

Case Name	Summary Facts	Element of Consent	Legal Point
M'Naghten 1843	The defendant killed Sir Robert Peel's secretary while suffering from extreme paranoia.	Definition.	First Insanity case which created test for insanity.
DPP v H 1997	The defendant was charged with driving with excess alcohol	Definition.	There is no defence of insanity to crime of strict liability.
Clarke 1972	The defendant took items from supermarket without knowing it due to diabetes and depression.	Defect of reasons.	Court of appeal quashed C's conviction as needed inability to reason, not just imperfect reasoning.
Kemp 1956	The defendant had hardening of arteries and he attacked his wife with hammer.	Disease of mind.	Court of appeal upheld insanity as physical illness removed defendant mind and ability to reason properly.
Sullivan 1984	The defendant was an epileptic who injured elderly neighbour during fit when visiting.	Disease of mind.	House of Lords created broad definition of disease of the mind; source of disease irrelevant.
Hennessy 1983	The defendant was diabetic and took no insulin for three days. He was charged with taking motor vehicle without consent and driving while disqualified.	Disease of mind.	Court of appeal held that insanity was correct defence se internal factor affected defendant's mind.
Quick 1973	The defendant was a diabetic nurse who took insulin but ate insufficient food and assaulted her patient.	Disease of mind.	Court of appeal held that condition was induced by insulin which is an external factor therefore defence of insanity is not appropriate.
Burgess 1991	The defendant attacked his girlfriend after falling asleep whilst watching film.	Disease of mind.	Court of appeal upheld sleep disorder causing sleepwalking as insanity.
Bratty 1963	The defendant strangled a girl with her stocking and claimed it happened during an epileptic sizzle.	Disease of mind.	House of Lords said that it defence of insanity was available and created ruling.
Windle 1952	The defendant killed his wife with 100 aspirin and said, 'I suppose they will hang me for this'.	Wrongness of act.	The defendant was not insane as he knew his act was wrong in law.
Johnson 2007	The defendant was a paranoid schizophrenic who attacked neighbour.	Wrongness of act.	The defendant was found not insane as he knew what he was doing and that it was legally wrong.