

Quantum Update

Edwina Rawson, Partner
Richard Lodge, Kingsley Napley
June 2011

Quantum update

INTERIM PAYMENTS

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

Cobham v Benjamin Eeles (March 2009)

Facts

- Young boy, brain damaged in RTA when baby
- Had interim payment of £450,000
- Wanted to buy property
- Sought further interim payment of £1.2m

Quantum update – interim payments



4

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

Cobham v Benjamin Eeles

First Instance



- Yes, £1.2m
- Valued case at £3.5m if won at trial (on full and final basis)
- £1.2m would not exceed a reasonable proportion of final award

5

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

Cobham v Benjamin Eeles (March 2009) C/A



6

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

Cobham v Benjamin Eeles (March 2009) C/A

• **ASK**

1. Is it likely that trial judge will want to make PPO? Here, yes.
2. What would the trial judge award as lump sum? (or capitalised value) – separate out likely lump sum from periodicals

- Lump sum: General damages, past losses, interest, accommodation
- Possibly others from future losses if confidently predict that trial judge would award higher than above as lump sum. And, a real need.

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

Cobham v Benjamin Eeles (March 2009) C/A

- Value of lump sum = £590,000
- Already had £450,000
- Reasonable house anyway

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

Life after Eeles

Quantum update - INTERIM PAYMENTS

- Preston v. City Electrical Factors (November 2009)
- FP v Taunton & Somerset NHS Trust (2009)
- Johnson v Serena Compton-Cooke (2009)
- Patel v. Patel (September 2009)
- Kirby v. Ashford & St. Peter's Hospital (2009 and 2011)
- Harris v. Roy (February 2010)
- Jessica Brown v. Liam Emery (March 2010)
- Muhammed Ali v. Frimley Park (2010)
- Best v Smyth (June 2010)
- Walton v Axa Belgium (February 2011)

10

Quantum update – INTERIM PAYMENTS

1 Best v Smyth (June 2010)

- RTA, rented bungalow up for sale
- C sought £800,000
- Contributory negligence argued at 50%
- Judge said 30% and with interim payments
- £650,000 under 4 heads of *Eeles*, so not enough
- Argued to draw down from other heads, under second limb
- Refused – real need for a property but didn't need to make adaptations

11

Quantum update – INTERIM PAYMENTS

2 Kirby v Ashford & St Peter's Hospital (March 2011)

- Brain injured child
- Previous interim payments of £1m for a property
- Application for £250,000 for outstanding building costs
- Costs had already been incurred
- And could only be met under the second limb of *Eeles*

12

Quantum update – INTERIM PAYMENTS

2 Kirby v Ashford & St Peter’s Hospital (March 2011)

- Awarded £150,000
- *Eeles* envisaged applications before the cost had been incurred, not retrospectively
- Could it be predicted with high confidence that the trial judge would save the C’s parents from their financial irresponsibility. Yes.
- Health warning

13

Quantum update – INTERIM PAYMENT

3 Walton v Axa Belgium (February 2011)

- Previous interim payments of £580,000
- £70,000 sought for adapted vehicle, total £650,000
- Agreed that C would get more than £650,000 lump sum at trial
- D argued that would change the status quo that would affect the trial judge’s assessment of the vehicle claim. Uneven playing field. Judge may make a higher award.
- Rejected: A modest step, unlikely that a judge would be diverted from objectivity, and not interested in how the money would be spent

14

Quantum update – ENHANCED INTEREST

Andrews v Aylott (March 2010)

- Liability trial, C won 75% with damages to be assessed
- Court orders interest at 5% above base rate on 33% of damages, to reflect D’s failure to beat a P36 offer
- Later, settles for lump sum and ppo
- Interest applied only to lump sum, on basis that C should not be kept out of compensation due to the D’s failure to accept Part 36 offer. Not apply to future payments as no delay.

15

Quantum update

FATAL ACCIDENTS

16

Quantum update - FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT 1976

Watson v Cakebread Robey Ltd (2009)



- Mesothelioma at work
- Claim during life
- Funeral expenses claimed. C said whilst alive he should be able to step into shoes of estate



- LR(MP)A 1934 made it clear claim arose on death
- Otherwise, any C with reduced life expectancy could claim irrespective of extent of reduction

17

Quantum update

CARE

18

Quantum update - CARE

- private vs state

Review

- Sowden v Lodge (2004), C/A
D pays only to extent necessary to **'top up'** state care by private care
- Crofton v NHSLA (2007), C/A
State funding for care should be taken into account.
Discounted **multiplier**



Quantum update - CARE

Chantelle Peters (March 2009), C/A

- Congenital rubella syndrome
- Care home costs shared between LA and PCT, costing about £132,000 per annum

Quantum update - CARE

Chantelle Peters (March 2009), C/A

BIG QUESTION: Was C obliged to make use of state care or could she claim full cost of care privately?



Quantum update - CARE

Chantelle Peters (March 2009), C/A

Having looked at statutory framework and principles of tort ...

“There was no reason in policy or principle why a C who wished to opt for self-funding and damages in preference to reliance on the statutory obligations of a public authority should not be entitled to do so as a matter of right, provided there was no double recovery.”

Quantum update - CARE

Chantelle Peters (March 2009), C/A

- Not a question of mitigation but who bears the cost
- £4m for her residential care needs
- But, is the fight over?

Quantum update - CARE

Sklair v Haycock (December 2009)

- C had Asperger's Syndrome, pre-existing
- Cared for by family
- RTA
- Mobility impaired and big psychological deterioration
- Claims now 24 hour care
- D argues

Quantum update - CARE

- 1) C only claim difference in care
 - Judge disagreed. Where care is given by love and affection before the accident and, but for the accident, this would have continued, no reason why has to put a value on it and give credit for it.
- 2) C should get care from the state
 - Judge disagreed. Applied Peters

25

Quantum update - Care

(1) Drake (2) Starkey (executors) v Wheeler (Aug 2010)

- Novel claim for hospice costs, mesothelioma
- Donation £10,000 (running costs over what given by PCT)
- D said medical treatment, and no authority
- Allowed, no floodgates because only if "lingering and painful dying period"
- Consistent with principles because if had paid for, could have claimed

26

Quantum update – CARE

Warner v (a firm) (July 2010, March 2011)

- Professional negligence
- Settled £425,000 – approved by court of protection
- Settled at an undervalue of about £1.2 m
- Failed to instruct a case manager in accordance with care expert
- Failed to obtain care statements and up to date assessment

27

Quantum update - CARE

Warner v (a firm) (July 2010, March 2011)

- Firm joins in the care expert by Part 20, saying did not make it clear that case manager was needed before trial
- Summary judgment in care expert's favour, reasonably clear
- Upheld in court of appeal

Quantum update

EARNINGS

Quantum update - EARNINGS

Blamire awards

- Where loss of earnings/pension subject to imponderables, court would approach case by "impression" rather than "precise calculation"

Multiplier and multiplicand



Quantum update - EARNINGS

Collett v Smith (July 2009), C/A

- Budding footballer for championship level
- Strong evidence
- Reduced by 15%, reasonable



31

Quantum update - EARNINGS

Cedric Abbs v Somerfield (April 2010)

- Self-employed plumber, worked alone
- Age 56
- Hip injury
- Orthopaedic experts both said fine for desk work
- Neuropsychological expert some underperformance in reading/writing
- Joint Employment expert said should learn basic computer skills, which he could do in his home town



32

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- BUT Cedric says ...

33

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- For last 5 years, I have not looked for work
- I do not intend to look for work
- If I did look for work, I wouldn't get a job anyway
- Never used a computer and didn't want to
- Only ever worked on my own
- Have "an aversion to paperwork, reading, routine or repetitive work and to working with people"

34

Quantum update - EARNINGS



35

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- Judge says

36

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- Cedric was not unreasonable and had not failed to mitigate
- Ingrained attitude, age, lack of qualification, lack of aptitude in reading, studying, made him incapable of finding work

37

Quantum update - EARNINGS

Clarke v Maltby (May 2010)

- C solicitor in banking
- RTA, recovers from physical
- Cognitive impairment
- Approach is to consider a number of scenarios (i.e. equity in local firm, medium city firm, large city firm) and to give each scenario a % chance that would earn over a basic level

38

Quantum update - EARNINGS

Hion v Morrisons Supermarket (May 2010)

- 37, injured leg in RTA
- Uninjured, little casual work and benefits
- No mathematical basis
- Injured leg would disadvantage him getting work
- £25,000

39

Quantum update - EARNINGS

Penny Johnson v Le Roux Fourie (May 2011)

- Cosmetic surgery case
- Liability admitted
- £6.2m, about £5.9m for earnings
- Successful own business set up in 2000
- Claims about £66m (including interest) for past and future earnings loss
- D argued for Blamire
- Loss of a chance

Quantum update - EARNINGS

Penny Johnson v Le Roux Fourie (May 2011)

- Although business unique, comparisons with competitors were helpful
- 2003-2011, real and substantial chance that business would have turnover of £25m p.a
- Needed to be discounted to reflect possibility of not achieving that, to £20m p.a.
- Assume net profit of 10% of turnover at 2010. Gives £2m net profit to be shared equally between her and husband
- Reduced to £800,000 p.a. to reflect changes in share holding. Less residual earnings

Quantum update - EARNINGS

XYZ v Portsmouth Hospitals (February 2011)

- C donated kidney to father
- Admitted liability
- PSLA, some past and future losses agreed at £888,000
- Dispute earnings (and medical treatment)
- High powered in the pharmaceutical industry
- Invited to make conclusions

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- **XYZ (February 2011)**
- Virtual certainty that would have set up own business
- Not up and running, but initial steps
- Witness evidence from people doing similar
- Virtual certainty of £2m turnover after 2 years. No discount.
- Mapped out over a 10 year period

43

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- **XYZ (February 2011)**
- 50% chance of annual turnover of £5m within 5 years
- Years 3,4 and 5 calculate on annual turnover of 75% of £3.5m
- 20% chance of annual turnover of £10m after 10 years
- Years 6 and 7, no increase in £5m
- Years 8 and 9, calculate on annual turnover of £6.5m
- Final year, £8m

44

Quantum update - EARNINGS

- **XYZ (February 2011)**
- Percentage chance to be applied:
 - Years 6 and 7, 50%
 - Years 8 and 9, 40%
 - Final year, 30%
- Based on:
 - equity share at end of year 2 of 34%
 - Net profit margin of 22% throughout
 - Deduction of 15% to net loss of earnings (for uncertainties not already taken into account)
- 75% chance that would have worked between 65-70 at same pay

45

Quantum update

OGDEN TABLES

46

Quantum update – OGDEN TABLES

Penny Johnson v Le Roux Fourie (May 2011)

- Issue whether there should be further discount under Tables A-D to allow for risk of periods of unemployment and sickness
- Remarkable career so risks of non-employment were negligible. Income unlikely to have been affected by sickness or demands of caring for children
- No further discount

47

Quantum Update - HOLIDAYS

- Divergence in approach
- Objective rather than subjective
- Usually modest

Pankhurst v (1) White (2) MIB (2009)

Test is one of reasonableness
 Rejected multiplier/multiplicand
 Lump sum £160,000
 Rejected C's evidence



48

Quantum update - DISCOUNT RATE

Helmot v Simon (January 2010)

- Guernsey Court of Appeal
- C 39 at trial
- Not bound to apply 2.5%, case by case
- 0.5% for future recurring non-earnings heads
- -1.5% for earnings-related losses including care
- 36.64 and 59.07
- Just under £14m
- Difference of over £5m just for care

Quantum update – DISCOUNT RATE

Love v Dewsbury (November 2010)

Day v Randhawa and MIB (January 2011)

- both sought adjournment, on basis of Helmot
- both failed, too uncertain whether rate would change and may not be decreased.

THANK YOU
