

A-level
LAW
7162/1

Paper 1

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

01 Select the **true** statement about liability for an omission.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

A An Act of Parliament can create liability for an omission.

02 Select the **true** statement about the defence of diminished responsibility.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

A The abnormality of mental functioning must provide an explanation for the defendant's conduct.

03 Within statutory interpretation, which **one** of the following is **not** an intrinsic (internal) aid to interpretation?

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

A A Law Commission Report

04 The CILEx Regulation Board has the power to discipline which **one** of the following?

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

C A legal executive

05 Select the **true** statement about the role of the jury within the criminal justice system.
The jury will

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

C reach a verdict based on the facts presented.

06	<p>The 1966 Practice Statement is a method used by the Supreme Court to avoid a binding precedent.</p> <p>Using any example, explain the 1966 Practice Statement.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[5 marks]</p>
-----------	--

Marks for this question: AO1 = 5

	Levels of response mark scheme 5 marks – AO1 only
Mark range	Description
4–5 Band 3	<p>Knowledge is good and demonstrates a good understanding of the English legal system.</p> <p>Where appropriate a good example of a case to illustrate suggested reasons.</p>
2–3 Band 2	<p>Knowledge is satisfactory and demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the English legal system.</p> <p>Where appropriate a satisfactory example of a case to illustrate reasons.</p>
1 Band 1	<p>Knowledge is limited and demonstrates a limited understanding of the English legal system.</p> <p>Where appropriate a limited example of a case to illustrate reasons.</p>
0	Nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Judicial precedent is based on ‘stare decisis’. Standing by previous decisions.
- 1966 Practice Statement allows the Supreme Court to depart from a previous decision when ‘it appears right to do so’.
- 1966 Practice Statement states that the Supreme Court should bear in mind the danger of disturbing retrospectively the basis on which contracts, settlement of property, and fiscal arrangements have been entered into and also the especial need for certainty as to the criminal law.

Appropriate examples which illustrate its use may include – **British Railways Board v Herrington (1972)** overruled **Addie v Dumbreck (1929)**, **R v Shivpuri (1986)** overruled **Anderton v Ryan (1985)**, **R v G (2003)** overruled **MPC v Caldwell (1982)**, **Austin v London Borough of Southwark (2010)** overruled **Brent London Borough Council v Knightley (1997)**.
Credit any other relevant point(s).

07	<p>Causation requires proof of causation in fact and causation in law. Alice caused the permanent damage to Belle's wrist in fact.</p> <p>Suggest why Alice is likely to have caused the permanent damage to Belle's wrist in law.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[5 marks]</p>
-----------	---

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2 and AO2 = 3

	Levels of response mark scheme 5 marks – AO1 (2) and AO2 (3)
Mark range	Description
4–5 Band 3	Good outline explanation of legal rules and principles and good application to the scenario in order to present a legal argument using appropriate terminology. Good explanation of a relevant case to support the application.
2–3 Band 2	Knowledge is satisfactory and demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Satisfactory application of legal rules and principles to the scenario. Satisfactory explanation of a relevant case to support the application.
1 Band 1	Knowledge is limited and demonstrates a limited understanding of legal rules and principles.
0	Nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

AO1

- Outline explanation that inadequate medical treatment can be a new intervening act that breaks the chain of causation.
- Outline explanation that a break in the chain of causation will only occur where the medical treatment is so independent and so potent that it makes the defendant's act insignificant.

AO2

- Identification of key facts: Alice pushed Belle causing a sprain to her wrist, this in turn required Belle to seek medical treatment that resulted in permanent damage.
- Application of the rule: The push is significant/substantial not de minimis. Consideration of the act of a third party (medical treatment) and that the chain would only be broken if the intervening act is sufficiently independent of the defendant's conduct.
- Recognition that medical negligence rarely breaks the chain of causation.
- To conclude that Alice is likely to be found to have caused the permanent damage.
- Case(s) enhance explanations or are the vehicle via which explanation emerges. Examples include **R v Cheshire (1991)**, **R v Jordan (1956)**, **R v Smith (1959)**.

Credit any other relevant point(s).

08 In relation to the incident with Debbie, advise Caroline of her criminal liability for the offence of assault (battery) occasioning actual bodily harm under s47 Offences against the Person Act 1861.

[10 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 3, AO2 = 4 and AO3 = 3

	Levels of response mark scheme 10 marks – AO1 (3), AO2 (4) and AO3 (3)
Mark range	Description
7–10 Band 3	Knowledge is good and demonstrates a good understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Good analysis of legal rules and principles leading to good application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. Good explanation of relevant legal authority to support the application. A good legal argument is presented using appropriate terminology to support advice.
3–6 Band 2	Knowledge is satisfactory and demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Satisfactory analysis of legal rules and principles leading to satisfactory application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. Satisfactory explanation of relevant legal authority to support the application. A satisfactory legal argument is presented using some appropriate terminology to support advice.
1–2 Band 1	A limited demonstration of knowledge. Limited analysis of legal rules and principles in relation to the scenario but rules and principles are not applied correctly to the scenario.
0	Nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

AO1

- Outline explanation of the elements of the offence of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm (actus reus and mens rea).
- Outline explanation of the actus reus elements of s47 apprehension of immediate unlawful personal violence or infliction of unlawful personal violence which causes more than trivial hurt or injury.
- Outline explanation of the mens rea elements of s47 as intention or (subjective) recklessness as to causing apprehension of personal violence or as to inflicting personal violence.
- Outline explanation of the requirements of causation in fact and causation in law including the thin skull rule
- Reference to supporting case authority, for example, **R v Chan-Fook**, **R v Savage**, **R v Latimer** **R v Blaue**.

AO2

- Application of the actus reus for battery to conclude that Caroline applied unlawful force when the soap made contact with Debbie.
- Application of the rules of causation (occasioning).
- Application of the thin skull rule in relation to the allergic reaction to conclude that causation is satisfied.
- Application to conclude that the allergic reaction and subsequent temporary blurred vision would satisfy the ABH (minor injury) requirement.
- Application of the mens rea to conclude that there may be evidence of direct intention or at the least recklessness for the battery.
- Application to suggest that Caroline may have committed an assault in causing Debbie to apprehend immediate personal violence by throwing the soap.
- Reference to supporting case authority – **DPP v K (1990)**, **R v Roberts (1971)**, **R v Chan-Fook (1994)**, **R v Blaue (1975)**.

AO3

- Analysis and evaluation of the actus reus elements, in particular, the meaning of actual bodily harm.
- Analysis and evaluation of the mens rea requirement (Intention/recklessness).
- Analysis and evaluation of the causation/thin skull issues.

Credit any other relevant point(s).

Note: If s47 is established via an assault only: Max. 7 marks (Band 3)

09	<p>Self-defence may be used as a defence in criminal law.</p> <p>Examine the meaning of 'justice' and discuss the extent to which the availability of the defence of self-defence may achieve justice.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[15 marks]</p>
-----------	--

Marks for this question: AO1 = 5 and AO3 = 10

	Levels of response mark scheme 15 marks – AO1 (5) and AO3 (10)
Mark range	Description
13–15 Band 5	<p>Knowledge is excellent and demonstrates an excellent understanding of the Nature of Law and legal rules and principles. Excellent selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>Excellent analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles; concepts and issues. Excellent drawing together of knowledge and understanding of substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study.</p> <p>A logical, sustained and well-developed line of reasoning is maintained leading to a valid, relevant and substantiated conclusion.</p>
10–12 Band 4	<p>Knowledge is good and demonstrates a good understanding of the Nature of Law and legal rules and principles. Good selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>Good analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles; concepts and issues. Good drawing together of knowledge and understanding of substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study.</p> <p>A sustained and, but not yet fully, developed line of reasoning is established leading to a partially justified conclusion.</p>
7–9 Band 3	<p>Knowledge is satisfactory and demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the Nature of Law and legal rules and principles. Satisfactory selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>Satisfactory analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles; concepts and issues. Some drawing together of knowledge and understanding of substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study.</p> <p>A chain of reasoning starts to develop which leads to a partially justified conclusion.</p>
4–6 Band 2	<p>Knowledge is limited and demonstrates a limited understanding of the Nature of Law and legal rules and principles. Limited selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>Limited analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles; concepts and issues. Limited drawing together of knowledge and understanding of substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study. Some reasoning is attempted which leads to a limited conclusion.</p>
1–3 Band 1	<p>Knowledge is minimal and demonstrates a minimal understanding of the Nature of law and legal rules and principles. Minimal selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>Minimal analysis and evaluation of legal concepts and issues.</p> <p>No chain of reasoning is attempted.</p>

0	Nothing worthy of credit.
---	---------------------------

Indicative content

AO1

- Identification and brief description of the different possible meanings 'of justice,' for example, justice in terms of basic fairness or equality of treatment.
- Identification and brief explanation of the rules of natural justice
- Identification of different theories of justice, eg distributive justice, utilitarianism and social justice
- Identification and brief explanation of the philosophies behind the theories and the thinkers who have explained them e.g. Aristotle, Marx, Bentham, Rawls etc.
- Identification and brief explanation of the elements required to successfully prove self-defence.

AO3

- Analysis of the importance of philosophical theories of justice and how they have been embedded within the legal system.
- Analysis of procedural justice and how legal institutions, such as the courts and the judiciary work to achieve justice.
- Analysis of how the law has been developed in order to achieve justice, for example, miscarriages of justice and the development of the Criminal Cases Review Commission.
- Analysis of the scope of self-defence.
- Analysis and evaluation of the necessity for force, pre-emptive strikes.
- Analysis and evaluation of the extent to which justice is promoted: use of the defence as a complete defence, mistaken use of force, proportionality, application to homeowners against intruders, use of pre-emptive force in self-defence.
- Use of supporting case authority to evaluate the analysis above. For example, **R v Gladstone Williams**, **Beckford v The Queen**, **R v Bird**, **R v Clegg**.

Credit any other relevant point(s).

Distribution of marks for substantive and non-substantive law:

Substantive	Non-substantive	Total marks
5	10	15

10	Consider the criminal liability of Frank in connection with the £200 and with the death of George.	[30 marks]
-----------	--	-------------------

Marks for this question: AO1 = 10, AO2 = 10 and AO3 = 10

	Levels of response mark scheme 30 marks AO1 (10), AO2 (10) and AO3 (10)
Mark range	Description
25–30 Band 5	Knowledge is excellent and demonstrates an excellent understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Excellent selection and use of appropriate legal authority. There is excellent analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles leading to excellent application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. An excellent legal argument is presented using appropriate terminology. A logical, sustained and well-developed line of reasoning is maintained leading to a valid, relevant and substantiated conclusion.
19–24 Band 4	Knowledge is good and demonstrates a good understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Good selection and use of appropriate legal authority. There is good analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles leading to good application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. A good legal argument is presented using appropriate terminology. A sustained and, but not yet fully, developed line of reasoning is established leading to a partially justified conclusion.
13–18 Band 3	Knowledge is satisfactory and demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Satisfactory selection and use of appropriate legal authority. There is satisfactory analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles leading to satisfactory application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. A satisfactory legal argument is presented using some appropriate terminology. A chain of reasoning starts to develop which leads to a partially justified conclusion.
7–12 Band 2	Knowledge is limited and demonstrates a limited understanding of relevant legal rules and principles. Limited selection and use of appropriate legal authority. There is limited analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles which may lead to limited application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. A limited legal argument is presented using little appropriate terminology. Some reasoning is attempted which leads to a limited conclusion.
1–6 Band 1	Knowledge is minimal and demonstrates minimal understanding of legal rules and principles. Minimal selection and use of legal authority. There is minimal analysis and evaluation of legal rules and principles which may lead to minimal application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario. A fragmented legal argument is attempted. No chain of reasoning is attempted.
0	Nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

AO1

- Identification and outline explanation of the offences of theft and robbery.
- Identification and outline explanation of unlawful act of manslaughter. (Credit actus reus elements of murder and credit elements of gross negligence manslaughter as an alternative)
- Identification and outline explanation of the defence of voluntary intoxication.
- Reference to supporting statutory authority (Theft Act 1968 s1 and s8).
- Reference to supporting case authority, eg **R v Ghosh**, **Ivey v Genting Casino**, **R v Dawson and James**, **R v Lockley**, **R v Beard**.

AO2

- Application of the actus reus of theft to conclude that there was an appropriation of property (£200) belonging to another (the shop).
- Application of the dishonesty mens rea requirement to conclude that Frank may not be regarded as dishonest due to the s2(1)(a) provision ‘... in the belief that he has in law the right to deprive the other of it’
- Application of the mens rea requirement; intention to permanently deprive to discuss the requirement in relation to s6 as Frank returned the money.
- Application of the actus reus and mens rea of robbery to conclude that the force used (‘push’) in order to escape is sufficiently proximate to the seizing of the money and so satisfies both the actus reus requirement; for the force to be used “immediately before or at the time of [the stealing]” and mens rea requirement of robbery. (**R v Lockley**).
- Application of the elements of unlawful act manslaughter to conclude that there was an unlawful act by throwing the beer which amounts to an assault.
- Application to the facts of the scenario to conclude that Frank probably caused the death of George by his crime of assault, and that the action of throwing beer is likely to be ‘dangerous’ as it is foreseeable that there is a risk of injury when a person responds quickly to ‘avoid being soaked’ by beer and so creates a risk of harm. (falling, bumping into people/objects) Credit alternative application of gross negligence manslaughter.
- Application of the rules of causation to suggest that the victim’s response to the threat was foreseeable and reasonable (**R v Roberts**) and so there is a direct link between the assault and the death.
- Application of the relevant mens rea for the unlawful act, not death. (**Newbury and Jones**).
- Application of the defence of voluntary intoxication to conclude that there is no defence based on **Majewski**.

AO3

- Analysis and evaluation of the actus reus and mens rea elements for theft, particular discussion relating to dishonesty.
- Analysis and evaluation of the actus reus and mens rea elements for robbery, particular discussion of the use of force in order to steal.
- Analysis and evaluation of the elements of unlawful act manslaughter, particular discussion of whether the act was dangerous based on facts.
- Analysis and evaluation of the availability of the defence of voluntary intoxication
- Use of supporting case authority to evaluate the analysis above. For example, **Velumyl**, **Dawson and James**, **R v Hale**, **R v Church**, **DPP v Majewski**.
- Credit any other relevant point(s).

ICG’s

- 1) Theft
- 2) Robbery and intoxication
- 3) Unlawful act manslaughter

Distribution of marks for substantive and non-substantive law:

Substantive	Non-substantive	Total marks
30	0	30

- 11** Consider Isobel's criminal liability for the murder of Harry.
- Assuming that Isobel is found guilty, assess the sentencing powers available to the court.
- [30 marks]**

Marks for this question: AO1 = 10, AO2 = 10 and AO3 = 10

	Levels of response mark scheme 30 marks AO1 (10), AO2 (10) and AO3 (10)
Mark range	Description
25–30 Band 5	<p>Knowledge is excellent and demonstrates an excellent understanding of the English legal system and legal rules and principles. Excellent selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>There is excellent analysis of legal rules and principles leading to excellent application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario.</p> <p>An excellent legal argument is presented using appropriate terminology.</p> <p>There is excellent analysis and evaluation of legal concepts and issues.</p> <p>Excellent drawing together of knowledge and understanding from substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study. A logical, sustained and well-developed line of reasoning is maintained leading to a valid, relevant and substantiated conclusion.</p>
19–24 Band 4	<p>Knowledge is good and demonstrates a good understanding of the English legal system and legal rules and principles. Good selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>There is good analysis of legal rules and principles leading to good application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario.</p> <p>A good legal argument is presented using appropriate terminology.</p> <p>There is good analysis and evaluation of legal concepts and issues.</p> <p>Good drawing together of knowledge and understanding from substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study.</p> <p>A sustained and, but not yet fully, developed line of reasoning is established leading to a partially justified conclusion.</p>
13–18 Band 3	<p>Knowledge is satisfactory and demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the English legal system and legal rules and principles. Satisfactory selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>There is satisfactory analysis of legal rules and principles leading to satisfactory application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario.</p> <p>A satisfactory legal argument is presented using some appropriate terminology.</p>

	<p>There is satisfactory analysis and evaluation of legal concepts and issues. Some drawing together of knowledge and understanding from substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study. A chain of reasoning starts to develop which leads to a partially justified conclusion.</p>
--	---

<p>7–12</p> <p>Band 2</p>	<p>Knowledge is limited and demonstrates a limited understanding of the English legal system and legal rules and principles. Limited selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>There is limited analysis of legal rules and principles leading to limited application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario.</p> <p>A limited legal argument is presented using little appropriate terminology.</p> <p>There is limited analysis and evaluation of legal concepts and issues.</p> <p>Limited drawing together of knowledge and understanding from substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study. Some reasoning is attempted which leads to a limited conclusion.</p>
<p>1–6</p> <p>Band 1</p>	<p>Knowledge is minimal and demonstrates a minimal understanding of the English legal system and legal rules and principles. Minimal selection and use of relevant legal authority.</p> <p>There is minimal analysis of legal rules and principles leading to minimal application of the correct rules and principles to the scenario.</p> <p>A fragmented legal argument is attempted.</p> <p>There is minimal analysis and evaluation of legal concepts and issues.</p> <p>Minimal drawing together of knowledge and understanding from substantive and non-substantive law from across the course of study. No chain of reasoning is attempted.</p>
<p>0</p>	<p>Nothing worthy of credit.</p>

Indicative content

AO1

- Identification and outline explanation of the offence of murder.
- Identification and outline explanation of the specific defence to murder of loss of control.
- Reference to appropriate supporting case and statutory authority (for example, s54 Coroners and Justice Act 2009).
- Identification of the sentencing powers of the Crown court.

AO2

- Application of the facts to suggest that the multiple stab wounds are strong evidence of an intention to cause at least serious injury; there is a prima facie case of murder.
- Application to suggest that Isobel may raise the defence of loss of control via the anger trigger due to the violence and taunt 'you're a useless wife'. Reference to the need for circumstances of extremely grave character and justifiable sense of being seriously wronged.
- Application of excluded matters including reference to sexual infidelity and how this could be used in addition, but not as a trigger on its own (Clinton) and possible evidence of revenge due to the time delay.
- Application to suggest that Isobel may be able to raise the fear trigger in response to the fear relating to the threat to 'beat her up' in accordance to s55 'D's fear of serious violence from V against D or another identified person'.
- Application of the requirement that 'a person of D's sex and age, with a normal degree of tolerance and self-restraint and in the circumstances of D, might have reacted in the same or in a similar way to D' (s54).

AO3

- Analysis and evaluation of mens rea in murder: direct and oblique intent (foresight of consequences); death and serious injury to conclude that Isobel may have express intention to kill or at the least she has implied intention to cause GBH based on the multiple stab wounds.
- Analysis and evaluation of the availability of the defence of loss of control to conclude that if successful the conviction will be voluntary manslaughter and if not it will be murder.
- Analysis and evaluation of the mandatory life sentence/levels of minimum term. Analysis of alternative sentences if guilty of voluntary manslaughter.
- Use of supporting case authority to evaluate the analysis above. For example **R v Woollin**, **R v Jewell**, **R v Clinton**.

ICG's

- 1) Murder
- 2) Loss of control
- 3) Non substantive element

Distribution of marks for substantive and non-substantive law:

Substantive	Non-substantive	Total marks
23	7	30

Assessment Objectives Grid

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1	1			1
2	1			1
3	1			1
4	1			1
5	1			1
6	5			5
7	2	3		5
8	3	4	3	10
9	5		10	15
10	10	10	10	30
11	10	10	10	30
Paper Total	40	27	33	100

Distribution of marks for substantive and non-substantive law

Question	Substantive	Non-substantive	Total Marks
1	1		1
2	1		1
3		1	1
4		1	1
5		1	1
6		5	5
7	5		5
8	10		10
9	5	10	15
10	30		30
11	23	7	30
Total	75	25	100
Total %	75	25	100