



Name: Sandie James Escol

Assignment title: Criminal law- assignment 1

Module code: BMLW4005/BML4009

argue against it. It is necessary to do a more thorough analysis of these ideas, supported by pertinent data and academic references.

Through case studies including Miller (1983), Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland (1993), and DPP v. K (A Minor) (1990), this article examines the fundamental requirements for criminal culpability by omission and the implementation of these concepts in actual situations. Furthermore, it explores the moral and practical issues related to establishing a general obligation of action. Throughout the article, we will include academic ideas and statistical data to support our analysis and give context, so advancing a thorough grasp of this complex field of criminal law.

The Foundations of Liability by Omission

The 'actus reus' aspect of a crime serves as the foundation for the idea of culpability by omission, or criminal liability for omitting to act, in the field of criminal law. The fundamentals and foundations of criminal responsibility by omission are examined in this section.

1. The Actus Reus in Criminal Liability

The two main elements that determine criminal responsibility are the "actus reus" and the "mens rea." As per Williams (2013), the bodily acts or omissions that comprise the criminal offence are referred to as the 'actus reus'. Realising those omissions—where someone does not act—can have the same legal weight as affirmative action is essential.

2. The Duty to Act: Sources and Implications

Whether there is a universal criminal law responsibility to act is a crucial topic in this regard. There are important discussions surrounding the idea of a universal obligation to interfere in certain circumstances (Ashworth, 2005). We will examine the many sources of responsibility to act, such as statutory, contractual, office-based, and common law requirements, in order to make this clearer.

Requirements for Criminal Liability by Omission