

**B.A. LL.B., (Hons.) DEGREE SECOND (Supplementary) SEMESTER  
EXAMINATIONS, August 2019**

**LAW OF CRIMES - I**

**Time: 3 Hours**

**Maximum Marks: 50**

**PART - A**

(Answer **ANY SIX** questions. All questions carry **EQUAL** marks)

**(6 x 5 = 30)**

- I. How does the system balance the inherent inequality among adversaries in the prosecution of a conventional crime?
- II. How far is the component of an act relevant in defining a crime? What do you understand by causation?
- III. How does the Penal Code deal with negligence? Why are they not taken seriously compared to other mental conditions?
- IV. Would it be appropriate to say that it is the mental element that determines the gravity of the offence? Why?
- V. Who is an abettor? What is the extent of his responsibility?
- VI. Law despises intoxication. Discuss it in the context of intoxication as an exception.
- VII. Mistake of law is never an excuse but mistake of fact may be treated so? Elucidate.
- VIII. Why does the law recognize the exception of private defence as a right? Discuss the same in the light of the scope of the defence.

**PART - B**

(Answer **ANY TWO** questions. All questions carry **EQUAL** marks)

**(2 x 10 = 20)**

- IX. D, who is a major, is an expert driver of a car but does not have a licence. While driving his car one day he causes the death of a pedestrian with no intention or knowledge and was not negligent. D claims the exception of accident. Decide.
- X. M, a child, picks up a gun and tries to shoot B, an adult. B immediately picks a stone, throws it hard and kills M. On being prosecuted for the death of the child, B claims private defence. Discuss the extent of B's criminal responsibility.
- XI. F provokes Q and R to commit robbery and provides them with arms for that purpose. Q and R break into the house, and being resisted by W, one of the inmates, murder W. Discuss the criminal responsibility of F, Q and R. Would it have made any difference if F had joined them for the robbery?