

LAW

Task 1: you already know a little bit about the law. Find out the answers to the following questions.

- Much of the law in this country comes from Parliament. Name the two houses of Parliament.
- What is the name for a legal representative who wears a wig and gown in court?
- Name the two main criminal courts that are used to decide guilt or innocence?
- How many people sit on a criminal jury? In which civil cases are juries used?
- What's the name of the offence of theft + trespass? What's the name of the offence of theft + use of or threat of force?
- Susie takes £10 from her mum's purse to buy cannabis. Is she guilty of theft? Archie takes £10 from his mum's purse for spending money for a college trip. Is he guilty of theft?

Task 2: law can be classified as either criminal or civil. Look at the terms below. Research what they mean. Classify them as: criminal; civil; both.

- jury
- prosecutes
- defendant
- punishment
- plaintiff
- compensation
- beyond reasonable doubt
- damages
- convicts
- R
- tax evasion
- small claims court
- CPS
- balance of probabilities
- county court
- crown court
- common law
- a signalman gets drunk, as a result a train crashes killing ten people
- a railway porter agrees to carry your bags for 50p and runs off with them



Task 3: find out what this is called?

True or false: they are used in courts in this country

You might like to visit <https://fullfact.org/law/no-gavels-please-were-british/>

Task 3: In law, cases are used to explain what the law means – using the following website, <http://www.e-lawresources.co.uk/> go to **case summaries** and explain what happened in the following cases. Say who won the case, and why.

- Barnett v Chelsea and Kensington Hospital
- Callow v Tillstone
- Elliot v Grey
- Haynes v Harwood
- Jones v Portsmouth City Council
- London and North East Railway v Berriman
- R v Adomako
- R v Chan-Fook
- R v Shadrock-Cigari
- R v Wilson (1996)



Task 4: Watch the video, and then read the following extract, and answer the questions below

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QIULKTZ9-rQ>

A teacher who beat a boy's head with a dumbbell while shouting "die, die, die" walked free from court yesterday after being cleared of attempted murder because he was mentally unwell and had been tormented by the pupil. In a case that raised doubts about whether there was sufficient help available for stressed teachers struggling with disruptive children, Peter Harvey, 50, was cleared after the jury deliberated for little more than an hour. He was also cleared of grievous bodily harm with intent. Only now can it be revealed that Judge Michael Stokes, QC, who welcomed the not guilty verdict as "common sense", had questioned why the attempted murder charge had been pursued in the first place. The science teacher admitted grievous bodily harm without intent. The boy, part of a handful of children trying to goad the tutor as they secretly filmed him at All Saints Roman Catholic School in Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, suffered a fractured skull and bleeding to the brain.

The judge said that Harvey would not be jailed for grievous bodily harm. Instead, the teacher, who was suspended from his post and spent eight months on remand, faces a community order intended to tackle his problems. During legal arguments, the judge said that "there is strong evidence to suggest that the way Mr Harvey was acting at the time, he did not appreciate what he was doing. It does seem to me that by continuing with this case the Crown may discover their attitude rebounds on them."

Questions:

1. What charges did Peter Harvey deny?
2. What charge did he admit?
3. What injuries did the 14-year-old boy sustain?
4. What charges did the jury clear him of?
5. What charge did the judge question?
6. What sentence did Peter Harvey receive?
7. Do you think Peter Harvey should have been found guilty of GBH with intent? Why?



Are you stuck? Do you want more to do? Contact me – a.whitlock@oaklandscatholicschool.org

