



دانشگاه جامع علمی کاربردی
مرکز دادگستری کل استان بوشهر
عنوان جزوه:
متون حقوق کیفری
استاد: جناب آقای حسن پور
تعداد واحد: ۱ واحد
تعداد صفحات ۶ صفحه

تهیه کنندگان: مهدی دست اورنجن - مهدی زنده بودی - سجاد شریفی نیا
دانشجویان ترم سوم حقوق - گرایش ارشاد در امور کیفری

www.jozveh.blog.ir

CHAPTER ۱۰

بخش ۱۰

CRIMINAL. LAW

حقوق جزا

Definition

There are as many definitions of a crime as there are textbooks on criminal law. This is because it is difficult to attach an exact definition to something which has many aspects; from motoring offences to murder; from theft to treason; from bigamy to blackmail and so on.

به همان اندازه تعاریفی از جرم وجود دارد که کتابهای اصلی در حقوق و جزا وجود دارد این بخاطر این است که مشکل نسبت دادن یک تعریف دقیق از چیزی که دارای جنبه های زیادی است از تخلفات رانندگی گرفته تا قتل عمد. از چند همسری تا اخاذی و غیره.

From these examples it is possible to see the great variety and difference in gravity of the offences, although they are all crimes.

از این مثالها امکان مشاهده تنوع گسترده و اختلاف در اهمیت جرائم می توان مشاهده و ملاحظه کرد اگر چه همه اینها جرم هستند

in the book, criminal law was classified as public law, because it is an offence against the State and is punished by the State.

سابقا و اوائل در کتابهای حقوق جزا تقسیم بندی شده بود به عنوان حقوق عمومی زیرا جرمی بودند علیه حکومت و توسط حکومت و دولت مجازات میشد.

It would appear, therefore, first that a definition of a crime must show that an offence is against the public, although it might affect only one person, and, secondly, that the person who committed an offence either by a positive act or by omitting to do something which was a legal duty will be punished in some manner prescribed by the State.

بنا بر این روشن خواهد بود اول اینکه یک تعریف یک جرم باید نشان بدهد در یک خطا و تخلف علیه عموم است اگر چه ممکن است یک نفر را تحت تاثیر قرار داده باشد و دوم اینکه شخصی که مرتکب یک جرم شده، خواه بوسیله عمل مثبت یا بوسیله عدم انجام چیزی که وظیفه قانونی او بوده است، مجازات خواهد شد به روشی که توسط حکومت تعریف شده است.

A definition which contains these points arose in the House of Lords when Lord Tucker, in Board of Trade v. Owen (1957) considered that the correct definition of a crime in the criminal law was the following passage from Halsburys Laws of England.

یک تعریفی که این نکات در بر دارد در مجلس اعیان ارائه شد (برخاسته شد) مطرح شد در زمانی که لورد تاکر در دعوای وردترین علیه آن هیات تجاری علیه آن ۱۹۵۷ در نظر گرفت یا مشاهده کرد در که تعریف صحیح از یک جرم در حقوق جزا این بود عبارت ذیل از حقوق انگلستان اثر مارگری

"A crime is an unlawful act or default which is an offence against the public and renders the person guilty of the act or default liable to legal punishment."

پس یک جرم فعل یا ترک فعل غیر قانونی است از یک تخلف علیه عموم است. که شخص که مجرم یا گناه کار است به واسطه فعل یا ترک فعل، مسئول قلم داد میکنند در مقابل مجازات قانونی.

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES

تقسیم بندی جرائم

Crimes may be classified in several ways as follows:

جرائم ممکن است به روش های متعددی به شرح ذیل طبقه بندی شوند:

۱. Method of trial

In order to establish the method of trial, offences are classed as:

۱- روش محاکمه

به منظور ایجاد روش محاکمه جرائم تحت عنوان:

(a) *Indictable offences*

These are serious offences, triable by judge and jury, for which a Bill of Indictment sets out the charges alleged to have been committed by the person(s) sent to the Crown Court for the trial.

(آ) جرائم قابل تعقیب (جرائم مستلزم کیفر خواست)

اینها جرائم جدی هستند (مهمی هستند) ، که قابل محاکمه بوسیله قاضی و هیات منصفه که برای آن یک لایحه کیفر خواست ، لایحه کیفرخواستی به دادگاه به دادگاه سلطنتی جهت محاکمه که بیان میکند اتهاماتی که بوسیله شخص یا اشخاص ارتکاب یافته است ، ارسال می شود .

(b) *Summary offences*

These are offences which are subject to trial by magistrates' courts. The cases are decided in these courts.

(ب) جرائم اختصاری

این ها جرائم موضوع محاکمه بوسیله دادگاه صلح می باشند . موضوعات در همین دادگاه ها مورد تصمیم قرار می گیرند .

(c) *"Hybrid" offences*

These are offences created by statute and may be tried either summarily or on indictment.

(ج) جرائم ترکیبی

اینها جرائمی هستند که بوسیله قانون موضوعه ایجاد می شوند و ممکن است به صورت اختصاری یا به وسیله کیفرخواست مورد محاکمه قرار گیرند یا رسیدگی شوند .

۲. Power to arrest

A new classification of offences was introduced by the Criminal Law Act ۱۹۶۷, which is important with respect to the power to arrest without a warrant (see p. ۲۲۸).

۲- اختیار دستگیری

تقسیم بندی جدیدی از جرائم به وسیله قانون جزایی سال ۱۹۶۷ در ارتباط قدرت دستگیری بدون قرار جلب ارائه شده که مهم است

(a) *Arrestable offences*

These are offences established by The Criminal Law Act ۱۹۶۷, " ... for which the sentence is fixed by law or for which a person (not previously convicted) may ... be sentenced to imprisonment for a term of five years.

(آ) اینها جرائمی هستند که بوسیله قانون جزایی سال ۱۹۶۷ ایجاد شده اند که برای آنها مجازات تثبیت شده است ، بوسیله قانون یا برای آن یک شخص (که سابقه محکومیت ندارد) ممکن است محکوم شود به حبس برای یک دوره ۵ ساله

"The Police and Criminal Evidence Act ۱۹۸۴ extended the list by including certain offences under Customs and Excise law, Official Secrets Act, Sexual Offences Act, Theft Acts and offences of corruption in office. For a more detailed summary see p, ۲۲۹.

قانون پلیس و مدارک کیفری کیفری ۱۹۸۴ توسعه داد (این لیست را لیست جرائم قابل بازداشت بدون قرار جلب) با درج جرائم خاصی تحت عنوان قانون گمرکات و مالیات ، قانون سرار داری قانون جرائم جنسی ، قانون سرقت و جرائم فساد اداری . برای خلاصه ای از جزئیات بیشتر به صفحه ۲۲۹ را ملاحظه کنید .

This classification is important in that arrestable offences are subject to the power to arrest without a warrant.

این تقسیم بندی مهم که در آن جرائم قابل بازداشت موضوع قدرت دستگیری یا اختیار دستگیری بدون حکم دستگیری است.

(b) Non-arrestable offences

Although this class is not defined by the Act, it relates to all other offences which are not arrestable offences.

(ب) جرائم غیر قابل بازداشت :

اگر چه این تقسیم بندی توسط قانون تعریف نشده ، مربوط می شود به سایر جرایم که قابل بازداشت نیستند (یعنی غیر از جرائم قابل دستگیری ، دیگر جرائم غیر قابل دستگیری هستند)

Elements of a Crime

عناصر یک جرم یا ارکان یک جرم

The rule of *mens rea* is an established rule of criminal law by which an act does not make a person guilty unless it is done with a guilty intention.

قائده رکن معنوی یک قاعده تثبیت شده حقوق جزا است که به موجب آن یک فعل یا یک عمل شخص را مجرم یا گنه کار نمی سازد مگر اینکه با قصد مجرمانه انجام شده باشد .

A person is generally guilty of a crime (but not always) if two elements are present.

یک شخص به طور کلی مجرم شناخته می شود اما نه برای همیشه اگر ۲ عنصر موجود باشند.

First, there must be a wrongful act which would be a crime and, secondly, there must be the intention to do the wrongful act, knowing it to be a crime.

اول غیر قانونی یا عمل اشتباه یا عمل غیر قانونی که جرم باشد و دوم اینکه باید قسمت انجام عمل باشد با علم به جرم بودن

Therefore, in most crimes there must be the physical element; a wrong act (the *actus reus*) and the mental element; a guilty mind (*mens rea*), and if both elements are not present there is no crime.

بنا براین در بسیاری از جرائم عنصر فیزیکی باید وجود داشته باشد و عنصر روانی قصد مجرمانه یا نیت مجرمانه (عنصر جلوگیری) اگر این دو عنصر وجود نداشته باشد جرمی هم وجود ندارد .

It should be noted that there are some crimes for which both elements are not necessary. These crimes are committed by the act, and the intention is not necessary (see strict liability below).

لازم به ذکر است که جرائمی وجود دارند که برای آنها هر دو عنصر ضروری نیست این جرائم با فعل ارتکاب می یابند و قصد و نیت ضروری نیست . ببینید مسئولیت مطلق پائین

۱. Mens Rea

Mens Rea means the guilty mind or wrongful intention and, obviously it differs from crime to crime. The wrongful intention of a person committing a theft is completely different from that of a person committing treason.

۱- رکن معنوی : عنصر معنوی یعنی قصد مجرمانه یا قصد غیر قانونی و به وضوح و به روشنی از جرمی به جرم دیگر متفاوت است .

قصد غیر قانونی شخصی که مرتکب یک سرقت میشود به طور کلی متفاوت است با قصد شخصی که مرتکب خیانت می شود .

To be criminally liable, a person must have intended to do wrong or have acted in such a reckless and negligent manner that a reasonable person must have realised that a crime would be committed.

برای مسئولیت جزایی یک شخص بایستی قصد داشته باشد انجام دهد عمل اشتباه و یا به چنان روش بی احتیاطانه یا بی مبالاانه عمل کند که یک شخص متعارف بفهمد که یک جرمی اتفاق خواهد افتاد .

If a terrorist leaves a bomb in a train and kills a passenger, it would not be a defence to claim that there was no intention to kill anyone. Such an act is so reckless, and the likelihood of death so foreseeable, that the wrong or criminal intention is present.

اگر یک شخص تروریست بگذارد در یک قطار و یک مسافری کشته شود دیگر دفاعی نخواهد بود که قصد کشتن کسی را نداشته است

این عمل آنچنان بی احتیاطی است و احتمال مرگ چنان قابل پیش بینی است که قصد غیر قانونی و قصد مجرمانه موجود است.

The House of Lords have ruled that intent to kill or inflict serious bodily harm is necessary to establish malice aforethought and even the foresight of the probable consequences of an act does not automatically mean the consequences were intended.

مجلس اعیان حکم کرده است در قصد کشتن یا ایراد صدمه بدنی جدی یا شدید ضروری است برای اثبات سبق سوء نیت (سبق یعنی قبل) یا سوء نیت قبلی و حتی پیش بینی نتایج احتمالی یک عمل به طور خودکار به این معنی نیست که نتایج مورد قصد و مقصود بوده است.

In *R. v. Moloney* (۱۹۸۵) the accused received a friendly challenge by his step-father to see who was "quicker on the draw" with shotguns.

در دعوی R علیه علیه مولینی در سال ۱۹۸۵ یک چالش و درخواست مبارزه طلبی دریافت کرد از طرف ناپدری اش برای دیدن اینکه چه کسی سریعتر است در کشیدن اسلحه شکاری

Both men were drunk, but good friends. Moloney shot and killed his step-father, although he claimed he had no intention to do so and did not appreciate that the gun was aimed at the victim.

هر دو مرد مست بودند اما دوستان خوبی بودند.

مولینی شلیک کرد و ناپدری اش را کشت.

اگر چه او ادعا کرد قصد انجام چنین کاری را نداشته است و نمی دانسته و متوجه نبوده که اسلحه را نشانه گرفته بر روی قربانی

The House of Lords held that Moloney was not guilty of murder as a person only intends the result of an act if his purpose is to bring about that result. As Moloney did not intend to kill his step-father he was not guilty of murder. He was, however, guilty of manslaughter.

مجلس اعیان رای داد که مولینی گناه کار و مجرم و مرتکب نیست از قتل عمد (مرتکب قتل عمد نشده است) چون مولینی قصد کشتن ناپدری اش را نداشته است او مرتکب عمد نشده است، او به هر حال مرتکب قتل عمد شده است.

In *R. v. Hancock and Shankland* (۱۹۸۵) the defendants were striking miners. They pushed blocks of concrete from a bridge above a road, which landed on a windscreen of a taxi carrying a miner to work.

در دعوی علیه هانکوک و شلکند که متهمان کارگران اعتصاب کننده بودند آنها قطعاتی از سیمان و بتون از روی یک پل بر روی یک جاده و راه هل دادند که بر روی شیشه جلوی یک تاکسی که یک معدنچی را به محل کار حمل می کرد فرود آمد.

The driver of the taxi was killed and the defendants were charged with murder.

راننده تاکسی کشته شد و متهمان متهم به قتل عمد شدند

They claimed that they had not intended to kill or injure anyone, but merely to block the road.

آنها ادعا کردند که قصد نداشتند که بکشند یا صدمه به کسی برسانند. فقط قصد مصدود کردن جاده را داشتند.

The House of Lords ruled that in such cases the probability of death or injury arising from the act done is important, because "if the likelihood that death or serious injury will result is high, the probability of that result may be seen as overwhelming evidence of the existence of the intent to kill or injure."

مجلس اعیان حکم داد که در چنین مواردی احتمال مرگ یا صدمه ناشی از عمل انجام شده مهم است، بخاطر اینکه اگر احتمال مرگ یا صدمه جدی که حاصل خواهد شد بالا باشد. احتمال آن نتیجه ممکن است تلقی و دیده شود به عنوان یک مدرک غیر قابل تردید از وجود قصد کشتن یا صدمه است.

" The men were found not guilty of murder but guilty of manslaughter.

آن مردها مجرم و مرتکب قتل عمد شناخته نشدند و مجرم قتل غیر عمد شناخته شدند .

This decision was followed by the Court of Appeal in *R. v. Nedrick* (۱۹۸۶), where the court considered that in such cases a person would only be guilty if his actions will inevitably result in death or serious harm, regardless of intent.

این تصمیم مورد پیروی قرار گرفت در دعوی **R** علیه ندریک (۱۹۸۶) در جایی که دادگاه در نظر گرفت در چنین مواردی یک شخص تنها زمانی مجرم است که فعل او به طور اجتناب ناپذیر منجر به مرگ یا صدمه جدی شود بدون در نظر گرفتن قصد .

Certain offences have **strict or absolute liability**, and *mens rea* is not essential. For example, the Health and Safety at Work, etc., Act provides that certain machines must have safety covers, and if these covers are not fixed, the employers are strictly liable. In one case, the employers asked an outside contractor to supervise the safety regulations but the employers were still liable when the contractors did not comply with the statutory requirements. Strict liability arises when the crime consists of performing a forbidden act or not performing a statutory duty (the *actus reus*); the wrongful intention (the *mens rea*) is irrelevant here.

In *Meah v. Roberts* (1977) two children were served with glasses of caustic soda instead of lemonade. Meah was found guilty of selling food unfit for human consumption, contrary to the Food and Drug Act 1955, even though another person was responsible for the cleaning fluid being in the lemonade bottle.

When interpreting statutes, there is a general presumption that *mens rea* is necessary in all crimes. This rule can only be replaced if an Act of Parliament expressly or impliedly excludes the necessity of *mens rea* (*Sweet v. Parsley* (1970)).

۲. Actus Reus

This element includes all circumstances relating to a crime other than the *mens rea*. It is the wrongful act or omission which leads to a crime. For example, burglary is committed when a person enters a building as a trespasser with intent to steal, or to inflict grievous bodily harm on any person, or to rape a woman; or to do unlawful damage to the building.

The *actus reus* of burglary is the entering into a building without right to do so. The *mens rea* is the intention of committing certain crimes when in the building. It is not burglary to enter a building without this intention, but merely the tort of trespass. The crime is committed when both elements are present. The *actus reus* of entering the building and the *mens rea* of intending to commit the other crimes, even though the other crimes were not actually committed.

Elements of a Crime

۲۱۷

The above is only a part of the definition of burglary, see p. 222 for the complete definition.

Specific Crimes

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON

۱. Unlawful homicide

Homicide is the killing of a human being by another human being and it is not necessarily a crime. To kill as a means of lawful self-defence is not unlawful homicide and is not a crime. The following are examples of unlawful homicide, and are crimes.

(a) Murder

Murder is unlawful homicide, and it is defined as unlawful killing with malice aforethought, with the death taking place within a year and a day of the attack or event that caused the death.

Malice aforethought may be defined as the intention to kill or cause grievous bodily harm to the other person. It could be murder if the killer intended to murder one person, but killed another instead.

When a person kills whilst committing a crime or avoiding arrest, it would not be murder unless there was an intention to kill or inflict serious bodily harm (*R. v. Hancock and Shankland* (1985) see p. 215).

The punishment for murder is imprisonment for life, and, when sentencing, the judge may recommend a minimum term to be served.

The defences to a murder charge are:

(i) **Diminished responsibility.** The defence is that the killer was suffering from an abnormality of the mind, that impaired the mental responsibility for committing the act or omission. If this defence is accepted the charge would be manslaughter. In the "Yorkshire Ripper" case the jury did not accept this defence, and found Peter Sutcliffe guilty of murder.

(ii) **Provocation.** The act by the dead person was such that would have made any reasonable person lose control of the mind. If the defence is accepted the charge would be manslaughter.

It should be noted that the House of Lords in *R. v. Howe, etc.* (1987), declared that duress (where a person is forced by another person to commit the crime) is 'no defence to murder.

۲۱۸

*Criminal Law**(b) Manslaughter*

Manslaughter is unlawful homicide without malice afore thought. Manslaughter occurs when:

- (i) A person acts with gross negligence and kills another person.
- (ii) A person kills another person whilst carrying out an unlawful act which would not normally kill or seriously hurt that other person.
- (iii) A person is directly the cause of another's death, although the actual killing was the act of a third party. For example, where a person involved in a shooting incident with police uses the victim as a shield as protection against the police bullets.
- (iv) The defences of provocation, suicide pact or diminished responsibility are pleaded successfully.

Examples (i), (ii) and (iii) above are classed as involuntary manslaughter because of the absence of malice aforethought. The last example is classed as voluntary manslaughter because the crime would have been murder but for the specific defences. The maximum punishment for manslaughter is imprisonment for life.

(c) Suicide

Suicide and attempted suicide are not crimes, but it is a criminal offence to aid, abet, counsel or procure the suicide of another. (Suicide Act 1961 s.2.) A suicide pact occurs when two or more persons agree that they shall be killed by some means. Survivors of such a pact are charged with manslaughter, whether they killed another or whether the dead person killed himself.

It should be noted that, as with murder, death by suicide must take place "within a year and a day" of the injury. (*R. v. Inner West London Coroner* (1988)).

(d) Infanticide

Infanticide is committed when a child under the age of 12 months is killed:

- (i) by its mother, and
- (ii) at the time of the killing, the mother was mentally disturbed as a result of not fully recovering from the effects of the child's birth.

Specific Crimes

۲۱۹

The maximum punishment is the same as for manslaughter.

(e) Causing death by reckless driving

This offence is committed when a motorist does not drive with due care and attention and causes the death of another. It is punishable by imprisonment of up to five years and/or a fine.

۲. Assault and battery

۸

It is common to hear these two charges joined as one. They are, however, separate offences.

(a) *Assault*

This is an act which causes another person to be in immediate fear of an unlawful physical attack. It is generally considered that mere words are not sufficient but that they must be accompanied by some positive action. An action which arouses fear, although there was no intention to harm, would still be an assault.

(b) *Battery*

This is the actual unlawful force on another person, without lawful reason or just cause. The force may be the merest touch which caused no physical harm or injury.

It is usual for both offences to occur at the same time, but assault is not committed if the person is unaware that the battery is to take place. For example, if an attack takes place behind a person's back.

Defences include lawful consent, parental or quasi-parental authority and reasonable self-defence.

۳. Wounding with intent

This offence is committed when a person, with intent, unlawfully and maliciously wounds or causes grievous bodily harm to another person. (Offences Against the Person Act 1861, s.18.) It is only possible to make this charge if there has been serious bodily harm or wounding by a breaking of the skin.

A bruise, burn or scratching of the skin is not wounding in this sense, nor would the breaking of a bone be so if the skin was not broken. It would appear, therefore, that bleeding from the wound is necessary for this offence. In *C. v. Eisenhower* (1983) a pellet from an airgun did not break the skin, but caused internal bleeding. The court held the defendant to be not guilty of unlawful wounding as there had not been a breaking of the skin.

۴. Rape

This offence occurs when a man has unlawful sexual intercourse with a woman without her free consent. It would still be rape if consent was given by a trick, such as a man pretending to be the woman's husband.

A husband cannot rape his wife unless they are legally separated but a husband may be charged with assault or causing bodily harm if he uses violence to force his wife to have intercourse.

Boys under 14 may not be charged with rape but they could be liable in a civil case involving affiliation proceeding, where a boy is the father of a child (*L. v. K.* (1985)). A woman who forces a male to have unlawful sexual intercourse would be liable to the charge of indecent assault.

OFFENCES AGAINST PROPERTY

The Theft Acts 1968 and 1978 provide many offences against property. The main crimes are as follows:

I. Theft

"A person is guilty of theft if he dishonestly appropriates property belonging to another with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it."

The punishment for theft is a maximum of 10 years' imprisonment. The definition of theft, set out above, which is found in section 1(1) of the 1968 Act contains certain words or phrases which need to be explained.

(a) *Dishonestly appropriates*

This could be considered the "*mens rea*" of stealing, so that if a person did not intend to be dishonest, there would be no theft. For example, if I took another person's coat from a rack, thinking it was my own, there would be no theft, but if I took it knowing it was not

my coat, it would be dishonest. If I took the coat thinking it was mine, but later discovered it belonged to another person, it would be theft if I decided to keep it. The Act does not define "dishonestly" but gives examples of when the appropriation of another's property would not be dishonest.

A	ترجمه
above	روی
accused	مستقیم
act	عمل
actusreus	عنصرمادی
affect	تاثیر
against	علیه
ained	نشانه گرفتن
alleged	ادعا شده
although	اگر چه
always	همیشه
anyone	کسی را
appeal	استیفاف
appreciate	دانستن
arose	برخاستن
arrestable	قابل بازداشت
asked	خواستن
asmahy	به همان اندازه
aspects	جنبه ها
austoms	کمرکات
B	ترجمه
bigemy	چند همسری
Black mail	اخاذی
bodily	بدنی
both	هر دو
both	هر دو
bridge	پل
briny	موجب
C	ترجمه
carving	حمل می کرد
caustic	سوز آور
certin	خاص
challenge	مبارزه طلبید
charged	متهم
claim	ادعا
claimed	ادعا می کرد
classifcation	طبقه بندی شده
classifioid	تقسیم بندی
criminallaw	حقوق جزا
cohcrete	بتن
cohsumption	مصرف
cohtraly	بر خلاف
cohvicted	محکومیت

comnitted	مرتکب جرم
completely	کاملا متفاوت
comply	موافقت
consider	رسیدگی
considrrred	مشاهده کرد
consiste	شامل
contain	در برداشتن
contractoor	پیمانکاران
corruption	فساد
court	دادگاه
court	دادگاه
crim	جرم
crown	سلطنتی
D	ترجمه
death	مرگ
default	ترک فعل
defehcc	دفاع
defehdahts	متهمان
defendants	متهمان
definition	تعریف
demage	خسارت
diecision	تصمیم
different	مشکل
differs	فرق دارد
dohe	ایجاد شد
draw	کشیدن
drunk	مست
duty	وظیفه
E	ترجمه
earlier	سابقا
eithed	به صرت
elmchts	ارگان
employers	کار فرمایان
enterihg	وارد
eorrect	صحیح
established	ایجاد شده
established	ایجاد شده
evidence	مدارک
evidence	مدرک
exact	دقیق
excise	مالیات
expressly	جراحت
eytehced	توسعه دار

F	ترجمه
fixed	تثبیت شده
fixed	نصب
flowed	پیروی شد
fluid	مایع
followiny	عبارت
forbidden	ممنوع
foreseeable	قابل پشتیبانی
found	شناخته شدن
G	ترجمه
gehrully	به طور کلی
gravity	اهمیت
great	گسترده
guilty	گناهکار
H	h
harn	شدید
health	سلامتی
hecassury	لازم
heccassury	لازم است
held	رای دار
heyliyent	تفریط
hoted	توجه
however	هرچند
human	انسانی
hybrid	مختلف
I	ترجمه
ihthehtion	قصر
impliedly	به طور
includihy	درجه
indictmeht	کیفرخواست
inflict	وارد کردن
injure	آسیب زدن
instead	به جای
intent	قصد
intention	قصر
intevpating	تغییر
J	ترجمه
judyt	قاضی
jury	هیئت منصفه
K	ترجمه
khowiny	با علم دانستن
killed	کشت
kills	بکشد

این جزوه توسط آقایان مهدی زنده بودی - مهدی دست اورنجن - سجاد شریفی نیا تهیه گردیده است و جهت استفاده عموم در آدرس اینترنتی www.jozveh.blog.ir منتشر گردید .