

case, he may have lost control as it states that he was angry and confused.

The test is that a reasonable person of the defendant's age and sex with a normal degree of tolerance and

Self control would have acted in the same way. In ~~Arthur's case~~ Arthur had been told that Roger has been attacked ~~him~~ in his their home and the fact his elderly, ~~people like to~~ it is likely that Roger in his situation would have acted in the same way. Therefore it would be likely that he would have a defence, if convicted of murder.

possibility of diminished responsibility. To be successful it must be proved that the defendant was suffering from an abnormality of mental functioning which arose from a recognised medical condition. In Arthur's case this could be depression; as it states he became 'nervous and depressed'.

The abnormality of mental functioning must be a significant contributory factor to the killing. In Arthur's case it is hard to say as we don't know whether he was still depressed at the time ~~of the killing~~ he shot Brian and could be argued that it was down to the insulin.

The abnormality of mental functioning must have substantially impaired the defendant's ability to understand the nature of their conduct; or form a rational judgment; or exercise self control. It could be said that he did not form. In Arthur's case this does not seem to be relevant and more down to the effects of insulin. Therefore it is unlikely that Arthur would have the defence of diminished responsibility.