**CLN4U: LEGAL PHILOSOPHIES CASE STUDY**

The Supreme Court of Canada is about to hear an appeal in the case of Craig Jaret Hutchinson, a Nova Scotia man convicted of sexual assault for poking holes in his girlfriend's condoms in a bid to salvage his relationship with the woman.

In the summer of 2006, Hutchinson thought he could save his flagging relationship by getting his girlfriend pregnant. He surreptitiously poked holes in her condoms, and later urged her to start taking pregnancy tests. The second test came back positive.

It was only after the positive pregnancy test that Hutchinson admitted to the sabotage. Things did not turn out as he'd hoped — his Halifax-area girlfriend broke off the relationship, called police and had an abortion. A publication ban protects her identity. Upon learning of the nature of this case, and hearing that initial trial judges found it difficult to apply the current laws to the situation at hand, there were massive public demonstrations both at parliament and local courts across the country.

He was charged soon after w/ sexual assault. The charges are as follows:

**Assault**

265. (1) A person commits and assault when

a) without the consent of another person, he applies force intentionally to that other person, directly or indirectly;

265. (2)Everyone who, in committing an assault,

b) causes bodily harm to the complainant,

***It is your job now to apply 4 contemporary legal philosophies to this case……also identify which theory really doesn’t fit in this situation.***