

NZ Crimes Final exam Cheat Sheet by Bendash13 (Bendash13) via cheatography.com/24992/cs/47251/

Theft	
Dixon	Info not property, data is.
Cox	Take car under mech lein = theft
Meredith	Take car from police where no auth =/ theft
Taylor	Any movement of property = theft
Barron	Consent must be w/o duress
Dronjak	Mislabelled prop, no active deception =/theft
Hudson	Deception of ID = theft
Davies	Fundamental mistake vitiates transfer
Russell	Removing ID marks on prop = TbU/D
Coombridge	Acting outside of mandate = TbU/D
Hayes	Facts infer DM unless mistaken belief
Watchorn	Believed legal right to property at time
Gush	Intent to deal in a way prop likely cannot be returned in same state.
Hare	Conditional intent sufficient
Leakey	Giving to 3rd pty for free = deprive
Broom	Negotiating reward =/ theft
Morunga	No intent for reusing coins in gambling
Velumyl	Taking money w/ intent to repay = theft

Receiving	
Stone	If not receiving then maybe dealing?
Kennedy	Must intend to possess goods
Cullen	Must know location
Lucinsky	Must be prop not proceeds or sub
Stevens	Don't need know manner of theft
Crooks	Wilful blindness = MR
Dean	Recklessness = MR
Obtaining	by Deception
Morley	AR s240(1)(d) harm to V not gain by D
Cai	No need for benefit by D
Barnard	Deceive as to ID = deceiving
Dronjak	Mistake =/deception
Rao	Changing price = Deception
Deller	Rep made believing false but actually true =/Deceiving
Lewis	Mock biddign = D
Scott	Bribing = s 240(2)(c)
Hensler	V know deception prior = NA
Bennitt	Timesheet false, employer = D

cri	mes
Compulsion	
Teichelman	1. Threat to kill or cause
	grievous bodily harm
	immediately 2. Threatener
	present during commission
	3. Compelled person
	believed threat would be
	carried out 4. Compelled
	person not party association
	5. Offence not in s 24(2)
	Crimes Act 1961.

Cannot deceive machines - other

Daire

Compuls	ion (cont)
Waters	GBH = 'really serious harm'
Chan- Fook	Includes Infection and serious psychiatric harm
Raroa	Threat must be connected to offence
Holland	Threatener may be reinforced by another
Neho	Must be able to immediately carry out
Ryan	Fortitude, Proportionality, lack of alternative
Joyce	Only fail if association forese- eably risks compulsion
Necessity	y
Woolnou	gh 1. Lesser evils 2. Best

Necessity	
Woolnough	1. Lesser evils 2. Best interest intervention
Re A	breach needed to avoid inevitable evil
Re F	Need to take action reasonable for best interest of concerned person

Conway	Objective danger not human
Martin	1. Extreme Circumstances 2.
	Actions reasonable and propor-
	tional3a. Fear of death/serious
	injury? 3b. Reasonable response
	to that fear?

Impossib	
Finau	Impossible to not breach law
Tifaga	Released w/o money & couldnt leave = breach



By Bendash13 (Bendash13)

Not published yet. Last updated 27th October, 2025. Page 1 of 3. Sponsored by Readable.com

Measure your website readability!

https://readable.com

cheatography.com/bendash13/



NZ Crimes Final exam Cheat Sheet by Bendash13 (Bendash13) via cheatography.com/24992/cs/47251/

Participation (cont)

Criminal Pro	cedure
Burton	Stopping police dispersal is breach of peace
Briggs	Police cannot just follow orders w/o thought
Hewitt	Blanket arrest policies are unlawful
Flyger	No evidence on some element for inability to convict
Mitchell	Complete overlap for prev aquittal plea
McAllister	Jury service legal obligation
Gordon- Smith	4 jury challenges per side
Abdula	Trial w/o interpreter unfair
Van Yzendoorn	Sentencing must be repeated with D there
Chatha	Not unfair if absent due to fleeing
Stewart	No allegations of EW fabric- ating evidence or suggesting D has motive to lie

Participation	
Bouyang	No participation without P
Ahsin	
Ngamu	AR made out by group, joint Ps
Paterson	Innocent agent
Thompson	No IA if V
Larkins	Awareness of assist not needed
Turanga	Psychological aid even if not actual aid
Talley	Preventing warning = aid
Coney	Active steps for abetting

Voluntary presence w/o
dissent = abetting
Watching and laughing = abetting
Abetting need not actually encourage
Abetting in time
Procuring
Oblique intention enough
Knowledge of 'type' of crime enough
Req know of MR for crime P
did
Must counteract prior abetting to withdraw
Must counteract prior
Must counteract prior abetting to withdraw
Must counteract prior abetting to withdraw 1. Offence committed by P 2. Shared understanding/agreement 3. Parties agreed to help each other and participate 4. Offence committed by P in the course of common purpose 5. D intended the offence, or knew was a probable consequence req foresight of both
Must counteract prior abetting to withdraw Irpose Liability 1. Offence committed by P 2. Shared understanding/agreement 3. Parties agreed to help each other and participate 4. Offence committed by P in the course of common purpose 5. D intended the offence, or knew was a probable consequence req foresight of both AR+MR 'Serious violence' too
Must counteract prior abetting to withdraw 1. Offence committed by P 2. Shared understanding/agreement 3. Parties agreed to help each other and participate 4. Offence committed by P in the course of common purpose 5. D intended the offence, or knew was a probable consequence req foresight of both AR+MR 'Serious violence' too ambiguous 'exacting revenge' too

	Shared understanding/agre-
	ement 3. Parties agreed to help
	each other and participate 4.
	Offence committed by P in the
	course of common purpose 5.
	D intended the offence, or
	knew was a probable conseq-
	uence req foresight of both
	AR+MR
Edmonds	'Serious violence' too
	ambiguous
Johnson	'exacting revenge' too
	ambiguous
Momi	Assault fine
Sullivan	Self-defence not unlawful
	therefore no P
Hubbard	Later arson outside of CP
Not publish	ned yet.
Last update	ed 27th October, 2025.

Commo	n Purpose Liability (cont)
Te Moni	CP rob bank, escape within ambit of CP
Burke	More than trivial harm foreseen req for ManS

Inchoate Offences	
Jay	Attempt does not need to be factually possible
Donnelley	Legal impossibility = no offence
Mesman	Possession attemptable
Ah- CHong	MR intention needed (excl sex violate)
RvB	Real and substantial step needed
Wilcox	No combining prior actions to make final step
Drewery	Crit Wilcox. intent w/ act = guilt
Harpur	Affirm <i>Drewery</i> supported by statute
Bateman	Prep actions can be aggregated to determine attempt

1. Is the item property capable of being stolen?

2. Was	a. Which subset in s 218
the	explains nature of ownership?a.
property	Which subset in s 218 explains
owned	nature of ownership?b. Does
by	this property have multiple
another?	owners?c. Are finders rules
	appropriate?

By Bendash13 (Bendash13)

cheatography.com/bendash13/

Page 2 of 3.

Sponsored by Readable.com Measure your website readability! https://readable.com



NZ Crimes Final exam Cheat Sheet by Bendash13 (Bendash13) via cheatography.com/24992/cs/47251/

Theft PSF (cont)

3. Was the property taken?

a. Is the property tangible or intangable? Does it meet the standard for its kind?b. Was there consent?

4. Was the property used or dealt with?

5. Was the dishonest? a. Is the belief as to auth so unreasonable that it cannot be genuinely held?

6. Was the act effected

a. Is the belief as to claim of right so unreasonable...?

without claim of right?

7. Was the act committed with an intention to permanently deprive the owner?

Receiving PSF

1. Was the property a. Was the property received from another person?b. Acquire possession/control? Aid in concealing/disposing?c.

Received the actual property?

received?

2. Know

a. Wilfully blind?

was stolen or criminally

obtained?

3. If not, were they reckless

a. On notice?b. Risk unreasonable to disregard?c. Proceed to receive the property

to this anyway?

fact?

Obtaining by Deception PSF

1. Which categories a. If s 240(1)(d) is engaged, was the loss direct?

s 240(1)?

Completed

deception'

2.

a. Was there a misrepresentation, direct or implied?b. Omission to disclose w/ duty to disclose?c. Fraudulent stratagem?

per s 240(2)?

3. Loss consequential?

4. Did the defendant act without claim of right?

5. Are the mens rea elements for s 240(1)

a. If s 240(1)(a)-(c) is engaged, intention to obtain the property and cause loss?b. If s 240(1)(d) is engaged, did the defendant intend to cause the loss?

6. Are the mens rea elements for s

met?

a. Did the defendant act with an intention to deceive?b. If s 240(2)(a) is engaged, know false or reckless as to falsehood?

240(2)

met?

Compulsion PSF

1. Offence on list in s 24(2)?

2. Threat of death or grievous

a.Threat associated both with a particular demand and the offence committed

bodily harm?

Compulsion PSF (cont)

Threatener present at commission?

a. Threat reinforced by third party if threatener not present?b. Threatener present with threatened third parties?

4. Subjectively believe threat will be carried out?

a. Subjectively believe there was an actual threat?b. Subjectively believe threat carried out immediately?

5. Association in which they are compelled

to commit

offences?

a. Construed objectively, Offence not have reasonably been foreseen despite any association, making the defence available again?

By Bendash13 (Bendash13)

Not published yet. Last updated 27th October, 2025. Page 3 of 3.

Sponsored by Readable.com Measure your website readability! https://readable.com

cheatography.com/bendash13/