



Ministry of Justice Consultation:

The Personal Injury Discount Rate: How it should be set in future

Response from the Motor Accident Solicitors Society

May 2017

This response is prepared on behalf of the Motor Accident Solicitors Society (MASS) and submitted by the Chairman, Simon Stanfield.

MASS is a Society of solicitors acting for the victims of motor accidents, including those involving personal injury (PI) MASS has 120 solicitor firm Members, representing approximately 2000 claims handlers. We estimate that member firms conduct in the region of 400,000 PI motor accident claims annually on behalf of the victims of those accidents. The Society's membership is spread throughout the United Kingdom.

The objective of the Society is to promote the best interests of the motor accident victim. This is central, and core to our activity. We seek to promote only those policy and other objectives which are consistent with the best interests of the accident victim. We seek to set aside any self interest in promoting these arguments, recognising that we are in a position of trust, and best placed to observe the best interests of motor accident PI victims first hand. We are a not for profit organisation, which requires specialism in motor accident claimant work as a pre-requisite for membership. We also have a Code of Conduct which member firms are required to abide by, which is directed to the best interests of the motor accident victim.

Contact:

If you have any queries or would like further information, please contact at first instance - Jane Loney at:

MASS
19-20 St Augustines Parade
Bristol. BS1 4UL

Tel: 0117 925 9604
Email: jane@mass.org.uk
www.mass.org.uk

1. General principles

MASS strongly believes that the principle of the law of damages and what is best for the accident victim must remain the central focus for the Government when considering how the discount rate should be set in the future.

This issue has been considered previously by the Law Commission in 1994 which culminated in the Damages Act 1996 and the arguments were thoroughly rehearsed by the House of Lords in *Wells v Wells* [1999] 1AC 345 which remains common law. We believe that the general process that has derived since this case has, and continues to work well, and therefore there is no justification to depart from it.

We continue to agree with Lord Hope's comments in *Wells v Wells* that the principle purpose of the discount rate is to ensure that the 100% compensation principle prevails. To preserve, in so far as possible this principle, the discount rate should be set with regard to the best representation of the risk-free rate of return; namely ILGS held to redemption. To do otherwise, would expose the injured claimant to a wholly unacceptable level of risk and certainly a risk that is greater than was originally envisaged in *Wells v Wells*.

This is a very complex area where specialist advice is essential. It would be wholly inappropriate to force injured claimants, who by the very fact that they have claims for future losses are likely to be disabled, to carry the additional burden of seeking investment advice to ensure they have enough income on which to cater for their essential care needs and day to day living. It would be especially onerous for those with a brain injury, which falls short of incapacity, those in severe pain, or those with communication difficulties or psychological injury such as PTSD. We believe that to impose such a burden on injured individuals would be fundamentally wrong and effectively amount to discrimination against the disabled.

Conversely, were the discount rate to be set with regard to a mixed portfolio of assets, allowance would need to be made for investment costs as another head of damage. This would not only lead to an increase in awards of damages, it would also introduce considerable uncertainty and possibly satellite litigation around the issue of how much should be allowed for the costs of managing portfolios. The appropriate level of investment costs will depend on the amount of time an IFA needs to spend with an injured claimant. Some individuals, for example those with reduced cognitive function, those with communication difficulties, psychological injuries or severe pain, will need more time/advice than others.

It is important to remember that whilst a mixed asset portfolio provides the claimant with a potential opportunity to achieve a higher return than a portfolio of ILGS, it also carries the risk of capital losses, in real terms. Consequently, we believe that in order to best meet the 100% compensation principle, the no risk profile should be maintained.

Lump Sum v PPO

MASS believes that all personal injury victims, no matter what their level of injury should be placed at the centre of any policy and law change, with this being especially poignant for the more seriously injured. Victims who have been injured through no fault of their own, must receive the care, attention and justice they are rightly entitled too.

For the more complex injuries where significant awards of compensation are given, we believe that it should be left to the individuals, their lawyers and experts to ascertain what is the most appropriate methodology for them and their circumstances when considering how they obtain their award and in what form. It may also depend on their individual needs, be it accommodation or specific equipment or care needs and loss of earnings. Both lump sum

awards and periodical payment orders (PPOs) will be suitable for various areas and individual circumstances and therefore the lawyers, experts and the individual victim should have the flexibility to choose which method is most suitable to meet their needs for the duration that is required.

Questions

Please Note: MASS as an organisation is not in a position to provide statistical evidence, which is best supplied by others. We would, however, like to submit our general views on the main principles that are being considered.

The principles set out in *Wells v Wells* remain a sound and stable approach to the law and have worked without difficulty. We believe that the following general principles should apply:

- The discount rate has not reflected investment trends and rates generally, has provided a windfall to insurers, and has lagged to the detriment of claimants, particularly those severely injured.
- Changes in litigation practice will not produce a benefit to litigants. Investors' actions are vastly different for those who are disabled. Even marginal adjustment to rates will vastly affect sums available to those who depend on it for care. It is essential to protect those who are vulnerable, and to differentiate from those who are merely investing and chancing the market. Injured claimants, particularly severely injured claimants, cannot be expected to gamble what are often specifically tailored heads of claim, required for specific needs. Sums negotiated or ordered are not additional sums given as a windfall. The normal investment risk profile of claimants should remain as risk averse or risk free.
- The circumstances around investment will vary on a case by case basis. However, claimants are largely concerned to take larger risks, knowing that minimum level capital sums will be required for care. Advice will of course vary greatly depending on age, mental and physical limitation. The decision to settle a claim by way of PPOs and/or lump sum is done on a case by case basis, including taking into account litigation risks.
- Solicitors are not authorised to provide investment advice, so independent advice will always be required by an appropriate financial expert who will always balance a large capital sum following an award or settlement of damages against a needs-based income. From members' experience, it is usually advised that investment is spread, particularly with regard to sums and risks.
- The current law relating to PPOs works well in numerous and diverse cases. PPOs are always relevant for case management and deputyship costs and where appropriate, negotiated or ordered, should always be available subject to there being sufficient security of a funder. Insurers have been reluctant to consider PPOs for other heads of loss, but with the present discount rates, insurers have been keen to revisit this. PPOs certainly do have their place, and are now utilised more often. A lump sum will be required often for accommodation, adaptation and necessary aids and equipment. Experience has shown that there are more PPOs in operation of late, particularly to address care needs, and the costs of a professional deputy.
- A regular review of the rate should be considered, perhaps for a fixed period of 5 years, but this should ideally be a matter for experts to consider. The key issue is that

those relying on damages paid regularly, or looking to assess damages need certainty.

- The discount rate should be considered by a panel of appropriately qualified experts. Panels for the Ogden Committee and Judicial College for general damages have worked well in the past.