

DUAL CLAIMS EXAMPLES - MANAGEMENT LIABILITY

Section: Directors & Officers Liability

Profile	Background	Outcome
Misleading & Deceptive Conduct	A marketing firm was sued for misleading and deceptive conduct by one of the Insured's competing restaurant for advertising that the Insured restaurant employed a celebrity chef. This particular chef was employed by the rival restaurant. The marketing firm then joined the Director of the Insured hotel to the proceedings alleging that they provided a verbal and written statement that this celebrity chef was employed in their restaurant.	The Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The claim was ultimately settled out of court for the amount of \$230,000 with the Insured agreeing to contribute \$160,000 to the settlement of the claim. Overall, costs of approximately \$65,000 were incurred and were also covered under the Policy.
Unfair Competition	The Managing Director of a medium sized hotel left and started up business in a larger hotel. He was subsequently sued by the Directors of his former company. The Directors of his former company alleged breaches of intellectual property rights and plagiarism in relation to the way in which the Managing Director was marketing his new business. The former company issued proceedings in the Federal Court seeking damages in excess of \$2 million.	As the claim was made against the Insured Person, it was determined that the Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The claim was settled at mediation with defendant Director agreeing to pay the amount of \$360,000 in damages. The legal costs incurred in this claim were in excess of \$200,000.
Misappropriation of Trade Secrets	A Managing Director of a competing construction company sued the Directors and Officers of an Insured competing construction company for \$820,000 after 4 builders left to join the Insured competing construction company. The company alleged theft of trade secrets and claimed that the 4 builders employees were still in the employment of the construction company when they began sharing proprietary information with the Insured competing construction company.	The Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The claim proceeded to hearing and was settled at mediation for the amount of \$680,000 with \$240,000 of costs incurred in legal costs and expert fees.
Misleading & Deceptive Conduct	A group of 4 home owners issued against the Insured Company and the Insured Director on the basis that they were dissatisfied with how long it took for their new homes to be completed. It was claimed that the company and the Director falsely misled new clients by stating that all new projects would be completed within 6 months. Many homes were still left uncompleted after 12 months.	The D&O and Company Reimbursement sections of the Policy were triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The Company negotiated an out of court settlement with the clients for a combined amount of \$950,000. The total legal costs incurred were \$85,000.

Section: Employment Practices Liability

Profile	Background	Outcome
Wrongful Termination	A business and development manager in a National office was terminated by the Insured on the basis that his position was made redundant. The ex employee issued proceedings in the Human Rights Commission alleging that he was wrongfully terminated on the basis that someone else was promoted into his position and that his former role was not redundant.	The ex employee was able to prove his case and accordingly, the Commission determined that there was wrongful termination and ordered the employer to reinstate the employee and pay him \$50,000 in damages and costs.
Harassment & Bullying	A claim was made by four former drilling contractors against certain directors, managers and supervisors for bullying, harassment, abuse and sexual harassment. Claims were made against the entity alleging that it failed to respond to those allegations. Employees claim combined compensation of \$500,000.	It was deemed that insuring clause 2.22(c) triggered. After protracted litigation, the matter settled for payment by the company of \$80,000 per claimant. In addition to this, the company incurred over \$150,000 in defence costs.
Sexual Harassment	A former employee who was retrenched as part of a company wide reduction in work force commenced proceedings against the company and two managers alleging sexual harassment, intentional infliction of emotional distress, wrongful termination, retaliation, and sex discrimination. The employee had made allegations against the Managing Director that he had inappropriately touched her and that he regularly made abusive and sexually explicit comments towards her. The employee further alleged that as a result, she has suffered depression and now unable to re enter the workforce due to her mental distress.	The Company was held liable and ordered to pay the former employee \$60,000 plus her legal fees. In addition the company paid \$30,000 in defence costs.
Unfair Dismissal & Sexual Harassment	A male former employee lodged claim with Fair Work Australia, claiming he was terminated because of his gender. His manager was a woman and most of his work colleagues were women. He alleges that his manager showed him inappropriate photos of herself and her husband and emailed these to him. He also alleged that she made advances of a sexual nature, which he says he rejected. He alleged that after that rejection she raised various performance issues which led to his employment being terminated. He seeks 6 months' salary by way of compensation, being \$60,000.	The matter settled at Conciliation with the employer agreeing to pay \$20,000. Legal defence costs incurred in this claim totalled \$16,000.

The information contained in this fact sheet is meant as a hypothetical guide only. DUAL Australia does not accept any liability arising out of any reliance on the information in this fact sheet. We urge you to consult your insurance broker, the Insurance Council of Australia or the Financial Ombudsman Service for further information. If you are unable to resolve any issues that you may have, you may need to obtain independent legal advice.

Section: Crime

Profile	Background	Outcome
Theft of stock	Over a period of 2 years, an employee of the Insured construction company in collusion with his wife and son were stealing building supplies to build homes for other clients. The employee and his wife had a marriage break up which resulted in her coming clean to the police. The employee was arrested and charged with the theft of \$550,000 worth of building supplies.	The Insured made a fidelity claim on their policy and it was determined that the Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The Insured was able to prove their loss and make a claim for the amount of \$680,000 following the report of the loss assessor who assisted the Insured to quantify their loss.
Theft of money	A group of 4 employees were stealing money from their employer by accepting cash payments for construction work completed. Over the space of 12 months, it was determined that the Insured lost approximately \$120,000 in revenue.	The Insured made a fidelity claim on their policy and it was determined that the Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The Insured was able to claim the amount of \$120,000 on their policy. The insurer then issued separate recovery proceedings against the fraudsters to recoup the amount of the loss along with the Insured's deductible.
Theft of property	A claim was made for the loss of \$220,000 worth of alcohol and stock from the Insured licensed club. Surveillance cameras detected a group of 4 employees and their friends stealing alcohol and stock totalling over \$250,000. The alcohol and stock were sold to unsuspecting purchasers who were not aware that the goods were stolen. The employees were charged and prosecuted by the police and were only able to repay the amount of \$30,000.	It was determined that the Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The Insured was able to claim the amount of \$220,000 on their policy. The insurer then issued separate recovery proceedings against the fraudsters to recoup the amount of the loss along with the Insured's deductible.
Theft of stock	The owners of a small family owned carpet installation company were shocked to discover one of their trusted employees manipulated inventory supply numbers of stock to defraud the company. The stock was stolen and on sold by the manager and employee over a two year period.	The total loss to the company was in excess \$20,000. The owners were able to make a claim for this amount under their Management Liability Policy.

The information contained in this fact sheet is meant as a hypothetical guide only. DUAL Australia does not accept any liability arising out of any reliance on the information in this fact sheet. We urge you to consult your insurance broker, the Insurance Council of Australia or the Financial Ombudsman Service for further information. If you are unable to resolve any issues that you may have, you may need to obtain independent legal advice.

Section: Occupational Health & Safety/Pecuniary Penalties

Profile	Background	Outcome
OH&S & Pecuniary Penalties	A mining engineer and geotechnical specialist, contracted by the insured mining company were inspecting a tunnel for the purposes of deciding how to support the excavations and what type of equipment would be best suited to cutting and drilling the rock mass. During the inspection, they were severely injured when part of the tunnel collapsed on them. The mining contractor was left paraplegic and the geotechnical was left with deep lacerations on his right thigh along with a punctured lung and head trauma. The insured company was subject to a full Occupational Health and Safety investigation and prosecution.	The company vigorously denied and successfully defended all allegations. Despite their attempt, the company was fined \$450,000 and incurred close to \$100,000 in legal defence costs.
OH&S	A team of 25 factory hands were contracted by the insured manufacturing company to work on the production line in the build up leading up to the Christmas period. The contractors received a speedy 2 hour course in safety and procedure. Unfortunately, on the first day of employment, two of the workers were seriously injured. One of the contractors suffered a deep laceration on his hand whilst the other contractor lost partial hearing in his left ear for failing to wear the safety equipment correctly. A full Occupational Health and Safety investigation began which eventually led to the company being prosecuted.	Following a 2 day hearing, the company was found liable and was fined \$120,000. Overall defence costs incurred were \$130,000.
OH&S & Statutory Liability	An apprentice builder on a construction site was inspecting drilling equipment was severely injured when a pile of debris fell on him. He was airlifted to hospital but unfortunately died two days later. A full Occupational Health and Safety investigation began which eventually led to the insured construction company being prosecuted. During the investigation, it was deemed that the company had failed in its duty of care to provide a safe work place for its employees.	Following a 1 day hearing, the company was found liable and was fined \$250,000. Overall defence costs incurred were \$80,000.

The information contained in this fact sheet is meant as a hypothetical guide only. DUAL Australia does not accept any liability arising out of any reliance on the information in this fact sheet. We urge you to consult your insurance broker, the Insurance Council of Australia or the Financial Ombudsman Service for further information. If you are unable to resolve any issues that you may have, you may need to obtain independent legal advice.

Section: Statutory Liability

Profile	Background	Outcome
Escaping Pollutants	An Insured construction company was fined \$40,000 for causing pollutants to escape from a building site.	The Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The Insured was made to pay the fine of \$40,000 and it was deemed to fall within the cover provided under the Statutory Liability section of the Policy.
Dumping Garbage	An Insured licensed club was fined \$12,000 from the EPA for dumping garbage in what was deemed to be an illegal dumping site in the vacant lot next door. The hotel had been using this site for the last 12 years and was under the impression that they were allowed to dump garbage there as many of the other businesses in the area were doing the same.	The Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The Insured was made to pay the fine of \$12,000 and it was deemed to fall within the cover provided under the Statutory Liability section and therefore covered by the Policy.
OH&S & Statutory Liability	An apprentice chef from the insured hotel restaurant was busy preparing for the dinner service. Unfortunately, he suffered severe injury when he sliced his hand on the hand slicer. A full Occupational Health and Safety investigation began which eventually led to the company being prosecuted. The prosecution alleged that the company failed to provide adequate training and supervision to the apprentice.	It was determined that the Policy was triggered and indemnity was extended to the Insured. The company vigorously denied and successfully defended all allegations. Despite their attempt at defending the claim, the company was fined \$25,000 and incurred close to \$20,000 in legal defence costs.
Dumping hazardous waste	The director and company were charged with four offences under the Environment Protection Act. These were indictable offences and each charge carried a potential maximum fine of \$280,000. The EPA alleged that the electrician (employed by the company) dumped hazardous waste into a nearby vacant lot which was not determined to be a legal dumping site.	The policy was triggered and following a 3 day hearing, the director and company were found liable and were fined \$120,000. Overall defence costs of \$60,000 were incurred over the duration of the investigation and prosecution.

The information contained in this fact sheet is meant as a hypothetical guide only. DUAL Australia does not accept any liability arising out of any reliance on the information in this fact sheet. We urge you to consult your insurance broker, the Insurance Council of Australia or the Financial Ombudsman Service for further information. If you are unable to resolve any issues that you may have, you may need to obtain independent legal advice.