**Crimes against People and Property**

**Introduction:**

Actus Reas: means the “guilty act” meaning the act of physically committing a crime.

Mens Rea: meaning the “guilty mind” and means when you have the intent in committing an offence.

Types of Mens Rea:

Direct Intention: Say someone plans to kill someone and they manage to complete it. They had direct intention to kill that person.

Indirect Intention: Someone plans to burn down a flat to scare someone but accidently kills her instead.

Recklessness: Someone is speeding and hits someone that would be recklessness because they are not thinking about the possible consequences

Coincidence: Someone steals something, and you were one of the people there when the item got stolen that would be a coincidence

Transferred Malice: Say someone was shooting at someone trying to kill them but accidently shot an innocent bystander instead and killed them that would be transferred malice.

Strict Liability: This is when you commit a speeding crime and get caught with CCTV and they can see it was you that would be Strict Liability meaning you cannot appeal it at all and can have no defence for it.

**Fatal Offences:**

Corporate Manslaughter: refers to the offence of causing death resulting from breaches of duty of care within a company or organisation. In the UK, this is regulated by the Corporate Manslaughter and Homicide Act of 2007 under section one which defines that any organisation can be held liable for deaths caused by its management shortcomings. Corporate Manslaughter does not blame individuals for the deaths caused but the whole company is at fault. For instance, a construction company's failure to provide workers with the appropriate safety equipment results in a tragic fall from a high scaffold.

Involuntary Manslaughter: When someone accidentally causes the death of another, usually by acting carelessly or recklessly, it is known as involuntary manslaughter. This offence is covered by common law in the UK rather than a specific statute. In general, there are two primary categories: gross negligence manslaughter, which occurs when there is a serious breach of a duty of care, and constructive manslaughter, which occurs when death is the result of an illegal act. Both kinds need proof that the defendant's actions were sufficiently blameworthy to sustain a manslaughter conviction. Example: When a landlord ignores a gas leak in a flat, a tenant is killed in an explosion. Example: During a furious dispute, someone kills another, but claims they were provoked and lost control.

Voluntary Manslaughter: When someone purposefully kills another but does it in a way that reduces the crime from murder to manslaughter, it is called voluntary manslaughter. Loss of control, diminished culpability, and unlawful conduct manslaughter are the three primary defences that are frequently used in the UK, where it is considered a less serious crime than murder. Common law provides most of the framework for voluntary manslaughter; however, statutes like the Coroners and Justice Act 2009, which specifically address the loss of control defence, also have an impact. The most important thing is that the defendant acted in a way that lessens moral culpability even though they intended to murder or seriously hurt someone. A good example would be if someone killed someone else during a furious dispute and claimed they were provoked and lost control. For example, when a landlord ignores a gas leak in a flat, a tenant is killed in an explosion.

Murder: The unlawful killing of another person with the aim to kill or seriously injure them is known as murder, which is a serious criminal offence. The common law definition of murder in the UK distinguishes it from manslaughter by requiring the presence of malice aforethought, which indicates that the accused had a planned intent to kill or do great bodily damage. The Homicide Act of 1957 and the Coroners and Justice Act of 2009, for example, contain statutory provisions that address issues of the law surrounding murder, such as the standard for demonstrating intent and the defence of reduced responsibility. A mandatory life sentence is usually imposed upon a murder conviction. An example would be if someone intentionally poisoned their lover with the goal of killing them.

**Non-Fatal Offences:**

Common Assault: is a criminal act that involves an intentional or reckless application of unlawful force to another person, or the threat of the same, in circumstances where that other person is in fear of receiving immediate harm. Injury is not essential—it covers everything from threatening gestures to minor physical contact, such as pushing or slapping. The key element is the victim's perception of imminent harm.

Battery: can be defined as an instance when unlawful physical force is applied intentionally or in a reckless manner to another person without a person's consent. There must be actual physical contact, although the contact can be slight, since hitting, punching, or even slapping also constitutes battery. Both Assault and Battery are included under one Section, Section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988, in England and Wales.

Actual bodily harm [ABH]: is any criminal act where, by an assault or battery, more than minor physical harm results to a victim, such as bruises, cuts, or any other kind of injury considered to be more than trifling. Force is applied intentionally or in a reckless way, and those injuries are inflicted. ABH, in England and Wales, is under the purview of Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.

Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH): is a serious criminal offense involving intentionally or recklessly causing severe physical harm to another person, such as broken bones, deep wounds, or life-threatening injuries. GBH can be charged under Section 20 (reckless) or Section 18 (intentional) of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861 in England and Wales. Section 18 carries a more severe penalty due to the requirement of intent.

Malicious Wounding: is a criminal act of an intentional or reckless causing of severe injury, specifically causing a break in the skin—a wound—or other severe injury to another using a weapon or any other means likely to cause injury. This is an offense under Section 20 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, and it is often charged coupled with GBH because there is an infliction of serious injuries but not to the extent of proving an intent to cause the most serious harm.

**Theft Offences:**

**Burglary:**

According to the stealing Act of 1968, a burglary is when someone enters a building illegally with the intention of committing a crime, stealing, but it can also include offences like assault or criminal damage. It may happen when someone enters with the intention of stealing or when they steal something. Forced or unapproved entry is possible. While non-dwelling burglary usually carries a maximum sentence of 10 years, dwelling burglary has a maximum sentence of 14 years. The intent to conduct a crime is sufficient for a burglary accusation, even if nothing is taken for instance, breaking through a window to take gadgets from a house.

**Robbery:**

Robbery is a theft offence in which someone's property is taken by force or the threat of force. Because it involves violence or intimidation, it is a more serious crime than theft. It is a crime of both theft and assault since the victim must be physically hurt or intimidated immediately during the steal. The maximum penalty for robbery is life in prison; the severity of the punishment is determined by the victim's injuries and the amount of force employed. The use of force makes it a far more serious violation than ordinary theft, even if the stolen property is not valuable. For instance, a robber threatens to take someone's wallet by brandishing a knife.

**Making off without Payment:**

According to the Theft Act of 1978, making off without payment is when someone purposefully departs without paying for goods or services they have received, knowing that payment is necessary and planning to do so indefinitely. Situations like as leaving a restaurant, hotel, or petrol station without paying are usually covered by this crime. In contrast to theft, it involves the authorised acquisition of goods or services but the dishonest avoidance of payment. If convicted in a Crown Court, the maximum punishment for stealing money is 2 years’ imprisonment.

**Managing stolen goods**

According to the Theft Act of 1968, managing stolen items entails knowingly obtaining, holding, selling, or helping to dispose of stolen things. When managing the commodities, the individual must have known or suspected that they were stolen. This is a significant violation since it creates a market for stolen goods, which makes it easier for theft to continue. Because handling stolen items contributes to criminal activity, the maximum penalty is 14 years in jail. An Example would be knowing that a laptop was stolen from a nearby store, a person purchases it from a friend.

**Obtaining Property by Deception**

Previously defined under the Theft Act of 1968, obtaining property by deceit entails dishonestly obtaining property by making a false claim with the intention of misleading the owner. Lying about one's identity, situation, or intentions to get cash, merchandise, or other assets could fall under this category. This offence had harsh penalties, reflecting its reliance on dishonesty to unlawfully obtain property, even though it was replaced by fraud offences under the Fraud Act 2006. For instance, feigning identification to obtain a bank loan.

**Obtaining Services by Deception**

Under the Theft Act of 1978, obtaining services by deception meant dishonestly obtaining services, such transportation, lodging, or utilities, by making a false claim with the intention of evading payment. The Fraud Act of 2006 replaced this offence; however, it brought attention to the use of deceit to get services for which one does not have a legitimate claim. The value of the services and the specifics of the crime determined the penalties. Example: Buying an online subscription with a fictitious credit card.

**Fraud offences:**

**False Representation:**

Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 defines fraud by false representation as when a person dishonestly makes a false representation with the intent to gain for themselves or another, to cause loss to someone else, or to expose them to a risk of loss. The portrayal, whether in words, conduct, or writing, must be false or misleading. One example is using someone else's credit card without permission and falsely claiming to be authorised. This crime carries a maximum punishment of ten years in prison or an infinite fine. For instance, someone selling fake concert tickets online under the pretence that they are authentic.

**Failing to disclose information:**

According to Section 3 of the Fraud Act 2006, fraud by failure to disclose occurs when someone dishonestly withholds information that they are legally obligated to share with the intention of benefiting oneself or harming another person. One example would be failing to disclose to your car insurance company that you have penalty points on your driver's license when you apply for a policy. The maximum penalty for this offence is ten years in prison or an infinite fine. For instance, concealing a pre-existing medical problem when applying for health insurance.

**Obtaining goods and services dishonestly:**

According to Section 11 of the Fraud Act of 2006, dishonestly obtaining services is when someone obtains services for which they must pay by lying or acting dishonestly with the goal of not paying. This can involve deception to avoid paying for expert services or using a fake credit card to access a subscription service. The maximum penalty for the offence is five years in prison or an endless fine. For instance, paying for a hotel stay with a credit card that has been stolen.

**Ponzi Schemes:**

When returns are provided to previous investors using the funds of more recent investors rather than from profits made from the running of a legal firm, this is known as a Ponzi scheme. The plan is unsustainable overall since it depends on an ongoing stream of new investments to pay returns to previous investors. Ponzi schemes are prohibited under multiple fraud laws, including the Fraud Act 2006, and anyone implicated can face serious penalties, including long prison sentences and fines. The strategy eventually collapses as it becomes difficult to recruit enough new investors to pay returns, leading to losses for those at the bottom of the pyramid. For instance, promising large returns on investments and using funds from new investors to reimburse early investors.

**Boiler Room:**

High-pressure sales techniques are employed in boiler rooms, a form of investment fraud, to persuade victims to purchase fraudulent or non-existent stocks, shares, or other financial instruments. Usually working from call centres, the scammers approach prospective investors with unsolicited calls and try to convince them to purchase expensive or worthless stocks. According to multiple fraud laws, such as the Fraud Act of 2006, boiler room schemes are prohibited, and individuals who engage in them risk harsh punishments, such as fines and jail time. These frauds are based on lies and manipulation, and when the plan fails, victims frequently lose a hefty sum of money. An example would be calling victims and persuading them to buy phoney stocks that promise rapid returns.

**Business Related Fraud:**

Crimes like bribery, corruption, and the use of counterfeit currency are all considered forms of business-related fraud. Bribery is when someone proposes, provides, or receives money to sway other people's business decisions. Corruption is the misuse of authority for one's own benefit, frequently in business or government transactions. The creation or use of counterfeit currency to defraud others is known as counterfeit money fraud. These acts are prohibited by several laws, such as the Fraud Act 2006 and the Bribery Act 2010, and those who commit them risk harsh punishments, such as lengthy jail terms and hefty fines. These kinds of fraud damage companies and results in large financial losses. An example of business-related fraud would be: Offering a bribe to a public official to obtain a government contract is an example of business-related fraud.

**Criminal Damage:**

**Aggravated Criminal Damage:**

According to Section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act of 1971, aggravated criminal damage is when someone wilfully damages or destroys property while also intending to risk life or knowing that their acts could cause injury. This can include destroying automobiles, setting property on fire, or vandalising structures with the intention of hurting other people. Compared to ordinary criminal damage, aggravated criminal damage is more serious and carries harsher penalties, up to life in prison if found guilty. It illustrates the additional risk that the offender's activities posed, particularly if doing so might have put life in danger. For instance, setting a building on fire while knowing that people are inside.

**Arson:**

According to Section 1 of the Criminal harm Act of 1971, arson is the deliberate or careless setting of property on fire that results in harm or the threat of injury. This may entail igniting houses, cars, or other objects, which could result in fatalities or severe damage. Arson is a serious felony that carries a life term in prison if it puts someone's life in danger. Given the significant harm and danger that flames can inflict on people, property, and the environment, arson entails harsh penalties even in cases when no life is in danger. For instance, purposefully igniting a car in a parking lot.

**Aggravated Arson:**

According to Section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act of 1971, aggravated arson is when someone intentionally sets fire to property knowing that their acts could endanger life. This type of arson is more severe since it endangers life in addition to causing property damage. Given the seriousness of the crime and the possible harm resulting from the wilful or careless risk of life by fire, a conviction for aggravated arson carries a life imprisonment sentence. An example of aggravated arson would be setting a house on fire with the intent to injure its occupants.

**Vandalism:**

According to the Criminal Damage Act of 1971 Section 1, vandalism is when someone wilfully or carelessly destroys or damages another person's property without that person's consent. This can involve doing things like smashing windows, damaging cars, or spray-painting graffiti on walls. Vandalism entails penalties, such as fines or incarceration, even though it is typically seen as a less serious violation than arson or aggravated criminal damage. The amount of damage and the specifics of the offence determine how harsh the punishment will be. One example would be graffiti spray painting on public property without authorisation.

**Analysis of Scenario’s:  
  
Scenario 1: Tom and Bill work for “Sanders”, a building company. They are told by their supervisor, Pete, to hoist some bricks up onto the scaffolding. As they do so, the rope breaks and Tom falls to the ground. He dies from his injuries.**

Section 1 of the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act of 2007 applies in this case since Tom passed away because of dangerous working conditions at "Sanders." The size of the business determines the sanctions for this infraction. They range from £540,000 to £2,800,000 for more serious situations (Category A) and from £350,000 to £2,000,000 for less severe cases (Category B) for small businesses. Although the corporation was at fault, Tom's experience may have lessened the degree of negligence, therefore I would go for a Category B fine. This occurrence may result in enhanced safety procedures and training for the organisation. But it may also cost them contracts, damage their reputation, and result in job losses. This provides some justice and acknowledges the company's shortcomings for Tom's family. Unfortunately, no punishment can reverse the preventable death toll.

**Scenario 2: Mary is 90 years old and is suffering from dehydration. She is admitted to her local hospital, but because of lack of staff on the ward, she is given a jug of water on her bedside cabinet, which she cannot reach. No intravenous drip of fluids is inserted to aid her recovery. She dies three days later.**

Corporate manslaughter, which occurs when a company's extreme negligence results in someone's death, is the crime in question. Section 1 of the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act of 2007 addresses this violation and holds companies accountable for their failure to provide adequate care for their employees.  
  
The severity of the situation determines the penalties for corporate manslaughter. The range of fines for a Category B case is £3,000,000 to £12,000,000. The fine range for a more serious Category A case is £4,800,000 to £20,000,000. Because of the significant degree of carelessness involved, the hospital's negligence in this case lasted for three days, making it a Category A crime.

Since the issue was not resolved for several days, I would categorise this as Category A if I were deciding on the punishment. To demonstrate how serious the failure was and to pressure the hospital into making significant improvements, a hefty fine would be required.  
  
One positive result for the hospital could be that they would develop new policies, increase their workforce, and enhance patient care to prevent such issues. However, there are drawbacks as well, like monetary loss from fines, harm to company brand, and increased expenses for system improvement and employee training.

Good outcomes for Mary's family could include receiving payment, witnessing justice being done, and the hospital acknowledging their errors, which could provide some solace. The greatest drawback is Mary's death, which neither money nor penalty can undo.  
  
This example demonstrates the dire consequences of subpar treatment and the importance of organisations acting responsibly and providing adequate care for those who are most in need.

**Scenario 3: Michael, a supervisor in a factory, raises his fist behind James as though to hit him, but then walks away. James is told by a colleague what has happened and in retaliation James begins a series of silent phone calls to Michael’s work extension, which make Michael afraid.**

Here, the offenses involved are common assault and silent call phone call. Under the minute effect, these come under Criminal Justice Act 1988, Section 39 which contains minor assaults along with other associated conducts.

These carry a maximum sentence of up to 26 months in prison for the most serious incidents-simple to most serious, referred to as Category 1. Because no direct threats were made in this circumstance, it would fall in the less serious cases, Category 3, whereby sentencing might be reduced to a fine instead of jail.

Category three would be my verdict because there were no threats involved, and the amounts taken were less. A fine in this regard would be more applicable since it keeps the offender responsible for his actions but does not incur undue harshness for a comparative minor action.

Some positives for the offender of a lighter sentence include that they will not have to suffer a more serious sentence, they can rehabilitate, and they will not likely act out the same behaviour again. On the other hand, some negatives include that they now have a criminal record, which might prohibit them from pursuing jobs in specific fields such as teaching, receiving any visa to travel to certain countries may be problematic, and they may even lose their current job.

The positive outcome for the victim would be that he feels safer, knowing that justice has been served. The sentence proves that the offender's actions were wrong. In contrast, the victim may still feel paranoid or concerned about any future actions and may also feel that the sentence was not hard enough.

This situation also proves that dealing with even minor offenses should be conducted fairly, with an appropriate balance of accountability and the opportunity for the offender to learn his lesson and modify his behaviour.

**Scenario 4: Sandra is annoyed that her boyfriend Caspar has finished with her. He is now going out with her friend, Rosie. They all work at the same supermarket. Sandra waits for the couple in the cloakroom and jumps out, spraying them with acid. Rosie is severely burned, but Caspar is barely touched by the acid. The acid irreparably damages the carpet in the cloakroom:**

Sandra committed two offences in this case. The first is grievous bodily harm (GBH), which is defined by Sections 18 and 20 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, for purposefully injuring Rosie severely with acid. The second offence is criminal damage, which is defined in Section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act of 1971, for using acid to harm the cloakroom carpet.

The severity of the punishment for criminal damage is determined by the damage's cost. A Band A sentence in Crown Court could result from substantial damage over £10,000. For small damage, a Band B or C sentence might include a conditional discharge. In this instance, I would categorise the crime as Band B or C because it is unlikely that the carpet will cost more than £10,000. This illustrates the gravity of causing property damage without needlessly intensifying it.

For Sandra, the advantages of a reduced term for the criminal damage include the possibility of rehabilitation and the avoidance of more severe punishment. She still has drawbacks, though, such as a criminal record, possible financial losses, and trouble obtaining work.  
Positive results for the supermarket include admitting the damage, receiving justice, and receiving payment for the repairs. However, the incident might hurt their reputation, and they might believe that the penalty is insufficient to repair the harm.

**Scenario 5: Ajay’s a cashier at a petrol station. He regularly gives customers too minor change and pockets the surplus from the till at the end of each day. On the way home from work one evening, he stops at a supermarket and leaves without paying for a bottle of whiskey, which he conceals in his jacket.**

In this case, two offences were committed.  
  
Part 1 is fraud against the employer, and it comes under the Fraud Act 2006, Section 1, and the Theft Act 1968, Section 17. It is an offence in dishonest acts that result in financial benefit. The sentence imposed on this crime depends on the value of the money stolen. As it was below £2,500, it falls into Culpability Category C, where sentences are lighter, and a fine would be imposed. A lighter sentence is advantageous to the offender, saving him from a heavier sentence and allowing him to redeem himself. Nonetheless, he will have to bear the consequences of having a police record, job loss, and visa issues, which will impact all his future. For the employer, this crime was an eye-opener in implementing more security measures, such as cameras around his workplace, observing every move of each employee to prevent this from happening again.  
  
On the negative aspect, the thief employer incurs a financial loss as a result.  
  
Count 2 is for theft, namely theft by making off without payment, under the Theft Act 1978, Section 5. The sentence for such an offence depends on the value of the item stolen. In the present case, since the value is below £200, this counts in Category 2. Punishment could take the form of a fine or a custodial sentence not exceeding 2 years upon discretion by the court.  
  
On the side of the offender, the benefits towards a lighter sentence include not being able to experience harsher punishments and attending rehabilitation programs that could potentially help prevent reoffending. However, they will have a criminal record, which may affect them in getting a decent job in the future. For the victim, justice would be served as it provides him with recognition along with closure on the situation. It also allows the business to weigh how to enhance its security from the expenditure incurred due to such a loss. The business suffers financially from the loss of profit.

**Scenario 6: Marianne is a waiter in a restaurant. One evening during her shift, she goes into the owner’s flat and is about to take some jewellery, when the owner’s daughter disturbs her. Marianne threatens the girl and leaves with the jewellery.**

The two offences Marianne committed are theft and threatening behaviour. Theft, under the Theft Act 1968, Section 1 since she stole some jewellery from the owner's flat. Minimum sentence for it is community order, while maximum is 7 years' imprisonment. Given the circumstances, this would be an appropriate sentence-a suspended sentence or community order-taking into consideration the breach of trust as an employee but noting any remorse and recovery of the jewellery. The advantages are rehabilitation and not having to go to prison. Disadvantages are a criminal record and restitution payments. The victim benefits from the recovery of stolen property and justice being served but suffers emotional distress and a breach of trust.

The second offence, threatening behaviour, is contrary to the Offences Against the Person Act 1861 or the Public Order Act 1986, both having minimum sentence of a fine or community order with a maximum of 5 years' imprisonment. A sentence of a community order or fine would be appropriate as the threat was verbal and no injury was caused. Marianne avoids the rigors of imprisonment and can rehabilitate; however, she must suffer stigma and a criminal record. The victim has the advantage of seeing the offender being brought to justice, but the psychological trauma and feelings of insecurity in their home environment are serious disadvantages.

**Conclusion**

**Katie Piper: A Non-Fatal Crime**  
  
Katie Piper, a model, and a television celebrity, was seriously hurt in a case of acid attack. Her offender was awarded a sentence of life imprisonment to function as a warning to others. The incident deeply impacted Piper's professional career, mental health, and personal life, requiring many medical procedures and psychiatric treatment. The companies she was employed in suffered financially due to her inability to work as a model during that time. The criminals in such cases get lengthy prison sentences, social isolation, and restrictions on their freedom of movement, hampering their chances in the future.  
  
A similar case was that of Resham Khan, a victim of acid attack. Her attacker was sentenced to 16 years, suggesting the strict legal repercussions of such attacks. Both cases indicate the long-term trauma to the victims and their families, business loss, and reputations in areas that suffer such attacks. Both cases also indicate stricter controls over such harmful chemicals to be sold to help prevent more attacks in the future. Victims require continued support, financially and emotionally, to rebuild their lives after such brutal attacks. Survivors of such attacks require multiple reconstructive surgeries, aside from dealing with the emotional effects of their attacks. Charities, support groups, and mental health professionals assist in rebuilding such victims' confidence to reintegrate into society.  
  
The impact on criminals is a criminal record that limits their future employment, denies them a visa to travel, and brings social stigma to their lives. They also endure long-term guilt or mental consequences of their deeds. Most acid attacks are premeditated and conducted to harm to their full potential, hence harsh legal punishments in most instances. There is also controversy over rehabilitation and restorative justice, in that criminals sometimes feel remorseful and attempt to compensate for their offense.  
  
**London Bombings of 2005: A Fatal Crime**  
  
The 2005 bombings in London were among the most deadliest terror attacks in British history, killing 52 people and causing hundreds of injuries. There were heartbreaking losses for families, and survivors suffered long-term emotional and physical trauma. Business in areas that were hit was financially affected, transport systems temporarily coming to a halt, causing financial losses. There was increased counterterrorism in response, such as surveillance and security tightening in public areas. The emotional impact on survivors and responders was immense, causing a demand for long-term mental health services and counselling.  
  
Offenders responsible for plotting and perpetrating the attack were sentenced to life in prison, reaffirming the position of the legal system regarding terrorism. The impact was replicated that of the Manchester Arena bombing in 2017, in which a suicide bombing killed twenty-two people and caused many injuries. Victims and their families in both cases experienced great grief, business suffered financially, and counterterrorism efforts were escalated to deter potential attacks in the future. The attacks also heightened public concern and interest in national security threats. Authorities have also escalated their efforts in sharing intelligence and campaigns of preparing the public to deter potential threats in the future. Counterterrorism efforts also shifted, with a greater focus on collaborating with the community and monitoring online radicalization to deter potential attacks in the future.  
  
The impact on criminals was that criminals were taken in to be given lengthy prison terms and punishments of life in prison. The attack also sparked increased counterterrorism efforts and increased security in public areas. Criminals also lost their job, restriction of travelling based on their criminal status, deportation if they were not permanent residents of the UK, and even having to conceal their identities in case their crimes got exposed to the public. Some of the survivors of the attacks were strictly monitored during their detention, with security forces keeping a close watch over possible extremist networks.  
  
**London Bombings of 2005: Criminal Damage**  
Beyond the loss of human life, the bombings of London also caused immense loss of property, particularly to Transport for London (TFL). The loss of trains and infrastructure took costly repairs to rectify and months to rebuild to make it safe for commuters again. The surrounding businesses suffered loss of business, causing monetary loss. Greater security in the way of more surveillance cameras and stricter transport controls was established to restrict potential future attacks. The financial cost of rebuilding destroyed infrastructure and offering compensation to business owners took a financial blow to the city over an extended period. Offenders responsible for such damages were sentenced to a life in prison, emphasizing the seriousness of their crime. The same impact was experienced after Manchester Arena bombing, when massive loss of property required massive repairs and stricter security in public places. The financial and emotional impact of such attacks continue to be felt in public infrastructure design and emergency response tactics to this day. Enhanced counterterrorism training of enforcers of the law and response tactics have also been established to help limit the impact of such attacks in the future. Transport networks now also have added security checks, while emergency response tactics continue to be developed to address new threats. A similar incident is that of the Manchester Arena Bombing in 2017, not only caused immense damage to the venue but required a great extent of restoration work and added security in public areas. The impact was the same in that both incidents resulted in loss of human lives, trauma to the victims, monetary loss to business, and long-term security consequences. Perpetrators of such attacks met harsh punishments in terms of law, and next of kin of the victims met permanent loss. Governments and security forces around the world have since increased cooperation in sharing of intelligence and detection of threats to prevent such large-scale attacks in the future. Next of kin of the victims also became activists for change, demanding stricter legislation and more efficient response procedures in cases of emergency.
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