

Actus reus and participation in
European criminal law

SCHOOL OF HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH SERIES, Volume 60

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

Actus reus and participation in
European criminal law

JOHANNES KEILER



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | mail@intersentia.co.uk

Johannes Keiler
Actus reus and participation in European criminal law

ISBN 978-1-78068-135-1
D/2013/7849/42
NUR 828

Cover image: Finsiel/Alinari Archives – Reproduced with the permission of Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Cultural, Italy.

© 2013 Johannes Keiler/Intersentia
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During one of our first meetings in 2007 my supervisor warned me that “writing a PhD may jeopardise your health”. At this point in time I thought he was joking; after all I had just landed my dream job. Five years later I am still convinced that doing legal research is my dream job, but I also came to realise after some sleepless nights pondering criminal liability, that there might be a kernel of truth in this statement. Corresponding to the current *zeitgeist* one should perhaps even consider printing this statement in bold letters on top of every PhD contract.

Writing this book has overall been an immensely enjoyable experience; one which would not have been possible without the help of many people, to whom I am very grateful. First and foremost, I would like to thank Gerard Mols, Michael Faure, Jacques Claessen and John Spencer for reading and approving the manuscript of this book. I would also like to thank everyone at Maastricht University and the department of criminal law for making this book possible and for creating a very enjoyable working atmosphere.

Moreover, thanks are due to my supervisor André Klip. Your clear and critical view of criminal law and legal research has helped and guided me throughout this research and has shaped and influenced my thinking on criminal law. Your passion regarding European criminal law has been truly inspiring. Thank you for your confidence in me and your ever-calm presence when I was on the verge of panic.

I wish to thank my co-supervisor, David Roef, for all our inspiring and challenging discussions about the foundations of criminal law and criminal liability (long may they continue!). Thank you also for all your invaluable feedback, advice and support during this project. You have greatly contributed to my growth as a scholar.

Part of this project also consisted of verifying the results of this comparative research with academics and practitioners from the investigated penal systems. In Germany Oberstaatsanwalt Lutz Bernklau and Richter Gerd Nohl helped to improve my knowledge of German criminal law and the German legal culture. In England I am indebted to Peter Alldridge, David Ormerod, William Wilson and Jeremy Horder. Thank you for welcoming me in London and giving me ample opportunity to discuss many issues of English criminal law. I am particularly indebted to William Wilson for closely reading and commenting on one of my early drafts on English criminal law.

At Oxford Andrew Ashworth diligently read and commented on my draft report on English criminal law. Thank you for warmly welcoming me at this beautiful University and for our valuable discussion on criminal law.

A factor which was very influential to this book was that I had the privilege to be part of the research team on European criminal law at Maastricht University, consisting furthermore of Jeroen Blomsma, Anne-Sophie Massa and Christina

Acknowledgements

Peristeridou-Rübenach. I have learned a lot from all of you and you have greatly contributed to my development as a researcher. Thank you. Our common visits of many conferences and trips abroad will always remain with me.

Jeroen, my partner in crime during the last five years: thank you for our invaluable countless discussions on criminal liability, this research project, etc. You have been my perfect counterpart in this project and you played a huge role in making me feel at home here in Maastricht.

Roland, thank you for making me feel at home here in Maastricht and for all our immensely interesting, stimulating as well as hilarious discussions in and outside the University. You have certainly helped to sharpen my view on the different shades of grey always to be found between the clear black and white poles of a matter.

I would also like to thank everyone in and outside the university for all their support and for all the great spare time activities. You know who you are!

Kati, thank you for being there and for your endless support, patience and understanding throughout the past five years. Thank you also for your very valuable feedback and comments on earlier drafts of this book. You were always willing to listen and help out wherever possible and you always knew when it was time for me to take a break. Without you this book would not have been possible.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family and friends back home. Mum, Dad, Steffi, thank you for your support during my entire life. You shaped me and without you I would not stand where I stand now. Mats, Nielse, Leo, Mike and Much, thank you for warmly welcoming me every time I return to Austria, be it only for a few days. Your friendship means a lot to me and you are the living proof that the saying “out of sight out of mind” need not always be true.

Maastricht,

12 November 2012

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv

Chapter I

Introduction	1
1. European criminal law	1
2. The need for a general part	3
2.1. Practical Relevance	3
2.2. Theoretical relevance.	5
3. Research questions	6
3.1. Introduction	6
3.2. Elaborated research questions and outline	8
3.2.1. Perpetration	8
3.2.2. Participating in crime – the multiple actor scenarios.	10
3.2.3. Inchoate liability.	10
3.2.4. Corporate Criminal liability.	11
4. Methodology	12
4.1. Introduction	12
4.2. Comparative research	13
4.2.1. The investigated penal systems	13
4.2.2. Comparative methodology	17
4.3. Criteria for synthesis	18
4.3.1. External criteria for the synthesis	18
4.3.2. Internal criteria for the synthesis	20
5. Criminal Liability	29
5.1. Definition.	29
5.2. Harm versus Culpability and Objectivism versus subjectivism in the law	31
5.3. The framework of criminal liability	32
5.4. Criminal liability in the risk society	34

Chapter II

Perpetration – The elements of crime	39
1. Introduction.	39
2. The doctrine of conduct or the conundrum of the baseline of criminal liability	41
2.1. Introduction	41

2.2.	The doctrine of conduct and the criminal law's image of man	45
2.2.1.	The image of man in the Risk Society	46
2.2.2.	Is criminal liability confined to human conduct?	49
2.3.	Different theories of conduct.	53
2.3.1.	The causal theory of action – or the ghost in the machine . . .	53
2.3.2.	The teleological theory of action – human conduct is “seeing”, not blind	55
2.3.3.	The social theory of action – significance lies not in the act but in the context in which it is born	57
2.3.4.	The normative act requirement – the legal normative view. . .	59
2.4.	The conduct requirement in practice.	60
2.4.1.	Loss of physical control	62
2.4.2.	Impaired consciousness	62
2.5.	The underlying rationale of the conduct requirement	65
2.6.	Conclusion	67
3.	Omissions: Criminal liability in absence of physical action?	68
3.1.	Introduction	68
3.2.	Omissions in criminal law.	71
3.2.1.	Statutory duties of care.	72
3.2.2.	Commission by omission	75
3.3.	Conclusion	104
4.	Causality	110
4.1.	Introduction	110
4.2.	The <i>conditio sine qua non</i> or the ‘but for’ test	116
4.3.	The theory of proximate cause	118
4.4.	The theory of adequate causation	119
4.5.	The relevance theory	120
4.6.	Causation in Criminal Law in England, the Netherlands and Germany	121
4.6.1.	The legal principled approach	122
4.6.2.	The metaphysical/normative approach.	129
4.6.3.	The normative/legal approach	135
4.7.	Evaluation	139
4.8.	Conundrums of causation	141
4.8.1.	Predispositions of the victim	141
4.8.2.	Conduct of the victim breaking the chain of causation	142
4.8.3.	Medical interventions.	144
4.8.4.	Drug administration cases	145
4.9.	Causation in European Union Law	145
4.10.	Conclusion	148

Chapter III	
Modes of liability – The multiple actor scenarios	153
1. Introduction	153
2. Terminology and outline	154
2.1. Terminology	154
2.2. Outline	156
3. Unitarian and differentiated concepts of participation	157
4. The derivative nature of the accomplices' liability.	159
4.1. Introduction	159
4.2. Rationales for secondary liability	160
4.3. The nature and quality of the derivative relationship	163
5. The concepts of participation in England: a short introduction	167
5.1. The English approach to participation	168
5.2. Secondary forms of participation	171
5.2.1. Actus reus	171
5.2.2. The fault element in complicity	177
5.3. An expansion of liability – The Serious Crime Act 2007	180
6. Perpetration: Choices and Dilemmas	183
6.1. Introduction	183
6.2. A Restrictive or extensive conception of perpetration?	185
6.2.1. The different connotations of perpetration	185
6.2.2. The restrictive concept of perpetration	186
6.2.3. An extensive concept of perpetration.	188
6.3. A Subjective or objective approach to perpetration?	189
6.4. Concluding remarks	192
7. Vertical forms of perpetration.	194
7.1. Introduction	194
7.2. The Perpetrator behind the scene	195
7.2.1. The German hegemony over the act doctrine	196
7.2.2. The Dutch doctrine of functional perpetration	200
7.2.3. The English doctrine of vicarious liability.	209
7.2.4. Evaluation	212
7.3. Perpetration by means.	214
7.3.1. The traditional scope of the doctrine	214
7.3.2. The different designs and limitations of the doctrine	217
7.3.3. Extending perpetration by means.	222
7.3.4. Concluding remarks	227
7.4. Instigation	229
7.4.1. Introduction	229
7.4.2. Instigation in Germany and the Netherlands	230
7.4.3. The fault element of instigation	233
7.4.4. Errors of the perpetrator and their effect on the instigator	235
7.4.5. The means of instigation in the Dutch penal system	235

8.	Horizontal forms of perpetration	240
8.1.	Co-perpetration	240
8.1.1.	Expanding the scope of mutual attribution	245
8.1.2.	Is mere presence sufficient to establish co-perpetration?	248
8.1.3.	The limits of mutual attribution	253
8.2.	The English doctrine of joint criminal enterprise	258
8.3.	Concluding remarks	262
9.	Assisting a criminal offence	266
9.1.	Introduction	266
9.2.	Assistance in the Netherlands, Germany and England/Wales	266
9.3.	The scope and nature of assistance	269
9.3.1.	The scope of assistance	269
9.3.2.	The nature of assistance	271
9.4.	The furthering effect of aid (causality)	273
9.5.	The fault element of assistance	280
10.	Limitations to participatory liability – Withdrawal	291
10.1.	Withdrawal from participation in a joint enterprise	292
10.2.	Withdrawal from assistance and encouragement	293
11.	The notions of perpetration and participation in EU Law	295
11.1.	Introduction	295
11.2.	The notions of agreement and concerted practices	299
11.3.	The objective requirement	300
11.4.	The subjective requirement	302
11.5.	The model of participation in competition law	303
11.6.	Evaluation	303
12.	Preliminary conclusion	306
13.	Towards a European concept of participation	311
13.1.	Introduction	311
13.2.	A normative concept of participation in crime	311
13.3.	Trivial assistance	317

Chapter IV

	Inchoate offences: Attempt and preparation	321
1.	Introduction	321
2.	Two patterns of criminality	324
2.1.	The pattern of manifest criminality a.k.a. the harm-centred view	324
2.2.	The pattern of subjective criminality a.k.a. the culpability-centred view	325
2.3.	The communalities of the two patterns	326
3.	The Objective – Subjective Debate	327
4.	The pattern of criminality in the culture of control	328
5.	Attempt versus preparation	331

6.	Preparation	333
6.1.	Introduction	333
6.2.	Offences criminalising preparatory conduct	334
6.2.1.	Introduction	334
6.2.2.	Specific offences: Possession and endangerment	336
6.3.	Preparation as a doctrine of the general part	339
6.3.1.	Introduction	339
6.3.2.	The Dutch doctrine of preparation	340
6.4.	Evaluation	350
7.	Criminal attempts	352
7.1.	Introduction	352
7.2.	The rationale for punishing attempts	354
7.2.1.	Introduction	354
7.2.2.	Objective rationales	355
7.2.3.	Subjective rationales	356
7.2.4.	Mixed rationales	357
7.3.	Analysing the legislative starting point of attempt liability	359
7.3.1.	Introduction	359
7.3.2.	Germany	360
7.3.3.	The Netherlands	361
7.3.4.	England	361
7.4.	The actus reus of criminal attempts	363
7.4.1.	Introduction	363
7.4.2.	Drawing the line between attempt and preparation	364
7.4.3.	Concluding remarks	380
7.5.	The fault element in attempts	383
7.5.1.	Introduction	383
7.5.2.	The fault element in England/Wales	384
7.5.3.	The fault element in the Netherlands	388
7.5.4.	The fault element in Germany	389
7.5.5.	Conclusion	391
8.	Impossible attempts	391
8.1.	Introduction	391
8.2.	The objective approach: Impossibility in the Netherlands	394
8.3.	The Subjective approach: Impossibility in England and Wales	397
8.4.	The mixed approach: Impossibility in Germany	400
8.5.	Concluding remarks	404
9.	Voluntary Withdrawal	406
9.1.	Introduction	406
9.2.	Rationales for accepting voluntary withdrawal	408
9.3.	The nature of the exception	410
9.4.	The constituent elements of withdrawal	411
9.4.1.	Categories of attempts	411

9.4.2.	Voluntariness	418
9.4.3.	The actus contrarius in complete attempts.	421
9.5.	Voluntary withdrawal from preparation?	425
10.	Inchoate offences in the European Union.	426
11.	Conclusion.	431
11.1.	Preparation.	431
11.2.	Criminal attempts	432

Chapter V

Criminal liability of legal entities 437

1.	Introduction	437
2.	Alternative and complementary methods to tackle corporate wrongdoing	441
2.1.	Introduction	441
2.2.	Regulatory offences.	442
2.3.	Strict liability offences	445
2.4.	Personal liability of corporate directors	445
3.	Models of Corporate criminal liability	447
3.1.	Introduction	447
3.2.	Objective models of liability: Vicarious liability and the benefit theory.	450
3.3.	The identification doctrine in English law	453
3.3.1.	The application of the identification doctrine	455
3.3.2.	Acting within the scope of corporate duty.	456
3.3.3.	The Meridian Case: Towards a more flexible approach of identification?	457
3.3.4.	The impact of the Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007.	458
3.4.	The identification doctrine in the German Administrative Offences Act	459
3.5.	The identification doctrine in European Union Law.	463
3.6.	The attribution of fault	464
3.7.	The pitfalls of the identification doctrine	465
3.8.	Alternative models of liability.	467
3.8.1.	The <i>Drijfmest</i> (slurry) judgment	477
3.8.2.	Jurisprudence after the <i>Drijfmest</i> (slurry) judgment	482
3.8.3.	The Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007	485
4.	Corporate culture and ethos	493
4.1.	Introduction	493
4.2.	Organisational fault.	493
5.	Conclusion.	497
5.1.	Introduction	497
5.2.	Corporate liability	500

Chapter VI	
Conclusion – Towards a general part of European Criminal Law	503
1. Introduction	503
1.1. The increasing normativity of criminal liability	504
1.2. The limits of criminal liability	504
2. A European concept of actus reus	508
2.1. The conduct requirement	508
2.2. Omission liability	509
2.3. Causality	512
3. Multiple actor scenarios	513
4. Inchoate offences	517
5. Corporate criminal liability	522
6. Concluding remarks	524
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	527
<i>Summary</i>	557
<i>Samenvatting</i>	569
<i>Curriculum Vitae Johannes Keiler</i>	583

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AC	Appeals Cases
AG	Advocate General
appl. no.	application number
Art	Article
All ER	All England Law Reports
BayObLG	Bayerisches Oberstes Landesgericht
BeckRS	Beck-Rechtsprechung
BGH	Bundesgerichtshof
BGHSt	Bundesgerichtshof's Official Gazette, criminal cases
BVerfG(E)	(Decision of the) Bundesverfassungsgericht
CLR	Commonwealth Law Reports
COM	Document originating from the EU Commission
Cox CC	Cox's Criminal Cases 1843–1945
CPS	Crown Prosecution Service
Cr App R	Criminal Appeal Reports
Crim LR	Criminal Law Review
DPC	Dutch Penal Code
DPP	Director of Public Prosecutions
EC	European Communities
ECHR	European Convention of Human Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECR	European Court Reports
EP	European Parliament
EPPO	European Public Prosecutor's Office
EU	European Union
EWCA	England & Wales Court of Appeal
EWCA Crim	England & Wales Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) Decisions
EWHC	England & Wales High Court
GA	Goltdammer's Archiv für Strafrecht
GDR	German Democratic Republic
GPC	German Penal Code
HMG	Hoog Militair Gerechthof
HRRS	Online-Zeitschrift für Höchststrichterliche Rechtsprechung im Strafrecht
HR	Hoge Raad
JA	Juristische Arbeitsblätter
JR	Juristische Rundschau
Jura	Juristische Ausbildung

List of Abbreviations

JuS	Juristische Schulung
JZ	Juristenzeitung
KB	King's Bench
LJ(J)	Lord Justice(s) of Appeal
MDR	Monatsschrift für Deutsches Recht
MPC	Metropolitan Police Commissioner
NbSr	Nieuwsbrief Strafrecht
NJ	Nederlandse Jurisprudentie
NJB	Nederlands Juristenblad
(N)JW	(Neue) Juristische Wochenschrift
NJOZ	Neue Juristische Online Zeitschrift
NStZ(-RR)	Neue Zeitschrift für Strafrecht (-Rechtsprechungsreport)
OJ L	Official Journal of the EU – Legislation
OJ C	Official Journal of the EU- Information and notices
OLAF	European Anti-Fraud Office
OLG	Oberlandesgericht
OWiG	Ordnungswidrigkeitengesetz
QB(D)	Queen's Bench (Division)
R	Regina
Rb.	Rechtbank
Re	Regarding (ablative of <i>res</i>)
REV	Revised version of a EU document
RG	Reichsgericht
RGSt	Reichsgericht, criminal cases
s	Section
StV	Strafverteidiger
StGB	Strafgesetzbuch
TEU	Treaty on the European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the functioning of the European Union
UK	United Kingdom
UKHL	United Kingdom House of Lords
UKPC	United Kingdom Privy Council
US	United States (of America)
v	versus
WLR	Weekly Law Reports
ZRP	Zeitschrift für Rechtspolitik
ZStW	Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft