Law Subject Overview The Appleton School.

Review November 2023



Subject: Law

Curriculum Intent (Covering Year 12 to 13)

Vision.

As a subject we would like our sixth form students to immerse themselves in our Legal system and explore all branches of law and cases happening currently in the law courts. Outside of the class we hope to enrich students with extracurricular opportunities including visits to the Royal Courts of Justice, the Old Bailey and talks with legal professionals. Moving them through this journey students will focus on the English legal system and areas of both private and public law within the law of England and Wales. Students will be required to show knowledge and understanding of the nature of law and the English legal system. This will provide them with the foundation for the study of both private and public law. The scheme of work will develop learners' understanding of legal method and reasoning through the study of statutory interpretation and judicial precedent. They will be introduced to the concept of legal liability through the study of criminal law and the law of tort. This will enable them to develop and apply the techniques of legal method and reasoning to analyse and offer answers to legal problems, based on legal rules and principles and develop the ability to construct and communicate legal arguments by reference to appropriate legal authorities. Students will develop their knowledge of law through advanced study of an additional legal subject – human rights law or the law of contract. They will develop their critical awareness of the law through the study of the nature of law.

In short we would like our students to develop into **Legal Eagles**.

The following qualities below are expected of legal professionals such as Barristers and Solicitors

- E- Excellent interpersonal and social skills
- A-Attention to detail with their work
- **G- Good Judgment**
- L-Love of learning and embracing of law in the news
- E-Enthusiasm and commitment to work in and out of class
- S- Skills in case researching and solving problems

How is the curriculum delivered?

The law curriculum is divided into themed modules of work which are generally completed within 6-8 weeks per module. The LEGAL EAGLES vision is incorporated into each themed topic through an incorporation of the following methods outlined below. The curriculum has been developed so that skills and knowledge are reinforced throughout the student's study of law across year 12 and 13.

| E Excellent | Students being active listeners of the teacher and peers during class discussions and taking an active |
|-------------------|---|
| interpersonal | interest in what others have to say on a topic. |
| and social skills | Students being encouraged to express themselves in a calm manner and be respectful of other peoples opinions. |
| | A culture of students being open to and asking for feedback from the class teacher and peers. |

| | Students seeking out opportunities to develop social and interpersonal skills through law enrichment opportunities such as the Napley Legal Challenge and Question and Answer Session with female Judges at The Royal Courts of Justice. | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| A- Attention to detail with | Adopting a quality mind-set that is non-negotiable- They have to stay with an essay/mock exam submission until it is on or above target. | | | | | |
| their work | Students use of essay plans for the criminal/tort law units that provide a structure for students to attain the detail needed for 20 marker questions. They have to fine tune their responses to exam scenarios ensuring they are concise and to the point. | | | | | |
| | Promoting routine of a minute a mark so that students are spending an appropriate amount of time on an exam question. | | | | | |
| G- Good Judgment | Students being aware of their own personal bias when reading cases in the news and recognising that their opinion isn't always the correct one. | | | | | |
| | Students considering opposite points of view with cases. Good judgement is about making the best decision rather than ensuring your viewpoint wins out. | | | | | |
| | Students accepting mistakes identified in their work and being able to take responsibility for mistakes and to take negative feedback when required. | | | | | |
| | Students learning from experiences and banking what worked when completing an exam question and avoid repeating what didn't. | | | | | |
| L Love of learning and embracing of | Planning of extracurricular opportunities for students outside of the classroom. Previous opportunities have included visits to seminars at the Old Bailey in London, a filmed question and answer session at The Royal Courts of Justice London and students participating in the Napley Legal Challenge. | | | | | |

| law in the news | Sparking pupils intellectual curiosity through an Incorporation of overnight reading challenges on cases that have sparked media interest, getting students to read the article and feedback linking to the curriculum such as what would be the pre trial procedures for the defendant, what sentence do they think the judge could impose. The teacher contributing the design of a engaging curriculum such as facilitating mooting and enacting court cases assigning students legal roles such as defence/prosecution Barristers, Jury members and a Judge. | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| E - Enthusiasm | Ensuring students are aware of their goals across year 12 and 13 with an action plan of how they will be accomplished and checkpoints for review of these. | | | | | |
| and commitment to work in | Providing students with an A3 ring binder that contains all resources for the A Level that is colour coded across each unit. | | | | | |
| and out of class | Encourage students to work together and learn from each other, making them feel like a part of something bigger. | | | | | |
| | Continual verbal and written feedback to be given to students to ensure students motivation stays high. | | | | | |
| | Deriving motivation from role models during their course of study be it trips to meet with guest speakers and providing media clips to students in the lesson for example | | | | | |
| | https://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcthree/article/51fe5032-193f-4553-9c97-879e02d2dbef | | | | | |
| S- Skills in case | A weekly challenge of students researching a case in the news. Regularly reading case laws greatly enhances legal research skills. | | | | | |
| researching | Teaching students to be effective readers and selective in what they read on case facts and judgements. | | | | | |

| and | so | lvi | ing |
|------|------|-----|-----|
| prok | olei | m | S |

Engraining an ethos in to pupils when addressing exam questions to remain objective with the story in the exam scenario, listing all the legal issues, identifying the defences and cases to support arguments and cast personal opinion aside.

How is the curriculum assessed?

Assessments are completed ongoing after each individual topic is delivered, for example once the topic of theft is delivered, students will be given a case study scenario assessing students ability to conclude if a defendant is guilt of theft using their knowledge gained from the teaching through using exemplar questions and past examination questions from the OCR website. At Key Stage three our Level descriptors provide a clear route of progression for students. At Ks5 we use the exam board grade boundaries and mark schemes as well as our own "In-house" front sheet attached to each students work outlining where marks were gained for A01,A02 and A03 with a www and EBI comment. All of the assessment data is collected on a departmental mark book and will inform future teaching and learning. At key points in the year determined by the school, year examinations will take place. These examinations will test knowledge and skills across modules and are again assessed using examination mark schemes and grade boundaries. This data is recorded on the school SIMS and is used to inform future planning and target setting across students.

How is the curriculum enriched (through speakers/visits/clubs) to generate a love of learning? Gatsby links

The law curriculum boasts many wonderful extra-curricular opportunities across year 12 and 13. Outlined below are examples of enrichment opportunities that have been provided to students.

| | What is the enrichment about | Links to the OCR A Level Law Curriculum |
|--|--|---|
| The Legal Apprentice- Kingsley Napley https://www.kingsleynapley.co.uk/the- legal-apprentice This is offered to year 12 Law students and done during lunchtime and after school. | Students entering the competition work as part of a team to complete a series of tasks, designed to encourage them to tap into their "inner solicitor" – using skills and logic to provide legal advice for virtual clients. The competition aims to provide students with first-hand experience of what it is like to be a solicitor. | Criminal process: Jurisdiction of the Magistrates' Court and the Crown Court, including classification of offences and pre-trial procedures. Barristers, solicitors and legal executives: Role, looking at the work they undertake and the regulation of legal professions. Changes and trends in legal services. |
| The Old Bailey Crime and Punishment Seminars https://old-bailey.com/seminars/ | The seminar hosts three speakers who give a talk on their careers with a Q&A at the end of each segment. | Wider roles beyond court roles in the legal system. |
| This is offered to year 12 and year 13 students as an evening trip. | Students get an exclusive insight into the English legal system from three different perspectives. It opens students eyes into how | |

| | the law works on a day to day basis from an insider's point of view. In the last visit students were introduced to Peter Collett a psychologist and a former Oxford don. David Tadd one of the top forensics experts in the country. He was the forensic advisor to the Lord Stevens enquiry into the death of Diana Princess of Wales and the third and final speaker was Timothy Langdale QC, who was one of the country's top criminal barristers. | |
|---|--|--|
| Judicial question time event at The Royal Courts of Justice | Students get an opportunity to learn more about our legal system. The National Justice Museum has been working with the Diversity and Community Relations Judges at the Judiciary and Young Citizens to develop opportunities for young people to learn more about the work of judges and to celebrate the first 100 years of women in law. Students got to pose questions to the female judges and then eat lunch and further network with them. | The judiciary: selection and appointment, training, role, retirement and removal. The separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary. |

| Courtroom workshop at The Royal |
|---------------------------------|
| Courts of Justice. |

https://www.nationaljusticemuseum.org. uk/education/courtroom-workshops/ Students learn about the law and justice system, explore civil or criminal cases in a real courtroom, create, prepare and present a trial, taking on roles such as the judge, jury, barristers, witnesses and defendant and collaborate to reach an outcome or verdict and debate the best sentencing options

Barristers, solicitors and Judges: their work and professional regulation.

As law is not delivered as a course earlier in the curriculum then no prior entry qualifications are needed when selecting law at A Level. However within Citizenship as outlined by the national curriculum students aims s to ensure that all pupils:

- acquire a sound knowledge and understanding of how the United Kingdom is governed, its political system and how citizens participate actively in its democratic systems of government
- develop a sound knowledge and understanding of the role of law and the justice system in our society and how laws are shaped and enforced

What skills and knowledge do students bring with them from Key stage 3 to key stage 4?

Teaching should develop pupils' understanding of democracy, government and the rights and responsibilities of citizens. Pupils should use and apply their knowledge and understanding while developing skills to research and interrogate evidence, debate and evaluate viewpoints, present reasoned arguments and take informed action. Pupils should be taught about:

• the development of the political system of democratic government in the United Kingdom, including the roles of citizens, Parliament and the monarch

- the operation of Parliament, including voting and elections, and the role of political parties
- the precious liberties enjoyed by the citizens of the United Kingdom
- the nature of rules and laws and the justice system, including the role of the police and the operation of courts and tribunals

What skills do students bring from Key stage 4 to year 12?

Teaching should build on the key stage 3 programme of study of Citizenship to deepen pupils' understanding of democracy, government and the rights and responsibilities of citizens. Pupils should develop their skills to be able to use a range of research strategies, weigh up evidence, make persuasive arguments and substantiate their conclusions. They should experience and evaluate different ways that citizens can act together to solve problems and contribute to society.

Pupils should be know about:

- parliamentary democracy and the key elements of the constitution of the United Kingdom, including the power
 of government, the role of citizens and Parliament in holding those in power to account, and the different roles of
 the executive, legislature and judiciary and a free press
- the different electoral systems used in and beyond the United Kingdom and actions citizens can take in democratic and electoral processes to influence decisions locally, nationally and beyond
- other systems and forms of government, both democratic and non-democratic, beyond the United Kingdom
- local, regional and international governance and the United Kingdom's relations with the rest of Europe, the Commonwealth, the United Nations and the wider world
- human rights and international law
- the legal system in the UK, different sources of law and how the law helps society deal with complex problem

What skills and knowledge do students bring with them from year 12 in to year 13?

- Identifying questions and sequences of enquiry
- Writing descriptively, analytically and critically
- Communicating their ideas effectively
- Developing an extended written argument
- Drawing well-evidenced and informed conclusions about legal questions and scenarios.
- Formulating a reasoned argument to support a particular proposition by reference to the relevant legal rules and principles that support that argument.
- Constructing clear, concise and logical legal arguments that are substantiated by legal authority, using appropriate legal terminology.
- Knowledge and understanding of the English legal system and areas of both private and public law within the law of England and Wales.
- An understanding of legal method and reasoning as used by lawyers and the judiciary.
- The techniques of legal method and reasoning to analyse and offer answers to problems, based on legal principles, legislation and case law.
- The ability to construct conclusions and communicate legal arguments by reference to appropriate legal authorities.
- Competence in using legal skills during the study of the nature of law, legal issues and the English legal system, and the private and public areas of substantive law.
- An ability to analyse a factual scenario by identifying the key facts from which legal issues arise.
- Analysing legislation by applying the rules and principles of statutory interpretation; and analyse case law by applying the doctrine of precedent.

What will students study- OVERVIEW OF YEAR 12

| | Term 1 | Term 2 | Term 3 | Term 4 | Term 5 | Term 6 |
|------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Year | Unit: Law | Unit: Law | Unit: Criminal | Unit: Tort Law | Unit: The | Unit: The |
| 12 | Making | Making | Law | | English Legal | English Legal |
| | | | | | system | system |
| | This unit | This unit | This unit | This unit | This unit | This unit |
| | focuses on | focuses on | focuses on | focuses on | focuses on | focuses on |
| | law making in | law making in | the rules and | the rules of | the legal | the legal |
| | England and | England and | general | tort, liability in | system, | system, |
| | Wales as well | Wales as well | elements of | negligence, | including the | including the |
| | as the | as the | criminal law | occupiers' | nature of law, | nature of law, |
| | European | European | and non-fatal | liability and | the civil and | the civil and |
| | Union. | Union. | offences | remedies. It | criminal courts | criminal courts |
| | Learners will | Learners will | against the | provides an | and the legal | and the legal |
| | study law | study law | person. It | introduction | profession. | profession. |
| | making | making | provides an | to civil liability. | Learners will | Learners will |
| | methods and | methods and | introduction | Learners will | develop | develop |
| | their | their | to criminal | develop | knowledge | knowledge |
| | underpinning | underpinning | liability. | knowledge | and | and |
| | concepts. | concepts. | Learners will | and | understanding | understanding |
| | They will | They will | develop | understanding | of the | of the |
| | develop an | develop an | knowledge | of the law of | processes and | processes and |
| | understanding | understanding | and | tort and the | people | people |
| | of legal | of legal | understanding | skills to apply | involved in | involved in |
| | method and | method and | of criminal law | their legal | the law and | the law and |
| | reasoning as | reasoning as | and the skills | knowledge to | the changing | the changing |
| | used by | used by | to apply their | scenario- | nature of the | nature of the |
| | lawyers and | lawyers and | legal | based | legal system. | legal system. |
| | the judiciary. | the judiciary. | knowledge to | situations. | | |

| | | scenario- based situations.` | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| Topics to be covered Parliamentary law making Delegated legislation | Topics to be covered Judicial precedent Law Reform | Topics to be covered General elements of criminal liability Non-fatal offences against | Topics to be covered Liability in negligence Occupiers liability | Topics to be covered Civil courts and other forms of dispute resolution Criminal courts | Topics to be covered Legal personnel Access to justice |
| Statutory Interpretation | EU Law | the person Evaluation of non-fatal offences, defences of intoxication, self-defence and consent - | Remedies Critical evaluation of liability in negligence, occupiers liability, and vicarious liability - including | and lay people | |
| Prior learning to be revisited. None | Prior learning to be revisited. Parliamentary law making | including ideas for reform Prior learning to be revisited. None | ideas for reform Prior learning to be revisited. None | Prior learning to be revisited. None | Prior learning to be revisited. None |

| How will learning from this unit be developed in the next unit? | How will learning from this unit be developed in the next unit? | How will learning from this unit be developed in the next unit? | How will learning from this unit be developed in the next unit? | How will learning from this unit be developed in the next unit? | How will learning from this unit be developed in the next unit? |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Students appreciating that within law making there can be broad, ambiguous phrases in statute hence the need for rules of statutory interpretation. | _ | Students making links from the consequences of breaking criminal laws as to legal personnel who would be involved in a criminal case. | Students making links from the consequences of breaching criminal laws as to legal personnel who would be involved in a criminal case. | | |

| Term 1 and 2 | Lesson Title/Topic Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities | Resources/cases to learn | Homework |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Parliament ary law making | Influences on Parliamenta ry law making | Understand the influences on Parliamentary law making: Political, public opinion, media, pressure groups and lobbyists. Discuss the advantages and disadvantag es of influences on Parliamentary law making | Each political party has its own policies and drafts a manifesto before a general election. When elected the Government will be a major influence on the laws it introduces in to Parliament. Strong public opinion or media reports can lead to a change in the law. Groups with a particular interest can bring issues to the attention of the general public and law makers. | Work through theory pack. Students to supplement notes with research from the attached websites to add context to theory notes on pressure groups, media, lobbying and political influences. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Parliamentary Law making https://labour.org.uk/manifesto/ https://www.tutor2u.net/politics/ reference/sectional-group https://www.tutor2u.net/politics/ reference/causal-pressure- group https://www.thesun.co.uk/news /4036966/sarahs-law-sarah- payne-murder-child-sex- offender-disclosure-scheme/ https://www.parliament.uk/get- involved/contact-an-mp-or- lord/lobbying-parliament/ | Describe the influence on Parliamentary law-making of any one of the following: • Lobbyists or • the media or • pressure groups or • Law commission. [8 marks] Briefly discuss advantages and disadvantages and disadvantages of the influence that you have described in the Question above. [8 marks |
| | | | | | | |

| 4 | | T | | 1 | | 1 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | People who meet MP's in the lobbies of Parliament in order to persuade them to support their cause, often by asking a question in Parliament. | | | |
| Parliament ary law making | The Green and white paper and different types of bill. | To understand the difference between the green and white paper and their purpose in the law making process. Identify the various types of bills that can go through Parliament. | There is usually prelegislative consultation, and green and white papers will set out the government's proposals for a change in the law. Bills can be put before Parliament by the Government or by individual MP's. A government bill is introduced by the Government. A Private Members bill is introduced by a | Work through theory pack. Research the following acts to add as example to different types of bill: 1. Government bill-Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015. 2. Private Members Bill-Household Waste Recycling Act 2003. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Parliamentary Law making | Describe with examples, the various types of bills that can be presented before Parliament. (8) |

| | | T | T | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | private MP, likely to be a public bill. A public bill involves matters of | 3. Public Bill- Legal Aid and sentencing and Punishment Act 2012. | | |
| | public policy which affect the general public. A private bill affects a particular organisation, person or place. A Hybrid bill is introduced by the government but likely to affect a single organisation, person or place. | 4. Private bill- Faversham Oyster Fishery Company Bill 2016 5. Hybrid Bill- Cross rail and HS2 Acts. | | |
| To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Commons and House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and disadvantage | There are several stages in Parliament in both houses before a bill can become an Act. These are first reading, second reading, committee stage, report stage and third reading. | Watch videos on the role of the common and house of lords to assist students in appreciating the differences in both houses that make up Parliament. Students form human chain across the classroom | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Parliamentary Law making https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-U0LhurGWOc https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FVHZycPVRsg&t=128s | Describe the law- making procedure in the House of Commons. [8 marks] Briefly discuss advantages and disadvantages of the parliamentary law- making procedure. [8 marks) |
| | describe the legislative stages in the House of Commons and House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages | a public bill. A public bill involves matters of public policy which affect the general public. A private bill affects a particular organisation, person or place. A Hybrid bill is introduced by the government but likely to affect a single organisation, person or place. To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Commons and House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and | a public bill. A public bill involves matters of public policy which affect the general public. A private bill affects a particular organisation, person or place. A Hybrid bill is introduced by the government but likely to affect a single organisation, person or place. To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Commons and House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and a public bill. A public bill is sentencing and Punishment Act 2012. 4. Private bill- Faversham Oyster Fishery Company Bill 2016 5. Hybrid Bill- Cross rail and HS2 Acts. Work through theory pack. Watch videos on the role of the common and house of lords to assist students in appreciating the differences in both houses that make up Parliament. Students form human chain across the classroom. | a public bill. A public bill involves matters of public policy which affect the general public. A private bill affects a particular organisation, person or place. A Hybrid bill is introduced by the government but likely to affect a single organisation, person or place. To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Commons and House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to describe the legislative stages in the House of Lords and the role of the Crown as well as give advantages and To be able to defect a single organisation, person or place. Work through theory pack. Work through theory pack. Watch videos on the role of the common and house of lords to assist students in appreciating the differences in both houses that make up Parliament. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FVHZycPVRsq&t=128s |

| | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| es of the law | Advantages of | in order of the legislative | https://www.youtube.com/wat | |
| making | parliamentary law | process explain their stage | ch?v=dS_SLF92e5A | |
| process. | making includes: | in the process. | | |
| | Davas a sveiti a | | | |
| | Democratic | | | |
| | Allows full | | | |
| | reform of law | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Consultation | | | |
| | before a bill is | | | |
| | presented to | | | |
| | Parliament | | | |
| | Discussion in | | | |
| | both house | | | |
| | during | | | |
| | legislative | | | |
| | | | | |
| | process | | | |
| | Disadvantages of | | | |
| | Parliamentary law | | | |
| | making includes: | | | |
| | · | | | |
| | Long process | | | |
| | Limited | | | |
| | Parliamentary | | | |
| | time may | | | |
| | prevent some | | | |
| | p. 6 . 6 6 | | | <u> </u> |

| ┟ ─── | | Τ | T | | T | T |
|--------------------------|---------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | laws been reformed. | | | |
| | | | Acts can be long and complex | | | |
| | | | Wording of an act may be difficult to understand and lead to court cases on interpretation and meaning May need to delegate power to other people to make law. | | | |
| Delegated legislation | By Laws | Understand and explain by-laws. Give example of | Delegated legislation is law made by some person or body other than Parliament, but with the authority of an act of Parliament. | Work through theory pack. Research example of by laws operating in various parts of the country. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Delegated legislation | Briefly explain by-laws as a form of delegated legislation. [8 marks] |

| | 1 | | | T | | _ |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | by-laws in force. | By-laws are made by local authorities or pubic corporations such as the railways. | | https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=rlWBbB2yBJA&t=1s https://www.brighton- hove.gov.uk/content/leisure- and-libraries/seafront/bathing- and-boating-bylaws | |
| Delegated legislation | Orders In Council | Understand and explain orders in council. Give example of orders in council passed. | Orders in Council are made by the queen and privy council typically in times of emergency. | Read through news articles and make notes on teacher pack of Orders in Council passed. The articles focus on the fuel crises and foot and mouth epidemic. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Delegated legislation https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rIWBbB2yBJA&t=1s | Briefly explain Orders in Council as a form of delegated legislation. [8 marks] |
| | | | | https://www.bbc.co.uk/ne ws/uk-england-12483017 https://www.bbc.co.uk/ne | | |
| | | | | ws/magazine-35581830 | | |

| | | | <u> </u> | 1 | T | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi /uk/924574.stm | | |
| Delegated legislation | Statutory Instruments | Understand and explain statutory instruments. Give example of statutory instruments in force. | Statutory Instruments are rules and regulations made by Government ministers under the authority of the enabling act. | Students to research and make notes on who the current Government Ministers are and their role. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Delegated legislation https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rlWBbB2yBJA&t=1s https://www.gov.uk/government/ministers | Statutory instruments are one form of delegated legislation. Describe how statutory instruments are made and used. [8 marks] |
| Delegated legislation | Parliamenta ry controls | Understand and explain controls on delegated legislation by Parliament and comment on their effectiveness. | Parliament controls delegated legislation by: The enabling act setting limits on the powers, Delegated Powers Scrutiny Committee, affirmative or negative resolutions, questioning of | Work through theory pack | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Delegated legislation | Explain parliamentary controls on delegated legislation. [8 marks] |

| | | | ministers, Joint select Committee on statutory instruments. Super affirmative resolutions. | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| Delegated legislation | Judicial Controls | Understand and explain judicial controls on delegated legislation and comment on their effectiveness. | The courts control delegated legislation through the judicial review process when it is ultra vires because, it is beyond the powers given by the enabling act, the decision is made unreasonable, it does not go through the correct procedure and consultation. | Work through theory pack | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Delegated legislation | Explain judicial controls on delegated legislation. [8 marks] |
| Delegated Legislation | Advantages and disadvanta ges of delegated legislation | Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of delegated legislation. | Delegated legislation is needed because of the detail needed, consultation required and for expert or local knowledge. The advantages include time saving, use of expertise or local knowledge, use of | Work through theory pack | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Delegated legislation | Briefly discuss advantages and disadvantages of delegated legislation. [8 marks) |

| | | | 1 | 1 | | |
|--------------|-------------|---|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | | consultation, relatively quick to make and easy to amend. | | | |
| | | | Disadvantages of delegated legislation include: undemocratic, sub delegation, large volume, lack of publicity and can be difficult to interpret. | | | |
| Statutory | The literal | То | Interpretation is | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT | Explain the literal rule |
| interpretati | rule | understand | needed because of | | area/OCR Law/Statutory | and its use by judges. |
| on | | the use of the | such problems as | | Interpretation | [8 marks] |
| | | Iiteral rule by judges. To be able to illustrate its use using case law. | Failure of legislation to cover a specific point, ambiguity, drafting errors, new technological developments. | Examine cases for the literal rule and pick out what phrase was given its plain, ordinary dictionary meaning. | http://www.e- lawresources.co.uk/Literal- rule.php | |
| | | | The literal rule gives words their plain, | | | |

| 1 | | T | | | _ | |
|--------------|------------|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | | ordinary, dictionary | | Whitely v Chappell(1868) | |
| | | | meaning. | | | |
| | | | _ | | London and North Eastern Railway Co v Berriman(1946) | |
| | | | | | Fisher v Bell(1961) | |
| Statutory | The golden | То | The Golden rule allows | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT | Explain the golden rule |
| interpretati | r∪le | understand | modification of words | | area/OCR Law/Statutory | and its use by judges. |
| on | | the use of the | where the literal rule | | Interpretation | [8 marks] |
| | | golden rule by judges. To be able to illustrate its use using case law. | would lead to absurdity, repugnance or inconsistency. There are 2 approaches, the wider approach and narrow approach. | Examine cases for the golden rule and pick out what approach the judge used, be it the narrow or wider approach. | http://www.e- lawresources.co.uk/Golden- rule.php Alder v George(1964) | |
| | | | | | Re Sigsworth(1935) | |

| 4 | | 1 | T | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | Re Allen(1872) | |
| Statutory interpretati on | The mischief rule | To understand the use of the golden rule by judges. To be able to illustrate its use using case law. | The mischief rule considers the mischief or gap in the old law and interprets the act in such a way that the gap is covered. | Examine cases for the Mischief rule and pick out what mischief the judge put a stop too. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Statutory Interpretation http://e-lawresources.co.uk/Mischief-rule.php Smith v Hughes(1960) Royal College of Nursing v DHSS(1981) Elliot v Grey(1960) | Explain the mischief rule and its use by judges. [8 marks] |

| | | 1 | | | | _ |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Corkery v Carpenter(1951) | |
| | | | | | DPP v Bull(195 | |
| Statutory interpretati on | The purposive approach | To understand the purposive approach and its use by judges. To be able to illustrate its use using case law | The purposive approach is more modern and looks for the intention of Parliament. The purposive approach is the one preferred by most European countries when interpreting their own legislation. It is also the approach which has been adopted by The European Court of Justice in interpreting EU Law. | Examine cases for the purposive approach and pick out what the purpose of the act was that judges inferred. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Statutory Interpretation http://e-lawresources.co.uk/Purposive-approach.php Pepper v Hart(1992) | Explain the purposive approach and its use by judges. [8 marks] |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | R v Registrar-General, ex parte Smith(1990) | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | R(on the application of Quintavalle) v Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority(2003) | |
| | | | | | Pickstone v Freemans Plc(1989) | |
| | | | | | R v Secretary of State for Health ex parte Quintavalle [2003] | |
| | | | | | | |
| Statutory interpretati on | Rules of language | To be able to identify the 3 rules of language and illustrate through case law | The three rules of language are: Ejusdem generis- General words which follow a list are limited to the same kind. | Work through theory pack deconstructing the 3 cases for each rule of language. Students in groups now have to explain in their own words with a | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Statutory Interpretation | Briefly explain each of the following, including how both are used by judges: • the purposive approach to statutory interpretation and • |

| | | | Expressio Unius- The express mention of one thing excludes another. | hypothetical act what each rule of language is and test the class as to if they pick the correct rule of language. | http://e- lawresources.co.uk/Aids-to- statutory-interpretation.php | one rule of language. [8 marks] |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | Noscitur a sociis- A thing is known by the company it keeps. | | Powell v Kempton Park Racecourse (1899) | |
| | | | | | R v Inhabitants of Sedgely (1831) | |
| | | | | | Foster v Diphwys Casson (1887) | |
| Statutory interpretati on | Aids to interpretatio n: intrinsic and extrinsic aids | Identify internal and external aids that help judges interpreting statutes. | Intrinsic aids are those in the relevant act and include: The short title and preamble, interpretation sections, headings, schedules. | Work through theory pack. Play YouTube video on Hansard and the work of the law commission. They are to add notes taken from the video on to the | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Statutory Interpretation | Outline internal (intrinsic) and external (extrinsic) aids to statutory interpretation. [8 marks] |
| | | | Extrinsic aids to interpretation include: | teacher packs. | | |

| | | Previous acts of Parliament, the historical setting, earlier | | http://e- lawresources.co.uk/Aids-to- | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | case law, dictionaries, Hansard, law commission reports and international conventions. | | <pre>statutory-interpretation.php https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=X1-2fsCONeM&t=157s https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=ial41_dqqn8</pre> | |
| interpretati European on Union Law and the Human Rights Act 1998 on | To be able to describe what effect EU law and Human Rights law has on statutory interpretation . | The purposive approach is the one preferred by most European countries when interpreting their own legislation. It is also the approach which has been adopted by The European Court of Justice in interpreting EU Law. Section 3 of The Human Rights Act says that so far as it is possible to do so, | Work through theory pack. Be able to explain how the judges had to interpret domestic law in linen with convention law in the case of Mendoza v Ghaidan. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Statutory Interpretation Mendoza v Ghaidan(200) | X |

| | | | legislation must be read and given effect in a way which is compatible with the European Convention On Human Rights. | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Judicial precedent | Doctrine of judicial precedent Stare Decisis Ratio decidendi Obita Dicta | Understand what is meant by the doctrine of precedent, stare decisis, ratio decidendi, obita dicta and the hierarchy of the civil and criminal courts. | The doctrine of precedent is based on stare decisis, keeping to the decision. Ratio decidendi is the reason for deciding and creates a precedent for future cases, the ratio is identified by judges in later cases. | Work through theory pack. Students to take the beginning of each phrase to help them understand the Latin meanings Ratio- Reason for deciding Stare decisis- Stand by what's been decided. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Judicial Precedent https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=akp4y9e60Mo | Outline the main features of the system of judicial precedent. [8 marks] |
| | The civil and criminal court structure | | Obita Dicta is the rest of the judgement and dos not create binding precedent. | Obita- Other things said. Allocate students with a court name- they come to the front in a muddle and | | |

| | | | Courts lower in the hierarchy must follow precedents set by higher courts. | the class has to sort them in to hierarchies for the civil and criminal court structure. | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Judicial precedent | Flexibility of the Supreme Court departing from previous practice. | To be able to explain the reasons for the creation of the practice statement and its use in the House of Lords pre 2009 and Supreme Court post 2009 | The Practice statement was introduced by the Lord Chancellor in 1966 which allowed the House of Lords to depart from previous decisions where it was right to do so. Powers of the Practice Statement were transferred to the Supreme Court in 2009. | Work through theory pack. Students to draw up a timeline of the creation of the practice statement and its use in civil and criminal cases in the House of Lords and Supreme Court. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Judicial Precedent https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=akp4y9e60Mo London Street Tramways v London County Council (1898) Conway v Rimmer (1968) | Outline both of the following ways judges can avoid binding precedent: the use of the 1966 Practice Statement by the Supreme Court (8) |

| | | | | | | 1 |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Herrington v British Railway Board (1972) | |
| | | | | | Addie v Dumbreck | |
| | | | | | R v Shivpuri (1986) | |
| | | | | | Anderton v Ryan (1985) | |
| | | | | | Austin v London Borough of Southwark (2010) | |
| | | | | | knauer v Ministry of Justice | |
| | | | | | | |
| Judicial precedent | Flexibility of the Court of Appeal in departing from | To be able to explain the exceptions in Young v | The Court of Appeal is bound by its own previous decisions: the only exceptions are those set out in | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Judicial Precedent | In the system of judicial precedent, explain the powers of the Court of Appeal when considering an |
| | | | | | | |

| | previous decisions | Aeroplane and the extra exception provided for | Young's case and an extra exception for the criminal division if they feel the law has been | | | earlier precedent of the Court of Appeal itself. [8 marks] |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | the COA criminal division. | misapplied or misunderstood. | | Young v Bristol Aeroplane Co. Ltd (1944) | |
| | | | | | Davis v Johnson (1979) | |
| | | | | | Rickards v Rickards (1989) | |
| | | | | | R v Taylor (1950) | |
| | | | | | R v Gould (1968) | |
| Judicial precedent | Binding, persuasive and original precedent; overruling; reversing; | To understand binding, persuasive, original precedent, | Binding precedent must be followed by courts lower in the hierarchy. | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Judicial Precedent | Explain how judges can use powers of overruling and distinguishing to avoid |
| | | | | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |

| dist | stinguishin | overruling, | Persuasive precedent | | | following a binding |
|------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|---|---|----------------------|
| g | | reversing and | can be followed but | ' | | precedent. [8 marks] |
| | | distinguishing. | doesn't have to be. | ' | | 1 |
| | | _ | | ' | R v R(1991)/Re A Conjoined | |
| | | | | ' | twins | |
| | | | Original procedent is | · | 1 | |
| | | | Original precedent is | · | ļ i | |
| | | | new precedent. | ' | | l |
| | | | | ' | | |
| | | | | | Ralfour / Ralfour /1010) and | 1 |
| | | | Courts higher in the | ' | Balfour v Balfour (1919) and | l |
| | | | hierarchy can overrule | ' | Merritt v Merritt (1971) | l |
| | | | a previous precedent. | ' | | 1 |
| | | | | ' | | 1 |
| | | | | ' | | 1 |
| | | | An appeal court can | ' | l | |
| | | | reverse a decision | ' | | 1 |
| | | | made by a court | ' | l | |
| | | | below. | ' | | 1 |
| | | | , | | | |
| | | | | ' | | |
| | | | ludges in later esses | ' | | |
| | | | Judges in later cases | ' | | |
| | | | do not have to follow | | | |
| | | | precedent if they can | ' | | |
| | | | distinguish their case | ' | | |
| | | | from the previous one. | ' | | |
| | | | | ' | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Judicial Precedent | Advantages and disadvanta | Discuss the advantages and | The advantages of judicial precedent are: certainty, consistency | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Judicial Precedent | Briefly discuss advantages and disadvantages of the |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | ges of precedent | disadvantag es of judicial precedent. | and fairness, precision, flexibility and time saving. | | | use of judicial precedent. [8 marks |
| | | | The disadvantages of judicial precedent are: rigidity, complexity, illogical distinctions and slowness of growth. | | | |
| Law reform | Law reform and the role of the Law | To understand the work of | The Law Commission was set up by the Law Commissions Act 1965. | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Law Reform | Explain the role of the law commission in reforming the law (8) |
| | Commission | the Law Commission. | | Research examples of law reformed by the law | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |

| | | Its role is to keep all the | commission and laws | | |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Advantages | Discuss the | law under review. This | repealed by the law | | |
| and | | is done by: | commission. | | |
| disadvanta | advantages | 1.Researching the | | | |
| ges of the | and | existing law. | | | |
| law | disadvantag | | | | |
| commission | es of reform | | | | |
| in reforming | through the | 2. Consulting. | | | |
| the law. | Law | 2. 0013011119. | | https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/ou | |
| | Commission. | | | r-work/statute-law-repeals/ | |
| | | 2. Drawin av voa | | | |
| | | 3. Drawing up | | | |
| | | proposals for reform. | | https://www.youtube.com/wat | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | ch?v=ial41_dqqn8&t=1s | |
| | | It can make proposals | | | |
| | | for | | | |
| | | Reforming the law, | | | |
| | | codifying the law, | | | |
| | | consolidating the law, | | | |
| | | repealing out of date | | | |
| | | law. | | | |
| | | idw. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | like a new constant | | | |
| | | Its proposals are put | | | |
| | | before Parliament who | | | |
| | | decides whether or | | | |

| not to implement | |
|-------------------------|--|
| them. | |
| | |
| | |
| Parliament doesn't | |
| always implement the | |
| Law Commissions law | |
| reform reports but the | |
| rate of implementation | |
| is improving. | |
| | |
| | |
| The advantages of | |
| reform through the | |
| Law Commission are: | |
| law researched by | |
| legal experts, its non- | |
| political, there is | |
| consultation on | |
| proposals and they | |
| can bring the law on | |
| one topic together in | |
| to one act. However, | |
| the Government is | |
| slow to implement | |
| reform, some reforms | |
| are never | |
| implemented, | |

| | ent have lack | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| of time to proposal | o consider Ils. | | |
| reviews and Royal between possible I They are investigated as ways of reform of the law. difference between possible I They are investigated on one specific as ways of reform of the law. A judge I where a to lead of investigated investigated as where a to lead of investigated investigated. | article on the use of Royal Commissions to add to notes on the theory pack. Students are to investigate the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry as an example of a judge led review and add it to their theory pack. Ied review is judge is asked an ation in to areas of law or | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/Law Reform https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/blog/lost-world-royal-commissions http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/ukpolitics/258957.stm https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/feb/22/institutional- | Explain the role of Royal Commissions and Judge led reviews in aiding reform of the law (8) |

| | | | | racism-britain-stephen-lawrence-inquiry-20-years https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/feb/22/macpherson-report-what-was-it-and-what-impact-did-it-have | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| European Union law | Institutions of the European Union | The institutions that make up the EU are: The Councilresponsible for broad policy decisions. | Work through theory pack. Add notes from the video to theory notes. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/European Union Law | Explain the composition and functions of the European Parliament and European Commission. (8) |
| | | The Commission- with one Commissioner from each member state. | | https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=O37yJBFRrfg | |
| | | The European Parliament- with MEP's directly elected by | | https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=80tLyLHjhgY | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|--|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | citizens in each | | https://www.youtube.com/wat | |
| | | member state. | | <u>ch?v=-jZu0lUUAeM</u> | |
| | | The Court of Justice of | | https://www.youtube.com/wat | |
| | | the EU- This has a judge from each | | ch?v=nWpgO1EPO_Y | |
| | | member state and to which cases can be referred by national courts in member states. | | https://www.youtube.com/wat ch?v=QFJnYt4z_S8 | |
| | | siules. | | | |
| European | Sources of | The sources of law of | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT | Discuss the various |
| Union law | European | the European Union | | area/OCR Law/European Union | sources of EU and their |
| | Union law | are: | | Law | application using case |
| | | Treaties that become part of our law | | | examples (12) |
| | | automatically under The European | | Van Duyn v Home Office (1974) | |
| | | Communities Act 1972. | | Maccarthys v Smith (1980) | |
| | | Regulations are directly applicable. | | | |
| | | Directives that have to | | | |
| | | be implemented by | | | |
| | | member states are | | | |
| | | 1110111001 310103 010 | | | |

| | usually given a 2-year | Re tachographs: Commission v |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | time period to pass | UK (1979) |
| | their own domestic | |
| | legislation. If not | |
| | implemented they can | Van Gen den Loos (1963) |
| | be relied on against | Vali Geli deli Loos (1783) |
| | the member state. | |
| | | |
| | | Costa v ENEL(1964) |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | R v Secretary of State for |
| | | Transport, ex parte Factortame |
| | | ECJ (1990). |
| | | 203 (1770). |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Marshall v Southampton and |
| | | South West Hampshire Area |
| | | Health Authority(1986) |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Defrenne v. SABENA [1974] |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Duke v GEC Reliance Ltd(1988) |
| | | |

| l | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| European Union law | The impact of European Union law on the law of England and Wales | To understand the impact of EU law on the law of England and Wales. | European Union law takes precedence over national law even if a later act is passed by Parliament to change the law. | Work through theory pack. | R Drive/Business and ICT area/OCR Law/European Union Law | Discuss the consequences of the supremacy of EU Law. [12] |
| | | | The sovereignty of Parliament is affected while the UKL remains a member of the EU. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Term 3 | Lesson Title/Topic Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities/Resources | Cases to learn | Homework |
| General elements of criminal liability | Actus reus: conduct and consequenc e crimes; voluntary acts and omissions; involuntarines s; causation | Understand the concept of Actus Reus, and conduct and consequence crimes. Understand voluntariness and involuntariness | can include conduct, circumstances or consequences. Actus Reus can be a failure to act (an omission) this usually occurs where D is under a duty to act. There is no | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Actus Reus Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | R v Pittwood(1902) R v Gibbons and Proctor(1918) R v Stone and Dobinson(1977) R v Evans(2009) R v Dytham(1979) R v Miller(1983) Airedale NHS Trust v Bland(1993) R v Paggett(1983) R v Kimsey(1996) R v Blaue(1975) R v Smith(1959) | Explain the meaning of the term causation in criminal law(8) Explain how an omission can be the basis of the actus reus of a crime. (8) |

R v Cheshire(1991)

involuntariness.

a duty to act. There is no general duty to act in English law but specific

| | _ | T | T | T | T |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | Understand when criminal liability can be imposed for a failure to | duties have been recognised. These are 1.Statutory. 2.Under a contract. 3.By a relationship. | | R v Jordan(1956) R v Malcherek(1981) R v Roberts(1972) R v Kennedy(2007) | |
| | act(omission) Understand the legal rules on causation. Apply the law to factual | 4.A duty undertaken voluntarily | | | |
| | situations. | | | | |
| General elements of criminal liability Mens rea: fault; intention and subjective recklessness; negligence and strict liability; transferred malice; coincidence of actus reus and mens rea | Understand the law on intention, both direct and oblique. Understand the law on subjective recklessness. Understand the law on negligence. Understand the principle of transferred malice. | Different crimes require different levels of Mens Rea. Intention is the highest level of Mens Rea: This may be direct intent where D's aim, purpose or desire is to bring about the consequence or It may be oblique where D does not desire the consequence but foresees it as virtually certain. Foresight of consequences is not the same as intention but it is evidence from which a jury may find intention. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Mens Rea Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Mohan(1975) Moloney(1985) Hancock and Shankand(1986) Nedrick(1986) Woollin(1998) Matthews and Alleyne(2003) Cunningham(1957) Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain v Storkwain Ltd(1986) Callow v Tillstone(1900) Harrow LBC v Shah and Shah(1999) Cundy v Le Cocq(1884) | Explain the meaning of the coincidence (contemporaneity) rule. (8) Outline the meaning of both of the following terms: • oblique (indirect) intention • transferred malice (8) |

| | | Understand the need for coincidence of actus reus and mens rea. Apply the legal principles to factual situations. | Subjective recklessness requires proof that D, knowing of the risk, took that risk. Negligence is where D fails to meet the standards of the reasonable man. Transferred malice is where D intends to commit a crime against one person but inadvertently commits it against another person. There must be coincidence of hew Actus Reus and Mens Rea. | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| · | | | | | | |
| Non-fatal offences against the person | Common assault: assault under s39 Criminal Justice Act 1988 | Understand the common law offence of Assault under sec39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. Analyse and evaluate this offence. | Actus Reus- An act, which causes the victim to apprehend immediate unlawful force. What does apprehend and immediate mean for the purpose of the Actus Reus. Mens Rea- Intention to cause the victim to | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Non-fatal offences Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans | R v Nelson(2013) R v Constanza(1997) R v Ireland(1997) R v Lamb(1967) Smith v Chief Superintendent of Woking Police Station(1983) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2018 Paper question 1 |

| | | | T | , | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | Apply the law to factual situations. | apprehend immediate unlawful force or Recklessness. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |
| Non-fatal offences against the person | Battery under s39 Criminal Justice Act 1988 | Understand the common law offence of Battery under sec39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. Analyse and evaluate this offence. Apply the law to factual situations. | Actus Reus- The application of unlawful force to another person. What does unlawful force mean for the purpose of the Actus Reus. How can a battery be committed indirectly and through a continuing act. Men's Rea-An intention to apply unlawful force physical force to another or Recklessness. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Non-fatal offences Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed | Collins v Wilcock(1984) Wood(Fraser) v DPP(2008) Fagan v Metropolitan Police Commissioner(1968) DPP v K(1990) Haystead v Chief Constable of Derbyshire(2000) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2016 Paper question 4 |
| Non-fatal offences against the person | Assault occasioning actual bodily harm under sec 47 Offences Against the Person Act 1861 | Understand the offence of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm sec 47 OAPA 1861 Analyse and evaluate this offence. | Actus Reus-Assault or Battery that causes Actual Bodily Harm. What constitutes Actual Bodily Harm. Mens Rea- Needed for the assault or battery but no Mens Rea needed for the actual bodily harm caused. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Non-fatal offences Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans | T v DPP(2003) Miller(1954) DDP v Smith (Michael)(2006) R v Chanfook(1994) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2017 Paper question 4 |

| | | Apply the law to factual situations. | | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Non-fatal offences against the person | Wounding and grievous bodily harm s20 Offences Against the Person Act 1861 | Understand the offence of wounding or inflicting GBH sec 20 OAPA 1861 Analyse and evaluate this offence. Apply the law to factual situations. | Actus Reus , Malicious wounding or inflicting grievous bodily harm. What is wounding for the purpose of the act. What constitutes Grievous Bodily Harm. What does inflict mean for the purpose of the actus reus. Mens Rea of sec 20 An intention to do the particular kind of harm that was in fact done OR Recklessness as to whether such harm should occur or not take the risk of it. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Non-fatal offences Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | R v Bollom(2004) R v Dica(2004) R v Burstow(1997) R v Parmenter(1991) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2018 Paper question 4 |
| Non-fatal offences against the person | Wounding and grievous bodily harm s18 Offences Against the Person Act 1861 | Understand the offence of wounding or causing GBH sec 18 OAPA 1861 Analyse and evaluate this offence. | Actus Reus- Maliciously wounding or causing grievous bodily harm. Mens Rea- The D must have intent to Do GBH OR Resist or prevent the lawful apprehension or detainer of a person. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Non-fatal offences Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans | R v Taylor(2009) R v Morrison(1989) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2018 Paper question 4 |

| | | Apply the law to factual situations. | An intention to wound is not sufficient Mens Rea for a sec 18. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | |
| Term 4 | Lesson Title/Topic Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities/Resources | Cases to learn | Homework |
| Liability in negligenc e | Liability in negligence for injury to people and damage to property The duty of care: Donoghue v Stevenson (1932) and the neighbour principle, and Caparo test Impact the decision in Robinson (2018) has on the use of | Understand the concept of liability in negligence for injury to people and damage to property. Understand the concept of duty of care and when it is owed: Donoghue v Stevenson (1932) and the neighbour principle and the Caparo Test. | Negligence can be caused by an act or omission which causes loss, injury or damage to another person. Negligence requires proof of a duty of care owed by the defendant to the claimant, a breach of that duty and loss or damage. A duty of care is a legal relationship between the claimant and the defendant. To establish a duty of care there is a 3 stage test: 1. Is there proximity of relationship. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Negligence. Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Donoghue v Stevenson(1932) Caparo v Dickman(1990) Kent v Griffiths (2000) Bourhill v Young(1943) McLoughlin v O'Brien (1982) Hill v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire (1990) Robinson v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire (2018) | OCR Practice Papers. Law Making and the law of tort Part B question 5 |

| | Caparo 3 stage test. | | 2. Is loss or damage reasonably foreseeable?3. Is there a public policy reason not to owe a duty of care. | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Liability in negligenc e | Breach of duty: the objective standard of care and the reasonable man; risk factors | Understand the need to prove breach of duty, the objective standard of care and the reasonable person, risk factors. | Breach of duty means falling below the standard the reasonable person. To judge whether a reasonable person would have acted in the same way as he D matters such as the age of the d and whether he is a professional or experienced can be considered. Risk factors may be used to judge if there has been a breach of duty. The loss of damage must have been caused by the breach of duty. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Negligence. Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Bolam v Friern Barnet Hospital Management Committee (1957) Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board (2015) Nettleship v Weston(1971) Mullin v Richards (1998) Paris v Stepney Borough Council (1951) Bolton v Stone (1951) Haley v London Electricity Board(1965) Latimer v AEC Ltd(1953) Roe v Minister of Health (1954) Watt Hertfordshire County Council (1954) Day v High Performance Sports (2003) | OCR Practice Papers. Law Making and the law of tort Part B question 5 |
| Liability in negligenc e | Damage: factual causation and the 'but | Understand the legal rules on remoteness of damage and causation, | Causation is proved by the "but for" and if there has been an intervening event. | Work through the teacher theory packs. Teacher theory pack | Barnett v Chelsea and Kensington Hospital Management Committee (1969) The Waggon Mound (1961) | OCR Practice Papers. Law Making and the law of tort Part B question 5 |

| | for' test; legal causation | factual causation and | The loss or damage must be reasonably | R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Negligence. | Hughes v Lord Advocate (1963) Bradford v Robinson Rentals (1967) | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Caosanon | the "but for" | foreseeable and not too | Law/1011 Law/11egiigeriee. | Doughty v Turner Asbestos(1964) | |
| | | test and legal | remote. The type of injury | | | |
| | | causation. | has to be reasonably foreseeable, not the exact injury suffered. The defendant must take his victim as he finds him. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Smith v Leech Brain and Co (1962) | |
| | | | Res Ispa Loquitur transfers | | | |
| | | | the burden of proof from the claimant | | | |
| | | | The most common | | | |
| | | | remedy for negligence is | | | |
| | | | the payment of damages. | | | |
| Liability in | Defences in | Understand | Contributory negligence | Work through the teacher | Sayers v Harlow Urban District | |
| negligenc | negligence | the defences | is a partial defence | theory packs. | Council(1958) | |
| е | Consent and | available in the tort of | where the claimant is partly responsible for | | Jayes v IMI (Kynoch) Ltd (1985) | |
| | contributory | negligence: | causing his injuries. If | Teacher theory pack | O'Connell v Jackson(1972) | |
| | negligence | Contributory negligence | successful, the judge will reduce the amount of | R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Negligence. | Froom v Butcher(1976) | |
| | | and Consent. | damages by the % of | Law/Ton Law/Thogingerice. | Stinton v Stinton (1993) | |
| | | | responsibility. | | Stermer v Lawson(1977) | |
| | | | Consent of the claimant is a complete defence. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Smith v Baker(1891) | |
| | | | The consent has to be | Topic to be completed. | STIIIIT V BUKEI (1071) | |
| | | | freely given and with the | | Haynes v Harwood (1935) | |
| | | | claimant's full knowledge | | Ogwo v Taylor(1987) | |
| | | | of its effect. | | Sidaway v Governors of the | |
| | | | | | Bethlem Royal and Maudsley Hospitals (1985) | |
| | | | | | ICT Ltd v Shatwell(1965) | |
| | <u> </u> | | | | ICI Lta v Shatwell(1965) | |

| | | | | | Manadalaia a Comana a (1072) | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | Wooldridge v Sumner(1963) | |
| Liability in | Critical | Critically | Obtaining compensation | Work through the teacher | | Type up Evaluation notes |
| negligenc e | evaluation of liability in negligence | evaluate liability in negligence, | for injury, loss or damage caused by negligence requires proof of fault. | theory packs. | | in to bullet point revision style notes. |
| | | showing ideas for reform. | The requirement to prove fault leads to greater cost for claimants, delay, | Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Negligence. | | |
| | | | need for lawyers and greater confrontation. | | | |
| | | | Alternative no fault compensation schemes exist in other countries. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |
| | | | Other no fault schemes could be introduced as an alternative to court | | | |
| | | | and fault based resolution. | | | |
| Occupiers' liability | Liability in respect of | Understand occupier's | Lawful visitors are owed the common duty of | Work through the teacher theory packs. | Wheat v E. Lacon and Co Ltd(1966) | OCR Practice Papers. Law Making and the law |
| , | lawful visitors (Occupiers' | liability in respect of | care by an occupier of property. | | Harris v Birkenhead Corporation (1976) | of tort Part B question 6 |
| | Liability Act 1957) | lawful visitors (Occupiers Liability Act | The common duty of care requires the occupier to keep the | Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Occupiers | Bailey v Armes(1999) | |
| | | 1957). Understand | visitor reasonably safe. | Liability. | Laverton v Kiapasha Takeaway Supreme(2002) | |
| | | the application of relevant | Greater care has to be taken by an occupier towards child visitors | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Dean and Chapter of Rochester Cathedral v Debell(2016) | |
| | | defences. | especially if an allurement is present. | Topic to be completed. | Cole v Davis-Gilbert, The Royal | |
| | | | · | | British Legion and others (2007) | |

| | | | | , | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | Occupiers can expect very young children to be supervised by their parents but will be liable for injury that is reasonably foreseeable. Occupiers can expect workman visitors to be aware of risks associated with their work. The occupier will not be liable for the work of independent contractors if it is reasonable to give the work to another, a reputable contractor is used and if possible the occupier checks the work has been properly done. Lawful visitors who are injured can claim damages for personal injury and damage to | | Glasgow Corporation v Taylor(1922) Phipps v Rochester Corporation (1955) Jolley v London Borough of Sutton (2000) Roles v Nathan (1963) Haseldine v Daw and Son Ltd. (1941) Bottomley v Todmorden Cricket Club (2003) Woodward v The Mayor of Hastings(1945) Rae v Marrs(UK) Ltd(1990) Staples v West Dorset District Council (1995) | |
| Liability in respect of trespassers | Understand occupier's liability in | The occupier owes a duty to trespasser to ensure the trespasser is | Work through the teacher theory packs. | British Rail Board v Herrington (1972) Ratcliff v McConnell (1999) | AQA Unit 4 2018 scenario 3 question 5 |
| (Occupiers' Liability Act 1984) | trespassers (Occupiers | the danger. | Teacher theory pack R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR | (2003) | AQA Unit 4 2017 scenario 4 question 8 |
| | Liability Act 1984). Understand the | The duty is owed when: The occupier is aware of the danger or has | Law/Tort Law/Occupiers Liability. | Tomlinson v Congleton Borough Council (2003) Higgs v Foster (2004) | |
| | respect of trespassers (Occupiers' Liability Act | respect of trespassers (Occupiers' liability in respect of trespassers (Occupiers Liability Act 1984). Understand | very young children to be supervised by their parents but will be liable for injury that is reasonably foreseeable. Occupiers can expect workman visitors to be aware of risks associated with their work. The occupier will not be liable for the work of independent contractors if it is reasonable to give the work to another, a reputable contractor is used and if possible the occupier checks the work has been properly done. Lawful visitors who are injured can claim damages for personal injury and damage to property. Liability in respect of trespassers (Occupier's liability Act 1984) Understand Very young children to be supervised by their parents but will be liable for injury that is reasonably foreseeable. Occupiers work and with their work. The occupier will not be liable for the work of independent contractors if it is reasonable to give the work to another, a reputable contractor is used and if possible the occupier checks the work has been properly done. Lawful visitors who are injured can claim damages for personal injury and damage to property. The occupier owes a duty to trespasser is not injured by reason of the danger. (Occupiers Liability Act 1984). Understand The duty is owed when: The occupier is aware of the danger or has | Very young children to be supervised by their parents but will be liable for injury that is reasonably foreseeable. Occupiers can expect workman visitors to be aware of risks associated with their work. The occupier will not be liable for the work of independent contractors if it is reasonable to give the work to another, a reputable contractor is used and if possible the occupier checks the work has been properly done. Lawful visitors who are injured can claim damages for personal injury and damage to property. Liability in respect of trespassers (Occupier's liability Act 1984) | Very young children to be supervised by their parents but will be liable for injury that is reasonably foreseeable. Occupiers can expect workman visitors to be aware of risks associated with their work. The occupier will not be liable for the work of independent contractors if it is reasonable to give the work to another, a reputable contractor is used and if possible the occupier checks the work has been properly done. Liability in respassers (Occupiers' Liability Act 1984) Understand Very young children to be supervised by their parents but will be liable for the work of inchependent contractors if it is reasonable to give the work to another, a reputable contractor is used and if possible the occupier checks the work has been properly done. Lawful visitors who are injured can claim damage store properly. Liability in respassers (Occupiers' Liability Act 1984) Liability Act 1985 Liability Ac |

| | | application of | reasonable grounds to | Exam questions linked to the | Rhind v Astbury Water Park (2004) | |
|---|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | relevant | believe it exists. | topic to be completed. | (, | |
| | | defences. | He knows or believes the | | Keown v Coventry Healthcare NHS | |
| | | | trespasser is in the vicinity | | Trust(2006) | |
| | | | of the danger and the | | | |
| | | | risk is one against which | | Baldaccino v West Wittering (2008) | |
| | | | he is expected to offer | | 2 3.6.6.6.6 3.1.7 | |
| | | | the trespasser some | | Westwood v Post Office(1973) | |
| | | | protection. | | | |
| | | | The occupier will not be | | | |
| | | | liable if the trespasser is | | | |
| | | | injured by an obvious risk | | | |
| | | | or the injury occurs at an | | | |
| | | | unusual time of day or | | | |
| | | | year. The occupier is not | | | |
| | | | required to spend | | | |
| | | | considerable amounts of | | | |
| | | | money in protecting the | | | |
| | | | trespasser from obvious | | | |
| | | | dangers. | | | |
| | | | Trespassers who are | | | |
| | | | injured can claim | | | |
| | | | damages for personal | | | |
| | | | injury only. | | | |
| Occupiers' | Critical | Critically | Obtaining compensation | Work through the teacher | | Type up Evaluation notes |
| liability | evaluation of | evaluate | for injury, loss or damage | theory packs. | | in to bullet point revision |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | liability of | liability in | caused by negligence | | | style notes. |
| | Occupiers | occupiers | requires proof of fault. | | | |
| | liability | liability, | The requirement to prove | Teacher theory pack | | |
| | | showing ideas | fault leads to greater | R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR | | |
| | | for reform. | cost for claimants, delay, | Law/Tort Law/Occupiers | | |
| | | | need for lawyers and | Liability. | | |
| | | | greater confrontation. | | | |
| | | | Criticism over rights | | | |
| | | | given to trespassers | Exam questions linked to the | | |
| | | | and confusion of | topic to be completed. | | |

| | occupiers liability | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| | spread across 2 acts. | | |

What will students study- OVERVIEW OF YEAR 13

| | Term 1 | Term 2 | Term 3 | Term 4 | Term 5 | Term 6 |
|---------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| Year 13 | Unit: Tort Law | Unit: Criminal | Unit: Further | Unit: Further | Exams | Exams |
| | | Law | Law | Law | | |
| | This section | This section | | | | |
| | focuses on | focuses on | This compulsory | This compulsory | | |
| | the rules of | the rules and | section focuses | section focuses | | |
| | tort, liability in | general | on the nature of | on the nature of | | |
| | negligence, | elements of | law. Learners will | law. Learners will | | |
| | occupiers' | criminal law | explore the | explore the | | |
| | liability and | and provides | nature of law in | nature of law in | | |
| | remedies. It | an | a wider context | a wider context | | |

provides an introduction and develop and develop introduction to criminal their their to civil liability. liability understanding understanding Learners will through the of how the law of how the law study of interacts with interacts with develop morality, justice, knowledge offences morality, justice, society and and against the society and understanding person and technology. technology. of the law of offences They will They will tort and the against consider the consider the skills to apply changing changing property. their legal Learners will nature of law. nature of law. develop their Learners will be Learners will be knowledge to scenarioknowledge expected to expected to based and bring together bring together understanding the different the different situations and aain a critical of criminal law areas of areas of awareness of and the skills knowledge and knowledge and to apply their understanding understanding the present state of the legal of the English of the English law of tort. knowledge to legal system legal system scenarioand the nature and the nature of law, legal of law, legal based situations and rules and rules and gain a critical principles, principles, awareness of concepts and concepts and the present issues from issues from state of across the full across the full criminal law. course of study. course of study.

| Topics to be covered | Topics to be covered | Topics to be covered | Topics to be covered |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Rules and theory | Murder | Law and morality | Formation |
| Negligence | Voluntary | | Terms |
| Occupiers' | Manslaughter Involuntary | Law and justice Law and society | Vitiating factors |
| | Manslaughter | | Discharge |
| Torts connected to land | Offences against property | Evaluation | Remedies |
| Vicarious Liability | Mental capacity defences | | Evaluation |
| Defences | | Prior learning to | |
| Remedies | General defences | be revisited. None | Prior learning to be revisited. None |
| Evaluation | Evaluations | | |
| | Prior learning to be revisited. Elements of criminal liability | | |

| Prior learni | ing to Non-fatal | | How will | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| be revisited | d. offences agains | it | learning from | |
| | the person | How will | this unit be | |
| Negligenc | е | learning from | developed in | |
| | | this unit be | the next unit? | |
| Occupiers | liability How will learnin | g developed in | This is a new | |
| | from this unit be | the next unit? | topic with no | |
| Evaluation | developed in th | e This is a new | prior | |
| | next unit? | topic with no | knowledge. | |
| | Students will re | prior | | |
| | visit elements of | knowledge. | | |
| How will le | criminal liability | | | |
| from this u | nit be focussing on | | | |
| developed | d in the Actus Reus and | | | |
| next unit? | Mens Rea and | | | |
| Students w | vill re using these 2 co |) | | |
| visit the de | efences concepts to | | | |
| and remed | dies apply to the ne | W | | |
| that apply | to criminal offence | es | | |
| negligence | e and that complete | | | |
| occupiers | · · | | | |
| as these ap | | | | |
| the remain | nder | | | |
| torts they le | | | | |
| part of this | unit. | | | |

What students will study- Detailed breakdown of unit/topics in Year13

| Term 1 | Lesson Title/Topic Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities | Resources/cases to learn | Homework |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Torts connected to land | Private nuisance | Understand the tort of private nuisance. | Private nuisance is "an unlawful (unreasonable) interference with a person's use or enjoyment of land coming from neighbouring land." Any person with an interest in the land affected can claim. The D will be the person who caused the nuisance or allowed it to continue. The court will take various factors in to account when considering if the D's activities are reasonable. Factors include the character of the neighbourhood, duration, sensitivity of the claimant, malice and social benefit. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Private nuisance. Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Sedleigh Denfield v O'Callaghan (1940) Leakey v National Trust (1980) Anthony v Coal Authority (2005) Hunter v Canary Wharf Ltd (1997) Crown River Cruises Ltd v Kimbolton Fireworks Ltd (1996) Robinson v Kilvert (1889) Network Rail Infrastructure v Morris (2004) Hollywood Silver Fox Farm v Emmett (1936) | OCR Practice Papers. Law Making and the law of tort Part B question 8 |

| Torts | Rylands v | Understand the | D's can argue defences such as prescription and statutory permission but moving to the nuisance is not an arguable defence. Courts have a wider discretion then in the past when ordering remedy. Damages may be considered more widely that in the past as an appropriate remedy. The tort was developed | Work through | Christie v Davey (1893) Miller v Jackson(1977) Sturges v Bridgman(1879) Allen v Gulf Oil Refining (1981) Marcic v Thames Water plc(2003) Gillingham Borough Council v Medway(Chatham) Dock Co (1993) Wheeler v Saunders (1996) Watson v Croft Promo-Sport (2009) Coventry v Lawrence (2014) | OCR Practice |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| connected to land | Fletcher | tort of Rylands v Fletcher. | in the case of the same name. | the teacher theory packs. | Fletcher(1868) | Papers. Law Making and the |

| | | | The damage caused to the adjoining property must be reasonably foreseeable. Various defences are available including act of a stranger, act of god, statutory authority to storage, consent and contributory negligence. The claimant can claim damages for the cost of repairing his property. | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| Torts connected to employers | Vicarious liability | Understand the nature of Vicarious liability. Understand liability for employees, including testing employment status and torts in or not in the course of employment. Understand liability for the crimes of | Vicarious liability means that someone other than the person who committed the tort is responsible for his actions and has to pay compensation. It usually applies when an employer has to pay for a tort committed by an employee. Two conditions have to be satisfied: The person who committed the tort is an employee as opposed to an independent contractor and he or she was | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Tort Law/Vicarious liability Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | Mersey Docks and Harbour Board v Coggins and Griffiths(Liverpool) Ltd (1947) Hawley v Lumninar Leisure Ltd (2006) Ready Mixed Concrete (South East) Ltd v Minister of Pensions and National Insurance(1968) | OCR Practice Papers. Law Making and the law of tort Part B question 9 |

| employees and | acting in the course if | McE v De La Salle |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| liability for | her employment. | Brothers (2007) |
| independent | Whether a person is | |
| contractors. | employed or self- | E v English Province |
| 0010010.01 | employed is a legal test | of Our Lady of |
| | which may involve: The | Charity(2012) |
| | control test- how much | |
| Evaluate the law | control the employer | |
| relating to this | had over the employee | JGE CV trustees of |
| liability. | in the way, and how the | the Portsmouth |
| | employee worked. The | Roman Catholic |
| | integration test- if a | Diocesan |
| Apply the law to | person's work is fully | Trust(2012) |
| factual | integrated in to the | |
| situations. | business, he or she will | Catholic Child |
| sireaneris. | be considered an | Welfare Society v |
| | employee. The | Various Claimants |
| | economic reality or | FC and the Institute |
| | multiple test- looks at | of the Brothers of |
| | the whole situation | the Christian |
| | between the worker | Schools(2012) |
| | and the employer | |
| | including ownership of | Cox v Ministry of |
| | tools, equipment or | Justice (2016) |
| | uniform, payment of | |
| | wages, deductions from | Fletcher v |
| | wages, job description, | Chancery Supplies |
| | taking of orders and | Ltd(2017) |
| | hours to be worked. | |
| | An employer will be | |
| | liable for a criminal act | Viasystems |
| | of an employee if there | (Tyneside) Ltd v |
| | is a close connection | Thermal Transfer |
| | between the crime and | (Northern) Ltd |
| | the work he or she is | (2005) |
| | required to do. For an | |

| employee who is doing | Limpus v London |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| his job but acts against | General(1862) |
| orders. If the employee | , , |
| does his job negligently. | |
| An employer will not be | Rose v Plenty(1976) |
| liable for an employee | |
| who is on a frolic of his | |
| own, for the tort of an | Twine Bean's |
| independent | Express (1946) |
| contractor. | |
| If the employer has to | Beard v London |
| pay compensation it | General Omnibus |
| can be recovered from | Co(1900) |
| the employee under the | |
| authority of the Civil | |
| Liability(Contribution)Act | Lister v Helsey |
| 1978. | Hall(2001) |
| 1770. | |
| | l v over |
| | N v Chief |
| | Constable |
| | Merseyside |
| | Police(2006) |
| | |
| | |
| | Mattis v |
| | |
| | Pollock(2003) |
| | |
| | Mohamud v |
| | Morrison's |
| | |
| | Supermarkets |
| | (2016) |
| | Century Insurance v |
| | Northern Ireland |
| | Normem lielana |

| | Road Transport Board(1942) |
|--|---|
| | Hilton v Thomas Burton (Rhodes) Ltd (1961) Smith v Stages(1989) |

| Term 2 | Lesson Title/Topic Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities | Resources/cases to learn | Homework |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| Fatal Offences Against The Person | Murder: actus reus and mens rea | Understand the Actus Reus of murder. | Murder is the unlawful killing of a reasonable person in being under the Queens Peace with malice | Work through the teacher theory packs. | R v Vickers (1957) R v Moloney(1985) R v Nedrick(1986) R v Woolin(1998) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law |

| Understand the | aforethought express | Teacher theory | 2018 Paper |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| Mens Rea of | or implied. | pack | <u> </u> |
| murder. | or implied. | R Drive/Bus ICT | question 2 |
| moraci. | For the Actus Reus of | area/OCR | |
| Evaluate the | murder it has to be | Law/Criminal | |
| law on murder. | proved that: | Law/Murder | |
| A so so by the or Levy y | 1.D killed. | | |
| Apply the law on murder to | 2.A reasonable creature in being. | Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT | |
| scenario based | 3.Under the queen's | area/OCR | |
| questions. | peace. | Law/Criminal | |
| 9003110113. | 4.And the killing was | Law/Essay Plans | |
| | unlawful. | 26, 200 6., 1 166 | |
| | For the Mens Rea | Exam questions | |
| | there must be express | linked to the | |
| | malice aforethought | topic to be | |
| | which is intention to | completed. | |
| | kill or implied malice | | |
| | aforethought which is | | |
| | intention to cause GBH. | | |
| | Foresight of | | |
| | - | | |
| | consequences is only | | |
| | evidence of intention | | |
| | so that: A jury should | | |
| | be directed that they | | |
| | can't find the | | |
| | necessary intention | | |
| | unless they feel sure | | |
| | that death or serious | | |
| | injury was virtually | | |
| | certain as a result of | | |
| | the D's actions and | | |

| Fatal Offences Against The Person | Voluntary manslaughter: defence of loss of control | Understand the partial defence of loss of control. Evaluate the law on loss of control. Apply the law on loss of control to scenario based questions. | that the D appreciated that such as the case. For loss of control there must be: 1. Actual loss of control. 2. Which must be due to a qualifying trigger, and 2. Which must be due to a qualifying trigger and 3. A person of D's sex and age with a normal degree of tolerance and self restraint and in the circumstances of D, might have reacted in the same or similar way. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Loss of control Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed | R v Jewell(2014) R v Ward(2012) R v Dawes(2013) R v Zebedee(2012) R v Hatter(2013) R v Bowyer(2013) R v Clinton(2012) | OCR Exemplar paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 6 |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Fatal Offences Against The Person | Voluntary manslaughter: defence of diminished responsibility | Understand the partial defence of diminished responsibility. Evaluate the law on diminished responsibility. | For Diminished Responsibility the D must show that: They were suffering from an abnormality of mental functioning and that this arose from a recognised medical condition | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Diminished Responsibility | R v Byrne(1960) R v Golds(2016) R v Dietschmann(2003) R v Wood(2008) | OCR Exemplar paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 6 |

| | | Apply the law on diminished responsibility to scenario based questions. | and substantially impaired d'S ability: 1. Understand the nature of his conduct. 2. Form a rational judgement. 3. Exercise self-control and Provides an explanation for D's conduct. | Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| Fatal Offences Against The Person | Involuntary manslaughter: unlawful act manslaughter | Understand the elements of unlawful act manslaughter. Evaluate the law on unlawful act manslaughter. Apply the law on unlawful act manslaughter to scenario based questions | For unlawful act manslaughter there must be: 1. An unlawful act, a crime. 2. That act must be objectively dangerous. 3. The act must cause death. 4. The D must have the Mens Rea for the unlawful act. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Unlawful act manslaughter Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed | R v Lamb(1967) R v Lowe(1973) R v Larkin(1943) R v JM and SM(2012) R V Goodfellow(1986) R v Dawson(1985) R v Watson(1989) R v Bristow, Dunn and Delay(2013) R v Cato(1976) R v Dalby(1982) R v Kennedy(2007)(DPP v Newbury and Jones(1976) | OCR Exemplar paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 5 |

| Fatal Offences Against The Person | Involuntary manslaughter: gross negligence manslaughter | Understand the elements of gross negligence manslaughter. Evaluate the law on gross negligence manslaughter. Apply the law on gross negligence manslaughter to scenario based questions. | For Gross negligence manslaughter there must be: 1. The existence of a duty of care. 2. A breach of that duty of care which causes death. 3. Gross negligence which the jury considers criminal. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Gross negligence manslaughter Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | R v Adomako(1994) R v Singh(1999) R v Litchfield(1997) R v Wacker(2002) R v Stone and Dobinson(1977) R v Bateman(1925) R v Misra and Srivastava(2004) | OCR Exemplar paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 5 |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Offences against property | Theft under s1 Theft Act 1968 | Understand the Actus Reus of Theft. Understand the Mens Rea of Theft. Evaluate the law on Theft. Apply the law on Theft to | Theft is defined in sec 1 of The Theft Act 1968. In order to prove theft there must be: Appropriation Of property Belonging to another With the intention of permanently | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Theft Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR | R v Pitham and Hehl(1977) R v Morris(1983) Lawrence v Commissioner for Metropolitan Police(1972) R v Gomez(1993) R v Hinks(2000) R v Atakpu and Abrahams(1994) R v Kelly and Lindsay(1998) | OCR Exemplar paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 8 |

| scenario based | depriving that other of | Law/Criminal | Oxford v Moss(1979) | |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
| questions | it. | Law/Essay Plans | R v Turner(No2)(1971) | |
| | | | R v Woodman(1974) | |
| | Dishonesty. | Exam questions | R (on the application of | |
| | · | linked to the | Ricketts) v Basildon | |
| | Appropriation occurs | topic to be | Magistrates Court (2010) | |
| | where there is an | completed. | R v Webster(2006) | |
| | assumption of the | | R v Hall(1972) | |
| | rights of an owner. | | R v Klineberg and | |
| | I fights of all owner. | | Marsden(1999) | |
| | Property includes | | Davidge v Bunnett(1984) | |
| | | | | |
| | money and all other | | A-G Ref No1 of 1983, | |
| | property real or | | 1985. | |
| | personal. | | R v Gilks(1972) | |
| | | | R v Holden(1991) | |
| | Things which cannot | | R v Robinson(1977) | |
| | be stolen include | | R v Small(1987) | |
| | knowledge, fruits, | | R v Ghosh(1982) | |
| | flowers, foliage and | | R v Velumyl(1989) | |
| | mushrooms all | | DPP v Lavender(1994) | |
| | growing wild unless | | R v Lloyd(1985) | |
| | taken for commercial | | R v Easom(1971) | |
| | purposes. Wild | | , , | |
| | creatures who are not | | | |
| | in captivity and | | | |
| | electricity. | | | |
| | Ciocinony. | | | |
| | Property belongs to | | | |
| | , , | | | |
| | another if they have | | | |
| | possession or control | | | |
| | of it or any proprietary | | | |
| | interest or obligation | | | |
| | or by mistake. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Dishonesty is not | | | |
| | defined in the Theft | | | |

| Offences | Robbery under | Understand the | Act 1968. The Ghosh test states that D is dishonest if what was done was dishonest according to the standards of reasonable honest people and D realised that what they were doing was dishonest by those standards. D is regarded as having the intention to permanently deprive if it is their intention to treat the thing as their own to dispose of. It is defined in sec 9 of | Work through the | R v Brown (1985) | OCR Exemplar |
|---------------------|----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| against property | s8 Theft Act 1968 | Actus Reus and Mens Rea of Robbery under sec 8 of The Theft Act 1968. Evaluate the law on Robbery. Apply the law on Robbery to scenario based questions. | the Theft Act 1968. There are 2 ways of committing burglary: Sec 9(1)(a) entering a building or part of building as a trespasser intending to steal, inflict GBH or do unlawful damage. Sec 9(1)(b) having entered a building or part of a building as a trespasser, steals or attempts to steal or | teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Burglary Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans | R v Ryan(1996) B and S v Leathley(1979) Norfolk Constabulary v Seekings and Gould(1986) R v Walkington(1979) R v Collins(1972) R v Smith and Jones(1976) | paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 9 |

| | | | inflicts or attempts to inflict GBH. Being a trespasser includes where D goes beyond the permission to enter. Building includes inhabited vehicles and boats. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|--|--|
| Mental Capacity defences | Insanity | Understand the defence of insanity. Evaluate the law on insanity. Apply the law on insanity to scenario based situations. | The definition of insanity is based on the M'Naughten Rules. D must prove that he/she was labouring under a defect of reason, from a disease of the mind, as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing, or if he did know it, that he did not know he was doing what was wrong. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Insanity Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans | M'Naughten(1843) R v Clarke(1972) R v Kemp(1956) R v Sullivan(1984) R v Hennessy(1989) R v Burgess(1991) R v Quick(1973) R v Coley(2013) R v Oye(2013) R v Windle(1952) R v Johnson(20047) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2017 Paper question 4 |
| | | | Disease of the mind includes physical diseases, which affect the mind: it does not include the effect of an external factor. | Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | | |

| | | | If the D knows the act | | | |
|----------|------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | | | is legally wrong then | | | |
| | | | they cannot use the | | | |
| | | | defence. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | If the defence is | | | |
| | | | successful the verdict | | | |
| | | | is not guilty by reason | | | |
| | | | of insanity. | | | |
| Mental | Automatism | Understand the | This is an act done by | Work through the | Hill v Baxter(1958) | AQA Unit 3 |
| Capacity | | defence of | the muscles without | teacher theory | R v T(1990)) | Criminal Law |
| defences | | automatism. | any control of the | packs. | A-G ref (No2 of | 2017 Paper |
| | | | mind. | R Drive/Bus ICT | 1992)(1993) | question 2 |
| | | Evaluate the | | area/OCR | R v Bailey(1983) | |
| | | law on | Automatism can be | Law/Criminal | R v Hardie(1984) | |
| | | automatism. | classes as insane or | Law/Automatism | | |
| | | | non-insane. | | | |
| | | Apply the law | | Lesson plan | | |
| | | on automatism | Where D is not at fault | R drive/Bus ICT | | |
| | | to scenario | in getting In to a non- | area/OCR | | |
| | | based situations. | insane automatic | Law/Criminal | | |
| | | | state then there is a | Law/Essay Plans | | |
| | | | defence and D is not | | | |
| | | | guilty. | | | |
| | | | 1.41 | | | |
| | | | I the automatism is | | | |
| | | | self-induced, D will be | | | |
| | | | able to use the | | | |
| | | | defence for a specific | France and address | | |
| | | | intent offence. | Exam questions linked to the | | |
| | | | If the automatism is | topic to be | | |
| | | | self-induced because | completed | | |
| | | | of D's recklessness, D | Combiered | | |
| | | | will have no defence | | | |
| | | | will have no detence | 1 | | |

| | | | for a basic intent offence. | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| Mental Capacity defences | Intoxication | Understand the defence of intoxication. Evaluate the law on intoxication. Apply the law on intoxication to scenario based situations. | Voluntary Intoxication (VI) can only be a defence to a specific intent(SI) offence. Where D is so intoxicated that he does not have the necessary Mens Rea for the offence. VI is not a defence to a basic intent(BI) offence as becoming intoxicated is a reckless course of conduct. Involuntary Intoxication (II) is a defence to crimes of SI where d did not have the necessary Mens Rea for the offence. Il can be a defence to crimes of BI as D has not been reckless in becoming intoxicated. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Intoxication Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | DPP v Beard(1920) A-G for Northern Ireland v Gallagher(1963) DPP v Majewski(1977) R v Harris(2013) R v Kingston(1994) R v Lipman(1970) R v O'Grady(1987) R v Hatton(2005) Jaggard v Dickinson(1980) | OCR Exemplar paper The Legal System and Criminal Law question 7 |
| | | | Where D makes a mistake because he/she is intoxicated, | | | |

| | | | then if the mistake means that D did not have Mens Rea for the offence, D can use intoxication as a defence. | | | |
|------------------|--------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| General defences | Self-defence | Understand the law on self-defence. Evaluate the defence of self-defence. Apply the law on self-defence to scenario based questions. | This includes the need to defend oneself and action taken to defend another. Sec 76 of The Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 sets out rules: 1. Degree of force must be reasonable and not disproportionate. 2. In householder cases the degree of force must not be grossly disproportionate. 3. Where D is acting under a mistake, he/she is judged on the facts as they genuinely believed them to be. 4. Where D is acting under a drunken mistake she/he cannot use the defence. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Self defence Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | R v Hussain(2010) Collins v Sec of State for Justice(2016) R v Gladstone Williams(1984) A-G ref (No 2 of 1983)(1984) R v Bird(1985) R v Clegg(1995) R v Martin (2002) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2018 Paper question 1 |

| Canaral | Durana lav | Ling do not one of the c | This is whare Die | Morle Haranada Hara | D. (110) ((11007) | A O A Limit 4 |
|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| General | Duress by | Understand the | This is where D is | Work through the | R v Howe(1987) | AQA Unit 4 |
| defences | threats, duress | law on duress by | effectively forced by | teacher theory | R v Wilson(2007) | Criminal Law |
| | of | threats and | threats to commit an | packs. | R v Gotts(1992) | 2018 Paper |
| | circumstances | circumstances. | offence. | | R v Valderrama- | question 3 |
| | | | | R Drive/Bus ICT | Vega(1985) | |
| | | Evaluate the | Not available for | area/OCR | R v Graham(1982) | |
| | | defence duress | murder, attempted | Law/Criminal | R v Martin(DP) (2000) | |
| | | by threats and | murder and possibly | Law/Duress | R V Hudson and Taylor | |
| | | circumstances. | treason. | | (1971) | |
| | | | | Lesson plan | R v Abdul-Hussain(1999) | |
| | | Apply the law | The threat mist be of | R drive/Bus ICT | R v Cole(1994) | |
| | | on defence | death or serious injury- | area/OCR | R v Sharp(1987) | |
| | | duress by | but cumulative | Law/Criminal | R v Shepherd (1987) | |
| | | threats and | effects of threats can | Law/Essay Plans | R v Hassan formerly | |
| | | circumstances | be considered. | , , | z) (2005) | |
| | | to scenario | | | R v Willer(1986) | |
| | | based questions | The threat must be to | Exam questions | R v Conway(1988) | |
| | | | D, or his family. | linked to the | R v Martin(1989) | |
| | | | B, or rus rarriny. | topic to be | R v Pommell(1995) | |
| | | | There are 2 tests: | completed. | R v Cairns(1999) | |
| | | | 1. Subjective- was D | compicioa. | K V Cairris(1777) | |
| | | | compelled to act as | | | |
| | | | he/she did because | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | he/she reasonably | | | |
| | | | believed that he/she | | | |
| | | | had good cause to | | | |
| | | | fear death or serious | | | |
| | | | injury? | | | |
| | | | 2.Objective- would a | | | |
| | | | sober person of | | | |
| | | | reasonable fitness | | | |
| | | | sharing the same | | | |
| | | | characteristics as D | | | |
| | | | have responded in | | | |
| | | | the same way? | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | characteristics include age, pregnancy, gender, serious physical disability, recognised mental illness or psychiatric disorder. | | | |
|-----------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Necessity | Understand the law on necessity. Evaluate the defence of necessity. Apply the law on necessity to scenario based questions. | This is where circumstances force a person to act to prevent worse evil. Criminal courts have been reluctant to recognise the defence. Civil courts have recognised the defence. In the criminal case of R v Shayler(2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. | Work through the teacher theory packs. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Necessity Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. | R v Dudley and Stephens(1884) Re F(mental patient:sterilisation)(1990) Re A(2000) R v Shayler(2001) | Research cases on necessity. |
| Consent | Understand the law on consent. Evaluate the defence of consent. | Consent can be a defence to some offences against the person. 1. It cannot be a | Work through the teacher theory packs. | R v Donovan(1934) R v Slingsby(1995) R v Tabassum(2000) R v Olugboja(1982) R v Dica(2004) R v Goldina(2014) | AQA Unit 3 Criminal Law 2018 Paper question 4 |
| | | law on necessity. Evaluate the defence of necessity. Apply the law on necessity to scenario based questions. Consent Understand the law on consent. Evaluate the | pregnancy, gender, serious physical disability, recognised mental illness or psychiatric disorder. Necessity Understand the law on necessity. Evaluate the defence of necessity. Apply the law on necessity to scenario based questions. Apply the law or necessity to scenario based questions. Understand the law on consent. Consent Understand the law on consent. Evaluate the defence to some offences against the person. | Pregnancy, gender, serious physical disability, recognised mental illness or psychiatric disorder. Necessity Understand the law on necessity. Evaluate the defence of necessity to scenario based questions. Apply the law on necessity to scenario based questions. Understand the law on consent. Consent Understand the law on consent. Consent Precognised the defence. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Understand the law on consent. Consent Understand the law on consent. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Consent Understand the law on consent. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Evaluate the law on consent. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Evaluate the law on consent. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Evaluate the law on consent. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Evaluate the law on consent. In the criminal case of R v Shayler (2001) it was concluded that necessity and duress were the same defence. Evaluate the law on consent. In the criminal case of R vive/Bus ICT area/OCR Evaluate the law on consent. Evaluate the defence to some offences against the person. It cannot be a R Drive/Bus ICT | pregnancy, gender, serious physical disability, recognised mental illness or psychiatric disorder. Necessity Understand the law on necessity. Evaluate the defence of necessity. Apply the law on necessity to scenario based questions. Consent Understand the law on consent. Evaluate the defence of necessity. Criminal courts have defence. Apply the law on necessity to scenario based questions. Understand the law on consent. Consent Understand the law on consent. Consent Understand the law on consent. It cannot be a Prive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Necessity Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. R v Dudley and Stephens(1884) Re F(mental patient:sterilisation)(1990) R v Shayler(2001) R v Shayler(2001) |

| Preliminary | Attempts: the | Apply the law on consent to scenario based questions. | nor where serious injury is caused. 2. The consent must be real. 3. V must have knowledge of relevant facts such as D being HIV positive. 4. There is implied consent to ordinary jostling's in everyday life. In sport there is consent to contact within the rules of the game. For minor injuries it has been held that it is not in the public interest that people should try to cause each other bodily harm for no good reason. The exceptions to this rule include properly conducted sports game, lawful chastisement, reasonable surgical interference, dangerous exhibitions. | Law/Criminal Law/Consent Lesson plan R drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/Criminal Law/Essay Plans Exam questions linked to the topic to be completed. Work through the | R v Brown (1993) R v Jones(1986) R v Aitken(1992) R v Emmett(1999) R (on the application of Pretty) v DPP(2001) R (on the application of another of Nicklinson and another) v Ministry of Justice 2014. | |
|-------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| offences | actus reus and mens rea; impossibility | actus reus of attempts. | Defined in sec 1(1) of The Criminal Attempts Act 1981. | teacher theory packs. | A-G Ref (N0 1 of 1992)(1993) R v Gullefer(1987) | |

| Understand the | | R Drive/Bus ICT | R v Geddes(1996) |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Mens Rea of | The Actus Reus of | area/OCR | R v Campbell(1990) |
| attempts. | attempt is doing an | Law/Criminal | R v Boyle and |
| | act which is more | Law/Preliminary | Boyle(1987) |
| Understand the | than merely | offences | R v Totsi(1997) |
| problems that | preparatory to the | attempts and | R v Jones(1990) |
| arise with | commission of the | impossibility | R v Easom(1971) |
| impossibility of | offence. | | R v Husseyn(1977) |
| completed | | Lesson plan | R v Whybrow(1951) |
| offences. | The mens rea of | R drive/Bus ICT | R v Millard and Vernon |
| | attempt is that D must | area/OCR | (1987) |
| Evaluate the | have the mens rea | Law/Criminal | A-G ref (No3 of1992) |
| law on | required for the full | Law/Essay Plans | (1994) |
| attempts. | offence. | | Anderton v Ryan (1985) |
| | | | R v Shivpuri(1986) |
| Apply the law | For murder there must | Exam questions | |
| on attempts to | be an intent to kill. | linked to the | |
| scenario based | | topic to be | |
| situations. | There can be a | completed | |
| | conditional intent i.e | | |
| | where D intends to | | |
| | steal if there is | | |
| | something worth | | |
| | stealing. | | |
| | | | |
| | Recklessness is not | | |
| | normally sufficient | | |
| | Mens Rea of attempt. | | |
| | | | |
| | Impossibility | | |
| | Originally the courts | | |
| | held that if the full | | |
| | offence was | | |
| | impossible to commit, | | |
| | then D could not be | | |
| | guilty of an attempt. | | |

| In R v Shivpuri the courts overruled their previous decision and held that a person could be guilty of an attempt even though the commission of the full offence was impossible. | |
|--|--|
|--|--|

| Term 3 | Lesson Title/Topi c Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities | Resources/cases to learn | Homework |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| The Natur e of Law | Law and Morality | • The distinction between law and morals • The diversity of moral views in a pluralist society • The relationship between law and morals and its importance | Morality is normative or prescriptive, that is, it specifies what ought to be done and delineates acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. There are various characteristics that | Work through exemplar essay adding on additional research notes in the margin. Pupils to learn rote fashion the essay. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/The Nature of Law/Law and Morality | Sarah's Law- Child Sex Offender Disclosure scheme. Recent ongoing news debate on legalising euthanasia- Recent challenge is that of Phil Newby Moral issues surrounding the Counter-Terrorism and Border Security Act 2019 R v Brown Hart Devlin debate | 'The moral values of a society should be reflected in its laws.' Discuss the extent to which the English legal system achieves a balance between law and morality. (20) |

| The | | •The legal enforcemen t of moral values | differentiate laws from morals. Laws and morals share a number of common characteristics. Changing moral values can lead to developments in the law and vice versa. Judges and Parliament are often forced to confront complex moral issues, Parliament can choose whether to legislate, Judges have no choice. | | The Wolfenden debate surrounding legalisation of homosexuality. The Marriage Same Sex Couples act of 2013 | (The series of the |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| The Natur e of Law | Law and Justice | •The meaning of justice •Theories of justice | Justice is a concept that can be defined as fairness, equality or even handedness. | Work through exemplar essay adding on additional research notes in the margin. | R v Birmingham ex parte Jowitt (1974) R v Ponting Mullins v Richards Nettleship v Weston | 'The aim of the law should be to achieve justice.' Discus s the extent to |

| The | | • The extent to which the law achieves justice | There are many theories of justice such as distributive justice and procedural Justice. Justice is essential in the law. The extent to which it is achieved varies with respect to different aspects of procedural and substantive law. Examples of justice can be seen in both criminal and civil law. Sometimes justice hasn't been achieved in our English Legal system with cases such as the Guilford 4. | Pupils to learn rote fashion the essay. R Drive/Bus ICT area/OCR Law/The Nature of Law/Law and Justice | The Marriage (Same Sex Couples) | which the English legal system achieves justice. (20) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| The Natur e of Law | Law and Society | The role law plays in societyThe law as a social control mechanism | Law plays the following role in society • Protect people from harm | Work through exemplar essay adding on additional research notes in the margin. Pupils to learn rote fashion the essay. | The Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act 2013 The Sex Offences Amendment Act of 2000 The London Riots of 2011 The poll tax riots The case of Sarah Payne | 'Law has the power to influence and change society'. Discuss the extent to |

| law to balance competing interests. Right realists argue that crimes even minor ones need to be dealt with rigorously through policies like zero tolerance in order | | |
|--|--|--|
| to maintain social order and coherent communities. They believe in "Just deserts" and retribution when | | |

| With Left realists, their argument is that social deprivation is a cause of crime. | | |
|--|--|--|
| Its not just the law that influences society, influencers can also be pressure groups and the media. | | |

| Term 4 | Lesson Title/Topi c Focus | Objectives Intent | Knowledge to be learnt-Key terms | Activities | Resources/cases to learn | Homework |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Contr act Law Forma tion | Offer and accept ance, includin g the rules of communication and | Understand offer and acceptanc e including the rules of communica tion and revocation. Evaluate formation of | Agreement in the formation of contract of contract requires an offer to be accepted while it is open. An offer is a statement of the terms upon which a person is prepared to be | A new unit so work in progress | Gibson v Manchester City Council(1979) Partridge v Crittenden (1968) Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co (1839) Fisher v Bell (1961) | A new unit so work in progress |

| revocati | contract in | bound by a | Pharmaceutical Society of Great |
|----------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| on | relation to | contract. | Britain v Boots Cash Chemists |
| | offer and | | (1953) |
| | acceptanc | An offer differs | |
| | e. | from an invitation | British Car Auctions v Wright (1972) |
| | | to treat as only an | Harvey v Facey(1893) |
| | Apply the | offer can form the | |
| | law to given | basis of a contract. | Tornton v Shoe Lane Parking(1971) |
| | situations. | An advertisement | Taylor v Laird(1856) |
| | | is an invitation to | Taylor V Larra (1838) |
| | | treat. It can only | Stevenson v McClean(1880) |
| | | be an offer when | |
| | | there is a | Routledge v Grant(1828) |
| | | unilatereal | Dickinson v Dodds(1876) |
| | | contract. | · , |
| | | Otherinvitations to | Hyde v Wrench(1840) |
| | | Other invitations to treat include | Ramsgate Victoria Hotel v |
| | | goods in a shop | Montefiore(1866) |
| | | window or n a | Wornenere (1000) |
| | | shop shelf, lots ar | Felthouse v Bindley(1863) |
| | | an auction and | Vertee v. Pullers (1075) |
| | | requests for | Yates v Pullen(1975) |
| | | information. | Reveille Independent LLC v |
| | | om | Anotech International (UK) Ltd |
| | | It is essential to | (2016) |
| | | know when an | |
| | | offer has been | Adams v Linsell(1818) |
| | | communicated so | |

| the cut it is our are arranged | Enteres y Miles For Foot/1055 | 1 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| that it is open, and | Entores v Miles Far East(1955) | |
| when it ends. | Brinkibon v Stahag Stahl(1983) | |
| An offer can end | Billikiborr v Starlag Starli(1700) | |
| | Byrne v Van Tienhoven(1880) | |
| through | , | |
| revocation, | | |
| rejection, lapse of | | |
| time, death and | | |
| when accepted. | | |
| Acceptance must | | |
| be communicated | | |
| | | |
| to be effective, | | |
| there are special | | |
| rules in some | | |
| circumstances | | |
| where there is | | |
| acceptance using | | |
| the post. | | |
| Evaluation of offer | | |
| and acceptance | | |
| includes | | |
| distinctions | | |
| between an offer | | |
| and an invitation | | |
| to treat and how | | |
| the rules with | | |
| | | |
| respect to | | |
| acceptance are | | |

| | | | dealt with in the modern world. | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Contract Law Formation | Intention to create legal relations: domesti c and commer cial, presump tions and rebuttals Conside ration: adequa cy, sufficien cy, past consider ation, preexisting duties • Privity: the | Understand intention to create legal relations, domestic and commercial, presumption and rebuttals. Understand consideration, adequacy, sufficiency, past consideration and preexisting duties. Understand privity: the rights of third parties under the | There must be an intention to create legal relations for there to be a valid contract. There is a distinction between business or commercial contracts and those that are of a social and domestic nature. Consideration involves each party to a contract giving something of value to the other. There are 5 rules with respect to what amounts to consideration. | A new unit so work in progress | Edwards v Skyways Ltd(1969) Jones v Vernin Pools(1938) Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Commissioners of Customs and Excise(1976) McGowan v Radio Buxton(2001) Kleintworth Benson Ltd v Malaysian Mining Corporation (1989) Sadler v Reynolds(2005) Balfour v Balfour(1919) Merritt v Merritt(1971) Jones v Padavatton(1969) Simpkins v Pays(1955) Parker v Clarke(1960) Thomas v Thomas(1842) Chappell v Nestle CoLtd(1960) White v Bluett(1853) Ward v Byham(1956) ReMcArdle(1951) Re Caseys Patient(1892) Lampleigh v Braithwaite(1615) Tweddle v Atkinson(1861) Collins v Godefroy(1831) Stilk v Myrick(1809) Shadwell v Shadwell (1840) Scotson v Pegg(1861) Glasbrook Bros v Glamorgan County Council(1925) | A new unit so work in progress |

| | rights of third parties under the Contrac t (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 and commo n law excepti ons | Contract (Rights of third parties) Act 1999 and common law exceptions. Evaluate the law relating to consideration and intention to create legal relations. Apply the law to given situations. | Privity of contract means that only a party to a contract can take legal action on it. There are exceptions to the doctrine of privity, both from case law and statute. | | Hartley v Ponsonby(1857) Williams v Roffey Bros and Nicholls(Contractors) Ltd(1990) Pinnells Case(1602) Foakes v Beer(1884) Central London Property Trust Ltd v High Trees House Ltd (1947) Re Selectmove Ltd (1955) D and C Builders v Rees(1965) Dunlop v Pneumatic Tyre Co Ltd v Selfridge and Co Ltd(1915) Jackson v Horizon Holiday Ltd(1975) Shanklin Pier Ltd v Detel Products Ltd(1951) Tulk v Moxhay(1848) Beswick v Beswick(1967) | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Contr act Law Terms | Express and Implied terms | Understand d express and implied terms Understand the types of term- Conditions, warranties | Terms are of three types- Conditions, warranties and innominate terms. The courts have to decide whether a statement is a representation or a term. | A new unit so work in progress | Poussard v Spiers and Pond (1876) Bettini v Gye(1876) Hong Kong Fir Shipping Co. Ltd v Kawasaki Kisen Kasiha Ltd (1962) Couchman v Hill(1947) Oscar Chess v Williams(1957) Dick Bentley v Harold Smith Motors (1965) Routledge v Mackay(1954) The Moorcock(1889) | A new unit so work in progress |

| and innominate terms. Apply the law to given situations. | Terms can be implied in a contract by the common law and/or by statute. Breach of a term gives rise to possible different remedies. The Consumer Rights Act 2015 uses the nomenclature of rights rather than terms. | Schawel v Reade(1913) Hutton v Warren(1836) Hilas v Arcos(1932) Shell UK Ltd v Lostock Garage Ltd(1977) Egan v Static Control Components (Europe) Ltd(2004) Marks and Spencer plc v BNP Paribas Securities Sevices Trust Company Jersey Ltd (2015) Sec 13 Sale of Goods Act 1979/Re Moore and Co and Landauer and Co Arbitration(1921) Sec 14(2) Sale of Goods Act 1979 Sec 14(3) Sale of Goods Act 1979/Baldry v Marshall(1925) Sec 3 Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982 Sec 4 Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982 Sec 13 Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982 Sec 13 Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982/Thake v |
|---|---|---|
| | terms. | Services Act 1982 Sec 4 Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982 Sec 13 Supply of Goods and |

| Contr | Misrepre | Understand | Vitiating factors | A new unit so work | Fletcher v Krell(1873) | A new unit so |
|---------|----------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| act | sentatio | the | include | in progress | With v O'Flanagan (1936) | work in |
| law | n, | concept of | misrepresentation | | Dimmock v Hallett (1866) | progress |
| Vitiati | includin | a vitiating | and duress. | | Tate v Williamson(1866) | progress |
| ng | g | factor in a | | | Lambert v Co-operative Insurance | |
| factor | omission | contract. | Misrepresentation | | Society BV(2000) | |
| S | in | | occurs where a | | Bisset v Wilkinson(1927) | |
| | consum | Understand | person is induced | | Edgington v Fitzmaurice(1885) | |
| | er | misrepresent | to enter a contract | | Attwood v Small(1838) | |
| | contexts | ation, | as a result of | | Redgrave v Hurd(1881) | |
| | | including | statements made | | Museprime Properties Ltd v Adhill | |
| | Economi | omission in | that are false. | | Properties Ltd(1990) | |
| | c duress | consumer | | | Clarke v Dickinson(1858) | |
| | | contracts | There are three | | Long v Lloyd(1958) | |
| | | and | types of | | Leaf v International Galleries(1950) | |
| | | remedies. | misrepresentation | | Lewis v Averay(1972) | |
| | | | each with it own | | Hedley Byrne and Co Ltd v Heller | |
| | | Understand | remedies: | | and Partners Ltd(1964) | |
| | | economic | innocent, | | Howard Marine v Ogden & Sons | |
| | | duress and | negligent and | | (1978) | |
| | | its remedies. | fraudulent. | | Royscot Trust Ltd v Rogerson (1991) | |
| | | | | | Derry v Peek((1889) | |
| | | Apply the | Economic duress | | Smith New Court v Scrimgeour | |
| | | law to | arises where there | | Vickers (1996) | |
| | | factual | is the threat to | | East v Maurer(1991) | |
| | | situations. | damage a | | Atlas Express v Kafco(1989) | |
| | | | business or a | | Universe Tankships v International | |
| | | | person financially. | | Transport Workers Federation, The | |
| | | | The court will | | Universe Sentinel(1983) | |
| | | | consider each | | Pao on v Lau yiu Long(1979) | |
| | | | case involving | | CTN Cash & Carry v | |
| | | | economic duress | | Gallagher(1994) | |
| | | | according to its | | | |

| | | | individual circumstances. | | Progress Bulk Carriers Ltd v Tube City(2012) | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Contract Law Discharge | Perform ance Frustration Breach of contract: actual and anticipa tory breach | Understand the concept of discharge of contract. Explain discharge by performance. Explain discharge by frustration and relevant remedies. Explain breach of contract: actual and anticipatory breach, and relevant remedies. | A contract can be discharged by performance (the usual method) frustration or breach (failure to perform in whole or in part). Performance must be complete and exact, but there are exceptions such as where part performance is accepted. If the contract is not discharged by frustration there will be a breach of contract. Breach and frustration have different remedies. | A new unit so work in progress | Cutter v Powell(1795) Ritchie v Atkinson(1808) Dakin & Co v Lee (1916) Hoenig v Isaacs(1952) Bolton v Mahadeva(1972) Young v Thames Properties (1999) Planche v Colburn(1831) Sumpter v Hedges(1898) Union Eagle Itd v Golden Acheivement Ltd(1997) Charles Rickards Ltd v Oppenheim(1950) Taylor v Caldwell(1863) Jackson v Union Marione Insurance Co Ltd(1874) Robinson v Davidson(1871) Condor v The Baron Knights (1966) Denny, Mott and Dickinson Ltd v James B Fraser & Co Ltd (1944) Re Shipton Anderson & Co and Harrison Bros &Co (1915) Krell v Henry(1903) Herne Bay Steamboat Co v Hutton(1903) Maritime National Fish Ltd v Ocean Trawlers Ltd (1935) Gamerco SA v ICM Fair Warning (Agency) Ltd and Missouri Storm | A new unit so work in progress |
| | | | condition, a | | Inc (1995) | |

| | Apply the law to give situations. | warranty or an innominate term. Breach can be actual or anticipatory. | | Armchair Answercall v People in Mind(2016) Poussard v Spiers and Pond (1976) Hochester v de la tour (1853) Geden Operations Ltd v Dry Bulk Handy Holdings Inc (Bulk Uruguay) (2014) | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| act es: Law co sat Reme da dies es; ca n c rer ess da e; mit n c er rer s • Co er rer s u the | mmpen damages are assessed in contract law, moten compensor ory damages, causation and remotenes of damag mitigation loss. medie under understan equitable remedies. | breach of contract can either be legal or equitable remedies. Compensatory damages are the most common form of damages and are compensation for losses suffered. In specific circumstances, more than the actual loss suffered will be awarded. Contracts sometimes try to establish what | A new unit so work in progress | Hadley v Baxendale (1854) Victoria Laundry Ltd v Newman Industries Ltd(1949) Czarnikow Ltd v Koufos(The Heron II)(1969) H Parsons (Livestock) Ltd v Uttley Ingham(1978) Wellesley Partners LLP v Withers LLP(2015) Staniforth v Lyall (1830) Wrotham Park Estate Co Ltd v Parkside Homes Ltd (1974) Experience Hendrix LLC v PPX Enterprises Inc. (2003) Bence Graphics International Ltd v Fasson UK Ltd (1996) Charter v Sullivan(1957) WL Thompson Ltd v Robinson Gunmakers Ltd (1955) Victoria Laundry Ltd v Newman Industries Ltd(1949) Chaplin v Hicks (1911) Anglia Television Ltd v Reed (1972) Farley v Skinner(2001) Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth(1996) | A new unit so work in progress |

| er Rights Act 2015 Consumer Rights Act 2015. Rights Act 2015. Apply the law to given situations. Equitable remedies are discretionary. Injunctions usually aim to prevent breach of contract. Specific performance requires delivery of goods but is not available for contract of services. Experimental terms if considered underground Electric Richards (1912) Thai Airways v K I Holding Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Garage and Motor Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Concavendish Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) Upton Rural District Square Hold Talal Ell Makadessi and Ltd v Beavis (2015) | railways ngs(2015) e Co v New (1914) ding BV v Parkingeye uncil v 1853) v d v |
|--|--|
|--|--|