

Institute of Professional Legal Studies
Admissions Test December 2023
Section B

- 1. Arlene Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a gypsy style caravan, the property of Margaret McShane, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
- 2. Arlene Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property by fire, namely a gypsy style caravan, the property of Margaret McShane, contrary to Article 3(1) and (3) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
- 3. Arlene Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Margaret McShane, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
- 4. Arlene Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to destroy property, namely a gypsy style caravan, the property of Margaret McShane, contrary to Article 4 of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
- 5. Armando Capaldi could be prosecuted for failing to provide Ian Corrie with adequate and suitable protective clothing for work with asbestos, contrary to Article 31 of the Health and Safety at Work (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 and Regulation 14 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.
- 6. Armando Capaldi could be prosecuted for his employee unlawfully damaging property, namely a fence, the property of John Westlake, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
- 7. Armando Capaldi could be prosecuted for knowingly causing controlled waste to be deposited on land without there being in force a waste management licence authorising said deposit, contrary to Article 4(1)(a) and Article 4(6) of the Waste and Contaminated Land (NI) Order 1997.
- 8. Farooq Amin could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle dangerously on a road, contrary to Article 10 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
- 9. Farooq Amin could be prosecuted for using a mobile phone while driving, contrary to Article 56A(b) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
- 10. Ian Corrie could be prosecuted for knowingly depositing controlled waste on land without there being in force a waste management licence authorising said deposit, contrary to Article 4(1)(a) and Article 4(6) of the Waste and Contaminated Land (NI) Order 1997.
- 11. Ian Corrie could be prosecuted for storing waste that contains asbestos otherwise than in a sealed and clearly marked receptacle or sealed and clearly marked wrapping, contrary to Article 31 of the Health and Safety at Work (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 and Regulation 24 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.

Institute of Professional Legal Studies
Admissions Test December 2023
Section B

12. John Westlake could be prosecuted for assaulting a constable, namely Constable Trevor Hughes, in the execution of his duty, contrary to Section 66 (1) of the Police (Northern Ireland) Act 1998.
13. John Westlake could be prosecuted for assaulting Luke Cockcroft, thereby occasioning him actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
14. John Westlake could be prosecuted for assaulting Constable Trevor Hughes, thereby occasioning him actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
15. John Westlake could be prosecuted for causing grievous bodily harm to Constable Trevor Hughes, with intent to cause him grievous bodily harm contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
16. John Westlake could be prosecuted for causing grievous bodily harm to Luke Cockcroft, with intent to cause him grievous bodily harm contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
17. John Westlake could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Luke Cockcroft, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
18. John Westlake could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Constable Trevor Hughes, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
19. John Westlake could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Liam Perry, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
20. Liam Perry could be prosecuted for assaulting John Westlake, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
21. Liam Perry could be prosecuted for assaulting John Westlake, thereby occasioning him actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
22. Liam Perry could be prosecuted for behaviour whereby a breach of the peace is likely to be occasioned, contrary to Article 18(1)(b) of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987.
23. Liam Perry could be prosecuted for intentionally or recklessly destroying wild plants included in Part 1 of Schedule 8 to the Wildlife (Northern Ireland) Order 1985, contrary to Article 14(1)(a) of that Order.
24. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for discharging polluting matter so that it entered a waterway, contrary to Article 7(1)(a) of The Water (Northern Ireland) Order 1999.

Institute of Professional Legal Studies
Admissions Test December 2023
Section B

25. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for dishonestly abusing a position in which he was expected to safeguard the financial interests of another person, namely Armando Capaldi, in relation to claims made to Armando Capaldi about the need for a liquid fertiliser tank, contrary to Section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006.
26. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for dishonestly making a false representation, intending by making that representation to make a gain for himself in relation to claims made to Armando Capaldi about the need for a liquid fertiliser tank, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
27. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for assaulting John Westlake, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
28. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for assaulting John Westlake, thereby occasioning him actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
29. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for intentionally uprooting wild plants included in Part 1 of Schedule 8 to the Wildlife (Northern Ireland) Order 1985, contrary to Article 14(1)(a) of that Order.
30. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for causing grievous bodily harm to John Westlake, with intent to cause him grievous bodily harm contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
31. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for obtaining services dishonestly in relation to claims made to Armando Capaldi about the need for a liquid fertiliser tank, contrary to Section 11 of the Fraud Act 2006.
32. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a fertiliser tank, the property of Armando Capaldi, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
33. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a fence, the property of John Westlake, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
34. Luke Cockcroft could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a quad bike, the property of Armando Capaldi, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
35. Margaret McShane could be prosecuted for assaulting Arlene Wilson, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
36. Margaret McShane could be prosecuted for assaulting Arlene Wilson, thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.

Institute of Professional Legal Studies
Admissions Test December 2023
Section B

37. Margaret McShane could be prosecuted for being in charge of a dog that attacked a person, contrary to Article 29(2)(b) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
38. Margaret McShane could be prosecuted for being the keeper of a dog that attacked a person, contrary to Article 29(2)(a) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
39. Margaret McShane could be prosecuted for causing a Japanese Tosa dog of which she was the keeper to be in a public place without a lead or muzzle, contrary to Article 25A(2)(d) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
40. Margaret McShane could be prosecuted for causing grievous bodily harm to Arlene Wilson, with intent to cause her grievous bodily harm contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
41. Mary Horgan could be prosecuted for dishonestly abusing a position in which she was expected to safeguard the financial interests of another person, namely Armando Capaldi, in relation to claims made to Armando Capaldi about the need for a liquid fertiliser tank, contrary to Section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006.
42. Mary Horgan could be prosecuted for dishonestly abusing a position in which she was expected to safeguard the financial interests of another person, namely Armando Capaldi, in relation to claims made about the condition of a liquid fertiliser tank which she sold to Armando Capaldi, contrary to Section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006.
43. Mary Horgan could be prosecuted for dishonestly making a false representation, intending by making the representation to make a gain for herself in relation to claims made to Armando Capaldi about the need for a liquid fertiliser tank, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
44. Mary Horgan could be prosecuted for dishonestly making a false representation, intending by making the representation to make a gain for herself in relation to claims made about the condition of a liquid fertiliser tank which she sold to Armando Capaldi, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
45. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for assaulting Farooq Amin, thereby occasioning him actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
46. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for causing grievous bodily harm to Farooq Amin, with intent to cause him grievous bodily harm contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
47. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for burglary of a dashboard camera, the property of Farooq Amin, from a Volkswagen Golf belonging to Farooq Amin, contrary to Section 9 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.

Institute of Professional Legal Studies
Admissions Test December 2023
Section B

48. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road without due care and attention, contrary to Article 12 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
49. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle dangerously on a road, contrary to Article 10 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
50. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for failing to keep a mechanically propelled vehicle of which he was the driver stationary at or near the place of an accident which occurred on 14th January 2022 contrary to Article 175(1)(ii) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
51. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for failing to report an accident which occurred on 14th January 2022 contrary to Article 175(1)(iv) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
52. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for failing to stop a mechanically propelled vehicle of which he was the driver after an accident which occurred on 14th January 2022 owing to the presence on the road of the said vehicle whereby injury was caused to a person other than him and damage was caused to property other than that vehicle or property belonging to him, contrary to Article 175(1)(i) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
53. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for robbery of a dashboard camera, the property of Farooq Amin, contrary to Section 8 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
54. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for theft of a dashboard camera, the property of Farooq Amin, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
55. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Farooq Amin, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
56. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a Volkswagen Golf, the property of Farooq Amin, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
57. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a dashboard camera, the property of Farooq Amin, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
58. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Farooq Amin, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
59. Patrick Robbins could be prosecuted for using a mobile phone while driving, contrary to Article 56A of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.

Institute of Professional Legal Studies
Admissions Test December 2023
Section B

60. Richard Sykes could be prosecuted for discharging polluting mater so that it entered a waterway, contrary to Article 7(1)(a) of the Water (Northern Ireland) Order 1999.
61. Richard Sykes could be prosecuted for failing to provide Ian Corrie with adequate and suitable protective clothing for work with asbestos, contrary to Article 31 of the Health and Safety at Work (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 and Regulation 14 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.
62. Richard Sykes could be prosecuted for knowingly causing controlled waste to be deposited on land without there being in force a waste management licence authorising said deposit, contrary to Article 4(1)(a) and Article 4(6) of the Waste and Contaminated Land (NI) Order 1997.
63. Richard Sykes could be prosecuted for storing waste that contains asbestos otherwise than in a sealed and clearly marked receptacle or sealed and clearly marked wrapping, contrary to Article 31 of the Health and Safety at Work (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 and Regulation 24 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.
64. Thomas Hardy could be prosecuted for failing to provide Ian Corrie with adequate and suitable protective clothing for work with asbestos, contrary to Article 31 of the Health and Safety at Work (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 and Regulation 14 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.
65. Thomas Hardy could be prosecuted for storing waste that contains asbestos otherwise than in a sealed and clearly marked receptacle or sealed and clearly marked wrapping, contrary to Article 31 of the Health and Safety at Work (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 and Regulation 24 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.
66. Tidy Tarmac Ltd could be prosecuted for permitting its employee, Tim Armstrong to cause a Japanese Tosa dog of which he was for the time being in charge to be in a public place without a lead or muzzle, contrary to Article 25A(2)(d) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
67. Tidy Tarmac Ltd could be prosecuted for permitting its employee, Tim Armstrong to be in charge of a dog that attacked a person, contrary to Article 29(2)(b) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
68. Tim Armstrong could be prosecuted for being in charge of a dog that attacked a person, contrary to Article 29(2)(b) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
69. Tim Armstrong could be prosecuted for being the keeper of a dog that attacked a person, contrary to Article 29(2)(a) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.
70. Tim Armstrong could be prosecuted for causing a Japanese Tosa dog of which he was for the time being in charge to be in a public place without a lead or muzzle, contrary to Article 25A(2)(d) of The Dogs (Northern Ireland) Order 1983.