

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910672004703321
Autore	Roach Kent <1961->
Titolo	Criminal law [[electronic resource] /] / Kent Roach
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Toronto [Ont.], : Irwin Law, 2012
ISBN	1-283-69440-9 1-55221-302-1
Edizione	[5th ed.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (587 p.)
Collana	Essentials of Canadian law
Disciplina	345.71
Soggetti	Criminal law - Canada Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Issued as part of the Irwin Law eLibrary.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Overview -- The criminal law and the Constitution -- The prohibited act. or actus reus -- Unfulfilled crimes and participation in crimes -- The fault element, or mens rea -- Regulatory offences and corporate crime -- Intoxication -- Mental disorder and automatism -- Self-defence, necessity and duress -- The special part : homicide, sexual, property, and terrorism offences -- Sentencing -- Conclusion -- Further readings -- Glossary -- Table of cases.
Sommario/riassunto	Since publication of the first edition in 1996, Criminal Law by Kent Roach has become one of the most highly-regarded titles in Irwin Law's Essentials of Canadian Law series. Professor Roach's account of the current state of substantive criminal law and theory in Canada has become essential reading, not only in law schools, but also among judges, practitioners, and others involved in the criminal justice system. The fifth edition of Criminal Law has been thoroughly updated and includes analysis of a number of important Supreme Court of Canada decisions especially in relation to the provocation defence, and in the Court's use of a modified and contextual objective standard that has implications for other defences. The book also examines the provisions relating to self defence, defence of others, and defence of property which Parliament has replaced with new and radically simplified defences in ss.34 and 35 of the Criminal Code. In addition the book reviews the judgment in R. v. Ipeelee where the Supreme

Court confirmed the need for restraint in the use of imprisonment and the need for a different approach to the sentencing of Aboriginal offenders, particularly in light of the fact that Parliament continues to restrict the use of conditional sentences and enact new mandatory minimum sentences.
