

## **Abstract**

The topic of this diploma thesis is a crime of robbery which is an offence under title two of chapter one of the special part of the Criminal Code as a crime against liberty (section 173 of Act No. 40/2009 Coll). Despite being one of the oldest delicts on our territory, its high severity and frequency in application render this topic particularly relevant.

Not only does this thesis focus on the crime of robbery itself, as defined in section 173 of the Criminal Code, but it also addresses other legal provisions of the Criminal Code which are related to this topic. All compulsory elements of the facts of the criminal offence of robbery are scrutinized in detail – its object, objective side, perpetrator and subjective side. This thesis does not only analyze the basic form of robbery defined in subsection 1 of section 173 of the Criminal Code, but also the circumstances in which more severe penalties might be applied, as defined in other subsections of this section. Furthermore, the development stages of robbery and the participation in this crime are described and a comparison between the crime of robbery and a selection of other crimes is made. Historical development of the crime of robbery and its comparison to the foreign legislation are not omitted. The conclusion summarizes the entire thesis and provides considerations *de lege ferenda*.

A specific feature of this crime is the plurality of objects and thus interests, which are protected by a corresponding legal provision of the Criminal Code. The object of the crime of robbery is thus both the liberty of an individual in terms of decision-making and the interest in property protection. In order to qualify the act of a perpetrator as a crime of robbery, it is essential that the both public interests be addressed simultaneously; therefore, the object is cumulative. Although it would be possible to classify the crime of robbery among crimes against property as its object lies in property protection, it is traditionally classified among crimes against liberty. The legislator thereby emphasizes the interest in personal liberty of an individual, which should be given a priority over the protection of property.