**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 doesn’t 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 the majority 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 particular 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 serious injury, specifically causing a break in the skin—a wound—or other serious 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, mainly 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.

**Handling stolen goods**

According to the Theft Act of 1968, handling stolen items entails knowingly obtaining, holding, selling, or helping to dispose of stolen things. When handling 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 in order 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 submitting an application 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 large 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 in order 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 serious 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 foreman, 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 financial 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 likely fall in the less serious cases, Category 3, whereby sentencing might be reduced to a fine instead of jail.

Category 3 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 have the opportunity to 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 carried out fairly, with an appropriate balance of accountability and the opportunity for the offender to learn his lesson and modify his behavior.

**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 badly burned, but Caspar is barely touched by the acid. The acid badly 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 possibly 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 little 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 most likely 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 waitress 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 possible 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-Lethal Crime:**

Katie Piper is one of the famous victims of a non-fatal attack, and I believe that her attack was inhuman and horrible in that it disfigured her private life and career. Her face having been thrown with acid resulted in extreme bodily injuries and trauma. For a model and television personality, Katie Piper, with life working in her direction, such an attack took a big toll in her career in terms of model work in consideration of face injuries sustained. Nevertheless, she has been a resilient character in that she is an attack survivors' campaigner, utilizing her ordeal to become a source of hope for many.

News articles, such as one in The Guardian, have mentioned her courage in defending herself and speaking out to the world about healing. Sentencing: Her attacker received a life imprisonment; a sanction I believe is warranted in consideration of the fact that the attack was planned and its impact long-term. That sanction could have frightened off others, but one cannot say for certain whether her attacker reformed for the positive.

The impact of her attack is that it affected her career when she was starting out as a model at the same period when she underwent attack. It took a toll on her mental state afterwards, as well, when she mentioned that she hated seeing her face afterward. She even underwent a variety of operations in a desperate attempt to reform her face and eyesight. That would have taken a big toll in her, even with operations performed, in that she could not ever become whole again.

The impact for her employing business would have been loss of a high-value and high-profile client through loss of face, having been disfigured in such a state. That could have translated into financial loss for model agencies and brands she represented.

The impact for offenders, however, was severe, with them being handed life imprisonment. That mirrors the severity of the offense and will serve as a deterrent to offenders. But whether offender reform took place is not yet apparent.

A similar case is that of acid attack in 2017 perpetrated against Resham Khan, when acid was hurled at Khan and her cousin, causing life-changing injuries. 16 years in prison is what offender Tomlin received. It reflects long-term consequences of acid attack and a reflection of long-term physical and psychological trauma acid attack victims endure, in addition to severe legal consequences for offenders.

London Bombings 2005: Fatal Crime In my opinion, bombings ranked amongst the most pointless and unfortunate events in UK modern times, and therefore, must have repercussions for a deadly crime for the 2005 London Bombings. Planned bombings of the London transportation system killed 52 and hurt many, and many communities and family groups were torn apart, with many communities in mourning and many family groups bereft and distraught at loss of a family member. Consequences of the bombings reached an enormous portion of the victims' lives, and to date, many of them suffer at loss of a family member. Business in and surrounding these areas experienced loss and disruption. Reporting at the time, such as for the BBC, focused on society's profound impact and determination for healing and moving over it for the city. In sentencing, many of the offenders died, and a portion of those involved in planning died and were captured and received a penalty for them and for co-conspirators, with punishments for them being extreme, proving severity of committing such a horrible act. It is, however, uncertain that these punishments changed them in any way.

The impact for family and victims, meanwhile, was disastrous, with many having lost a family member and with survivors having gone through severe mental and physical trauma. Even today, its psychological impact can affect persons who have experienced it firsthand.

The impact for businesses was significant, with transportation networks disrupted, incurring financial loss for companies that rely on a daily commute base. Loss of infrastructure also forced costly repairs and security upgrades.

The impact for offenders included offenders apprehended getting long-term imprisonment and life imprisonment penalties. The attack initiated increased counterterror operations and increased security in public spaces.

A similar case is the Manchester Arena Blast in 2017, in which a loss of 22 lives and numerous injured persons resulted when a suicide bomber attacked them. The attack bore a similar impact, with family lives torn apart, companies affected, and a heightened anti-terrorism policy.

**London Bombings 2005: Criminal Damage**

The London bombings in 2005 not only killed and injured many, but it also caused a lot of property loss to property owned by Transport for London (TFL). In my estimation, such a case identifies vulnerability of public transportation networks to such an attack and its catastrophic consequences. TFL then had a Herculean task in repairing the destroyed trains and terminals and in assuring passengers that it could use them again in a safe manner. Newspapers, including in The Independent, wrote about financial and operational hardships that TFL underwent in terms of rebuilding. Some of the perpetrators were captured and convicted and handed life imprisonment or long-term imprisonment terms. How effective such sentencing was in deterring others planning such atrocity is not known.

The impact for family members and victims was significant, with citizens in target communities living in a state of trauma, loss of family, and lack of security. Society in general underwent trauma in general during the attack.

The impact for businesses included financial loss, with areas under attack having less foot traffic, operations interrupted, and high rebuilding and repair costs.

The impact for offenders consisted of life imprisonment and long-term imprisonment. There was heightened security and observation in the aftermath of bombings, and it became less feasible for such an attack in the future. A similar case in point is Manchester Arena Bombing in 2017, not only did a lot of harm to the venue but forced a lot of restoration and added security protocols in public spaces.
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