, distinguished between merely preparatory acts and those that a jury could consider as being acts more than merely preparatory.</li> <li>Merely Preparatory – obtaining the shotgun, shortening the barrel of the shotgun and going to the victim's car;</li> <li>More Than Merely Preparatory – getting into the car, taking out the loaded shotgun and pointing it at the victim with the intent of killing him and saying 'You are not going to like this!'</li> <li>AP4 Discuss that Lord Taylor stated that a court must not to try and fit pre-1981 actus reus tests into the words of the section. In particular, he rejected the defendant's argument that the last act test or other common law tests were embodied in section 1(1). For example, Eagleton, Stonehouse, Robinson.</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Max 6 marl</li> <li>Max 3 marl</li> <li>Level 5</li> <li>Responses are u discussing the C purpose of show well developed a</li> <li>Re: AP5</li> <li>Please note cred that has direct re generic commen</li> <li>Re: Linked case</li> </ul>	ks for Analytical ks for a relevant nlikely to achiev P, without using ing developmen nalytical points. it can only be gi levance to <i>Jone</i> t should not be d it can only be gi	Points (AP) Linked Case (LC) re level 5 without a linked case for the t and without two ven for comment s. Hence any credited.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance		
	<ul> <li>AP5 Consider any other relevant comment. For example, Lord Taylor's discussion on codifying Acts.</li> <li>LC Link to any relevant case eg White, Boyle and Boyle, Attorney-General's Reference (No1 of 1992), Dagnall, Gullefer, Geddes etc.</li> </ul>				
	Assessment Objective 3 - Communication and presentation	4	AO2 Marks	AO3 Marks	
			10-12	4	
	Present logical and coherent arguments and communicate relevant		7-9	3	
	material in a clear and effective manner using appropriate legal		4-6	2	
	terminology.		1-3	1	

Question	Answer	Marks		Guidance	
2*	Potential answers <b>may</b> :				
	Assessment Objective 1 - Knowledge and understanding	16	AO1 Level	AO1 Marks	
			5	14-16	
	Re mens rea:		4	11-13	
	• Explain that the common law's approach to the mens rea of an		3	8-10	
	attempt was, in practice, to require [the same as] that of the full		2	5-7	
	crime: an intent to commit the substantive offence <i>Easom</i>		1	1-4	
	Explain the 1981 Criminal Attempts Act so as to define the mens rea of the offence as being intent				
	<ul> <li>Explain the courts' insistence on intention purely as the basis of</li> </ul>		Level 5	unlikalu ta aabi	iovolovol <i>E</i> without
	mens rea post-1981 eg Millard and Vernon			ked cases, 6 of	ieve Level 5 without
	<ul> <li>Explain the importance of establishing at what point a criminal</li> </ul>			ndidates will use	
	intention can be said to have progressed to the stage of an			ce materials and	
	attempt - Geddes etc		Level 4		a boyona.
	<ul> <li>Explain the development of the mens rea in relation to</li> </ul>			unlikelv to achi	ieve Level 4 without
	attempted murder and attempted infliction of grievous bodily			ed cases, 4 of w	
	harm from cases such as Whybrow, Mohan, Walker and Hales,		developed.		
	Woollin		Level 3		
	Explain the development of the mens rea in relation to				ieve Level 3 without
	recklessness after Millard eg Attorney General's Reference			ed cases, 2 of w	which will be well
	(No3 of 1992, Khan)		developed.		
	Re attempts to do the impossible:		Level 2		
	<ul> <li>Explain the difference between a crime that is physically</li> </ul>				ieve Level 2 without which will be well
	impossible and one which is legally impossible		developed.		
	<ul> <li>Explain the pre-1981 common law's lack of liability for</li> </ul>		Level 1		
	defendants who attempted the impossible eg Haughton v.			not expected to	o discuss anv
	Smith		cases.		
	• Explain the Law Commission's desire to prevent decisions like			not be rewarde	ed for an
	that in <i>Haughton</i> by enacting S.1(1) of the Criminal Attempts		explanation on	the actus reus	of Attempts unless
	Act 1981		they make a cle		
	• Explain that aspects of attempting the impossible may very well				hose responses
	refer to the realistic and hypothetical absence of an actus reus			xplain the <i>actus</i>	
	of any sort unless defined by the accused's belief. Refer to Ss 1				possibility will only
	(2) and (3) as well as Anderton v. Ryan and Shivpuri		be rewarded in	the case count	it relevant.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
Question	<ul> <li>Explain attempting the impossible crime eg <i>Taffe</i></li> <li>Credit any other relevant point.</li> <li>Assessment Objective 2 - Analysis, evaluation and application</li> <li>Re mens rea: <ul> <li>Discuss the rationale of criminalising attempts through the <i>mens rea</i></li> <li>Discuss the significance of the decision in <i>Whybrow</i> in defining the <i>mens rea</i> required for attempted murder and grievous bodily harm and whether the decisions in <i>Mohan, Walker</i> and <i>Woollin</i> may have clarified the law</li> <li>Discuss the relevance of <i>Attorney General's Reference (No3 of 1992)</i> and <i>Khan</i> in terms of intended consequences and recklessness</li> <li>Consider any reference to the Draft Criminal Code</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Marks 14	AO2 Level       AO2 Marks         5       13-14         4       10-12         3       7-9         2       4-6         1       1-3         Level 5       Responses are unlikely to achieve Level 5 without sophisticated analytical engagement with the question and very focused on the quote and provide a logical conclusion.         Level 4       Responses are unlikely to achieve Level 4 without
	<ul> <li><i>Re attempts to do the impossible:</i></li> <li>Discuss the ineffectiveness and unfairness of the pre-1981 common law eg <i>Haughton</i></li> <li>Discuss the House of Lords confusion over attempting the impossible in <i>Anderton v Ryan and Shivpuri</i></li> <li>Consider the morally reprehensible situation of the defendant not being found guilty of the impossible crime when they clearly intended to engage in criminal activity</li> <li>Consider any reference to the Draft Criminal Code</li> <li>Credit any other relevant point.</li> </ul>		a good analytical engagement with the question and <b>good</b> focus on the quote and provide a logical conclusion. Level 3 Responses are unlikely to achieve Level 3 without an adequate analytical engagement with the question and limited focus on the quote and provide a logical conclusion. Level 2 Responses are unlikely to achieve Level 2 without limited analytical engagement with the question. Level 1 Responses are unlikely to achieve Level 1 without very limited analytical engagement with the question.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guida	nce	
				Responses will not achieve credit for any discussion on the <i>actus reus</i> of Attempts unless they make clear links in relation to the <i>mens</i> <i>rea/</i> impossibility on Attempts. Response which simply discusses the <i>actus reus</i> with no relationship to the <i>mens rea/</i> impossibility will not achieve credit.		
		Assessment Objective 3 - Communication and presentation	4	AO1 + AO2 Marks	AO3 mark	
		Present logical and coherent arguments and communicate relevant		24-30	4	
		material in a clear and effective manner using appropriate legal		17-23	3	
		terminology. Reward grammar, spelling and punctuation.		9-16	2	
				1-8	1	

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer	Marks		Guid	ance
3	Potential answers <b>may</b> :		Level	AO1 Marks	AO2 Marks
	Assessment Objective 1 - Knowledge and understanding	10	5	9-10	17-20
	• Explain the <i>actus reus</i> of an attempted crime under section	_	4	7-8	13-16
	1(1) Criminal Attempts Act 1981		3	5-6	9-12
	<ul> <li>Explain that in order to convict the defendant the act must</li> </ul>		2	3-4	5-8
	<ul> <li>Explain that more than merely preparatory to the commission of the offence</li> <li>Explain that more than merely preparatory means that the</li> </ul>			1-2	1-4
	<ul> <li>defendant must have gone beyond purely preparatory acts and have '<i>embarked on the crime proper</i>' <i>Gullefer</i></li> <li>Explain that the distinction between mere preparation and</li> </ul>		Marks sho follows:	ould be awarded	l (per scenario) as
	an attempted crime is determined by a jury considering		Level		
	<i>thas the defendant done an act which shows that he has</i>		5	9-10	
	actually tried to commit the offence in question, orhas he		4	7-8	
	only got ready or put himself in a position or equipped		3	5-6	
	himself to do so' Geddes		2	3-4	
	Explain relevant cases in the answer:		1	1-2	
	<ul> <li>Explain relevant cases in the answer:</li> <li>MP eg <i>Gullefer, Campbell, Geddes</i> etc.</li> <li>MTMP eg <i>Jones, Boyle and Boyle</i></li> <li>Explain the <i>mens rea</i> of an attempted crime under section 1(1) Criminal Attempts Act 1981</li> <li>Explain that the <i>mens rea</i> of attempts is an intent to commit the full offence and the meaning of intent has the same meaning as that under the common law <i>Mohan</i></li> <li>Explain that in cases involving attempted murder or attempted grievous bodily harm a higher level of <i>mens rea</i> is required. For attempted murder the defendant must intend to kill as an intent to cause grievous bodily harm is insufficient <i>Whybrow</i></li> <li>Explain section 1(2) and (3) Criminal Attempts Act 1981 – a person can be guilty of an attempted crime even though on the facts the commission of the offence is impossible <i>Shivpuri</i></li> <li>Explain sections 1(2) and (3) Criminal Attempts Act 1981.</li> </ul>		for each p Max Max Max of the (CON In order to	m of 3 marks ca art of the quest 3 marks for the 0 6 marks for Appl 1 mark for a logic e most likely outo N). • reach Level 5, on of the Critica	Critical Point (CP);

Mark Scheme

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	AnswerAssessment Objective 2 - Analysis, evaluation and applicationIn the case of (a): CP Identify Latifah's act is one capable of being 'more than merely preparatory' under section 1(1) Criminal Attempts Act 1981 using a relevant case, Jones, Boyle and Boyle AP1 Identify why Latifah's act is 'more than merely preparatory'AP2 Identify why Latifah's act is 'more than merely preparatory'AP2 Identify why Latifa's act may, although unlikely, be one of 'mere preparation' using a relevant case Gullefer, Geddes Campbell etcAP3 Identify that Latifah's intent was to commit the full offence - a proof of a decision to bring about the offence no matter whether the accused desired it or not – Mohan – or Moloney CON Reach any sensible conclusionIn the case of (b): AP1 Identify Edward's act is one capable of being 'more than merely preparatory' under section 1(1) Criminal Attempts Act 1981 using a relevant case, Jones, Boyle and Boyle AP2 Identify why Edward's act is 'more than merely preparatory'AP3 Identify why Edward's act may, although unlikely, be one of 'mere preparation' using a relevant case Gullefer, Geddes Campbell etcAP3 Identify that Edward's intent was to commit the full offence – a proof of a decision to bring about the offence no matter whether the accused desired it or not – Mohan or MoloneyCP Identify that Edward's intent was to commit the full offence – a proof of a decision to bring about the offence no matter whether the accused desired it or not – Mohan or MoloneyCP Identify that Edward can still be liable even if the offence is one of attempting the impossible – s.1(2), Shivpuri CON Reach any sensible conclusion	20	Guidance

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	In the case of (c): <b>CP</b> Identify Jill's act is capable of being one of 'mere preparation' and not under section 1(1) Criminal Attempts Act using a relevant case <i>Gullefer, Geddes, Campbell</i> etc <b>AP1</b> Identify why Jill's act is 'mere preparation' <b>AP2</b> Identify why Jill's act may, although unlikely, be one which is 'more than merely preparatory' using a relevant case, <i>Jones, Boyle and Boyle</i> <b>AP3</b> Identify that Jill's intent was to commit the full offence – a proof of a decision to bring about the offence no matter whether the accused desired it or not – <i>Mohan</i> or <i>Moloney</i> <b>CON</b> Reach any sensible conclusion		

### Mark Scheme

There are five levels of assessment of AOs 1 and 2 in the A2 units. The first four levels are very similar to the four levels for AS units. The addition of a fifth level reflects the expectation of higher achievement by candidates at the end of a two-year course of study. There are four levels of assessment of AO3 in the A2 units. The requirements and number of levels differ between AS and A2 units to reflect the expectation of higher achievement by candidates at the end of a two-year course of study.

Level	Assessment Objective 1	Assessment Objective 2	Assessment Objective 3 (includes QWC)
5	Wide ranging, accurate, detailed knowledge with a clear and confident understanding of relevant concepts and principles. Where appropriate candidates will be able to elaborate with wide citation of relevant statutes and case–law.	Ability to identify correctly the relevant and important points of criticism showing good understanding of current debate and proposals for reform <b>or</b> identify all of the relevant points of law in issue. A high level of ability to develop arguments <b>or</b> apply points of law accurately and pertinently to a given factual situation, and reach a cogent, logical and well-informed conclusion.	
4	Good, well-developed knowledge with a clear understanding of the relevant concepts and principles. Where appropriate candidates will be able to elaborate by good citation to relevant statutes and case-law.	Ability to identify and analyse issues central to the question showing some understanding of current debate and proposals for reform or identify most of the relevant points of law in issue. Ability to develop clear arguments or apply points of law clearly to a given factual situation and reach a sensible and informed conclusion.	An accomplished presentation of logical and coherent arguments and communicates relevant material in a very clear and effective manner using appropriate legal terminology. Reward grammar, spelling and punctuation.
3	Adequate knowledge showing reasonable understanding of the relevant concepts and principles. Where appropriate candidates will be able to elaborate with some citation of relevant statutes and case-law.	Ability to analyse most of the more obvious points central to the question or identify the main points of law in issue. Ability to develop arguments or apply points of law mechanically to a given factual situation, and reach a conclusion.	A good ability to present logical and coherent arguments and communicates relevant material in a clear and effective manner using appropriate legal terminology. Reward grammar, spelling and punctuation.
2	Limited knowledge showing general understanding of the relevant concepts and principles. There will be some elaboration of the principles, and where appropriate with limited reference to relevant statutes and case-law.	Ability to explain some of the more obvious points central to the question or identify some of the points of law in issue. A limited ability to produce arguments based on their material or limited ability to apply points of law to a given factual situation but without a clear focus or conclusion.	An adequate ability to present logical and coherent arguments and communicates relevant material in a reasonably clear and effective manner using appropriate legal terminology. Reward grammar, spelling and punctuation.
1	Very limited knowledge of the basic concepts and principles. There will be limited points of detail, but accurate citation of relevant statutes and case-law will not be expected.	Ability to explain at least one of the simpler points central to the question or identify at least one of the points of law in issue. The approach may be uncritical and/or unselective.	A limited attempt to present logical and coherent arguments and communicates relevant material in a limited manner using some appropriate legal terminology. Reward grammar, spelling and punctuation.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations) 1 Hills Road Cambridge CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre** 

#### **Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998 Facsimile: 01223 552627 Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

#### www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee Registered in England Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU Registered Company Number: 3484466 OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations) Head office Telephone: 01223 552552 Facsimile: 01223 552553



