# The Philosophical Dilemma of Criminalising Medical Negligence in England and Wales: A Critical Review of Involuntary Manslaughter and the Harm Principle

**Abdulaziz Mohammed Ramas Al Rawas***

**PhD Researcher Department of Sharia and Law, Academy of Islamic Studies, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.**

**Orcid No: 0009-0009-4816-3718**

***Corresponding Author**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600296**

**Received: 04 June 2026; Accepted: 10 June 2026; Published: 22 June 2026**

## ABSTRACT

The study reviews the philosophical and legal bases for criminalizing the medical profession for gross negligence manslaughter in England and Wales. The study is based on several fundamental criminological and legal theories, such as the harm principle (principle of harm) developed by John Stuart Mill and legal moralism. The study critically evaluates how the criminal justice system processes unintentional medical errors committed under stressful conditions. The research study identifies a significant doctrinal conflict in the application of common law where medical professionals are convicted of a high-level homicide charge based on an objective breach of standard of care, without the requisite subjective element of intent or negligence (mens rea). The study used doctrinal and qualitative research methodologies to determine that this systemic standards-based approach results in the expansion of individual blameworthiness without taking into account the multi-layered institutional healthcare pressures faced by medical professionals and has resulted in defensive medicine rather than true deterrence. The conclusion of this research is that, for criminal liability in Medical Practices, there has to be a change in how we view it philosophically. The authors argue that governmental penal authority needs to intrude into the field of medicine only if the physician engaged in self-willed recklessness. This would prevent the criminalization of physicians practicing self-conscientiously but allow for system-wide safety.

**Keywords:** Over-criminalisation, Harm Principle, Mens Rea, Medical Negligence, England and Wales

## INTRODUCTION

Historically, Western criminal law has been based on the central principle that actus non facit reum nisi mens rea sit-"an act is not criminal unless the mind is also guilty" (Bishop 1923). The concept has acted for centuries as a 'moral constraint against the state acting arbitrarily and punishing those who were not responsible in some sense'- i.e. It was believed that the criminal sanction should only be reserved for the deliberate commission of offences either by way of intention, oblique intention or recklessness (Simester et al., 2016). Today, in the context of criminal liability imposed upon the medical profession within England and Wales, GNM, a common law offense, has emerged as an obvious and shocking anomaly to the rule that "the guilty mind must accompany the act" (Lodge 2017; Quick 2010). The state, when a doctor fails in his or her duty of care, and a patient dies, skips any necessity for a subjective 'guilty mind' and criminalises the doctor with the utmost severity of liability, (the sentence carries life imprisonment) on solely the objective basis of not reaching the expected standard of the 'reasonable' medical practitioner (R v Adomako [1995]).

This theoretical framing poses serious ethical and practical issues for contemporary medical practice. A doctor finds themselves in a dangerous, unstable, and persistently undersupplied clinical setting and, fundamentally, is driven by an occupational obligation to maintain life and prevent harm. Instead of the typical criminal who

voluntarily introduces risk into the social world, the doctor engaged in clinical intervention is actually attempting to resist pre-existing, natural risks of death. While it seems to be true that medical errors take a myriad of different forms; the English criminal law applies the same 'one size fits all' retributive scheme to subconscious cognitive errors, organizational systemic pressures, and true human error under the same punishment for all involuntary manslaughter (Merry & McCall Smith, 2001).

The human and institutional implications of this legal model are truly devastating. Major prosecutions in the last ten years, including the exceptionally divisive cases of R v Rose [2017] and R v Bawa-Garba (Hadiza) [2016] have sent a shudder through the UK's healthcare systems. Rather than an open approach centered around learning from errors to achieve patient safety, the aggressive intervention of the Crown Prosecution Service and professional regulators has demoralised loyal professionals, generating an 'atmosphere of toxic fear of reprisals' throughout hospitals (Samanta and Samanta, 2019). Doctors feel increasingly singled out and put at risk of career ending criminal prosecutions for clinical errors influenced by systemic factors, including a lack of staffing and slow access to diagnostic resources (Hadiza Bawa-Garba v General Medical Council [2018]), which will inevitably deter doctors from reporting errors and ensure competent graduates are diverted away from particularly stressful medical fields (The Lancet, 2019).

As a result, there is an immediate need to re-examine philosophically whether the existing common law mechanics of GNM manslaughter are ethically sound or whether they inherently promote a structured over-criminalisation of medical professionals (Husak, 2009). Exploring the main legal issues arising from the complete absence of subjective mens rea in GNM, the essay will seek to establish whether the power of the state is being wrongly utilized in the pursuit of a primitive retribution following medical failures (Oldenquist, 1988). The author will then further consider where the burden of responsibility can be equally and fairly divided between the 'single point of failure' doctor and a complex and multi-layered, and over-stretched, medical system (Reason, 1990). In essence, this study aims to reduce the dichotomy between legal theory and medical reality by establishing a rigorous conceptual framework to critically evaluate the doctrinal alignment of the current common-law test with fundamental penal principles.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The philosophical bedrock of criminal responsibility is the moral basis of state retribution. The criminal justice system of England and Wales fails to distinguish the judgment of professional failing leading to death, from the philosophical paradigms of classical criminology. As criminal law considers the potential liability of health professionals, it is inevitably caught between the public demand for retribution, and the moral limitations on its practice. This framework defines the parameters within which the concepts of mens rea, public wrongfulness, and moral status of acts done with honest professional belief, lie within this research.

### Classical Criminological Paradigms in Healthcare

The theory-practice gap in the field of criminalization is notoriously difficult to bridge satisfactorily to clinical reality. Over time, utilitarian and retributive frameworks have been invoked in justifying the activation of the state's punitive apparatus. On a utilitarian account of criminal sanctions, as elaborated by H.L.A. Hart, "the utilitarian aim is the maximization of welfare by the conscious and unconscious deterrence" (Hart, 1968). The model requires a presumption that particular acts have a deterrent effect on subsequent action in conformity with societal standards. The conscious and unconscious nature of error in the field of medicine is however, incompatible with the application of the utilitarian equation. To suppose that threat of criminal liability, which may terminate a career, has any deterrent effect on unconscious cognitive errors or human system fallibility simply ignores the psychology of human functioning under pressure (Reason, 1990).

In contrast, the retributivist approach posits that punishment is necessarily entailed on account of being deserved, without regard for the consequences to society in the future (Oldenquist, 1988). What it aims for is a reestablishment of some sense of moral equilibrium which has been disturbed by wrongdoing. However, to apply this same notion of retaliation-as-deserts in the context of medicine engenders such deeply distorting moral consequences. The wrongful act in this context does not arise from malice or an evil disposition toward others, it arises from being within a profession utterly concerned with saving lives. It thus fails to make any moral sense at

all to criminalize accidental medical events on the same theoretical terms that apply to malicious or rapacious harms in society.

### The Intersection of Criminal Law and Medical Good-Faith

Here there is a singular moral tension at play: at the point where the state's punitive powers come into conflict with actions performed by a medical professional in good faith. Criminal law is predicated on differentiating a class of people who knowingly flout society's expectations from a class of people who comply. Criminalization: A Philosophical Approach, R.A. Duff suggests that criminal trials should concerned themselves with 'public wrongs' – acts that consist in a knowing defiance of a community's collective moral norms (Duff, 2018). Professional medical practice is by definition an institutional ethical act-welcomed, and indeed, supported, by the community-for the latter sees the clinician not as a menace but as a rescuer.

A well-trained professional is attempting to thwart an ongoing risk of death that the patient has already encountered. An ordinary criminal perpetrator attempts to affirmatively introduce into a non-risk situation a new, uninvited risk for an inappropriate purpose. A clinical mistake, therefore, is a mistake made during an attempt to bring about some acceptable good; to brand this act with the clumsiness of homicide undermines the need for fine distinctions between malicious risk-creation and an earnest person who has, at times, made an unknowing mistake while acting for some good at an extreme of operational pressure, while trying to save a life.

### The Misapplication of Mill's Harm Principle in Medical Negligence

The chief weakness in the contemporary regime is a doctrinal distortion of J.S. Mill's Harm Principle (Mill, 1998) as it applies to Gross Negligence Manslaughter (GNM). Mill's liberal order typically views state compulsion and criminal punishment as only justifiable when necessary to prevent the person from imposing on the person or persons who are performing a risky, volitional act in causing others to be subjected to danger; that, importantly, involves implicitly presupposing an actor of sufficient volitional capacity or recklessness to bring the risk into being. Applying that principle to the well-intentioned doctor operating under extreme cognitive load and institutional strain, the state's intervention morphs from the prevention of the imposition of the risk itself into the punishment of the sad, contingent outcome. Hart and other legal theorists (Hart, 1968) argue that criminal law should be sensitive to individual capacity and control; GNM cases on a systemic level criminalize not the active imposition of social risk, but the failure to effectively ameliorate an already existing, natural pathology. To impose an absolute objective standard of care on the institutionally constrained professional effectively abrogates Mill's liberal boundary with the Harm Principle and transforms criminal law into a mechanism of strict liability for outcome.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Any exploration into the psychological and legal gravity of criminal responsibility must rest on a firm, cohesive methodological foundation. In order to fully investigate and describe the considerable tension that exists between legal theory and the clinical realities of practice, this thesis employs a multi-dimensional methodology, defining law not as pure static text, but rather as a social force with palpable emotional resonance and meaning.

### Doctrinal Research Design (Black Letter Law Method)

The primary architectural foundation of this research relies on the doctrinal research methodology. Often characterized as the "black letter law" method, this approach forms the historic core of common-law legal scholarship, providing a systematic framework for analyzing primary legal sources, including case law, judicial precedents, and statutory enactments (Duncan and Hutchinson, 2012). By engaging in a meticulous examination of landmark appellate decisions in England and Wales—most notably the foundational rulings in R v Bateman [1925] and R v Adomako [1995], alongside contemporary shifts in R v Rose [2017] and R v Bawa-Garba [2016]—this method uncovers the internal contradictions and shifting thresholds of culpability embedded in common-law homicide architecture.

This black letter law treatment is effective because it provides a close dissection of a legal rule from within the system itself. Yet rather than remaining within the boundaries of a formal text, the doctrinal concept is used to

illustrate the human impact of legal definitions. How the actual words uttered by a judge turn an unwanted medical mistake into an irreversible criminal sentence.

### Qualitative Evaluation of Policy and Public Reports

To maintain the intense situatedness and mimicry of frontline experiences, doctrinal design is accompanied by qualitative assessment of contemporary policy documents and individual investigative reports. The stratum of structural analysis consists of critically engaging with the in-depth regulatory review reports commissioned to address the legal and professional crisis of the healthcare system. It examines the Gross Negligence Manslaughter in Healthcare Review (Sir Williams, 2018) and the General Medical Council's Independent Review of Gross Negligence Manslaughter and Culpable Homicide (Hamilton, 2019).

By examining these secondary sources, we can bridge the gap between theoretical legal criteria and actual clinical facts. Instead of considering figures and findings on the system as dry, hard facts, the qualitative methodology here unpacks the human story which forms them. It shows the "toxic fear of reprisals", loss of professional integrity, and pressure of the system that physicians are dealing with in their daily lives (The Lancet, 2019). The blend of formal legal doctrines with these testimonies recorded in public reviews enables a holistic, empathic and legally grounded examination of the criminalisation of medical professionals.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The expanding scope of criminal regulatory involvement in the healthcare sector of England and Wales has sparked intense academic debate across legal, medical, and criminological disciplines. Scholars have focused their inquiries on the critical issues of expanding individual criminal blame, the lack of subjective mens rea in fatal professional errors, and the profound social consequences that over-criminalisation inflicts on frontline clinical practices.

### The Scholarly Consensus on Measuring 'Grossness'

At the heart of modern legal scholarship, it is this fundamental structural critique of the common-law definition of 'grossness' in cases of medical manslaughter that has been central to contemporary debates. Critics maintain that the legal test of gross negligence introduced by R v Adomako [1995] adds a circular and unpredictable structure to the common law, transferring the issue of criminal culpability into the realm of retrospective jury decision-making. (Quick, 2006) maintains that the current standard of gross negligence manslaughter ultimately depends on the administrative and prosecutorial discretion that offers no clear distinction between the dangerous and thoroughly culpably inclined medical practitioner and the good doctor driven to that particular level of misfortune by an unusual array of clinical variables.

It is this circle that is subject to much criticism from lawyers, whose analysis indicates that juries are told in substance to convict a doctor of a crime if they believe the negligence to be criminal (i.e. "gross") without the existence of an established or legislatively defined standard of what that level of criminality actually is. (Lodge, 2017) argues that it places an unjust weight on the final outcome, rather than the individual's degree of moral responsibility, and results in an unprincipled extension of state punitive authority that violates ordinary common-law principles of individual responsibility.

### The Culpability Bar and Objective Standards

This academic debate becomes more serious when considering the total absence of a subjective mens rea inobjective negligence. Under the decision of the Court of Appeal in R v Rose [2017], liability depends entirely on whether a reasonable professional would have foreseen a serious and obvious risk of death at the time of the breach. According to (Mullock, 2018),This poses a rather unsettling dilemma: 'unwitting negligence should attract a commensurate sentence of knowing recklessness,' such that an unavoidable clinical error born out of non-awareness is forced into the clumsy mechanisms of criminal homicide.

Moreover, commentators assert that to frame clinical errors by means of an objective test does not acknowledge the realities of the intense and intricate working environment in which contemporary medical practitioners

operate. As (Samanta and Samanta, 2019) assert, high-profile prosecutions such as that of R v Bawa-Garba [2016] serve as evidence of an deep and unsettling detachment in the system. The criminal system views an individual doctor, acting alone and as an isolated entity, as entirely autonomous and not intrinsically related to the previously established overcrowding, lack of personnel and extensive layers of system failure that have indeed facilitated the untoward outcome. This increasing corpus of text is testament to the general consensus that the prevailing objective test, within the context of England and Wales, does not serve the purpose of substantive justice and rather establishes a noxious regime of fear which is inherently detrimental to patient safety, and that is actively engendering defensive practice.

## CRIMINALISING THE MINDLESS ACT: MENS REA AND ENGLISH LAW

The doctrinal integrity of criminal liability is significantly undermined where the state is empowered to impose the harshest criminal penalty in relation to conduct devoid of subjective malice. Specifically in the context of medical practice in England and Wales, the common-law use of the tests of homicide for mistakes in clinical judgment causes a doctrinal crisis which effectively obliterates the historically mandatory notion of a 'guilty mind'.

### "An Evil Mind" vs. Objective Breach of Care

Since centuries ago, the moral validity of criminal law has hinged on finding some form of subjective intention- a decision, either intentional or negligent, to transgress moral boundaries (Simester et al., 2016). Such a condition protects against the criminal justice system imposing penalties on individuals who act without moral culpability because of either bad luck or some form of systemic clumsiness. In the English common law, gross negligence manslaughter abolishes this entire subjective element and replaces it with an objective test (R v Adomako [1995]); it now does not matter whether the doctor was in fact aware of the risk, but rather whether their behaviour failed to meet the standard of a reasonable professional.

This sets up the disturbing picture of a highly trained individual who is seeking to prevent an impending risk of death that his patient is in fact experiencing. In failing to maintain this difference, criminal law, again, takes a doctor's subconscious cognitive error under duress and deals with it with the same kind of retribution with which the law addresses those who willingly inflict social harm, thereby abandoning the very basis of criminal punishment which must reflect personal blameworthiness (Brudner, 2008).

### Vague Standards and Common-Law Anomalies

The vagueness of an objective test is complicated by the even vaguer definition of "grossness" necessary for conviction. Lacking the concrete statutory limits provided by statutes in the common law, the jury is faced with determining how far in error a professional's mistake had to be to constitute criminality; in essence, a structural or clinical error is transformed into a qualitative examination of the practitioner's character. This vagueness leaves physicians vulnerable to hindsight criticism in which death of the patient colors the retrospective perception of care (Quick, 2010).

The legal position on R v Rose [2017] makes it clear that if a practitioner was wholly unaware of a latent risk by reason of operational omission they can still be liable on grounds of criminal negligence where a reasonable peer would have been aware of the risk at the time. This form of punishment has the effect of treating oblivious ignorance the same as determined recklessness leading to uncertainty in the law for healthcare professionals. In such cases, where an objective standard replaces a clear subjective awareness, the law risks punishing an individual's administrative and cognitive failure under stress on the same terms as an intentional act of malice, thereby diluting the moral vocabulary of the criminal law.

## DECONSTRUCTING CULPABILITY: THE HARM PRINCIPLE AND LEGAL MORALISM

The legal justification for the state imposing its coercive criminal sanction on the individual always has to meet high moral standards. The application of English and Welsh criminal homicide liability to the physician causing an involuntary mistake, is a fundamental overloading of orthodox liberal theories of criminalisation and represents an unprincipled extension of state coercion.

**Applying Mill's Harm Principle to Accidental Omissions**

The moral basis of any criminal offense hinges significantly on John Stuart Mill's seminal harm principle, "The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others." (Mill, 2008). Whilst this principle adequately accounts for the criminalization of intentional positive acts of violence where the actor's sole intention is to cause harm to another, it is notoriously insufficient to address complex clinical omissions where a cognitive error, or operational misjudgment in a complex procedure, on the part of the clinician does not involve an intentional set of actions. Rather, any subsequent harm results from the inherent natural pathological condition that the clinician was trying to ameliorate.

By overlooking this difference, the common law framework wrongly imports the liberal theory of criminalization. Where a physician fails to prevent an existing risk due to subconscious mistake in a moment of high stress in an operating room, the interpretation of this failure as an act of harm creation does grave damage to the thought-content of Mill. The state's perspective is shifted from blaming bad decisions to punishing unlucky outcomes, and from a vocational effort at overcoming human mortality to an inexcusable criminal wrong (Feinberg, 1987).

**Legal Moralism and the Search for Culpable Scapegoats**

Once the stringent dictates of the harm principle can no longer yield an effective justification for criminalisation, the criminal justice system often relies upon an implied legal moralism. In a society which regards criminalising acts simply on the basis that they cause indignation, or transgress prevailing notions of what is considered respectable and appropriate (Duff, 2018), a single, precipitant and shocking medical death may engender immediate and overwhelming retributive desires-for answers and vindication. A criminal justice system, empowered with the discretion of prosecution, will often respond by channeling popular outrage toward a convenient scapegoat in order to shoulder the blame for an institutional problem (Quick, 2006).

Such penalisation quickly morphs into a morality driven frenzy which requires a human scape goat to assuage the public hunger for mourning, regardless of the objective assessment of individual responsibility. In such circumstances, employing the blunt instrument of gross negligence manslaughter against honest physicians satiates a superficial, temporary need for justice while ignoring the underlying systemic problems; this ultimately reduces the criminal trial to a morality tale wherein a multi-complex healthcare tragedy is narrowly attributed to an individual so as to ignore the bedrock requirement that criminal liability accurately reflects an individual's actual moral deserts (Oldenquist 1988).

**RETRIBUTIVE DESIRES VS. THE MYTH OF CLINICAL DETERRENCE**

The imposition of rigorous penal sanctions on practitioners involved in non-intentional clinical negligence is often justified by the state as being required to secure public confidence and deter professional malfeasance. Analysis of such high-level prosecution in terms of the existing penal model demonstrates a stark incongruity between the theoretical aspiration for reفاقتثبيبيبيبtribution and the very real world of present-day medicine.

**The Failure of Utilitarian Deterrence in Good-Faith Errors**

Central to the standard utilitarian argument for punishing criminals is the concept of deterrence: The deterrent theory states that threats of punishment and state imposed sanctions will move rational agents to choose obeying over disobeying (Hart, 1968). Whereas this logic of punishment might deter planned predatory crimes it hits a insurmountable wall in the subconscious psychology required for involuntary medical errors within the hospital setting, where practitioners face immense pressure (Merry & McCall Smith, 2001). An honest doctor, who due to subconscious flaws, lapses, omission of operations, errors of commission and in diagnostic processes commits an error due to the intense pressure is not voluntarily committing a criminal offense: such errors and failures are a result of subconsciously limitations and institutional constraints (Reason, 1990).

This means that threats of imprisonment sentences up to life for gross negligence manslaughter cannot prevent subconscious mistakes in clinicians because an actor can not be deterred from making mistakes he has no intent to make. Therefore the overuse of criminal sanctions against physicians acting with intent can, instead of

increasing social welfare, further impair the utilitarian logic through punishment of a vulnerable practitioner for an institutional fault outside of his direct control (Husak, 2009).

### Public Outrage, Bereavement, and the Scapegoat Mechanism

In the event that a clinical trial ends in premature and fatal outcomes, the impact of loss upon a family typically leads to immediate and vehement demands for answers and retribution (Samanta & Samanta, 2019). Often, driven by public and prosecutorial pressure, the criminal justice system directs societal anger towards one easily identifiable target capable of shouldering all of the blame of an inherently institutional disaster (Quick, 2006). The ensuing response to punishment transforms the individual clinician into a modern-day scapegoat for modern medicine, reducing complex medical procedures to a question of whether an individual has committed a crime (Oldenquist, 1988).

Thus, while the state provides the moral gratification the public so eagerly seeks in the form of individual prosecution and the pursuit of a single culpitable doctor in the form of a modern day, high profile homicide trial, it successfully removes punishment from the equation of individual moral desert, thereby neglecting the structural threats which present themselves in medicine, instead allowing the doctor to stand as a conduit for society's righteous anger.

### Institutional Realities and the Rise of Defensive Medicine

The lasting institutional ramifications of letting retributive impulses trump clinical realities is enormously harmful, both to patient safety and to the institution of healthcare. Rather than establishing an honest and open atmosphere in which errors are reported and can be used to develop institutional methods of prevention, criminal liability has engendered a hostile and deleterious culture of silence and defensiveness within hospitals (Sir Williams, 2018). Conscious and hyper-aware of the legal ramifications of any common-law "wrong," doctors are compelled to practice medicine defensively and conduct extra diagnostic tests or decline risky procedures lest they be the subject of a post-mortem trial (The Lancet, 2019).

This atmosphere ultimately turns on society, as the myth of criminal deterrence contributes to the departure of highly trained professionals from practice, worsens understaffing and encourages practitioners to abandon high-risk fields of care, and results in medical errors ultimately impacting patients (Hamilton, 2019). The deterrence model thereby compromises patient care because weaponizing homicide rates for the sake of clinicians creates an unhealthy atmosphere of institutional paranoia that impacts the society it seeks to protect.

## MODERN HEALTHCARE REALITIES VS. SINGLE AGENCY CULPABILITY

Clinical environments in the modern day provide us with the site of the most sophisticated and multi-layered complexity imaginable in terms of the interconnectedness of technological apparatus, complex administrative systems and a multidisciplinary management of patient care. The dilemma for English criminal law is that in the event of a system failure in such an environment resulting in a disaster for the patient (in what is almost always a system failure), the problem for it lies in its conceptual framework as it relies on a dated and individualistic concept of criminal responsibility.

### The Illusion of Individual Autonomy in Complex Environments

At the core of traditional Gross Negligence Manslaughter is the philosophical assumption of one-agent responsibility-the notion that a discrete individual has the ability to fully and comprehensively master the full spectrum of relevant factors within a relevant operating domain (Simester et al. 2016). In the modern setting of tertiary healthcare this premise is but an illusion. The individual frontline doctor is no lone agent; her diagnostic decision, operative approach or timing of treatment is entirely contingent on the numerous elements in the surrounding structure (Reason 1990).

The Common Law concept ofsingling outa doctor in order to examine his practice according to an idealised abstract conception of proper care creates a false independence between the individual doctor and the structure that constrained his or her actions. This isolation misrepresents the work that a doctor actually performs in the

modern practice of medicine wherein an individual's cognitive capacity is mediated by, shaped, and at times exhausted by the structural domain in which he is situated (Merry & McCall Smith 2001).

**Interconnected Hospital Failure vs. Individual Criminal Blame**

All independent regulatory reviews of tragedies within the NHS invariably conclude that when death occurs as a result of negligence the individual culpability, if any, rarely derives from a single gross failing by an individual clinician, but rather represents the terminal outcome of an extended pathway of latent systemic failings (Sir Williams, 2018). Criminal prosecution in high-profile cases, such as R v Bawa-Garba [2016], reveals the stark divide between the locus of blame in the criminal law and clinical practice. In that specific case, the individual clinician was working under conditions of extreme institutional stress, not least due to an complete breakdown of the hospital's IT system, and whilst having to cover two departments simultaneously due to gross under-staffing and lacking any consultant input.

When the CPS brings to bear the full force of the criminal law the multi-layered nature of the institutional failure is, systematically and with cold indifference, erased by the framework of the common law; the punitive impetus of the criminal law is focussed upon the last human agent in the causal sequence, a systemic institutional breakdown reduced to a singular case of personal criminal blame (Quick, 2006).

**Systemic Stressors and the Fragility of the Clinical Workforce**

Such a demand to personalize culpability within a failing structure inevitably establishes a thoroughly unsustainable atmosphere for the healthcare workforce. Chronic understaffing of institutions, long turnaround times for diagnostics, and disintegrated networks of communication cannot be dismissed as sporadic errors or exceptional circumstances; these are everyday realities with which frontline workers are compelled to grapple on a nightly basis (Hamilton, 2019). When the legal system imposes such extreme moral accountability upon the medical profession in punishing an individual doctor criminally for a case that was so influenced by these institutional frailties, it assigns such a morally undue weight to physicians.

This strict pursuit of objective negligence disregards the state's role in chronically under-resourcing and over-taxing the infrastructure within which such mistakes arise; holding doctors criminally responsible for the frailty of an overworked and undersupported health system constitutes an extraordinary failure of legal justice in displacing such duties of structural upkeep onto good individuals (Husak, 2009).

## CONCLUSION AND ROADMAP FOR LEGISLATIVE REFORM

The interface between criminal law and the practice of medicine warrants a fundamental re-examination from both a conceptual and institutional perspective. The application of gross negligence manslaughter (GNM) in England and Wales has decoupled criminal sanction from its most time-honored moral basis: the subjective, guilty mind (Simester et al., 2016). By maintaining an objective standard of negligence that entirely discards the mental state of the professional, the common law has created a regime that is relentlessly punitive, militating against patient safety, organizational accountability, and the foundations of fair treatment.

To repair this deep structural imbalance, the law must abandon opaque common-law tests in favor of a definitive statutory framework. Synthesizing the arguments established throughout this study, the following normative and legislative solutions provide a clear roadmap for reform, successfully balancing public accountability with systemic healthcare safety without perpetuating the over-criminalisation of the medical profession:

1. **Statutory Shift to Subjective Fault:** The threshold for criminalizing professional failure must be raised from purely objective negligence to a statutory requirement of subjective recklessness (Hart, 1968; Stark, 2019). The prosecution should be legally required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a medical professional was consciously aware of an obvious, serious, and unjustifiable risk of death, and made a deliberate, blameworthy choice to disregard it. This subjective requirement preserves the moral vocabulary of the criminal law by punishing conscious disregard rather than cognitive overload.
2. **Statutory Codification of Criminal Liability:** The ambiguous common-law standard established in *R v Adomako*[1995] must be replaced by a precise statutory definition. Parliament should explicitly codify

the exact parameters of criminal professional failure, stripping juries of the power to retrospectively manufacture criminal standards based on the emotional gravity of a tragic, unforeseen fatal outcome (Quick, 2010).

3. **Mandatory Integration of Systemic Context:** Criminal courts must be statutorily mandated to perform a holistic evaluation of the organizational environment during any medical manslaughter inquiry. Latent systemic failures—including institutional understaffing, forced over-work, and technological breakdowns—must be integrated directly into the legal assessment of causation and culpability, rather than being dismissed as mere mitigating factors during sentencing (Reason, 1990; Williams, 2018).
4. **Establishment of a Protected Reporting Sanctuary:** To combat the toxic culture of defensive medicine and fear of reprisal, the state must legally safeguard a non-punitive space for clinical error reporting (Hamilton, 2019). Internal safety disclosures made by practitioners acting in good faith must be statutorily privileged, ensuring they cannot be weaponized by prosecutors as self-incriminating evidence in a criminal trial.

Ultimately, transitioning from an objective gross negligence test to a statutory requirement of subjective recklessness ensures that the crushing fist of the criminal law is reserved strictly for truly reckless and dangerous behavior, thereby shielding conscientious clinicians from the destructive power of over-criminalisation while maintaining public trust in both the legal and healthcare systems.

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study is a purely theoretical and legal policy review of published appellate judicial decisions, legislative materials, and public regulatory reports. Because the research did not involve human participants, clinical patient records, or animal subjects, explicit institutional ethical approval was not required.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no potential, actual, or perceived conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, with any legal, academic, or medical institution that could inappropriately influence or bias the integrity of the findings presented in this manuscript.

## DATA AVAILABILITY

All primary legal statutes, case law precedents, and public regulatory reports (including the Williams and Hamilton independent reviews) analyzed within this manuscript are publicly available through official United Kingdom judicial databases, parliamentary archives, and open-access regulatory libraries.

## REFERENCE

1. Bingham, T. (2011). The rule of law. Penguin Books.
2. Bishop, J. P. (1923). Criminal law (9th ed.). T.H. Flood.
3. Brudner, A. (2008). Subjective fault for crime: A reinterpretation. Legal Theory, 14(1), 1–26.
4. Duff, R. A. (2018). Introduction: A theory of criminalization? The realm of criminal law. In The Realm of Criminal Law. Oxford University Press.
5. Duncan, N., & Hutchinson, T. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. Deakin Law Review, 17(1), 83-119.
6. Feinberg, J. (1987). The moral limits of the criminal law: Harm to others (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Hadiza Bawa-Garba v General Medical Council [2018] EWCA Civ 1879.
8. Hamilton, L. (2019). Independent review of gross negligence manslaughter and culpable homicide. General Medical Council.
9. Hart, H. L. A. (1968). Punishment and responsibility: Essays in the philosophy of law. Clarendon Press.
10. Husak, D. (2009). Overcriminalization: The limits of the criminal law (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
11. Lodge, A. (2017). Gross negligence manslaughter on the cusp: The unprincipled privileging of harm over culpability. Journal of Criminal Law, 81(5), 343–360.

12. Merry, A., & McCall Smith, A. S. (2001). Errors, medicine and the law (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
13. Mill, J. S. (2008). On liberty and other essays (2nd ed.). Oxford World's Classics.
14. Mullock, A. (2018). Gross negligence (medical) manslaughter and the puzzling implications of negligent ignorance: Rose v R [2017] EWCA Crim 1168. Medical Law Review, 26(1), 150–161.
15. Oldenquist, A. (1988). An explanation of retribution. The Journal of Philosophy, 85(9), 464–478.
16. Quick, O. L. (2006). Prosecuting 'gross' medical negligence: Manslaughter, discretion and the Crown Prosecution Service. Journal of Law and Society, 33(3), 421–450.
17. Quick, O. L. (2010). Medicine, mistakes and manslaughter: A criminal combination? Cambridge Law Journal, 69(1), 186–203.
18. R v Adomako [1994] UKHL 6; [1995] 1 AC 171.
19. R v Bateman [1925] EWCA Crim 1; (1925) 19 Cr App R 8.
20. R v Bawa-Garba (Hadiza) [2016] EWCA Crim 1841.
21. R v Rose [2017] EWCA Crim 1168.
22. Reason, J. (1990). Human error. Cambridge University Press.
23. Samanta, A., & Samanta, J. (2019). Gross negligence manslaughter and doctors: Ethical concerns following the case of Dr Bawa-Garba. Journal of Medical Ethics, 45(1), 10–15.
24. Simester, A. P., Spencer, J. R., Stark, F., Sullivan, G. R., & Virgo, G. J. (2016). Simester and Sullivan's criminal law: Theory and doctrine (6th ed.). Hart Publishing.
25. Stark, F. (2019). The reasonableness in recklessness. Criminal Law and Philosophy, 13(2), 311–327.
26. The Lancet. (2019). Gross negligence manslaughter. The Lancet, 393(10190), 2466.
27. Sir Williams, N. (2018). Gross negligence manslaughter in healthcare. Department of Health and Social Care.