

Level 1 Legal Text Processing – 06970 Spring 2010

General

Most papers submitted for this series were of a high standard.

Document 1

This letter was generally produced very well. There were omissions of small words, such as 'in dispute' instead of 'in a dispute'. A high number of candidates keyed 'you' instead of 'your' in this letter. Other common errors were 'contacts' instead of 'contracts' and 'instruction' instead of 'instructions'. Careful proofreading would pick up such errors. Some candidates chose to expand '&' into 'and'. This is not necessary, but was acceptable if both signs were expanded consistently. However, candidates are reminded that this sign should not be expanded in the names of firms, such as in Document 3.

Document 2

This document was usually produced accurately. Some candidates failed to be consistent with the use of initial capitals as shown on the paper for the word Owner. Candidates are reminded that capitalisation should be followed exactly as shown. There were some instances of the legal word 'seised' being keyed as 'seized'. There are no unmarked spelling mistakes in this examination so proofreading should pick up this type of error and candidates should not always rely on the spellchecker. Proper names must be copied carefully, as there are many variations and candidates must key names exactly as shown. Many candidates failed to change line spacing to single for the final section (the attestation clause).

Document 3

Some candidates omitted the final full stop and should be reminded to follow punctuation exactly as shown. There were few other errors in this document apart from occasional misspellings of Shillingwood.