Candidate Number:					
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--

1.	Adam McNee could be prosecuted for interfering with a motor vehicle, namely a Golf MK5, the property of Robert Montgomery, contrary to Article 33(1)(b) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
2.	Adam NcNee could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Robert Montgomery, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
3.	Adam NcNee could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Lucy Montgomery, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
4.	Adam McNee could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a Golf MK5, the property of Robert Montgomery, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
5.	Ciaran Hanratty could be prosecuted for fraud by false representation concerning the ingredients of a brownie, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
6.	Ciaran Hanratty could be prosecuted for dishonestly abusing a position in which he is expected to safeguard the financial interests of another person, namely Grace Irwin, contrary to Section 4(1) of the Fraud Act 2006.
7.	Ciaran Hanratty could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Grace Irwin, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
8.	Ciaran Hanratty could be prosecuted for assaulting Grace Irwin, thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
9.	Ciaran Hanratty could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Grace Irwin, thereby causing her grievous bodily harm, contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
10.	Ciaran Hanratty could be prosecuted for selling food supplements which are not pre-packaged, contrary to Regulation 4 of the Food Supplements Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2003.
11.	Catherine Lawrence could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug of Class C, namely Tramadol in her possession, contrary to Section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
12.	Catherine Lawrence could be prosecuted for theft of Tramadol tablets, the property of Roger Lawrence, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
13.	Catherine Lawrence could be prosecuted for burglary of Tramadol tablets, the property of Roger Lawrence, from premises belonging to Roger Lawrence, contrary to section 9 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.

Candidate Number:				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

;	14.	Denis Makepiece could be prosecuted with taking a motor vehicle for his own use, namely a Volkswagen camper van, the property of Sam Maloney, without the consent of its owner, contrary to Article 172(1) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
	15.	Denis Makepiece could be prosecuted for theft of a Volkswagen camper van, the property of Sam Maloney, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	16.	Denis Makepiece could be prosecuted for burglary of a Volkswagen camper van, the property of Sam Maloney, from premises belonging to Exhibition NI Ltd, contrary to Section 9 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	17.	Denis Makepiece could be prosecuted for robbery of a Volkswagen camper van, the property of Sam Maloney, contrary to Section 8 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	18.	Isabelle Werth could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a bouquet of flowers, the property of Mark Maginn, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
	19.	Isabelle Werth could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Mark Maginn, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
	20.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for using disorderly behaviour in a public place, contrary to Article 18(1) of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987.
	21.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a bucket, the property Bob Ewing, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
	22.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a billboard, the property of Billboards R Us Ltd, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
	23.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a ladder, the property of Bob Ewing, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
	24.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a billboard poster, the property of Exhibition NI Ltd, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
	25.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for robbery of a bucket, the property of Bob Ewing, contrary to Section 8 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	26.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for handling stolen goods, namely a bucket, the property of Bob Ewing, contrary to Section 21 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.

Candidate Number:			
Candidate Muniber.	1 1	1 1	1

27.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for causing grievous bodily harm to Bob Ewing, contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
28.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted for being drunk in a public place, contrary to Article 10(1) of the Criminal Justice (Northern Ireland) Order 1980.
29.	Malachy Wilson could be prosecuted with resisting a constable in the execution of his duty, contrary to Section 66 of the Police (Northern Ireland) Act 1998.
30.	Mark Maginn could be prosecuted for smoking in a smoke free place, contrary to Article 8 of the Smoking (Northern Ireland) Order 2006.
31.	Mark Maginn could be prosecuted for making a false or misleading statement, contrary to Article 12(3) of the Smoking (Northern Ireland) Order 2006.
32.	Mark Maginn could be prosecuted for contravening an indication given by a traffic sign without lawful excuse, contrary to Article 50 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
33.	Mark Maginn could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a Golf MK5, the property of Robert Montgomery, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
34.	Mark Maginn could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Isabelle Werth, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
35.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for burglary of a bouquet of flowers the property of Francie Pinkerton, from premises belonging to Francie Pinkerton, contrary to Section 9 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
36.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for making off without payment for goods, namely a bouquet of flowers, the property of Francie Pinkerton, contrary to Article 5 of the Theft (Northern Ireland) Order 1978.
37.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for burglary of a bouquet of roses, the property of Francie Pinkerton, from premises belonging to Francie Pinkerton, contrary to Section 9 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
38.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for fraud by false representation in respect of a bouquet of roses, the property of Francie Pinkerton, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
39.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for dishonestly abusing a position in which he is expected to safeguard the financial interests of another person, namely Francie Pinkerton, contrary to Section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006.

Candidate Number:		

×	40.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for failing to prevent smoking in smoke free premises, contrary to Article 9 of the Smoking (Northern Ireland) Order 2006.
□	41.	Paul McDonald could be prosecuted for making a false or misleading statement, contrary to Article 12(3) of the Smoking (Northern Ireland) Order 2006.
	42.	Peter Nugent 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.
	43.	Peter Nugent 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.
	44.	Peter Nugent could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road when unfit to drive through drink or drugs, contrary to Article 15 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
	45.	Peter Nugent could be prosecuted for theft of a cycle belonging to Robin Berry, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	46.	Peter Nugent could be prosecuted for taking a cycle for his own use, namely a cycle, the property of Robin Berry, without the consent of the owner, contrary to Article 172(1) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
	47.	Peter Nugent could be prosecuted for riding a cycle when unfit to ride through drink or drugs, contrary to Article 44 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
	48.	Peter Nugent could be prosecuted for failing to stop riding a cycle on a road when requested to do so by a constable, contrary to Article 180 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
	49.	Peter Nugent could be prosecuted for failing to ride a vehicle on the left or near side of the carriageway whilst riding that vehicle on a road, contrary to Article 3 of the Road Traffic Regulation (Northern Ireland) Order 1997.
	50.	Rachel Briggs could be prosecuted for theft of a bucket, the property of Bob Ewing, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	51.	Rachel Briggs could be prosecuted for handling stolen goods, namely a bucket, the property of Bob Ewing, contrary to Section 21 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
	52.	Rachel Briggs could be prosecuted for using behaviour in a public place whereby a breach of the peace is likely to be occasioned, contrary to Article 18(1) of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987.
	53.	Rachel Briggs could be prosecuted for being drunk in a public place, contrary to Article 10(1) of the Criminal Justice (Northern Ireland) Order 1980.

Candidate Number:			

	Section B
54.	Rachel Briggs could be prosecuted for resisting a constable in the execution of his duty, contrary to Section 66 of the Police (Northern Ireland) Act 1998.
55.	Robert Montgomery could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on the road on 13th February 2020, without due care and attention, contrary to Article 12 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
56.	Robert Montgomery could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle dangerously on a road on 13th February 2020, contrary to Article 10 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
57.	Robert Montgomery could be prosecuted for failing to stop a mechanically propelled vehicle of which he was the driver following an accident on 13th February 2020 which occurred owing to the presence on the road of the said vehicle whereby injury was caused to a person other than himself, contrary to Article 175(1)(i) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
58.	Robert Montgomery could be prosecuted for failing to keep a mechanically propelled vehicle of which he was the driver on 13th February 2020 stationary at or near the place of an accident which occurred owing to the presence on the road of the said vehicle whereby injury was caused to a person other than himself, contrary to Article 175(1)(ii) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
59.	Robert Montgomery could be prosecuted for failing to report an accident which occurred on 13th February 2020 owing to the presence on the road of a mechanically propelled vehicle of which he was the driver whereby injury was caused to a person other than himself, contrary to Article 175(1)(iv) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
60.	Roger Lawrence could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug in his possession, with intent to supply to another, contrary to Section 5(3) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
61.	Sam Maloney 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.
62.	Sam Maloney could be prosecuted for knowingly permitting the production of a controlled drug on premises, in the management of which he is concerned, contrary to Section 8 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
63.	Sarah Lawrence could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug in her possession, contrary to Section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
64.	Sarah Lawrence could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug in her possession, with intent to supply to another, contrary to Section 5(3) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
65.	Sinead Higgins could be prosecuted for robbery of a sledgehammer, the property of Owen Phillips, contrary to Section 8 of the Theft Act 1969.

	Candidate Number:
, * ,	Institute of Professional Legal Studies Admissions Test December 2021 Section B
☐ 66.	Sinead Higgins could be prosecuted for burglary of a sledgehammer, the property of Owen Phillips, from a site hut belonging to Owen Phillips, contrary to Section 9 of the Theft Act 1969.
67.	Sinead Higgins could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a sledgehammer the property of Owen Phillips, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
□ 68.	Sinead Higgins could be prosecuted with aggravated trespass, contrary to Section 68(1) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.