

**Institute of Professional Legal Studies**  
**Admissions Test December 2022**  
**Section B**

- 1. Alana Cumming could be prosecuted for knowingly permitting Joseph McIntosh to supply a controlled drug to Peter Carlton, contrary to Section 8 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
- 2. Alana Cumming could be prosecuted for knowingly permitting Joseph McIntosh to attempt to supply a controlled drug to Richard Howard, contrary to Section 8 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
- 3. Alfred Donnell could be prosecuted for permitting intoxicating liquor to be carried on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(2) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
- 4. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for possessing intoxicating liquor on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(4) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
- 5. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for permitting intoxicating liquor to be carried on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(2) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
- 6. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for dishonestly making a false representation, intending, by making the representation to make a gain for himself, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
- 7. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for fraudulently using a registration mark on a vehicle, contrary to Section 44 of the Vehicle Excise and Registration Act 1994.
- 8. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for driving a motor vehicle on a public road in respect of which no test certificate has been issued contrary to Article 63 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
- 9. Ciaran O'Neill 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, as, per Article 11(2) of the said Order, it would have been obvious to a competent and careful driver that driving the vehicle in its current state would be dangerous.
- 10. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for driving on a road a motor vehicle of a class otherwise than in accordance with a licence authorising him to drive a motor vehicle of that class, contrary to Article 3 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1981.
- 11. Ciaran O'Neill could be prosecuted for using an unlicensed vehicle on a public road, contrary to Section 29 of the Vehicle Excise and Registration Act 1994.
- 12. David Shelbourne could be prosecuted for permitting disorderly conduct, namely that of Wilson Pettigrew, to take place in licenced premises of which he is the licence holder, contrary to Article 61(1)(a) of the Licensing (Northern Ireland) Order 1996.
- 13. David Shelbourne could be prosecuted for selling intoxicating liquor to a drunken person, namely Wilson Pettigrew, knowing him to be such, contrary to Article 61(1)(b) of the Licensing (Northern Ireland) Order 1996.

**Institute of Professional Legal Studies**  
**Admissions Test December 2022**  
**Section B**

14. Eamon Cassidy could be prosecuted for assaulting Ruth Thompson, thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
15. Eamon Cassidy could be prosecuted for assaulting Ruth Thompson, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
16. Elizabeth Robinson could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Jordan Richards, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
17. Gerard Morrison could be prosecuted for permitting intoxicating liquor to be carried on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(2) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
18. Jan Harmer could be prosecuted for accepting a bribe, contrary to Section 2 of the Bribery Act 2010.
19. Jan Harmer could be prosecuted for dishonestly making a false representation, intending, by making the representation to make a gain for himself, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
20. Jan Harmer could be prosecuted for theft of money, the property of Jac Robertson, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
21. Jason Dunn could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a speaker, the property of Leisure Events Organiser Limited, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
22. Jason Dunn could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a camera, the property of Karen Fearon, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.
23. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for possessing intoxicating liquor on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(4) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
24. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for permitting intoxicating liquor to be carried on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(2) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
25. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for possession of an article whose main purpose is the emission of a flare during the period of a regulated match, contrary to Section 39 of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
26. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for being drunk in a public place, contrary to Article 10 of the Criminal Justice (Northern Ireland) Order 1980.
27. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for assaulting Lisa Walkingshaw, thereby causing her grievous bodily harm, contrary to Section 20 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.

**Institute of Professional Legal Studies**  
**Admissions Test December 2022**  
**Section B**

28. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for assaulting Lisa Walkington, thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
29. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for assaulting a constable, namely Alice McNutt, in the exercise of her duty, contrary to Section 66 of the Police (Northern Ireland) Act 1998.
30. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Alice McNutt, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
31. Jordan Richards could be prosecuted for assaulting Alice McNutt, thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
32. Joseph McIntosh could be prosecuted for supplying a controlled drug to another, namely Peter Carlton, contrary to Section 4 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
33. Joseph McIntosh could be prosecuted for producing a controlled drug of Class C namely Testosterone, contrary to Section 4 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
34. Joseph McIntosh could be prosecuted for offering to supply a controlled drug of Class C namely Testosterone to another, namely Richard Howard, contrary to Section 4 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
35. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for permitting intoxicating liquor to be carried on a motor vehicle to which Section 40(1) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 applies, contrary to Section 40(2) of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
36. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for throwing an article capable of causing injury to a person struck by it, at or towards an area in which spectators were present, during the period of a regulated match, contrary to Section 36 of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
37. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for being drunk in a public place, contrary to Article 10 of the Criminal Justice (Northern Ireland) Order 1980.
38. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for going on to the playing area at a regulated match, contrary to Section 38 of the Justice Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.
39. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for theft of a whiskey bottle, the property of Robert Quinn, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
40. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for robbery of a whiskey bottle, the property of Robert Quinn, contrary to Section 8 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
41. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for unlawfully damaging property, namely a whiskey bottle, the property of Robert Quinn, contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal Damage (Northern Ireland) Order 1977.

**Institute of Professional Legal Studies  
Admissions Test December 2022  
Section B**

42. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for using threatening, abusive or insulting words against Sue Betts, intending thereby to stir up hatred or arouse fear, contrary to Article 9 of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987.
43. Lee Brown could be prosecuted for assaulting Sue Betts thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
44. Lillian Daly 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.
45. Lillian Daly 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.
46. Lillian Daly could be prosecuted for theft of money, the property of Wilson Pettigrew, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
47. Mark Edmington 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.
48. Mark Edmington 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.
49. Peter Carlton could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug in his possession, contrary to Section 5 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
50. Peter Carlton could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug in his possession with intent to supply it to another, contrary to Section 5 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
51. Reece Malone could be prosecuted for unlawfully making a threat to kill Wilson Pettigrew, contrary to Section 16 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
52. Reece Malone could be prosecuted for using threatening, abusive or insulting words against Wilson Pettigrew, intending thereby to stir up hatred or arouse fear, contrary to Article 9 of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987.
53. Reece Malone could be prosecuted for sending articles conveying threats to Wilson Pettigrew with the intention of causing him distress or anxiety, contrary to Article 3 of the Malicious Communications (Northern Ireland) Order 1988.
54. Richard Howard could be prosecuted for having a controlled drug in his possession, contrary to Section 5 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
55. Sara Smith could be prosecuted for unlawfully assaulting Olivia Patterson, contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.

**Institute of Professional Legal Studies**  
**Admissions Test December 2022**  
**Section B**

56. Sara Smith could be prosecuted for assaulting Olivia Patterson, thereby occasioning her actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
57. Sara Smith could be prosecuted for assaulting Olivia Patterson, thereby causing her grievous bodily harm, contrary to Section 20 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
58. Sara Smith could be prosecuted for theft of money, the property of Joshua Daly, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
59. Sara Smith could be prosecuted for theft of money, the property of Lillian Daly, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
60. Sara Smith could be prosecuted for dishonestly abusing a position in which she was expected to safeguard the financial interests of another person, namely Lillian Daly, contrary to Section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006.
61. Turlough Rafferty could be prosecuted for failing to wear an adult belt while riding in a rear seat of a motor vehicle, contrary to Article 23(3) of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995 and Regulation 5(1)(c) of the Motor Vehicles (Wearing Seatbelts) Regulations 1993.
62. Turlough Rafferty could be prosecuted for driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road without reasonable consideration for other persons using the road, contrary to Article 12 of the Road Traffic (Northern Ireland) Order 1995.
63. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for bribery, contrary to Section 1 of the Bribery Act 2010.
64. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for disorderly behaviour, contrary to Article 18 of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987.
65. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for being found drunk in licensed premises, contrary to Article 61 of The Licensing Order (Northern Ireland) 1996.
66. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for winning property from another person, namely Jac Robertson, by means of a cheat in wagering on an event, namely the draw for the group stage of the Games, contrary to Article 169 of the Betting, Gaming, Lotteries and Amusements (Northern Ireland) Order 1985.
67. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for dishonestly making a false representation, intending, by making the representation to make a gain for himself, contrary to Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006.
68. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for theft of money, the property of Jac Robertson, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
69. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for unlawfully and maliciously administering poison to another person, namely Reece Malone, thereby causing him to suffer grievous bodily harm contrary to Section 23 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.
70. Wilson Pettigrew could be prosecuted for assaulting Reece Malone, thereby causing him actual bodily harm, contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.