

## CAMBRIDGE LAW TEST

### SAMPLE 1

#### Instructions:

The test will last for one hour.

Answer **one** of the following questions

1. It may be argued that fighting crime would be made very much easier if everyone was required to have their DNA registered, so that DNA found at the scene of a crime could always be matched to an individual. Would you support such a change in the law? If not, is it justifiable to register anyone's DNA, and, if so, on what grounds?
2. 'As society becomes more sophisticated, there ceases to be a need for general rules. All justice should be individualised.' Discuss.
3. In English law companies are considered to have their own legal personality which means that they can make contracts, must pay taxes, can sue and be sued. Do you think companies should be capable of being convicted of crimes? If so, in what circumstances do you think companies should be convicted?

## CAMBRIDGE LAW TEST

### SAMPLE 2

#### Instructions:

The test will last for one hour.

Answer **one** of the following questions

1. Is there ever justification for attacking the values enshrined in foreign legal systems, or for attacking the ideas of right and wrong found in the cultures of other nations?
  
2. Should a drug dealer ever be punished for the death of someone who overdoses on drugs that he has supplied?
  
3. Some forms of conduct that would normally constitute a criminal offence will not constitute such an offence if the person affected by the conduct has consented to it.
  - (a) Do you agree that this is a sensible position for the law to have adopted?and
  - (b) Should consent on the part of the person affected by the conduct always have the effect of relieving the person who undertook the conduct of criminal liability? In addressing this matter, consider the following situations:
    - (i) a boxing match;
    - (ii) the killing of a terminally-ill person who wishes to be killed.

## CAMBRIDGE LAW TEST

### SAMPLE 3

#### Instructions:

The test will last for one hour.

Answer **one** of the following questions

1. In some legal systems, judges are allowed to refuse to enforce laws which they consider to be contrary to fundamental principles such as human rights.
  - (a) Do you think that judges should have such power?and
  - (b) If you were asked to draft rules setting out the circumstances in which judges should be allowed to refuse to enforce laws, what considerations would you wish to take into account?
  
2. Do we owe greater moral duties to our family and friends than we owe to all other people in the world? Why, or why not?
  
3. The law of intellectual property protects people's rights in such things as inventions, trademarks and ideas. Do you think the following should be protected as intellectual property and, if so, what do you think might be the consequences of such protection:
  - (a) a perfume;
  - (b) your name;
  - (c) information that a famous model has had cosmetic surgery?

## CAMBRIDGE LAW TEST

### SAMPLE 4

#### Instructions:

The test will last for one hour.

Answer **one** of the following questions

1. Would it be a failure of UK democracy if a majority of UK adults supported restoration of the death penalty, but the UK Parliament consistently voted to maintain its abolition?  
Discuss.
2. Is there ever justification for holding a person liable for damage that he or she does not cause? If so, in what circumstances?
3. If you come up with an idea for a new product and tell a friend about it, should you be able to sue your friend for a share of profits if your friend (without your knowledge or consent) takes your idea, develops the product and makes a lot of money from selling it?  
Discuss.

## CAMBRIDGE LAW TEST

### SAMPLE 5

#### Instructions:

The test will last for one hour.

Answer **one** of the following questions

1. 'The principle of Parliamentary sovereignty means that Parliament has, under the English constitution, the right to make or unmake any law whatever'. What advantages and disadvantages can you see arising from this understanding of parliamentary sovereignty?
2. Who benefits from freedom of speech? Who loses?
3. It is often suggested that the state should incarcerate without trial those whom it suspects might perpetrate terrorist or other criminal activity. Might such a practice ever be justifiable?