GradeMax



Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level

In Law (YLA1)
Paper 02 The Law in Action

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

October 2019
Publications Code YLA1_02_MS_1910
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
1(a)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (2 AO3)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Definition of aims of sentencing under S142 Criminal Justice Act 2003, e.g. what the judge hopes to achieve by passing a sentence. • Identification of the aims of sentencing such as reform of the offender, punishment, or reduction of crime. • Identification of the range of sentences under S177 Criminal Justice Act 2003 and The Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000 such as custodial, suspended sentence, community sentence, fines, discharges. Applying aims of and sentences to **Jose**: • Punishment – Jose has committed a serious offence for which society should seek revenge. • Custodial sentence with maximum of life in prison as Jose made an unprovoked attack on a vulnerable person. Applying aims of and sentences to **Rosa**: • Reform of offender/rehabilitation – As this is Rosa's first offence and it is a minor one the courts may seek to change her behaviour to ensure no further offences are committed. • A maximum custodial sentence of 6 months can be given but suspended for up to two years. • As Rosa's first offence likely to be a conditional discharge of up to 12 months as first offence, i.e. as long as no further offences committed then the court will give no further punishment. • Alternatively, the court may decide to give a community sentence such as unpaid work from 40 to 300 hrs. NB: accept any aims and range of sentences that are appropriately analysed and evaluated in the context of the situation. Allow credit for students who discuss appropriate sentences for non-fatal offences relevant to the question.	**(6)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	**1–2**	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent.
Level 2	**3–4**	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately.
Level 3	**5–6**	Accurate knowledge and understanding is demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented in a consistent and balanced manner and supported by appropriate legal authorities.

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
1(b)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (4 AO3), (6 AO4)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Identification of the property offence of **basic criminal damage** S1(1) Criminal Damage Act 1971, destroy or damage, property, belonging to another, without lawful excuse, intention or subjectively reckless • Analysis and evaluation of criminal damage: • Property S10(1) – loosening the bolts • Belonging to another – Can damage own property, i.e. Ketva's hiring of scaffolding to Andil • Damage or destroy – Hardman v Chief Constable, Roe v Kingerlee, Roper v Knot • Intention or subjective recklessness – R v G and R • Identification of property offence of S1(2) **Aggravated criminal damage**, reckless as to endangering life, intention or recklessness as to endangering life • Analysis and evaluation of aggravated criminal damage: • Criminal damage must risk endangering life – R v Steer vs R v Warwick • Subjective recklessness as to criminal damage that risks endangering life – R v G &R – discussion of the effects on the foreseeability of the risk • Identification of **intoxication** is a defence established by common law principles based on the inability to form the MR of the criminal offence, voluntary intoxication, basic intent crime. • Analysis and evaluation of intoxication as defence: • Kveta is voluntary intoxicated through being aware of drinking a significant amount of vodka. • Criminal damage/aggravated criminal damage is a basic intent crime as proving Kveta was voluntarily drinking alcohol before the crime took place is seen as evidence of a reckless course of action proving the MR of both offences. • Concluding that Kveta is unlikely to be able to use the defence. • Credit any application of S5 of the Criminal Damage Act and intoxicated mistakes concluding this is not available as a defence for Kveta. • Reference to cases such as Majewski v DPP, Jaggard v Dickinson.	**(14)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	1–3	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent. There may be an incomplete attempt to raise possible outcomes and conclusions based on interpretations of the law.
Level 2	4–6	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied appropriately to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately. There is an attempt to raise possible outcomes and conclusions based on interpretations of the law.
Level 3	7–10	Accurate knowledge and understanding is demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding is supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented, but connections and/or unbalanced support of legal authorities may be inconsistent or unbalanced. Evaluation attempts to contrast the validity and significance of competing arguments, which may include unbalanced comparisons, possible outcomes and conclusions based on valid interpretations of the law.
Level 4	11–14	Accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported throughout by relevant legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Well-developed and logical chains of reasoning, showing a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in different legal authorities. Evaluation shows a full awareness of the validity and significance of competing arguments, leading to balanced comparisons, possible outcomes and effective conclusions based on justified interpretations of the law.

Question number	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**(1 AO1), (1 AO2)** **One mark for stating an example of a public body (1 AO1), and one mark for a brief explanation / enhancement (1 AO2).** • The Freedom of Information Act (FOI) applies to bodies, persons or office holders and publicly owned companies (1 AO1), for example an NHS Hospital/Education provider or Police Force (1 AO2) • The FOI lists some public authorities by name (1 AO1), such as the Health and Safety Executive or the National Gallery (1 AO2) • Others are listed by type (1 AO1) for example, government departments, parish councils or maintained schools (1 AO2) • Accept any other appropriate examples such as the Armed Forces • Accept relevant examples of what could be classed as public information or exempt information e.g. statistics, financial information, performance data, trade secrets, commercial information • NB: Executive agencies are classed as part of their parent government department, for example the DVLA is covered by the FOI as it is part of the Department for Transport. • NB: Do **not** allow requests for personal data/credit scores as this is not covered by the Freedom of Information Act.	**(2)**

Question number	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2)** **One mark for each description of the appeals process, up to two marks (2 AO1), and one mark for each appropriate expansion / example, up to two marks (2 AO2).** • Fill application form (1 AO1), then assigned to an admissibility hearing/judge checks form to ensure meets all the admissibility criteria (1 AO2) • Goes to a chamber hearing (1 AO1), 7 judges of the Court will consider the merits of the case (1 AO2) • Reference to the Grand Chamber (1 AO1), where the case brings up issues of legal significance and importance (1 AO2) • A decision is made in the Court (1 AO1), the Committee of Ministers will ensure the judgment is implemented/enforced (1 AO2)	**(4)**

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
2(c)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (4 AO3), (6 AO4)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Definition of Article 10 HRA, e.g. Right to freedom of expression with responsibilities and duties, protection of the reputation and rights of others. • Identification of the tort of defamation of character and the difference between libel (written) and slander (spoken) under the Defamation Act 2013 S1 statements published that are likely to cause or have caused serious harm to the reputation of the claimant, meaning of serious harm in S2 and S3, truth and honest defences in S4. Applying **Article 10** and rights/duties of freedom expression: • Costa has a right to freely express himself. • Costa's right is a qualified one – in this case as he has admitted he had no proof of Amelia's wrong doing he had no right to publicly accuse her of a criminal act. • Amelia has a right to have her privacy and reputation protected unless Costa can show he acted in good faith and has evidence to show Amelia's wrong doing. • Conclude that Costa had no right under Article 10 in this case and Amelia's right to privacy had been violated. Applying **Defamation Act 2013**: • Evaluation of Amelia's ability to satisfy the components of defamation using the Defamation Act S1, S2 and S3 and likelihood that Costa's statements have caused serious harm to her reputation. • Costa's possible defences of honest opinion (S3) and on a matter of public interest (S4). • Remedies, damages against Costa for serious harm to Amelia's reputation, i.e. £50,000 plus possible retraction, injunction is a court order that instructs a person that they are not allowed to commit a certain act. • Use of appropriate cases such as Monteiro da Costa Noqueira v Portugal, Cooke v MGN Ltd, Ames v Spamhaus Ltd, Thornton v Telegraph Media, Joseph v Spiller, Reynolds v Times Newspapers, Flood v Times Newspapers.	(14)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	1–3	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent. There may be an incomplete attempt to raise possible outcomes and conclusions based on interpretations of the law.
Level 2	4–6	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied appropriately to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately. There is an attempt to raise possible outcomes and conclusions based on interpretations of the law.
Level 3	7–10	Accurate knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented, but connections and/or unbalanced support of legal authorities may be inconsistent or unbalanced. Evaluation attempts to contrast the validity and significance of competing arguments, which may include unbalanced comparisons, possible outcomes and conclusions based on valid interpretations of the law.
Level 4	11–14	Accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported throughout by relevant legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Well-developed and logical chains of reasoning, showing a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in different legal authorities. Evaluation shows a full awareness of the validity and significance of competing arguments, leading to balanced comparisons, possible outcomes and effective conclusions based on justified interpretations of the law.

Question number	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2)** **Up to two marks for giving two ways a person may commit a trespass to land (2 AO1), and one mark for each appropriate expansion / example, up to two marks (2 AO2).** • Walking onto land without permission (1 AO1), such as ignoring clear warning signs telling unauthorised persons to keep out. (1 AO2) e.g. Basely v Clarkson. • Continuing trespass of land (1 AO1), where a person fails to remove an object unlawfully placed on the land (1 AO2), e.g. Holmes v Wilson & Others. • Other suitable explanations.	**(4)**

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
3(b)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (2 AO3)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Identification of relevant issues under the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957 such as the duty S2(1), duty of care S2(2), warnings S2(4)(a) discharging the duty, independent contractor S24(b). • Analysis of Sergio's duty under the Occupiers' Liability Act 1957, i.e. Sergio owes a duty of care to Kamila as a lawful visitor. The duty is for Sergio to take such care in all the circumstances to see that Kamila will be reasonably safe in the gym. • Sergio appears to have discharged his duty to Kamila as she was injured by faulty workmanship of the contractors installing and checking the exercise bike. • Reference to cases such as Paris v Stepney Borough Council, Woollins v British Celanese, Haseldine v Daw, Woodward v Mayor of Hastings etc.	**(6)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	**1–2**	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent.
Level 2	**3–4**	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately.
Level 3	**5–6**	Accurate knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented in a consistent and balanced manner, and supported by appropriate legal authorities.

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
3(c)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (3 AO3), (3 AO4)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Discussion of the reasonable man test e.g. Blyth v Birmingham Waterworks • Discussion of the risk factors affecting the reasonable man e.g. Paris v Stepney, Bolton v Stone, Nettleship v Weston, Marshall v Osmond • Analysis of possible risk factors affecting the standard of care expected of a reasonable man cutting the branch of a tree near the adjoining property • Evaluation that includes how risk factors may lower or higher the standard expected of a reasonable man, i.e. Akello not a professional, no known higher or lower risks for Joyce, the magnitude of the risk, the potential for serious harm, public utility • Discussion of res ipsa loquitur, an obvious case of negligence, and its effect on the burden of proof, i.e. if applicable it reverses the burden of proof • Discussion of res ipsa such as Joyce cannot say how her ear injury happened but it is clear Akello was in control of the situation causing the injuries and it is more likely than not to have been caused by his negligent use of the power tool, e.g. Scott v London & St Katherine Dock Co, Mahon v Osborne, Pearson v NW Gas Board, Byrne v Boadle • Evaluation that the res ipsa tests likely to be satisfied and burden of proof moves from Joyce to Akello with Akello having to show he has not been negligent • Discussion of remedies available to Joyce because of a breach of Akello's duty of care, i.e. general and special damages • Analysis of heads of damages, e.g. damage to property and expenses incurred, loss of future earnings, pain and suffering • Evaluation of damages applied to Joyce, e.g. special damages, expenses and quantifiable loss incurred up to claim, mitigation, loss of future earnings and loss of amenity.	**(10)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	**1–2**	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent. There may be an incomplete attempt to address competing arguments based on interpretations of the law.
Level 2	**3–4**	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied appropriately to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately. There is an attempt to gauge the validity of competing arguments based on interpretations of the law.
Level 3	**5–6**	Accurate knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented, but connections and support of legal authorities may be inconsistent or unbalanced. The response attempts to contrast the validity and significance of competing arguments, which may include comparisons, based on valid interpretations of the law.
Level 4	**7–10**	Accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported throughout by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Well-developed and logical chains of reasoning, showing a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in different legal authorities. The response shows an awareness of the validity and significance of competing arguments, leading to balanced comparisons based on justified interpretations of the law.

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
4(a)	**(4 AO2)** **One mark for each point identifying the potential implied terms in the scenario, up to four marks.** • John must act with the reasonable care and skill in laying Edith's new lawn (1). • As John's catalogue describes the turf as "the best quality" it must match this description, which it clearly doesn't as it has not been watered for 2 weeks (1). • There is an implied term that John must complete the laying of the lawn within a reasonable amount of time (1). • A reasonable amount of time is established by looking at the facts surrounding the contract between John and Edith, e.g. a gap of six months between removing the old grass and laying the new lawn is likely to be considered unreasonable (1). • Accept references to The Consumer Rights Act 2015/The supply of Goods and Services Act 1982.	**(4)**

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
4(b)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (2 AO3)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Identification of Consumer Protection Act 1987, damage, defective product, producer, development risks defence, damages • Strict liability means claimant does not have to prove fault, producer is the person who manufactured the product Topshine plc (S1(2)), product is any good, i.e. the paint • Defect (S3) if the safety of the product is not such as persons are entitled to expect taking into account proper use and reasonable expectations and reasonable care for own safety, e.g. toxic fumes when Logan using paint • Damage (S5) to Logan through property the ruined carpet but not property worth less than £275 and the paint itself • Development risks as a defence (S(4(1)(e) i.e. scientific knowledge of dangerous substance in paint was not advanced enough to spot defect then complete defence • Damages i.e. special and general damage • Alternatively, identification of tort of negligence, duty,	**(6)**

	breach, damage and remoteness, damages • Use of relevant cases such as Abouzaid v Mothercare, Bogle McDonalds, Richardson v LRC Products, European Commission v UK.	

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	**1–2**	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent.
Level 2	**3–4**	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately.
Level 3	**5–6**	Accurate knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented in a consistent and balanced manner, and supported by appropriate legal authorities.

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
4(c)	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (3 AO3), (3 AO4)** **Responses are likely to include:** • Identification of the AR and MR of **Theft** under S1 Theft 1968, appropriation, property, belonging to another, dishonest, intention to permanently deprive. • Analysis of the liability: • Appropriation (S3) – appropriation with consent, deception and consented to, any assumption of the rights of the owner • Property (S4) - Incudes money and all other property real and personal • Belonging to another (S5) – Any person owning or having possession or control • Dishonestly (S2) – Two stage Ghosh test • Intention to permanently deprive (S6) – Intends to treat the thing as his own regardless of the others rights • Evaluation of liability: • Mobile phone - appropriation mobile by grabbing it off Lucio • As Tom violently grabs phone or throws phone over fence likely to meet the Ghosh test of dishonesty • Property belonging to another to be dealt with in particular way S5(3) or on trust S5(2) • Intention to permanently deprive and the legal right to deal with the property contrary to Lucio's rights. • Identification of AR and MR of **robbery** under S8 Theft Act 1968, completed theft, meaning of force, timing of force before or at the time of the theft, force used to steal • Analysis of liability: A violent grab is sufficient to constitute force used by Tom • Theft took place at the point the force was used to grab the mobile phone • Evaluation of liability: Tom appears to satisfy all the elements of robbery • Reference to cases such as R v Morris, R v Lawrence, R v Gomez, R v Hinks, R v Ghosh, R v Lavender, R v Clouden, R v Corcoran & Anderton, R v Hale, R v Lockley.	**(10)**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	**1–2**	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent. There may be an incomplete attempt to address competing arguments based on interpretations of the law.
Level 2	**3–4**	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied appropriately to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately. There is an attempt to gauge the validity of competing arguments based on interpretations of the law.
Level 3	**5–6**	Accurate knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented, but connections and support of legal authorities may be inconsistent or unbalanced. The response attempts to contrast the validity and significance of competing arguments, which may include comparisons, based on valid interpretations of the law.
Level 4	**7–10**	Accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported throughout by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories and applied to the given legal situation. Well-developed and logical chains of reasoning, showing a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in different legal authorities. The response shows an awareness of the validity and significance of competing arguments, leading to balanced comparisons based on justified interpretations of the law.

Question number	Indicative content	Marks
5	**(2 AO1), (2 AO2), (8 AO3), (8 AO4)** **Responses are likely to include:** For **Jump Ltd against Hakan** Identification of contractual issues: • Offer • Acceptance • Intention to create legal relations • Consideration • Breach, actual and anticipatory • Damages, rather than specific performance For contract, consideration of: • Request for information/Invitation to treat – Hakan's email 3rd January • Invitation to treat – Jump Ltd's email with price list/order form • Offer Hakan – completed order form for hire of helicopters week beginning 11th February • Counter offer – Hakan for two helicopters week beginning 11th February • Acceptance – Jump Ltd's email with acceptance taking place at the point the email could be reasonably expected to be read rather than at the time of reading. • Intention to create legal relations - As both businesses presumption of commercial agreement • Use of relevant cases such as Thornton v Shoe Lane, Gibson v MCC, Hyde v Wrench, Felthouse v Bindley, Entores v Miles Far East Corporation, Thomas v BPE Solicitors, Merritt v Merritt, Balfour v Balfour, Esso Petroleum v Customs & Excise, Poussard v Spiers. For **Jump Ltd against Hakan** consideration of frustration/Breach of contract. Identification of frustrated contract issues: • Meaning of Frustration and Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943 • Change in circumstances which renders the contract impossible to perform – Leading star of Hakan's film	**(20)**

	unexpectedly taken ill which is not Hakan's fault • Contract discharged by frustration – similar to personal incapacity and/or commercial purpose as film star's unexpected illness means Hakan has a lack of capacity to use helicopters for film • Breach of contract/contract not frustrated – if Hakan deemed to be at fault for breach such as using understudy then anticipatory breach at weekend and/or actual breach when refuses to pay for helicopters on 8th February • Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943 – S1(2) all money payable under contract ceases to be payable, i.e. Hakan will no longer owe Jump Ltd £10,000 though any expenses incurred may be awarded against Hakan • Remedies - rescission, i.e. as contract just formed and appears no costs, then parties returned to same position as before contract or breach of contract and £10,000 payable to Jump Ltd • Use of relevant cases such as Condor v Baron Knights, Krell v Henry, Herne Bay Steam Boat v Hutton, Davis Contractors v Ferham UDC, Poussard v Spiers, Hochester v De La Tour. Coming to logical conclusions focusing on key elements of each claim and appropriate remedies. NB: Allow correct analysis and evaluation of a student response that discusses the issue of a cancellation clause being in the contract.	

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	A completely inaccurate response.
Level 1	**1–4**	Isolated elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Application of knowledge and understanding is not appropriately related to the given context. Reasoning may be attempted, but the support of legal authorities may be absent. There may be an incomplete attempt to raise possible outcomes and conclusions based on interpretations of the law.
Level 2	**5–8**	Elements of knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are applied appropriately to the given legal situation. Chains of reasoning are attempted but connections are incomplete or inaccurate, and support of legal authorities may be applied inappropriately. There is an attempt to raise possible outcomes and conclusions based on interpretations of the law.
Level 3	**9–14**	Accurate knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported by relevant and legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Logical chains of reasoning are presented, but connections and/or unbalanced support of legal authorities may be inconsistent or unbalanced. Evaluation attempts to contrast the validity and significance of competing arguments, which may include unbalanced comparisons, possible outcomes and conclusions based on valid interpretations of the law.
Level 4	**15–20**	Accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding are demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding are supported throughout by relevant legal authorities and legal theories, and applied to the given legal situation. Well-developed and logical chains of reasoning, showing a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in different legal authorities. Evaluation shows a full awareness of the validity and significance of competing arguments, leading to balanced comparisons, possible outcomes and effective conclusions based on justified interpretations of the law.