Table of Contents

HOMICIDE

Murder	5
 Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Actus Reus elements of murder under s18(1)(a 	ı) of
the Crimes Act?	
Did the end of a human life occur?	5
B. Did the accused commit an act/omission?	5
C. Was the accused's conduct voluntary?	6
D. Did the accused's conduct cause the victim's death?	8
II. Did the accused fulfil the Mens Rea elements of murder under s18(1)(a) of the Crimes 10	Act?
A. Did the accused have intent to kill?	10
Did the accused have intent to commit Grievous Bodily Harm?	
C. Did the accused act with reckless indifference to human life?	
D. Was the accused intoxicated?	
Can the accused be held criminally liable for constructive murder?	
III. Was there concurrence of the physical and fault elements of murder?	
A. Can fault be imposed on a continuing act?	
B. Can fault be imposed over a series of acts?	
C. Can fault be imposed on acts which are nearly contemporaneous?	
Manslaughter	
I. Is the accused liable for voluntary or involuntary manslaughter?	
A. Voluntary Manslaughter	
B. Involuntary Manslaughter	
<u> </u>	
II. Is the accused liable for Unlawful and Dangerous Act Manslaughter?	21
A. Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Actus Reus and Mens Rea elements of the	
foundational offence?	
B. Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Actus Reus elements of UDA Manslaughter?	
C. Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Mens Rea elements of UDA Manslaughter?	
D. Was there concurrence of the physical and fault elements of UDA Manslaughter?	
III. Is the accused criminally liable for Criminally Negligent Manslaughter?	
A. Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Actus Reus elements of CN Manslaughter?	
B. Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Mens Rea elements of CN Manslaughter?	
C. Was there concurrence of the physical and fault elements of CN Manslaughter?	39
ASSAULT	
Common Assault	41
General Rule	
Intoxication:	
I. Assault by threat of force	
A. Did the accused's conduct satisfy the Actus Reus elements of assault by threat of force	
II. Assault by use of force	
•	
Aggravated Assault	
Assaults accompanied by an intention of a particular kind	48

SEXUAL ASSAULT

Sexual offences:	53
Sexual Assault:	
(i) First AR element: Sexual Intercourse	53
(ii) Second AR element: 'without consent'	54
MENS REA:	56
(i) Knowledge	
(ii) Recklessness	
(iii) No Reasonable Grounds – S61HA (3) (c)	57
AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ASSAULT	57
Circumstances of aggravation	57
Aggravated Sexual Assault in Company	58
General Rule - S61JA(1)	58
Meaning of ABH:	
Offensive weapon:	
Meaning of in company:	59
<u>DEFENCES</u>	
Provocation	60
I. Was the provocative conduct towards or affecting the accused?	61
Towards or affecting the accused	
II. Was the provocation induced by conduct of the deceased which was a serious indictable	
offence?	
III. Did the victim's conduct cause the accused to lose self-control?	
IV. Would the victim's conduct have caused an ordinary person to lose self-control to the	
extent of intending to kill/inflict GBH?	
Conduct would have caused an Ordinary Person to Lost Self-Control to the extent of intendin to kill or GBH	
Self Defence	66
Procedural Rules	
Burden and Standard of Proof	.66
General Rule	66
Exceptions to the Rule	.66
a. Limb 1: was the conduct necessary?	67
General Rule – s418 (2)	.67
Intoxication	
Nature of victim's conduct	
What constitutes 'necessary'?	68
b. Limb 2: was the response reasonable (objective), given how the circumstances were	
perceived (subjective)	
Application of 2nd limb-consider	
General Rule – s418 (2)	
(first half of second limb, subjective perceptions) What is taken into account?	
Limitations: Mistake, Delusion, and Intoxication	.69

1. Physical Element One: Appropriating Property81	Ge		
Analysis			
Defence of Insanity	Δn	eneral Rule – s421: Self-Defence – Excessive force that inflicts death70	
2i) Capacity to understand nature and quality of conduct		alysis70	
2ii) Capacity to know conduct was wrong	Defend	e of Insanity71	
General Rule –	2i)	Capacity to understand nature and quality of conduct71	
Disease of the mind			
Diminished responsibility/substantial impairment of mind			
Burden of proof	Di	sease of the mind71	
General Rule –			
Intoxication- S23 (3)			
I. Did the accused have an abnormality of mind?			
Abnormality of mind			
II. Did this abnormality substantially impair the accused's mental capacity to:		·	
III. So substantially as to warrant a reduction from murder to manslaughter?			
COMPLICITY Accessorial Liability			
Accessorial Liability		so substantially as to warrant a reduction from murder to manslaughter?	
Joint Principle Liability	COMPL	<u>.ICITY</u>	
Extended Common Purpose (based on common purpose)	Access	orial Liability	
PROPERTY OFFENCES Theft	Joint P	rinciple Liability	
Theft	Extend	ed Common Purpose (based on common purpose)79	
I. Can the accused be held criminally liable for the theft of the victim's item?		TV OFFENCES	
I. Can the accused be held criminally liable for the theft of the victim's item?		TOFFERCES	
A. Pairing One: Appropriating Property & Dishonesty/Intention to permanently deprive81 1. Physical Element One: Appropriating Property	PROPERT		. 81
Physical Element One: Appropriating Property81	PROPERT		
Physical Element One: Appropriating Property81	PROPERT	nt of theft	81
	PROPERT Theft Elemen	nt of theftan the accused be held criminally liable for the theft of the victim's item?	81 81
	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A.	nt of theftan the accused be held criminally liable for the theft of the victim's item?	81 81 81
3. Fault Element 1: Dishonesty84	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A. 1.	nt of theft an the accused be held criminally liable for the theft of the victim's item? Pairing One: Appropriating Property & Dishonesty/Intention to permanently deprive Physical Element One: Appropriating Property	81 81 81
4. Fault element 2: intention of physically depriving85	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A. 1. 2.	nt of theftan the accused be held criminally liable for the theft of the victim's item?	81 81 81 81
	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A. 1. 2. 3.	nt of theft	81 81 81 81 83
else 86	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A. 1. 2. 3. 4.	nt of theft	81 81 81 83 84
Physical Element 1: Belonging to Someone Else	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A. 1. 2. 3. 4. B.	nt of theft	81 81 81 83 84
Fault Element 1: Recklessness as to the property belonging to someone else	PROPERT Theft Elemen I. Ca A. 1. 2. 3. 4. B. else	nt of theft	81 81 81 83 84 85

Homicide

Murder

- I. Does the accused's conduct satisfy the Actus Reus elements of murder under s18(1)(a) of the *Crimes Act*?
- A. Did the end of a human life occur?

Beginning of life

Common Law Position: Homicide can only be committed on a person who is 'in being' -R vHutty

'Legally a person is not in being until he or she is fully born in a living state' – Barry J
in R v Hutty

Statute Position: Only for murder

- 'Born alive if it has breathed, and... wholly born into the world whether it has an independent circulation or not.' s20 Crimes Act 1900
- o I.e. if charged under manslaughter, use Common Law position

Unborn child is not a legal human being – Attorney General v T

End of life

A person has died where there has occurred – Human Tissue Act 1983 (NSW) S 33

- o An irreversible cessation of all function of the person's brain; or
- o Irreversible cessation of circulation of blood in the person's body

For death of foetus: (s 4 Crimes Act 1900): Grievous bodily harm includes:

- The destruction (other than in the course of a medical procedure) of the foetus of a pregnant woman, whether or not the woman suffers any other harm
- B. Did the accused commit an act/omission?

Re Omissions - No general duty to prevent a crime - R v Instan

- However Duty to act may arise as a result of a family relationship R v Russell 1933 or undertaking to care for another unable to self care - R v Instan
- Can be criminally liable for failure to take measure within one's power to counteract selfcreated danger – **R v Miller**
- Where a duty to provide for in CL or statute, omission to act can amount to criminal conduct R
 v Miller
- Once the accused becomes aware of the danger he has created, a duty arises to take reasonable steps to counteract the danger **R v Miller**
- C. Was the accused's conduct voluntary?

General Rules

- The physical element must be acted voluntarily: 'pursuant to the accused's will, exerted with conscious control over the muscular contractions' **Ryan v The Queen**
- Volition is presumed in the absence of contrary evidence (evidential burden on the defence, which then shifts to the prosecution BRD) – R v Falconer, Ryan, Bratty v AG for Northern Ireland
- Whether the act was voluntary is a matter to be left to the jury Murray v The Queen

Involuntary acts

(i) Accident - Falconer