



GCE A LEVEL

1150U30-1

TUESDAY, 4 JUNE 2024 – AFTERNOON

LAW – A2 unit 3

The Practice of Substantive Law

1 hour 45 minutes plus your additional time allowance

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

A WJEC pink 16-page answer booklet.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Use black ink, black ball-point pen or your usual method.

Answer TWO questions in total, each question from a different section.

SECTION A – Human Rights Law

SECTION B – Law of Contract

SECTION C – Criminal Law

Write your answers in the separate answer booklet provided.

Use both sides of the paper. Write only within the white areas of the booklet.

Write the question number in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer.

Leave at least two line spaces between each answer.

(Turn over)

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The number of marks is given in brackets at the end of each question or part-question.

Answer TWO questions in total.

SECTION A

HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

Answer ONE question from this section if you have studied this area of law.

The questions which follow require you to:

- **demonstrate knowledge and understanding of legal rules and principles;**
- **apply legal rules and principles to the scenario; and**
- **present a legal argument using appropriate legal terminology.**

Credit will be given for the use of relevant supporting case law and authority.

EITHER,

- 10. Phillipa Peters, a professor of Geography, wrote a book about climate change in which she claimed that this was mainly caused by changes in the earth itself rather than by human behaviour. Phillipa's former lecturer from her University days, Professor Stephens, was asked to write a review of the book for the Sunday Probe, a serious broadsheet newspaper. In her review, Professor Stephens wrote: "Phillipa Peters' book is style over substance. Like the professor herself, it looks pretty on the outside but is full of empty-headed nonsense on the inside." Evan Thomas, the editor of the Sunday Probe, felt that it was in the public interest that a dispute between two well-known professors on such an important subject as climate change should be given greater publicity than to be hidden away in the review column of the paper. He therefore dedicated half a page to the review, under the headline: "Battle of the Boffins – Stephens Blasts Peters Over Climate Change." The story was picked up by a national television network, with the result that Phillipa was sacked from her job at the university.**

In light of reported case law and other sources of law, consider whether Phillipa has a case for defamation against the Sunday Probe and Professor Stephens.

[50 marks]

(Turn over)

OR,

- 20. Eleri's elderly aunt Maureen asked Eleri to stay at her house to help her as she was recovering from an operation. Maureen gave Eleri her credit card to do some shopping for her. On the third day of her stay, Eleri went out to do some food shopping and was stopped and searched in the street by two police officers, who seized her purse and credit cards. When Eleri asked what this was all about, the officers told her that they were arresting her on suspicion of using a stolen credit card. Despite Eleri's protests that she had been given permission to use her aunt's card, she was put into a police car and driven to the local police station where she was placed directly in a cell. After eight hours the police took her fingerprints and a sample of her DNA, and then questioned her for eighteen hours about her various credit card transactions. Eleri asked to be allowed to contact her aunt and speak to a solicitor, but was told that she would have to wait, as the investigation was at a crucial stage. Eleri was then returned to her cell and kept there for a further 46 hours. After that, she was then told that no charges would be brought against her and that she was free to go.**

In light of reported case law and other sources of law, advise Eleri as to the legality of the actions of the police. [50 marks]

(Turn over)

SECTION B

LAW OF CONTRACT

Answer ONE question from this section if you have studied this area of law.

The questions which follow require you to:

- **demonstrate knowledge and understanding of legal rules and principles;**
- **apply legal rules and principles to the scenario; and**
- **present a legal argument using appropriate legal terminology.**

Credit will be given for the use of relevant supporting case law and authority.

EITHER,

- 30. Aziz and Leona are world famous ice skating champions. Their agent, Tony, agreed to them taking the leading role in the opening of a new ice skating rink in London which was owned by Olivia. Unknown to Tony and before he had contracted with Olivia, Aziz had an accident whilst training resulting in a broken leg, which doctors informed him would take at least three months to heal. As a result, he would be unable to perform when the new ice rink opening was scheduled. In the meantime, Leona decided not to perform at the opening because whilst she could perform, she was reluctant to do so without Aziz.**

In light of reported case law and other sources of law, advise Olivia. [50 marks]

(Turn over)

OR,

40. **Andy contracted to carry out certain plumbing work on Susan's building project. The contract specified that it would be completed by the 1st of May. It became clear that Andy had underpriced the job and would not complete it on time. Completing the job on time was critical to Susan since she wanted to sell the building and the market price was dropping every day. Susan therefore promised to pay Andy an additional fifty percent of the contract price if he completed on time. Andy completed the job on time. Susan is now refusing to pay Andy a penny more than the original contract price.**

In light of reported case law and other sources of law, advise Andy. [50 marks]

(Turn over)

SECTION C

CRIMINAL LAW

Answer ONE question from this section if you have studied this area of law.

The questions which follow require you to:

- **demonstrate knowledge and understanding of legal rules and principles;**
- **apply legal rules and principles to the scenario; and**
- **present a legal argument using appropriate legal terminology.**

Credit will be given for the use of relevant supporting case law and authority.

EITHER,

- 50. Robert was woken up in the middle of the night by the sound of somebody moving around downstairs. Robert's wife was still asleep, so not wishing to worry her, Robert went quietly into the bedroom where his two young sons slept, to check that they were safe. The bed of his younger son, Charlie, was empty, and Robert thought he could hear him crying downstairs in the living room. Full of fear and rage, Robert ran down the stairs and burst into the living room. He found Charlie crying and cuddling the family's dog, which was bleeding from a blow to the head. Near to Charlie stood a frightened-looking young man with a baseball bat in his hand. The young man tried to run past Robert and escape, but Robert picked up the nearest hard object he could find, which happened to be his bass guitar, and struck him with such force that he later died from his injuries.**

In light of reported case law and other sources of law, consider whether Robert may have any defences to a charge of murder. [50 marks]

(Turn over)

OR,

60. **Roxy told her husband James that she intended to leave him, as she had met someone else. James flew into a rage and started to hit Roxy, shouting that he intended to scar her so badly that no other man would ever look at her. Roxy collapsed unconscious on the floor, and James was unable to wake her up. Convinced that he had killed her, James dragged Roxy into her own car, and then drove to an isolated spot near the top of a mountain, intending to set fire to Roxy's car with Roxy's body inside and tell everyone that she had gone away of her own accord. It was dark and James realised that he would need petrol to start the fire. While James was extracting petrol from the tank, Roxy recovered consciousness and crawled out of the car. In the dark, James did not see her go. Having soaked the car with petrol, he set it alight and then made his way home. Roxy was found by a walker and his dog and driven to the nearest hospital in the walker's car. By the time she arrived at the accident and emergency unit, Roxy was experiencing severe breathing problems. The doctor on duty, Joel, failed to realise that Roxy's breathing problems were due to Roxy suffering a severe allergic reaction to the walker's dog, with the result that Roxy died.**

(Turn over)

60. In light of reported case law and other sources of law, consider whether James may be criminally liable for Roxy's death. [50 marks]

END OF PAPER