

Examine the concept of dishonesty and the role it plays in relation to offences of theft in the UK

This document is going to discuss and explain dishonesty and the role it plays in relation to offences of theft in the UK. Dishonesty is one of the essential components that must be demonstrated for a conviction to occur, it plays a significant role in stealing charges in the UK. Since it is the basis for most stealing offences, the idea of dishonesty is essential to comprehend them, Section 2 of the Theft Act of 1968 defines dishonesty, a term that is essential to understanding theft offences.

Legally speaking, dishonesty is typically defined as behavior that is inconsistent with the norms of regular, decent individuals. A two-stage test was introduced in the case of *R v. Ghosh* [1982] EWCA Crim 2 and defined the standard for dishonesty in theft proceedings. This test decides whether someone is dishonest if they behaved in a way that the public would find dishonest. They knew that by those criteria, what they were doing was dishonest. In the UK, this objective and subjective test is often used to identify dishonesty in theft cases.

For example, it would be deemed dishonest behaviour and might result in a theft prosecution if someone took something from a store without paying for it and had no intention of returning it. Comparably, someone is acting dishonestly and may face theft charges if they get services under false pretences, for as by using a credit card that has been stolen or by lying about who they are. (Hough, Mike 2020 accessed on 02/05/2024)

In the UK, dishonesty plays an important role when it comes to stealing charges. The illegal seizure of another person's property with the intention of permanently depriving the owner of that property is known as theft. But in addition to acting dishonestly, a person must be judged guilty of theft.

It's important to remember that the term "dishonesty" is very inclusive and can refer to a variety of actions outside of the more conventional categories of stealing and shoplifting. For example, it might involve fraud, embezzlement, or other types of economic crimes. (Jessica K Miller, 2022 accessed on 02/05/2024)

The objective test inquires as to whether the average decent person (ODP) would view the defendant's actions as dishonest. This test focuses on whether the acts performed would be viewed as dishonest by an impartial party. For instance, the ODP would most likely view it as dishonest to shoplift an item and not pay for it.

Regardless of what a reasonable person might perceive, the subjective test considers the defendant's belief that their actions were dishonest. This exam is more difficult since it evaluates the defendant's moral compass and belief system. Someone might think their acts were not dishonest, for example, if they wrongly thought they paid for an item when they left their wallet at home. (Williams, Glanville (1981) 02/05/2024)

It is important to remember that there are many kinds of behaviour that fall under the wide terms of dishonesty. As an illustration, dishonesty might include deceit, misrepresentation, and breach of trust. Furthermore, the notion of dishonesty is not restricted to tangible actions; it can also encompass intangible resources like secret knowledge or intellectual property.

Role of Dishonesty in theft offences, establishing criminal culpability for theft offences requires proving dishonesty. According to the Theft Act of 1968, stealing involves three primary components: taking another person's property, intending to permanently deprive the owner of it, and being dishonest. A theft accusation cannot be upheld without evidence of dishonesty. (Griffiths, Cerian (1981) accessed on 02/05/2024)

A person's activities are evaluated morally and ethically in relation to the component of dishonesty. When someone intentionally acts in a way that defies social norms and expectations, it guarantees that they will be held responsible for their actions.

Challenges in establishing dishonesty, norms of decent and honest individuals. If yes, then the defendant needs to have known that his actions were dishonest under those standards. This test's subjective component requires both a subjective evaluation of the defendant's mental state and an objective determination of whether the defendant's actions were dishonest.

It is important to remember that judging whether someone has acted dishonestly can occasionally be difficult and subjective. Courts have established a set of guidelines to help them make decisions where there is uncertainty about whether an individual's acts were dishonest or not. (Anthony Collins (2020) *R v Ghosh* [1982] EWCA Crim 2, Birmingham. Available at <https://www.anthonycollins.com/insights/ebriefings/the-end-of-r-v-ghosh-and-the-new-test-for-criminal-dishonesty/> accessed on 02/05/2024)

R v Ghosh 1982, It can be difficult to prove dishonesty in some situations, particularly when the defendant may contend that they had a legitimate belief or claim to the property they took. To decide guilt in these cases, judges must carefully consider the evidence that has been offered and apply the legal standard for dishonesty.

The standards for dishonesty have changed due to significant cases and judicial interpretation. *R v. Ghosh* (1982) and *Ivey v. Genting Casinos UK Ltd* (2017) are two notable instances that have influenced how people view dishonesty. (Campbell, Kenneth, (1921), accessed on 02/05/2024)

The court developed a two-limbed test to identify dishonesty in the *R v. Ghosh* case, Whether the behavior in question was dishonest by the common

The court developed a two-limbed test to identify dishonesty in the *R v. Ghosh* case, Whether the behavior in question was dishonest by the common norms of decent and honest individuals. If yes, then the defendant needs to have known that his actions were dishonest under those standards.

This test's subjective component requires both a subjective evaluation of the defendant's mental state and an objective determination of whether the defendant's actions were dishonest. (Virgo, Graham (2001) accessed on 02/05/2024)

Ivey v Genting Casinos UK Ltd 2017, The standard for dishonesty changed greatly due to the *Ivey v. Genting Casinos UK Ltd* case. The *Ghosh* test's second limb, which relied on the defendant's subjective definition of dishonesty, was ruled to be mistaken by the Supreme Court. Rather, the court approved of a wholly objective standard for dishonesty:

"What ordinary honest people would consider dishonest is to be used to assess dishonestly." This modification emphasized that an individual's guilt should not be

decided by their judgement of their conduct as honest or dishonest; rather, it should be based on an objective criterion. (Bogg, Alan L (1981) accessed on 02/05/2024)

Comparison and implications, the test for dishonesty in English law has been made simpler and clearer by moving from the subjective part in Ghosh to the strictly objective test in Ivey. Courts are now better equipped to determine whether someone was acting dishonestly by considering the perspective of an average person regarding the conduct in question.

Ivey v. Genting Casinos UK Ltd. established a strictly objective method for judging dishonesty, replacing the two-limbed test with a subjective part that was introduced in R v. Ghosh. This development is indicative of a more direct and uniform method of evaluating dishonest behaviour under English criminal law.

Prosecutors must prove the accused's dishonest behaviour in order to convict them of stealing. This can be proven in many ways, including by acting dishonestly, not believing in ownership rights, or demonstrating a desire to permanently deprive.

(The UK government (2020) *Update: CPS case redefines the legal test for 'dishonesty' in criminal law*, London. Available at <https://www.cps.gov.uk/cps/news/update-cps-case-redefines-legal-test-dishonesty-criminal-law> accessed on 02/05/2024)

It might be difficult to prove dishonesty because it requires determining the accused's mental state at the time of the alleged offence. It is difficult to provide a uniform definition of dishonesty since various people may have different moral standards and ideas about what is honest. Furthermore, societal and cultural standards can affect how people view honesty and dishonesty, which complicates the process of evaluating criminal responsibility in stealing instances. (Brenda HALE 2001 accessed on 02/05/2024)

In cases of theft, the existence or lack of dishonesty can have a substantial effect on the sentence imposed. When dishonesty is established beyond a reasonable doubt, conviction may result in more severe punishments.

Furthermore, dishonesty plays a bigger part in stealing cases than merely proving that an offence was committed. Additionally, it may affect mitigation and punishment. For instance, a person's sentence may be adjusted if it is discovered that their actions were motivated by great financial difficulty or necessity. But worse punishments can follow if it turns out that they behaved dishonestly and

didn't care about how their actions affected other people. (Campbell, Kenneth, (1921) accessed 02/05/2024)

A key idea when it comes to stealing offences in the UK is dishonesty. It functions as a crucial part that, to establish criminal culpability, must be shown with other components. To effectively prosecute and decide theft cases, it is imperative to comprehend the role of dishonesty and how the courts evaluate it, the idea of dishonesty is central to stealing charges in the United Kingdom. Case law controls it, and a conviction needs to pass both the objective and subjective standards. Dishonesty can relate to both material and immaterial assets and includes a variety of behaviours.

- Jessica K Miller author (2022) *The policing mind: developing trauma resilience for a new era*, Policy Press.)
 - Hough, Mike (2020) *Good Policing: Trust, Legitimacy and Authority*, Bristol, UK.
 - Brenda HALE (2001) *Dishonesty*, London, England.
 - Williams, Glanville (1981) *Innocuously dipping into trust funds*, Oxford, UK
 - Griffiths, Cerian (1981) *The honest cheat: a timely history of cheating and fraud following Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords [2017] UKSC 67*, Cardiff
 - Virgo, Graham (2001) *CHEATING AND DISHONESTY*, Cambridge, UK
 - Bogg, Alan L (1981) *Protecting the vulnerable: legality, harm and theft*, Oxford, UK
 - Campbell, Kenneth, (1921) *The Test of Dishonesty in R. v. Ghosh*, Cambridge, UK
 - The UK government (2020) *Update: CPS case redefines the legal test for 'dishonesty' in criminal law*, London. Available at <https://www.cps.gov.uk/cps/news/update-cps-case-redefines-legal-test-dishonesty-criminal-law> accessed on 02/05/2024.
- Anthony Collins (2020) *R v Ghosh [1982] EWCA Crim 2*, Birmingham. Available at <https://www.anthonycollins.com/insights/ebriefings/the-end-of-r-v-ghosh-and-the-new-test-for-criminal-dishonesty/> accessed on 02/05/2024.