

Anish Adhikari

Statement of Opinion

 Component B - Individual Work - Statement of Opinion

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::26687:125299680

7 Pages

Submission Date

Dec 29, 2025, 10:41 AM GMT+5:45

515 Words

Download Date

Dec 29, 2025, 10:43 AM GMT+5:45

3,536 Characters

File Name

Statement of Opinion.docx

File Size

79.2 KB

14% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Match Groups

-  **5** Not Cited or Quoted 13%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **1** Missing Quotations 1%
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **0** Missing Citation 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0** Cited and Quoted 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 12%  Internet sources
- 10%  Publications
- 11%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Match Groups

-  5 Not Cited or Quoted 13%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  1 Missing Quotations 1%
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  0 Missing Citation 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  0 Cited and Quoted 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 12%  Internet sources
- 10%  Publications
- 11%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1 Student papers

Brunel University on 2025-10-04 3%

2 Publication

Sophie Mortimer, Andy Phippen, Emma Bond. "Ten Years of the Revenge Porn Hel... 3%

3 Student papers

University of Lancaster-Main Account on 2025-12-17 3%

4 Internet

www.kentononline.co.uk 2%

5 Internet

www.coursehero.com 1%

6 Publication

Aiman El Asam, Muthanna Samara. "Cyberbullying and the law: A review of psych... 1%

Cyber Crime and Digital Evidence

Opinion Writing



Submitted by:

Full Name: Anish Adhikari

Orbund ID : 11147

Student ID : 24071101

Kathmandu, Nepal

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Basis of Opinion	3
2. Interpretation of the Suspect's Actions	4
3. Applicable UK Legislation and Potential Punishment	5
4. Overall Conclusion	6
5. References	7

5

Basis of Opinion

This opinion is based entirely on the digital forensic evidence recovered from the suspect's PC, specifically derived from the artefacts contained within the Hunter XP image file. The goal of this is to provide a realistic professional evaluation of the kinds of activities carried out and their importance considering the governing UK laws.

Interpretation of the Suspect's Actions

The evidence shows that the suspect intentionally stalked the victims and captured pictures of the two girls without their consent or knowledge. The photos of the girls were stored on the suspect's device by creating a folder with the victim's names. The folder contained photos of their everyday lifestyle and activities.

By repeatedly gathering and monitoring the victim's personal data, the suspect committed harassment. The victims would understandably be afraid or disturbed by this constant pattern of behavior that lasted for an extended period.

In addition, the suspect committed extortion and blackmail by demanding ransom from the victim's father in exchange for their safety. This suggests that the suspect tried to gain financial advantage by using threats.

Furthermore, the suspect attempted to manipulate the evidence by deleting and altering data. This demonstrates that the suspect was aware of his wrongdoing and tried to conceal his digital footprints.

Applicable UK Legislation and Potential Punishment

1. Law: Protection from Harassment Act 1997

Punishment: Up to 6 months of imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine

Reason: The suspect repeatedly monitored and secretly photographed the victim's daily activities, causing harassment without their consent.

2. Law: Theft Act 1968 – Section 21 (Blackmail)

Punishment: Up to 14 years of imprisonment and/or a fine

Reason: The suspect demanded money from the victim's fathers by threatening for their safety.

3. Law: Common Law Offence – Perverting the Course of Justice

Punishment: Life imprisonment (often 2 to 7 years, depending on severity)

Reason: The suspect tried to destroy, hide, and change digital evidence to interfere with the investigation.

4. Law: Computer Misuse Act 1990 – Section 3

Punishment: Up to 10 years of imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine

Reason: The suspect intentionally altered and deleted computer data to impair the integrity of digital evidence.

Overall Conclusion

In my opinion, Bob Hunter knowingly and intentionally engaged in criminal activities using the Windows XP system. The forensic artefacts recovered clearly demonstrate acts of stalking, harassment, blackmail, extortion and attempts to manipulate the evidence. These findings offer a solid argument for legal accountability under the relevant laws of the UK.

References

1. **UK Government** (1968) *Theft Act 1968, Section 21*. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1968/60/section/21>
2. **UK Government** (1997) *Protection from Harassment Act 1997*. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/40/contents>
3. **UK Government** (1990) *Computer Misuse Act 1990, Section 3*. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/18/section/3>
4. **Sentencing Council** (n.d.) *Perverting the Course of Justice Guidelines*. Available at: <https://sentencingcouncil.org.uk/guidelines/perverting-the-course-of-justice>