

# HANDLING STOLEN GOODS PRACTICE EXAM (SAMPLE)

## STUDY GUIDE



*Prepare with structure. Pass with confidence*



**Copyright © 2026 by Examzify - A Kaluba Technologies Inc. product.**

**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**

No part of this book may be reproduced or transferred in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, web distribution, taping, or by any information storage retrieval system, without the written permission of the author.

Notice: Examzify makes every reasonable effort to obtain accurate, complete, and timely information about this product from reliable sources.

SAMPLE

# Table of Contents

|                             |    |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Copyright .....             | 1  |
| Table of Contents .....     | 2  |
| Introduction .....          | 3  |
| How to Use This Guide ..... | 4  |
| Questions .....             | 5  |
| Answers .....               | 8  |
| Explanations .....          | 10 |
| Next Steps .....            | 15 |

SAMPLE

# Introduction

Preparing for a certification exam can feel overwhelming, but with the right tools, it becomes an opportunity to build confidence, sharpen your skills, and move one step closer to your goals. At Examzify, we believe that effective exam preparation isn't just about memorization, it's about understanding the material, identifying knowledge gaps, and building the test-taking strategies that lead to success.

This guide was designed to help you do exactly that.

Whether you're preparing for a licensing exam, professional certification, or entry-level qualification, this book offers structured practice to reinforce key concepts. You'll find a wide range of multiple-choice questions, each followed by clear explanations to help you understand not just the right answer, but why it's correct.

The content in this guide is based on real-world exam objectives and aligned with the types of questions and topics commonly found on official tests. It's ideal for learners who want to:

- Practice answering questions under realistic conditions,
- Improve accuracy and speed,
- Review explanations to strengthen weak areas, and
- Approach the exam with greater confidence.

We recommend using this book not as a stand-alone study tool, but alongside other resources like flashcards, textbooks, or hands-on training. For best results, we recommend working through each question, reflecting on the explanation provided, and revisiting the topics that challenge you most.

Remember: successful test preparation isn't about getting every question right the first time, it's about learning from your mistakes and improving over time. Stay focused, trust the process, and know that every page you turn brings you closer to success.

Let's begin.

# How to Use This Guide

This guide is designed to help you study more effectively and approach your exam with confidence. Whether you're reviewing for the first time or doing a final refresh, here's how to get the most out of your Examzify study guide:

## 1. Start with a Diagnostic Review

Skim through the questions to get a sense of what you know and what you need to focus on. Your goal is to identify knowledge gaps early.

## 2. Study in Short, Focused Sessions

Break your study time into manageable blocks (e.g. 30 – 45 minutes). Review a handful of questions, reflect on the explanations.

## 3. Learn from the Explanations

After answering a question, always read the explanation, even if you got it right. It reinforces key points, corrects misunderstandings, and teaches subtle distinctions between similar answers.

## 4. Track Your Progress

Use bookmarks or notes (if reading digitally) to mark difficult questions. Revisit these regularly and track improvements over time.

## 5. Simulate the Real Exam

Once you're comfortable, try taking a full set of questions without pausing. Set a timer and simulate test-day conditions to build confidence and time management skills.

## 6. Repeat and Review

Don't just study once, repetition builds retention. Re-attempt questions after a few days and revisit explanations to reinforce learning. Pair this guide with other Examzify tools like flashcards, and digital practice tests to strengthen your preparation across formats.

There's no single right way to study, but consistent, thoughtful effort always wins. Use this guide flexibly, adapt the tips above to fit your pace and learning style. You've got this!

## Questions

SAMPLE

- 1. What Tricks Might Thieves Use To Hide Stolen Goods When Selling Them?**
  - A. Forged Receipts, False Ownership Documents, Altered Numbers, Or Missing Packaging.
  - B. Offering Free Shipping.
  - C. Providing Unneeded Warranty.
  - D. Repacking The Item In A Sealed Box.
- 2. How does due diligence affect liability under these offences?**
  - A. Demonstrating due diligence can negate knowledge or beliefs that goods were stolen, possibly avoiding liability.
  - B. Demonstrating due diligence increases liability.
  - C. Due diligence has no impact.
  - D. Due diligence only affects civil damages.
- 3. If the defendant believes goods are stolen but they are not, their liability is for which of the following?**
  - A. Not guilty
  - B. Guilty of attempting to handle them
  - C. Guilty of handling the goods
  - D. Guilty of theft
- 4. For the MR in handling stolen goods, which principle governs dishonesty according to the notes?**
  - A. Dishonesty is required; lvey does not apply
  - B. Dishonesty is optional
  - C. Dishonesty is not required
  - D. Dishonesty depends on the value of the goods
- 5. Which scenario would fail to satisfy 'receiving' because the goods were not received from another person?**
  - A. The defendant takes possession from the thief
  - B. The defendant finds the goods on the street and walks away
  - C. The defendant receives via an agent
  - D. The defendant takes possession with others

- 6. Which scenario could give rise to liability under s.22?**
- A. A person steals goods themselves
  - B. A person, knowing they are stolen, sells them to a third party
  - C. A person handles goods but has no knowledge they are stolen
  - D. A person receives goods they believe are stolen but is honest
- 7. What steps should a legitimate supplier take to avoid liability?**
- A. Do not verify provenance or IDs.
  - B. Accept deals that look suspicious.
  - C. Sell only to known associates.
  - D. Verify provenance, request receipts, check IDs, and avoid deals that look suspicious.
- 8. In stolen goods offences, what does 'reasonable grounds to believe' mean?**
- A. The circumstances would lead a reasonable person to believe the goods are stolen.
  - B. The defendant must actually know the goods are stolen.
  - C. A formal confession is necessary.
  - D. A police report is required.
- 9. R v Pethick and R v Bellenie confirm that mere suspicion is:**
- A. Sufficient to establish belief.
  - B. Insufficient to establish belief.
  - C. Conclusive proof of belief.
  - D. Irrelevant to belief.
- 10. How does the defense of honest mistaken belief operate in handling stolen goods cases?**
- A. It always results in acquittal.
  - B. It has no bearing on liability.
  - C. An honest mistaken belief that the goods were stolen or that the seller had authority to deal with them is a recognized defense in some cases.
  - D. It requires proven ownership by the seller.

## **Answers**

SAMPLE

1. A
2. A
3. B
4. A
5. B
6. B
7. D
8. A
9. B
10. C

SAMPLE

## **Explanations**

SAMPLE

## 1. What Tricks Might Thieves Use To Hide Stolen Goods When Selling Them?

- A. Forged Receipts, False Ownership Documents, Altered Numbers, Or Missing Packaging.
- B. Offering Free Shipping.
- C. Providing Unneeded Warranty.
- D. Repacking The Item In A Sealed Box.

*The tactic hinges on masking where the item came from and making it look like legitimate, traceable property. Forged receipts create a believable purchase history, so buyers and sellers see a paper trail that suggests lawful ownership. False ownership documents further misrepresent who actually owns the item, which can fool background checks or resale venues. Altered numbers—such as serial numbers, model numbers, or barcodes—remove or obscure identifiers that could reveal a theft or prior ownership, making the item appear authentic or unrecorded. Missing packaging also strips away the usual clues that help verify an item's origin, age, and condition, making it harder to detect tampering or theft. Those methods align with hiding stolen goods because they directly manipulate proof of ownership and identity markers, which are the primary means by which provenance is verified. The other options don't tackle provenance in the same way: offering free shipping is a sales tactic, not a theft concealment method; providing an unneeded warranty doesn't address provenance; repacking in a sealed box could aid a sale but doesn't inherently conceal theft or misrepresent ownership in the same systematic way as forgery and altered identifiers.*

## 2. How does due diligence affect liability under these offences?

- A. Demonstrating due diligence can negate knowledge or beliefs that goods were stolen, possibly avoiding liability.
- B. Demonstrating due diligence increases liability.
- C. Due diligence has no impact.
- D. Due diligence only affects civil damages.

*Due diligence is a defense that goes to the mental element of offences involving possession or handling of stolen goods. Many such offences require that you know the goods are stolen, or at least that you believe they are. If you can show you took reasonable steps to verify the goods' origin, you didn't know or believe they were stolen, and that lack of knowledge means you're not liable. The test is practical: would a reasonable person have done what you did in the circumstances? This might include asking for provenance documents, checking ownership, verifying serial numbers, contacting the supplier or authorities, and keeping records. When those steps would have reasonably revealed a problem, your due diligence helps negate the required knowledge and can avoid liability. It doesn't apply if you didn't take reasonable steps, and it doesn't inherently affect civil damages; it specifically targets the criminal mens rea by showing you lacked the necessary belief or knowledge.*

**3. If the defendant believes goods are stolen but they are not, their liability is for which of the following?**

- A. Not guilty
- B. Guilty of attempting to handle them**
- C. Guilty of handling the goods
- D. Guilty of theft

*The key idea is that you can be guilty of attempting to commit a crime even if the crime itself isn't completed. Here, the offense would be handling stolen goods, which requires the intent to handle goods you know or believe to be stolen and taking steps toward that act. If the defendant believes the goods are stolen and actually moves to handle them, they show the intent and take a substantial step toward the offense. But the goods aren't actually stolen, so the act of handling stolen goods isn't completed. Because the elements of the offense are not met in reality, the law punishes the attempt rather than the completed crime. So, the person can be liable for attempting to handle them. Not guilty would ignore the evident intent and steps toward the crime, theft isn't present because there's no taking, and handling the goods isn't completed because the goods aren't stolen.*

**4. For the MR in handling stolen goods, which principle governs dishonesty according to the notes?**

- A. Dishonesty is required; Ivey does not apply**
- B. Dishonesty is optional
- C. Dishonesty is not required
- D. Dishonesty depends on the value of the goods

*Dishonesty is a required element of the MR for handling stolen goods. The offence is committed only if the person handles the goods dishonestly, so dishonesty must be proved as part of the actus reus/mens rea connection. Because the offence itself hinges on dishonesty, the general Ivey approach to dishonesty (an objective test) does not govern here. In other words, you don't rely on a broader Ivey-style assessment to decide if someone was dishonest; the statute already requires dishonesty as the mental element. The other options suggest dishonesty isn't required or depends on value, which contradicts the offence's structure.*

**5. Which scenario would fail to satisfy 'receiving' because the goods were not received from another person?**

- A. The defendant takes possession from the thief
- B. The defendant finds the goods on the street and walks away**
- C. The defendant receives via an agent
- D. The defendant takes possession with others

*Receiving stolen property means you acquire possession or control of goods that have been transferred to you by another person. The crucial element is that the goods come to you through a transfer from someone else, not by simply finding them. If you find goods on the street and walk away, there's no transfer from another person to you—you didn't receive them from anyone. That's why this scenario fails to satisfy receiving. By contrast, taking possession from the thief, receiving via an agent, or taking possession with others all involve obtaining the goods through a transfer from someone else, so they meet the concept of receiving.*

## 6. Which scenario could give rise to liability under s.22?

- A. A person steals goods themselves
- B. A person, knowing they are stolen, sells them to a third party**
- C. A person handles goods but has no knowledge they are stolen
- D. A person receives goods they believe are stolen but is honest

*Liability under s.22 comes from handling or dealing with stolen goods while knowing or believing they are stolen. The scenario where a person, knowing the goods are stolen, sells them to a third party, fits exactly: selling is a way of dealing with the goods, and the required knowledge about their stolen status is present. The other options don't match s.22: stealing the goods yourself is a theft offense, not handling or dealing with stolen goods; handling without knowledge misses the mental element; receiving goods (even if you believe they're stolen) is a different offense focused on receiving, not on handling or dealing.*

## 7. What steps should a legitimate supplier take to avoid liability?

- A. Do not verify provenance or IDs.
- B. Accept deals that look suspicious.
- C. Sell only to known associates.
- D. Verify provenance, request receipts, check IDs, and avoid deals that look suspicious.**

*The key idea is showing due diligence to prevent handling stolen goods. A legitimate supplier reduces liability by confirming where the item came from, proving ownership, and ensuring the buyer can be identified. Verifying provenance means asking for the item's history and any official records, and checking serial numbers or other identifiers to confirm it wasn't stolen. Requesting receipts provides an independent paper trail showing you and the seller acquired the item legally. Checking IDs ties the sale to a real person, making the transaction traceable and less anonymous. And avoiding deals that look suspicious—such as unusual cash payments, pressure to move quickly, or vague information—demonstrates careful, compliant business behavior. Together, these steps show you're taking practical, protective actions to avoid facilitating theft and to minimize legal risk. The other options describe negligent or impractical approaches that would raise, not reduce, liability.*

## 8. In stolen goods offences, what does 'reasonable grounds to believe' mean?

- A. The circumstances would lead a reasonable person to believe the goods are stolen.**
- B. The defendant must actually know the goods are stolen.
- C. A formal confession is necessary.
- D. A police report is required.

*The test is about how to judge "reasonable grounds to believe" in stolen goods offences. It uses an objective standard: the facts and circumstances would lead a reasonable person to conclude the goods are stolen. You don't have to actually know they're stolen; what matters is whether the available evidence would make a reasonable person believe so. Think about it this way: if you encounter goods with suspicious clues—no receipts, inconsistent story from the seller, or an obvious risk they were stolen—those facts could give someone reasonable grounds to believe the goods are stolen. If the circumstances clearly point to that conclusion, you can be liable even if you personally aren't certain. The other possibilities aren't the test here because they rely on things like actual knowledge, a formal confession, or a police report, which aren't what "reasonable grounds to believe" requires.*

**9. R v Pethick and R v Bellenie confirm that mere suspicion is:**

- A. Sufficient to establish belief.
- B. Insufficient to establish belief.**
- C. Conclusive proof of belief.
- D. Irrelevant to belief.

*Belief, as the mental element in handling stolen goods, must be more than a vague feeling or guess. In R v Pethick and R v Bellenie, the court makes clear that simply suspecting something is stolen does not amount to having belief that it is stolen. The belief must be genuinely held and grounded in some facts or grounds the person relies on. Because mere suspicion lacks that grounding, it does not establish the belief needed for the offence. So the correct understanding is that mere suspicion is insufficient to establish belief.*

**10. How does the defense of honest mistaken belief operate in handling stolen goods cases?**

- A. It always results in acquittal.
- B. It has no bearing on liability.
- C. An honest mistaken belief that the goods were stolen or that the seller had authority to deal with them is a recognized defense in some cases.**
- D. It requires proven ownership by the seller.

*In handling stolen goods cases, the key idea is that liability depends on the mental element the law requires—the defendant's knowledge or belief about the goods' status. If the defendant honestly believes that the goods were not stolen or that the seller had authority to deal with them, that honest belief can negate the required mens rea for handling stolen goods. In other words, the offense isn't automatically satisfied by possession or dealing; it hinges on what the defendant genuinely believed at the time. This defense isn't universal; it's recognized in some cases and jurisdictions, and its success can depend on whether the belief is both honest and, in some places, reasonable. The important takeaway is that an honest mistaken belief can absolve liability in those contexts, rather than always producing conviction. It's not about proving ownership by the seller, and the defense isn't guaranteed to win every time. It also does bear on liability because without the genuine belief, the mental element needed for the offense is present.*

## Next Steps

Congratulations on reaching the final section of this guide. You've taken a meaningful step toward passing your certification exam and advancing your career.

As you continue preparing, remember that consistent practice, review, and self-reflection are key to success. Make time to revisit difficult topics, simulate exam conditions, and track your progress along the way.

If you need help, have suggestions, or want to share feedback, we'd love to hear from you. Reach out to our team at [hello@examzify.com](mailto:hello@examzify.com).

Or visit your dedicated course page for more study tools and resources:

<https://handlingstolengoods.examzify.com>

We wish you the very best on your exam journey. You've got this!

SAMPLE