HOW CRIMINAL DEFENCES WORK

By Sourish Ray[514] & Divyank Sindhu[515]

INTRODUCTION

The liaison organized by criminal law is very much different from that existing between clubs, societies, and members of a family or the other social communities of concerns. In its archetype pattern of core offences, it manifests various obligations which are dependant for their jurisdiction not upon the presence of the rule itself and their indiscriminate internalization, as in games and sports or the demand to encourage and cultivate the purity of a really close relationship which can be seen within families, but upon a categorical acknowledgment of the real truth of the rules and standards which are concerned. Sometimes this can be observed when ones own parents give them up to the regulatory authorities, the police upon the finding of an act of grave wrongdoing. People should not think that due to this act of the parents, they don't care or have lost their love for their own off springs, but the subtle reason behind this is to show that they themselves are not the owners of such a wrongdoing and they want the concerned authorities to take whatever action is needed on behalf of the particular community or individual which has been harmed, so as to prevent or deter their children from committing such crimes in the longer run. Individuals who hunt, steal, kill or commit an offence are always made the main aim of public censure. No other mechanism, other than punishment can willfully explicit this censure and none other than the State has the jurisdiction to punish on behalf the community which has been affected. For all these various reasons, *mens rea* is very much required. It is just inappropriate to punish and castigate someone who has committed a wrong until and unless they are really at fault in committing the wrongdoing.[516] The benchmark here is that the criminal law has a role to play over and above confirming wrongdoings particularly to restrict its brunt to those who disregard the values which

[514] 4th Year (Criminal Honors), KIIT School of Law, Bhubaneswar
[515] 3rd Year, KIIT School of Law, Bhubaneswar
[516] See generally HLA Hart *Punishment and Responsibility* (1968)

have been embodied in the norms of criminal law and therefore are deserving to have their actions adjudicate as a public wrongdoing.[517]

Modern communities these days really lack the developmental and intellectual homogeneity which is vital to showcase a common impression of what is right and what is wrong. People who go to the same pubs for drinking, who have the same pattern of lifestyle may nevertheless not agree on what the law of murder should consist of. Is Euthanasia or Abortion an element of an individual's personal choice, or is it a sacrosanct moral pressure.[518]

THE ROLE OF THE STATE

The states elementary role, in this aspect is to clearly specify the regulations by which cases are governed where the equivalence of reasons for and against the operations might be misconceived. Where as in grave offences, like rape and murder and various other offences of high culpability, the behavior aspect encompasses a moral constraint, contributing an individual's reasons for creating violence a detailed role in the crime would be self annihilation. By entrusting situations and emotions to the domain of pursuing defences, the lucidity of the moralistic precept that harming people is a wrongdoing in itself can be maintained. It is a doctrine which formulates its own reasons to ascertain. To an individual it may seem on the squeal of a puzzle that to mercifully kill is the best choice, and this is because the criminal defences and offences are patterned in such a way.[519] Criminal proscriptions require conformity even in the time of coercive reasons for non abidance. They have a lucidity of reason, which allows people to be aware of what is the correct thing for the people to do, without the intervention of a principled enquiry. If the special intent of the individual is heroic enough to provide a balanced reason, then not conforming to that particular reason has to be evaluated in the beginning from the scope of the ostracized society rather than that of the individual himself.

---

[517] G Lamond 'What is a Crime?' (2007) 27 Oxford Journal of Legal Studies 609;

[518] R Dworkin, *Life's Dominion* (Penguin, London, 1993); W Wilson *Central Issues in Criminal Theory* (2002), chapter 2.

[519] See J Raz, *The Authority of Law*, ch 1 and generally, (OUP, Oxford, 1979). A Norrie, *Punishment Responsibility and Justice* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000),

This rejection to grant motive and context a bigger say in the building of criminal liability marks up, a general standardized dilemma which no volume of judicial trifling can hope to correct, namely how to mitigate the demands of the society and fairness, equity and justice to the individuals where the private interests, perceptions collide with the public interests.[520] This dilemma can be recapitulated as asking whether or not it is probable to formulate a basic prototype for the purpose of criminal defences by which defences meet up for realization can be accordingly judged. These burdens have had the most serious impact for the offence of murder. The necessary and statutory sentence makes it philosophically crucial, rather than simply enticing, for criminal defences to patrol effectively in the borders between the most dangerous killings and those which might be excused or partly can be excused.[521]

ROLE OF CRIMINAL DEFENCES IN THE FORMULATION OF LIABILITY

Rather than getting involved in general righteous interpretation of the defendant's behavior for the determination of estimating the defendant's vigor for punishment and denunciation, the criminal justice system makes its valued decisions through a rational spectrum, which displaces the false act and the wrong components in criminal liability into more fundamental elements. This spectrum based approach targets to react a division of the unbiased facts out of which a criminal proscription and its accompanying mental status is constructed, from the circumstantial elements which might provide to excuse the breach or justify for the breach.[522] The scope of compartmentalizing the fault and conduct variable in such a way, is as has been discussed to study the control over the contingent elements which does or does not affect the criminal liability and to mitigate the scope and nature for uncertainty and denial of what is censurable conduct and what is not censurable conduct. What is historical is this detailed separation was showcased in a criminal procedure in which the defense and the prosecution ferried separate onuses.[523] The prosecution had to bear the burden of justifying

[520] Lacey, Space, time and function : intersecting principles of responsibility across the terrain of criminal Justice, Criminal Law and Philosophy (2007) 1 :233-250, p.235

[521] See B Mitchell & J Roberts, *Exploring the Mandatory Life Sentence for Murder* (Hart Publishing 2012)

[522] R A Duff (2007) Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law (Hart Publishing).

[523] G Fletcher (1978), chapter 7. J Langbe in (2003) *The origins of adversary criminal trial* (Oxford, OUP)59.

the very fundamental elements of the crime and for the defense, matters like self defense, regulated to acquit the liability from the defendant for the offence committed. There was a time, whether a defense was benchmarked as a justification or an alibi was a proud moment. A murderer who was excused of manslaughter nonetheless had to give away his valuable possessions to the Crown. A justified killer did not have to do this. Ceremonial aftermaths no longer affix to segmenting defences in such a way. Maybe they should. Diminishing this difference serves to abolish vital penological and principled functions of the doctrine of defense.[524] Let's take an example like, if an individual murders another person, in the mistaken notion that he was about to commit a grave offence will be granted an acquittal of unqualified nature. It may take some more sense than to catalogue excused wrongs with an exclusive verdict. It might also advocate various different procedural or evidential convocations like an annulment of the burden of persuasion connected maybe with a lower level of proof.[525]

Not only would such conclusions tinkle better with the balanced principled reaction which pardoned wrongdoing contributes to evoke it is quite possible that there will be a bigger eagerness to actually accept peripheral excuses, for example murdering for reasons of humanity, if the result was not an absolute acquittal. It could also distribute as a ground for implanting onto the not guilty decree enforceable situations constructed to mitigate the possibility that such an act which is wrong in nature will be again repeated.[526] The shield of automation is a very evident case in this point. In the courts of England, mainly for various reasons of social defences, have often constrained to embed the special decree of not being guilty for reasons like insanity or various other corrective mechanisms.[527]

Going by the concept, criminal defences work about in tandem along with the requirement of *mens rea*, clarifying the terminologies of the definition of offences to insure that the principled reason of a criminal proscription is accomplished.[528] This is specifically for justifying; whose

[524] G Fletcher op cit

[525] See A Stein 'Criminal Defences and the Burden of Proof' *Coexistence 26*: 70, 82-86 (1990)

[526] The offence of handling stolen property provides something of a prototype in this respect.

[527] See for example *Lipman* [1969] 3 All ER 410; *R v Sullivan* [1984] AC 156; *Burgess* [1991] 2 All ER 386.

[528] P. Robinson 'Criminal Law Defences: A Systematic Analysis' (1982) 82 Col L Rev 199, at 209.

standardizing pattern supports and complements that of the crimes themselves. An abridged synopsis of offences of violence signifies why a structure of restrictions grounded in principled rules or norms assumes also a methodical mean to justify violations. Violence is prohibited, at a large scale but not entirely, as it involves an attack upon the personal autonomy of individuals which is generally unjustified. The requirement for individual freedom, justifies the reasoning of not using force against an individual and even this is defeated when the other party consents to it, or is not capable of giving consent where the usage of force is in his interest. It also explains why the reason is not vanquished if it goes against the patients wishes.[529] Criminal offences and defences are two distinct facet of the same coin.[530] This has punctuated the view that the circumstances of liability are better evaluated without resorting to the somewhat unreal classes of *mens rea, actus Reus* and defences. All of the principles which have been envisioned by the term *actus reus* do not attribute to the main state of affairs which are prohibited by a criminal prohibition. The rationale mental component sometimes aids to determine the wrongdoing rather than making the individual culpable for it. All the questions of responsibility, fault are not resolved by the principles of *mens rea*, but they require the regulations which govern causation and defences. This restoration of the ternary division into the more elemental division of the circumstances of liability into those of faults and acknowledgement underpins the categorizing of defences into excuses and justifications. The antecedent is relevant to the wrongdoing that is whether their committed action of violence and the violation of the laws is indeed an occurrence of wrongdoing for which they must be held accountable for. The latter is much more relevant to acknowledgement that is whether the defendant is culpable for their acts of wrongdoings. The benefits of this analogy has consequently been put to question[531] there is no other substantial way

[529] *St George's Healthcare NHS Trust* v. *S* [1998] 3 All ER 673; *Re C* [1994] 1 All ER 819.;*Malette* v. *Shulman* (1988) 63 OR (2d) 243; *Re W (a minor)(medical treatment)* [1992] 4 All ER 627.

[530] R A Duff (2007) *Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law* (Hart Publishing). CF A Loughnan 'Diminished Responsibility as Hybrid Legal Form' (Mental Disorder and Criminal Justice Conference, Northumbria University, October 2013).

[531] See P. Greenawalt, 'The Perplexing Boundaries of Justification and Excuse' (1984) Columbia Law Review 1847; P. Robinson, 'Criminal Law Defences: A Systematic Analysis' (1982) 82Col LR 199; J.C Smith, Justification and Excuse in the Criminal Law (1989), London: Sweet &Maxwell; Fletcher (1978), Chapter 10. D. Husak, 'On the Supposed Priority of Justification to Excuse', Law and Philosophy 24 (2005), 557; J. Gardner, 'In Defence of Defences' in Offences and Defences, Selected Essays in the Philosophy of Criminal Law, Oxford: OUP (2007); A

to comprehensibly render this fact that those who help an individual who is behaving in a justified manner, like for self defense, but not in an excused manner, under force, also escapes from the grunts of criminal liability. Justified coercion cannot legally be prevented, but on the other hand excused coercion can legally be prevented.[532]

ROLE OF CRIMINAL DEFENCES IN THE CIRCUMVENTION OF LIABILITY

Following this division of defences into justifications and excuses, what if one should really go forward in terms of their essential components[533]? The paramount structure of the formulation of criminal excuses is the happening of some forms of crisis of nature to stop the normal inference that those who pierce a fundamental norm of conduct manifests the type of evil character which suits them for denouncement and punishment for their acts. This is not to take any favorable sides in the choice versus character dispute on criminal responsibility.[534] It rather encompasses the uncontroversial belief that for most of the excuses the applications which evoke the conclusion that an individual lacks the fair chance to react as per the requirements of law. However, there is a meta- theoretical base for promoting one to the next which is always ignored or overlooked. This is that choice theory affirms, in such a way which the character theory does not, the whole scenario that state punishment is very problematic.[535] In facilitating criminal defences in the absenteeism

---

Simester, 'On Justifications and Excuses ' In L Zedner and J Roberts (eds) Principles and Values in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice: Essays in Honour of Andrew Ashworth (OUP 2012) 95

[532] see W Wilson Central Issues (2002), chapter 10

[533] See generally R A Duff (2007) Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal

Law

[534] see P. Arenella, 'Character, Choice and Moral Agency' in E.F. Paul, F.A. Miller and J. Paul (eds) *Crime, Culpability and Remedy* (1990), Oxford: Clarendon Press; N Lacey 'Character,

capacity, outcome: towards a framework for assessing the shifting pattern of criminal responsibility in modern English law' in M D Dubber and L Farmer (eds.) *Modern histories of crime and punishment: Critical perspectives on crime and law* (Palo Alto; Stanford University Press) 14-41; N Lacey (2011) 'The Resurgence of Character: Criminal Responsibility in the Context of Criminalisation' in R A Duff and S Green (eds) *Philosophical Foundations of Criminal Law* (Oxford, OUP), 151-178.

[535] See generally A Brudner, *Punishment & Freedom: A Liberal Theory of Penal Justice* (OUP 2012 and a special issue of the New Criminal Law Review devoted to its analysis' (2011) 14(3) New Criminal LR 427, See also R A Duff 'Blame, moral standing and the legitimacy of the criminal trial' *Ratio*, 23(2), 123-140; A Norrie, *Punishment Responsibility and Justice* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000), ch 1; N Lacey, ''Punishment, (Neo)Liberalism & Social Democracy', in J Simon & R Sparks (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Punishment and Society* (Sage Publishing 2012) 260-280.

of the chance to affirm to a criminal restriction, the chance theory averts making any connection between responsibility in a criminal activity and desert in punishment. It involves itself only to the purview that without intentional acts of wrongdoings, punishment is not deserved and hence includes a farther prerequisite for the intervention of the state mechanism, as long as the state is unbiased and not acting unfairly.[536]

Neither of the challenging doctrines of defences moves forward keeping this premise in mind. If the individual's wrongdoings are in character or if the individuals wrong acts is equitably not reasonable, then no further protocols for state punishment and denouncement is required. As it may be, each and every theory moves forward from an acceptance of the elemental building blocks of dilemma, and the feedback, thereto which constructs the vital criminal defences. The excuses are founded in the admission either that the reception of the defendant was quite reasonable or the most equitable amongst many of the people can, in dire situations like anger, terror, trauma loses touch with that elemental core of justifications which invites upon affirmation with legal regulations.[537] The fundamental excuse template bringing together these defences assures, in a way which is comparable to defences of justified reaction, that it is only such one sided reactions to dilemmas which are experienced in blocking the ascription of morally disgraceful conduct.[538] All the vital criminal defences of loss of self control, duress, self defense, automatism and necessity reflects this aptitude to separate those things which occur to us by merit of who the people think they are and the things which happen to them, where they are set out by an impulsive fate to be the individual to face a dilemma.[539]

---

[536] See generally R A Duff (2007) Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law (Hart Publishing; For recent discussion see V Tadros, The Ends of Harm: The Moral Foundations of Criminal Law (OUP 2011)

[537] For criticism of the view that all excuses reduce to the claim that the defendant's action was reasonable see J Horder, *Excusing Crime* (2007); V. Tadros, *Criminal Responsibility* (2005), 286, W Wilson 'The filtering role of crisis in the constitution of criminal excuses' (2004) Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence XVII, See also D Klimchuk (2012) 'Excuses and Excusing Conditions' in F Tanguay- Renaud and J Stribopoulos (eds.) *Rethinking Criminal Law Theory: New Canadian Perspectives in the Philosophy of Domestic, Transnational, and International Law* (Hart) 118

[538] W. Wilson, The Filtering Role of Crisis in the Constitution of Criminal Excuses' Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence XVII, 2 (July 2004); W. Wilson, 'The Structure of Criminal Defences' [2005] Crim LR; P. Westen, 'An Attitudinal Theory of Excuse' (2006) Law and Philosophy 289

[539] This is not to say, of course, that this is an invariable rule. Certain excuses or defense groupings, for example, are clearly grounded in individual moral or practical bases which necessarily exclude the operation of the template. For example, the defense of voluntary withdrawal for accessorial liability requires a very different ingredient of organizing

THE FUNDAMENTAL TEMPLATE

The Trigger

The preponderance of vital defences which include automatism, involuntary conduct, necessity, duress, loss of self control are functional only upon the application of proof of an external trigger. This functions whether the ground of the defense is a valid justification or merely an excuse and or the righteous claim is whether the defendant reacted reasonably as in protecting himself or herself or it was necessary, as justifiably during loss of self control or duress, or the most philosophical demand that the trigger dispossessed the state of any ground upon which to assess the conduct of the individual as in involuntary conduct. In each of the cases, the trigger executes two vital functions. At first it constructs the defense in terms susceptible to proof, and secondly it provides criminal justifications with their political and moral authorization.

The fundamental components of the trigger for each of the confirmative defenses are therefore very similar. The menace of harm has to be taken care of and avoided or provocations by words or actions. For each and every defense, the criminal behavior which it is desired to excuse or justify has to be directly affirmative to the threats, which is dependant upon. The defences are not available if the act which was taken was for ambiguous reasons. An individual cannot depend on either loss of self control or self defense if galvanized by revenge rather than the trigger.[540] An individual cannot depend on coercion if, although the subject matter of a threat which is mortal in nature, the correct trigger for activity was blackmail.[541] An individual cannot resort to coercion or necessity if they are not able to pin point a particular threat, and the source which punctuated such

rationale from other excuses and justifications—one based essentially in societal needs rather than fairness to the individual beset by crisis.

[540] R v *Ibrams* and Gregory (1981) 74 Cr App R 154; R; R v *Hussain & Hussain [2010]* EWCA Crim 94

[541] *Singh* [1972] 1 WLR 1600; *Valderrama-Vega* [1985] Crim LR220.

a reaction.[542] Furthermore, an individual cannot depend on loss of self control if the defense is not able to pin point any particular provocative words or actions which punctuated the reaction.[543]

The trigger executes a proportionate part in the defense of loss of self discipline. In the case of *Dawes, Hatter Bowyer,* There was a distinction made between the general determinants and the specific triggers by giving reference to the events arising from a marriage breakdown. Despite the fact, that the fall out from the breakdown of a relationship may formulate an enabling trigger, where the deceased advocates quite a few hurting actions or assertions.[544] The break down of a relationship cannot give rise to circumstances of a dangerous character to provide for a justifiable trigger.

The Reaction

Central to the concept of the trigger is an occurrence which is of an essence to agitate a reaction. Accordingly, the entire affirmative defences demand, admitting to differing degrees, the reaction to be an instinctive one. Again the alterations are managed and controlled by the hypothesis of the defense. The relationship between the hypothesis and the essence of the reaction has been analyzed thoroughly in connection to the loss of self discipline and its primogenitor and provocation.[545] The hypothesis of each differentiates those whose conduct is triggered by a morally plausible emotion of fear or reasonable moral anger rather than a desirable desire to vindicate or to safeguard oneself from farther occurrences of violence. The former attitude would offer no alibi of any kind. The following would need to affirm to the criticisms of self defense for it to be rational with respect for the rules and regulations of the legal system. Although the attitude must be determinable to a triggering occurrence it is quite clear that it shouldn't or need not to be followed immediately.[546] This is because loss of self discipline is, by rationale, an exemplified reply to stress. As such, it can be triggered in various manners banking upon the particular individual, the situation, and the nature of the triggering act. A classic example of a postponed loss of self discipline is that which

[542] R v *Shayler* [2001] EWCA Crim 1977

[543] *Acott* ([1997] 1 All ER 706, House of Lords); *R v* Bowyer [2013] EWCA Crim 322

[544] Clinton, R. v [2012] EWCA Crim 2 (17 January 2012)

[545] Law Com 290 2004, Partial Defences to Murder; Law Com No 304 (2006) Murder, Manslaughter and Infanticide

[546] *Ahluwalia* [1992] 4 All ER 889

is generally experienced by individuals who have fallen prey to domestic violence. In the landmark case of R v. Dawes it was noted that provided there is a loss of discipline, it really does not matter whether the loss was immediate or it wasn't. An answer to situations of acute intensity may be postponed. Different personnel in various circumstances do not react analogously, nor reply immediately. Therefore for the determination of the new defense, the loss of discipline may pursue from the accumulative brunt of earlier events.

Adjacency or amazement is however of fundamental concern to coercion, although again one must certify this by allusion to the kind of coercion, that whether it was of moralistic involuntariness or of equitable reciprocation to confrontation. Taking into account the formers case, which generally involves coercion in the form of threats, this demands for prompt action on the footing of the excuse that is, it would not be fair to hope that the defendant would overcome his or her anxiety, is abolished. If the intimidation was not an immediate one, then there would be no valid reason to acclaim the allegations that the defendants regularizing reserves were subdued. Contradicting this with compulsion of circumstances and obligations where the defendants principled claim will normally be of good sense, that is it was practical for a human being to select a pathway of action which did not cede his own life or that of another thing for which he is liable, or in cases of urgency, was a justifiable mean to avoid a bigger wrongdoing.

In the case of Pommell[547], the defense team was held responsible to defend the defendant for carrying a firearm without a valid license, but according to him the defendant possessed the firearm to avert its original owner from using it for a vengeance killing.[548] Although it can be argued that it was a case of urgency or necessity than of coercion. It was quite clear that accession rather than promptness of threat was satisfactory to grant the explained excuse.[549]

The Reaction Must Not Embed a Dangerous Personality

The reaction and trigger components in the templates of the criminal defense are imminent elements of the conventional humanistic approach of liability which is deeply rooted in an

[547] [1995] 2 CrAppRep607.

[548] Cf. *Cole,* in which no great enthusiasm for such a prospect was voiced.

[549] J. Horder, 'Self-defence, necessity and duress' [1998] Can J Law and Juris 143.

individual's wrongful act. An individual is sought to have committed the offence of murder only when there is intent to kill until and unless this *reaction* is provoked by an occurrence which prevents his societies inclination to hold him responsible. By this embodiment it thoroughly becomes crystal clear that though the reaction and the trigger are prerequisites of justly holding an individual to give account for his or her wrongful doings, is not the whole story. The main subject matter of criminal approbation is not a confined person. This same individual is one who lives in a society whose belief's define and establish him or her as a person and as a subject matter. Necessarily, both crimes and defences therefore manifest those beliefs in the tenacity of wrongdoings and in the assurance for criticism.[550]

There are proportionate constraints on the opinions outlining the other affirmatory defenses, each of which is linked to the respective hypothesis of the defense. For coercion the trigger does not operate if it is observed that the defendant does not have the fortitude of an ordinary citizen of the society. People might feel that this is not fair. If principled involuntariness along with justifications of reaction lies at the crux of the defense, the question is why should it then matter whether or not the horror was justifiably honored or not. Principled involuntariness does not necessarily lie at the crux of the defense or maybe there lies another reasoning why justifications require reactions to amplify up to the equitable canonicals of bravery and courage. The general reason which is normally provided is duress, like all the other excuses which operate by rejecting principled accusation. Principled accusation is not annihilated by declaring that an individual is liable to be scared of, on supposedly an accusation of theft.[551]

Criminals laws only permit is to construct into the various features of the subject matter which is to be judged, unlike lack of principled endurance are not genuine forms of who they are but are features which could be revisited upon any practical individual like a lessened scope or capacity

[550] see RA Duff; Sandel, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice, (1982); Walzer, 'The Communitarian Critique of Liberalism' [1990] Political Theory 6-23; Etzioni, *The Responsive Community : A Communitarian perspective*¸ American Sociological Review.

[551] being 'unnaturally cowardly ... is the very ground for blaming him. It could hardly serve as an excuse. Such defences are not accorded in moral any more than in legal judgment.' S. Kadish, 'Excusing Crime' (1987) 75 Calif LR 257 at 276.

to intimidations available to accumulative violence's at the very hands of the oppressor.[552] Once again the intimidations or threats of the oppressor do not qualify to a workable trigger if placed as he or she was or he or she might have avoided being in the company of deadly offenders.[553]

PROPORTIONALITY

Proportionality is elemental to the concept of urgency, with its requirement that the measures taken are proportionate to the wrongdoing which is to be prevented. In the actual scenario, while proportionality on a lesser of two harms ground is required it is not in itself suitable to establish the reason. This is so because of the principled preference which is given to personal rights over unified interests.

In the future, it will never be legal to coerce a person to shed blood even though many lives might be protected and saved. As an elemental need, a guarantee to equity must assure that the measure which has been taken do not affect a calculated baloney of an innocent person.

CONCLUSION

All the vital defenses propound an identical build up. This has instilled the certainty that defenses share an universal philosophy whether that hypothesis be in the matter of core justifications, that the defendants wrongful act was out of caliber, was as justified as it could be familiar in the situations or was not the subject of a reasoned, justified choice. These diversified explanations tend to obstruct peoples considerations and understandings of how the various defenses tend to work. In cases of self defense, coercion and urgency problems helps pin point the guidelines for the requirement for and equitability of a subject matters reaction or action. For the reason of intellectual or physical involuntariness contingencies might also bereave individuals of their sensitivity to affirm their conduct to the rules and regulations. The accepted construction manages to afford means of dodging the free will enigma by conforming that the triggers rather than elementary explanations compromise principled authority, and insuring an efficient and equitable

[552] *Emery*. (1993) 14 Cr App R (S) 394

[553] *R v Hasa*n [2005] UKHL 25; *Mullally* [2012] EWCA Crim 687.

balance between the rules of the legal system and righteousness to the individuals in matters where private and public concerns meet head on.