



Submission to
The Royal Commission into
Victoria's Mental Health System

Submitted on behalf of
Slater and Gordon Lawyers
July 2019

For contact:
Philip Reed
Head of Government and Stakeholder Relations
Level 12, 485 La Trobe Street
Melbourne 3000
P: 03 9190 0590
W: <https://www.slatergordon.com.au/>

Index:

Key Issues Summary (Page 3)

Background (Page 4)

- + **Company Background**
- + **Slater and Gordon's interest in the Royal Commission into Victoria's Mental Health System**

Issues (Page 5)

Workplace Safety and Compensation (Page 5)

Transport Accidents (Page 10)

Public Liability (Page 15)

Slater and Gordon Lawyers appreciates the opportunity to make a submission to the Royal Commission into Victoria's Mental Health System

Key Points

In Slater and Gordon's experience:

1. Individuals who sustain psychiatric injuries face inherent stigma and discrimination when navigating Victoria's accident compensation systems and public liability laws.
2. The process of proving the existence of a diagnosable mental health condition can often aggravate the mental health of an accident compensation scheme claimant
3. Systemic inequalities arise when psychiatric injury claims are assessed and litigated, and inherent prejudice exists in the relevant legislation and common law.
4. Because psychiatric injuries rely on an element of self-reporting and subjectivity there is more suspicion and scrutiny towards this type of injury in the compensation context with legislative frameworks maintaining higher threshold requirements
5. The terms of reference for the Royal Commission may not be broad enough to adequately examine these issues and the Commission should consider the opportunity to specifically explore these issues in more detail in the future.

Slater and Gordon would welcome the opportunity to expand on our observations on request from the Royal Commission.

Background

Company Background

Slater and Gordon Limited is a publicly listed company.

We are a leading Australian Consumer Law and Plaintiff Injury Law firm employing 800 people in 40 locations across the country. Our mission is to give people easier access to world class legal services. We provide specialist legal and complementary services in a broad range of areas, including:

- + Personal Injury
- + Superannuation and Insurance
- + Class Actions
- + Commercial Litigation
- + Employment Law.

Since our establishment in 1935, we have built a powerful reputation as a law firm built on social justice values that fights to achieve the best outcomes for our clients, while reducing the stress they go through to obtain justice. From the many landmark legal cases we have won, to the introduction of innovations such as No Win - No Fee, we have been determined to ensure that more Australians are able to access affordable legal services, no matter where they are.

Slater and Gordon's interest in the Royal Commission into Victoria's Mental Health System

As one of Australia's leading Personal Injury Law firms Slater and Gordon assists many Victorians to exercise their rights and obtain their correct legal entitlements following a life-changing event such as sustaining a workplace injury or transport accident.

Consistent with our deep commitment to social justice principles we've long recognised the significant psycho-social difficulties our clients face within the legal context, and over ten years ago identified a service gap and made the decision to employ a social work team to provide free social work services to our clients. In fact, we were the first - and are still the only - law firm in Australia to do so.

The work of both our legal practices and our social work team has given us unique insights into both the causes and effects of mental health injuries.

Our submission wishes to explore these issues in three broad areas:

- + Workplace Safety and Compensation,
- + Transport Accidents,
- + Public Liability.

Issues

Workplace Safety and Compensation

1. A Rising concern

Psychological injuries are the second most common cause of worker's compensation claims in Australia. In Victoria alone, they account for 11% of WorkCover claims and this statistic appears to be growing.

Our observation is that psychological injuries unsurprisingly result in longer absences from work than physical injuries. In cases involving purely psychological work-related harm, especially those injuries that arise from bullying, we often see a large number of employees who fear of returning to work with their pre-injury employer.

In Victoria, to be entitled to workers' compensation, any injured person must be considered a worker and must have suffered an injury arising out of or in the course of their employment. However, whether it be pursuant to the "no-fault" or "fault-based" compensation avenues, the Victorian WorkCover scheme forces workers to endure more rigorous criteria in respect of psychological injury claims when compared to physical injury claims.

2. Onerous Criteria for the Psychologically Injured

To begin with, a worker must establish that they have suffered a diagnosable psychiatric disorder. From experience, we see many psychologically injured workers who are told that while they may exhibit some ongoing symptoms, they do not satisfy the criteria of a diagnosable injury. For these workers, the case can often end here unless they are prepared to challenge the decision about the existence or non-existence of a diagnosable condition – a process that can often aggravate their mental health.

A worker must also establish not only that their injury occurred in the context of employment but that work was a 'significant contributing factor'. This immediately sets the bar much higher than for a physical injury. Noting that 'significant contributing factor' takes into account the following:

- + The duration of employment;
- + The nature of the work performed;
- + The particular tasks of the employment;
- + The potential development of the injury if that employment had not taken place;
- + The existence of any hereditary risks;
- + The lifestyle of the worker;
- + The activities of the worker outside the workplace.

To put this into context, this bar only applies to physical injury claims so far as it relates to 'aggravation' injuries, that is, when the worker already had a pre-existing condition of the same nature which was then aggravated by work.

To have their WorkCover claim accepted, an overwhelming number of workers who suffer from a mental health injury must also overcome the complete defence that WorkCover insurers often deploy against psychological injury claims – the ‘Reasonable Management Action Defence’. This defence essentially states that if the mental injury was wholly or predominantly caused by reasonable management action, taken in a reasonable manner, then the claim will be denied. Anticipation or an expectation by the worker of such action being taken or a decision by the employer, on reasonable grounds, to take or not take any management action, are sufficient to trigger the defence. The legislation provides a long list of what is considered management action (which is not exhaustive) including:

- + appraisal of the worker’s performance
- + counselling of the worker
- + suspension or stand-down of a worker’s employment
- + disciplinary action taken in respect of the worker’s employment
- + transfer of the worker’s employment
- + demotion, redeployment or retrenchment of the worker
- + dismissal of the worker
- + promotion of the worker
- + reclassification of the worker’s employment position
- + provision of leave of absence to the worker
- + provision to the worker of a benefit connected with the worker’s employment
- + training a worker in respect of the worker’s employment
- + investigation by the worker’s employer of any alleged misconduct
- + communication in connection with an action mentioned in any of the above paragraphs.

The management action must only be reasonable and is assessed without using hindsight to reflect upon the ultimate consequences for an employees mental health.

Our firm has seen this defence relied upon by insurers to reject a worker’s claim in cases that included or involved elements of bullying, interpersonal conflict or harassment. When this provision is relied upon by WorkCover insurers, workers have no other avenue but to litigate in the Magistrates’ Court in order to have an opportunity at overturning this decision. They are otherwise precluded from accessing their no-fault benefits of weekly payments for lost income and medical and like expenses.

3. No Fault Statutory Benefits – the additional stressors for the psychologically injured

If a worker succeeds in these circumstances in having their claim accepted, they face a further stressor when it comes to resolving issues relating to return to work obligations, capacity for work and therefore an entitlement to ongoing weekly payments. Generally speaking, for the first 130 weeks of the claim, the test to continue receiving weekly payments assesses the worker’s ability to undertake all aspects of pre-injury work. However, for psychological injuries there is an exception.

Commonly now known as the ‘*Kerridge*’ principle, if a worker is found to have a theoretical capacity to return to their pre-injury duties with an alternative employer where they would not be confronted by the ‘perpetrator/s’ causing stress or the work culture that caused the psychological harm, then the

entitlement to weekly payments would cease. That is, an inability to return to the worker's pre-injury place of employment does not amount to an incapacity for work itself.

The no fault lump sum benefit available for injured workers, known as an impairment benefit, is assessed according to the *Guide to the Evaluation of Psychiatric Impairment for Clinicians*. The clinician makes an assessment on the injury's impact on intelligence, thinking, perception, mood, judgment and behaviour. However, what sets apart psychiatric claims compared to physical injury claims is the percentage threshold necessary to be awarded compensation. For psychiatric injuries, a worker must have a whole person impairment of 30% or more to be eligible for compensation. To put this into perspective – workers with musculo-skeletal injuries (those involving muscles or bones) are only required to establish a whole person impairment of 5% or more and for other physical injuries (such as scarring or respiratory disease), a whole person impairment of 10% or more is required for compensation to be awarded. This 30% psychiatric impairment hurdle often means that significantly injured workers (with ongoing debilitating symptoms) who are unable to establish negligence against their employer, have limited prospects in obtaining lump sum compensation for their compensable injury because the no fault benefit threshold is so high.

In addition, a person who suffers a physical injury initially and then goes on to develop a significant psychological sequelae is disadvantaged when trying to access compensation pursuant to the impairment benefits claim so far as it relates to their psychiatric injury. The legislation is quite clear that any psychological injury secondary in nature, notwithstanding that it is compensable and could be debilitating, is disregarded. In assessing the degree of impairment, regard must not be had to any psychiatric or psychological injury, impairment or symptoms (no matter how devastating) arising as a consequence of, or secondary to, a physical injury.

It must be noted that impairment benefit claims did not even exist for those psychiatrically injured between 1992 and 1997. Whilst this position seems to have improved after 1997, it was not until 2010 that psychiatric conditions reaching 30% impairment began receiving appropriate levels of no fault compensation awards. Notwithstanding the very high threshold of 30% impairment that was required, for claims lodged prior to 2010 psychiatrically injured workers received significantly lower compensation for their impairment benefits claim. For example, a worker who had a 30% impairment rating due to a psychiatric injury and lodged their claim before 10 December 2009, would only receive \$13,650 if their injury occurred in the 2009/2010 financial year. A musculoskeletal injury that rated 30% with a claim lodgement date before December 2009 and with a date of injury in the 2009/2010 financial year would receive \$68,240. It was only after 10 December 2010 that psychiatric injury claims arising from an injury in the 2009/2010 financial year received \$68,240 following significant changes to the compensation tables. The fact that this discrepancy persisted well into modern times, highlights the general inequity and social attitudes towards psychiatric conditions as opposed to physical ones.

4. Common Law Negligence Claims – Jumping the “Severe” line and establishing negligence.

The common law entitles you to claim damages if you can establish that:

- + You have suffered a “serious injury” within the meaning of the WorkCover legislation; and
- + Your injury has been caused by negligence on the part of your employer and / or another entity, for example an occupier of a premises.

However, a worker with a psychiatric injury can only be granted a 'Serious Injury Certificate' if their injury is a "permanent severe mental or permanent severe long-term behavioural disturbance or disorder." In contrast, physical injuries need to show a "serious long-term impairment or loss of a body function". In this context the word "severe" coupled with "permanent" as opposed to "serious" has traditionally had a higher burden of proof. The test takes into account the medical condition and symptoms, treatment and medication, and the impact on work, home life, hobbies, relationships etc.

In our experience, the symptoms and treatment of a physical illness tends to be earlier and more straight forward and consistent than with psychological illnesses which can create additional hurdles for a larger battle ground in respect of serious injury certificates sought for "severe" psychological injuries. It can often be more challenging to disentangle consequences of the psychiatric injury caused by employment from the consequences caused by other stressors in that individual's life. If there are any pre-existing stressors, depression or anxiety, this often adds an additional layer of complexity.

In addition to establishing "Serious Injury" as defined above, a worker will also need to demonstrate that there has been negligence on the part of the employer. For claims where the psychological injury is the main grievance and where it has arisen in the context of bullying, harassment or interpersonal conflict, establishing 'fault' or negligence is difficult given the 'he said/she said' nature of these claims. It is often the case that establishing that bullying has taken place is not sufficient. A worker must establish that the employer had knowledge of the situation and failed to take reasonable steps to remedy the issue.

As solicitors, we can face barristers refusing briefs for these common law claims due to the degree of difficulty and complexity unless the injured worker is prepared to pay their fees upfront, which is prohibitive for many. This makes the hurdles surrounding the no fault scheme even more pertinent.

Furthermore, claims that arise from conflict that cannot be categorised by the bullying definition such as interpersonal issues, stress due to overwork or stress due to the inherent nature of the work are extremely difficult due to the High Court precedent set in *Koehler*. The High Court adopted a conservative and stringent approach to these claims. The Court confirmed that an employee who has contractually agreed to undertake onerous duties cannot subsequently rely on the fact that they lodged complaints about the excessive workload or complained about an inability to cope to prove their psychiatric claim in negligence. Instead, there must be some evidence of psychiatric injury observable by, or known to, the employer like the employee's external distress or prolonged absences from work to satisfy that such psychiatric harm as suffered by the worker was reasonably foreseeable. Therefore, the argument that an employer ought to be held liable for psychiatric injury resulting from an employee's stress in the workplace or being overworked, whilst not impossible, has been significantly curtailed.

5. Increased Litigation

Some claimants not only have to litigate at the outset to have their no fault WorkCover claim and benefits accepted, but then are also forced to litigate their common law damages claim because historically they are more frequently challenged by the Victorian WorkCover Authority and self-insurers. We can expect to litigate claims involving psychological injury either at the Serious Injury phase or, if the worker manages to satisfy the "severe" test and obtain a Serious Injury Certificate, then at the damages trial phase. In addition, cross-examination of these workers tends to be far more

lengthy and critical. For instance it would not be unusual to see a Plaintiff vigorously questioned about a smiling photograph on Facebook and have their mental “suffering” questioned.

Often short term or long-term support is denied by insurers by cutting funding for psychological treatment. The costs of litigation mean that pursuing disputes in the Magistrates’ Court about treatment, especially when it relates to short term treatment plans, can often be uneconomical for workers.

Anecdotally, workers suffering from psychiatric and/or psychological injury have had to endure a more rigorous scrutiny of their family and personal background from the outset of their claim. We are often managing distressed workers on the other end of a phone call following psychiatric medical examinations arranged by the WorkCover insurer. The vulnerable workers often have their entire lives and the lives of their immediate family members questioned and probed. These examinations often occur without a support person and workers regularly provide feedback that they did not feel sufficiently able to tell their story. Workers may have limited opportunity to explain inconsistencies in their histories before the insurer makes adverse determinations with respect to their entitlements based on these assessments. It is not unusual for the reports of psychiatrists commissioned by the WorkCover insurer to offer a diagnosis, often linked to non-work-related factors, that is in stark contrast to the diagnosis offered by long term treating practitioners who have seen the worker on multiple occasions. Unfortunately, the reports of the worker’s treaters are rarely favoured over these medico-legal assessments when insurers make determinations on the workers’ entitlements to weekly benefits, medical and like expenses and even lump sum compensation.

6. Our Observations

The road to recovery and the opportunity to pursue their legal rights and entitlements for those who sustain injuries to their mental health, compared to physical injuries, is - in our opinion - unjustly challenging, long and protracted and in some cases unfortunately never proceed. Forthcoming and fair changes to the WorkCover scheme for those that suffer from psychological / psychiatric injuries – whether it be in respect of eligibility to enter the scheme, the impairment and injury thresholds or the awards of compensation amounts – have not only been slow but also at times inequitable.

Transport Accidents

1. Introduction

Any driver, passenger, cyclist or pedestrian who has been injured in a road or public transport accident in Victoria or in a Victorian registered vehicle interstate can make a claim to the Transport Accident Commission (TAC). The TAC will pay for treatment and compensation benefits for people injured in transport accidents, in accordance with the *Transport Accident Act 1986*.

A serious motor vehicle accident is considered a traumatic event in the DSM-5 (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders), the handbook used by health care professionals in Australia and much of the world as the authoritative guide to the diagnosis of mental disorders. This means that depending on the circumstances, following a motor vehicle accident, an individual is at risk of developing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). PTSD is a serious mental illness that causes significant distress and impairment to functioning.

In addition to PTSD, people may experience disabling mood disorders, such as depression and anxiety, following a motor vehicle accident. Chronic pain following a physical injury from a motor vehicle accident is also a common experience. Chronic pain has a significant mental health component with regard to its treatment and management.

Studies¹ have shown that psychological distress (PTSD in particular) mediates the relationship between trauma exposure and poor health and leads to adverse health outcomes via multiple pathways - physical, behavioural and attentional. Other studies² indicate that individuals with psychological trauma symptoms report much higher pain severity and higher impairment of functioning in their family, occupational and other social roles, than those with only physical symptoms. In short, psychological injuries arising from a traumatic event such as a motor vehicle accident are not only extremely disabling in and of themselves, they can lead to increased pain and more significant restriction of activities of daily living.

In Slater and Gordon's experience, individuals who sustain psychiatric injuries face inherent stigma and discrimination when navigating the TAC system, due to systemic inequalities that arise when their claims are assessed and litigated, and inherent prejudice in the relevant legislation and common law.

2. Impairment Benefits

Lump sum compensation is paid to an individual by the TAC if their injury results in a permanent impairment of greater than 10% of the whole body, according to the AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment³. This assessment does not take into consideration any pain and suffering or how the injury affects the person's earning capacity.

¹ Schnurr P.P and Green B.L. (Eds) (2004) *Trauma and health Physical health consequences of exposure to extreme stress*. Washington D.C. American Psychological Association.

² Geisser, M.E., Roth, R.S., Bachman, J.E. & Eckert, T.A. (1996) The relationship between symptoms of PTSD and pain, affective disturbance and disability among patients with accident and non-accident related pain, *Pain*, 66, 207 - 2014

³ American Medical Association, 1995, Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, 4th edition.

In terms of psychological injuries, this assessment can only take into account psychiatric impairment that is not secondary to physical injury (ie: only impairment arising from the trauma of the happening of the accident itself can be assessed. This precludes individuals being compensated for the significant mood disorders, such as depression and anxiety, that commonly arise after a motor vehicle accident. A person can be significantly disabled from psychological injuries caused by their involvement in a motor vehicle accident and receive no compensation under the impairment benefits sections of the *Transport Accident Act 1986*.

Further, individuals who suffer psychiatric disorders as a result of a motor vehicle accident face difficulties and prejudice in having their impairment claims assessed. Because psychiatric injuries rely on self-reporting, it is arguable that there is more scrutiny and suspicion towards this type of injury in the compensation context. Psychiatric conditions can be fluctuating in nature, and a person may function and present far better on the day of assessment than they do in their everyday life. The disentangling of neurological impairment from psychiatric impairment can be very difficult if the patient has a head injury and a psychiatric injury as a result of a motor vehicle accident.

Many factors can impact a person's susceptibility to developing a psychiatric injury following a motor vehicle accident. These include childhood trauma, lower education, female gender, belonging to an ethnic minority and pre-existing psychiatric psychopathology⁴. Yet under the *Transport Accident Act 1986*, any pre-existing or unrelated psychiatric impairment must be excluded from the assessment. This is a difficult task for medico-legal assessors, and anecdotally we have found that a person's background, previous life experiences and mental health history – the very factors that can influence the likelihood and severity of developing a psychiatric disorder - can negate the perceived severity or indeed existence of psychiatric symptoms arising from the motor vehicle accident.

In general, the TAC waits 12 months before assessing a person's level of impairment, however, assessments may commence as soon as three months after the accident provided the injuries have substantially stabilised. It is generally accepted that psychiatric injuries take 12 – 18 months to substantially stabilise and the TAC is unlikely to assess a psychiatric injury sooner than 12 months post-accident. As such, individuals with psychiatric injuries not only face more difficulties in the accurate assessment of their injuries, but it will generally take much longer for their impairment claims to be assessed, as compared to physical injuries.

3. Common Law Claims

The TAC will pay compensation under the common law for pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life and lost earnings (past and future). However, before proceeding with a common law claim, a person needs to satisfy the TAC or a County Court Judge that they have suffered a '*serious injury*' within the meaning of the law. They must also establish that another party is at fault, or partly at fault, for the transport accident.

⁴ Christiane Steinert, Mareike Hofmann, Falk Leichsenring & Johannes Kruse (2015) The course of PTSD in naturalistic long-term studies: High variability of outcomes. A systematic review, *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 69:7.

An injury will be considered ‘serious’ if the person’s degree of permanent impairment is determined at 30% or more. Alternatively, a person may be entitled to common law compensation if the injury has led to:

- + Serious long-term impairment or loss of a body function;
- + Permanent serious disfigurement;
- + Severe long term mental or severe long term behavioural disturbance or disorder; or
- + Loss of a foetus.

4. Inequality, Stigma and Discrimination

It is clear that, at common law, the test in relation to psychiatric injuries is more difficult to meet than that for a physical injury. To access compensation under common law, a person must show that they have suffered a ‘severe’ psychiatric injury, as opposed to ‘serious’ disfigurement or a ‘serious’ physical injury. Victorian Courts have held that the word ‘severe’ connotes a stronger meaning than the word ‘serious’ – *Mobilio v Balliotis (1997) VSC 56*.

In terms of a physical injury or disfigurement case, to meet the threshold the injury must be, in comparison with other cases, ‘fairly described as “very considerable” and certainly more than “significant” or “marked”’ (*Humphries v Poljak [1992] 2 VR 129, [40]; [1992] VicRp 58*). In the case of psychiatric injuries, the common law states that the words ‘serious’ and ‘severe’ are not to be equated and that the word ‘severe’ is of stronger force than the word ‘serious’ (*Mobilio v Balliotis [1998] 3 VR 833*).

The inequality in the test for physical injuries versus psychiatric injuries is not accidental. As outlined above, the Victorian compensation scheme for work-related accidents also requires the higher threshold of ‘severe’ for psychiatric injuries to be deemed ‘serious’ under the law. When introducing the *Accident Compensation (Common Law and Benefits) Bill 2000*, the government explained that it intended to preserve the different standards required for a serious physical injury and a severe mental injury:

“The definition of serious injury maintains the previous distinction between the requirement of a serious impairment or loss of a body function or serious disfigurement and a severe mental or behavioural disturbance or disorder. The government recognises it is proper to maintain a higher threshold requirement for a mental or behavioural disturbance or disorder due to the degree of subjectivity involved in such a condition.”⁵

This perceived ‘subjectivity’ involved in a psychiatric condition exemplifies the stigma and discrimination faced by claimants with a psychiatric injury in the context of a TAC claim. In Slater and Gordon’s experience, this misconception that psychiatric injuries are more subjective than physical injuries, and that therefore there is a higher likelihood or risk that people will exaggerate or fake symptoms, means that our clients with psychiatric injuries can face a far more prolonged, difficult and stressful passage through the TAC claims process.

⁵ Parliamentary Debates, Legislative Assembly, Accident Compensation (Common Law and Benefits) Bill 2000, 13 April 2000, Mr Cameron, 1004

We recognise that psychiatric injuries are complex, in terms of diagnosis, treatment and the impact on the individual. A psychiatric disorder may have severe consequences, even though the claimant has not undergone much treatment. Claimants in this position may experience a particularly difficult road through the TAC Common Law process to prove their case. Conversely, merely because an individual has attended many doctors and undergone much treatment, the law is clear that a psychiatric disorder is not 'severe' unless the symptoms and consequences of the disorder properly call for that level of treatment (*TAC v Katanas* [2017] HCA 32, [23]). However, complexity should not lead to inequality and Slater and Gordon advocates for a review of the thresholds and processes in assessing common law claims for psychiatric injury.

Change can be achieved. In 2013 the Liberal government made the test for psychiatric injuries even more restrictive, requiring an injured person to show that over a continuous 3-year period since the accident they had:

- + Suffered from a recognised mental illness or disorder, **and**
- + Suffered symptoms and disability that have not responded to known effective clinical treatments provided by a registered mental health professional, **and**
- + that the condition caused significant distress and severe impairment to a person's relationships **and** social **and** vocational functioning

This was a very difficult test to satisfy and it greatly reduced the rights of those with psychiatric injuries resulting from motor vehicle accidents. Slater and Gordon applauds the Andrews Government for repealing this legislative change retrospectively in 2016.

5. Our Observations

Slater and Gordon see this stigma and inequity against people with psychiatric injuries and mental illness played out anecdotally across the breadth of the cases we act in.

Due to the narrower gateways for psychiatric injuries, our clients with psychiatric injuries and mental illnesses endure a more onerous journey through the TAC compensation scheme. Their requests for mental health treatment are more seriously scrutinised and more readily denied than for claimants with clear physical injuries that are simple to diagnose via scans or investigations.

We find that their applications for Serious Injury Certificates take far longer to process, are more heavily scrutinised and again more readily denied. Psychiatric claims for common law compensation are more likely to be litigated, rather than settled informally. These claimants are required to undergo more independent medical examinations. The background, history and credit of a claimant with a psychiatric injury is more commonly analysed, dissected and used against them in the claims and litigation process. They are more likely to be the subject of surveillance, online and in person, should their case proceed to Court.

Slater and Gordon would like to see the removal of this increased scrutiny of people with psychiatric injuries arising from motor vehicle accidents as they navigate the TAC claims and legal systems.

6. The future

Slater and Gordon note, and have been pleased to see, some recent recognition by the TAC of the complexity of psychiatric injuries and a progressive response to dealing with such claims.

Following the extremely distressing Bourke Street and Flinders Street incidents where multiple people were killed and injured by motor vehicles, the TAC (together with other insurers such as WorkSafe and Victims of Crime) took a very proactive approach to mitigating poor mental health outcomes for victims. The TAC ensured these claims were accepted immediately and treatment, particularly psychiatric treatment, was readily acceded to. This was a hugely positive example of the capacity of the TAC to recognise and respond to a large pool of potentially significant psychiatric injuries arising out of road trauma.

In addition, TAC's new claims management framework focussing on early intervention and treatment, including for psychological injuries, as a means of assisting people to get their lives back on track after a motor vehicle accident is a step in the right direction and should be acknowledged and used as an example for other insurers.

We also look to the future, where neuroscience and neurotechnology has the capacity to fundamentally change how psychiatric injuries are assessed in tort law by providing an objective assessment of subjective experiences – making the invisible visible.⁶ Psychiatric disorders and mental illnesses have biological bases which neurotechnology can potentially present visually with neuroimaging, much like an MRI or X-ray does for physical injuries.

We hope that these advances will help to de-stigmatise conditions such as depression, anxiety and PTSD, and contribute to these conditions being managed and judged based on the scientific evidence that can be obtained.

⁶ *Making the Invisible Visible: The Effects of Neuroscience on Mental Injury Claims* by Justin Brandon Ng, A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Laws Faculty of Law University of Toronto, 2018

Public Liability

1. Introduction

Public Liability claims in Victoria covers a wide range of circumstances where a person incurs injury or death as a result of another person's negligence, or failure to take reasonable care. Public Liability claims are governed collectively by the common law and the *Wrongs Act 1958* ("Wrongs Act").

The *Wrongs Act* encapsulates some aspects of the common law and sets out the process and restrictions that apply to negligent (non-intentional) and intentional actions (e.g. assault, battery, sexual abuse). The *Wrongs Act* governs claims for damages for not only public liability claims, but also matters of medical negligence and dust exposure.

In order to bring a successful public liability claim in Victoria, the injured party must prove that another party is wholly or partly responsible for the injury or loss sustained. Negligence must be established on the part of another party (or person) to receive compensation. "No Fault" benefits are **not** available to injured parties.

In order to bring a claim in negligence, necessary components of an action in negligence must be proven:

- + Duty of Care is owed to the Plaintiff by the Defendant;
- + Defendant/s breached the duty owed to the Plaintiff and failed to act to a reasonable standard of care;
- + Breach of duty causes actual loss and damage to the plaintiff that the defendant should have reasonably foreseen.

In circumstances of negligence there are potentially three heads of damage (compensation) available for claimants:

- + Pain and suffering (for loss of enjoyment of life or loss of amenity)
-Must satisfy the injury threshold defined in the *Wrongs Act* to qualify
- + Medical and related expenses (both past and future)
- + Loss of earnings or loss of earning capacity (both past and future)

2. Changes to the Public Liability landscape

In the early 2000s the Australian insurance industry purportedly experienced a 'crisis' due to a surge in public liability claims. As a result of rising premiums and claims, a panel was appointed to review the law of negligence and its interaction with the then *Trade Practices Act 1974*. What came of the review was the 2002 'Ipp report' which was the foundation of major tort law changes in most Australian jurisdictions.

Reforms were rolled out in Victoria in 2002 and 2003 which introduced relevant injury thresholds for physical and psychiatric injuries. The introduction of such threshold was perceived to offset the requirement to have a system of legitimate insurance in place, while reducing the number of claims, or claims being made for injuries which were considered minor, modest or non-permanent.

In 2014, the Victorian Competition & Efficiency Commission tabled the *Adjusting the Balance Report* which reviewed aspects of the *Wrongs Act* including the injury thresholds. This was in response to a view that the changes a decade earlier had gone too far.

Thereafter came the *Wrongs Act Amendment Act 2015* which made further changes to the injury thresholds that must be satisfied in order to qualify for non-pecuniary damages. This included a change for threshold levels in relation to spinal injuries. It also included an amendment to the threshold for a psychiatric injury to an impairment of 10 percent or more (rather than the former, 'more than 10 per cent').

3. A "significant injury" in the Wrongs Act

Injury thresholds are defined currently in the Wrongs Act as follows:

Injury thresholds for non-economic loss	
Spinal	permanent and equal to or greater than 5%
Physical injuries *(other than spinal)	permanent and >5%
Psychiatric injuries	equal to or >10%

- + Compensation for pain and suffering is currently capped at approximately \$600,000 (indexed annually).
- + Changes introducing injury thresholds have significantly affected claims for damages in public liability cases and restricted the common law right to claim for non-pecuniary (pain and suffering) damages in public liability cases.
- + Whether or not a claimant has a "significant injury" is determined in accordance with the *American Medical Association Guides to the Assessment of Permanent Impairment* (4th edition) for physical and spinal injuries, or GEPIC for psychiatric injuries.

4. Psychological and psychiatric injuries

Our work and experience in these claims, provides us with an insight into challenges which are faced by claimants who have sustained a psychological or psychiatric injury.

Psychological or psychiatric injuries typically vary in nature in both cause and impact. They can (commonly) be combined with a physical injury and are therefore secondary, consequential or reactive in nature. Others psychiatric injuries are 'primary' in nature and are caused through a traumatic event.

Examples of claims which typically have a primary psychiatric injury include the following:

Common causes of psychiatric injuries (primary), subject to a Public Liability claim	
Nervous Shock claims/ witness to a traumatic event or aftermath	Sexual Abuse claims
Animal Attacks	School bullying

The significantly high thresholds required to be met in order to claim for pain and suffering damages for psychiatric injuries disproportionately restricts not only access to fair compensation outcomes to claimants; but the operation of such high thresholds can result in claimants feeling invalidated by the process despite instances of legitimate claims in negligence. This can ultimately lead to claimants being denied compensation (or being left under-compensated) by the operation of the high impairment thresholds for psychiatric injuries.

In our experience, psychiatric injuries have historically been viewed as 'lesser' injuries and have not attracted large pain and suffering awards. It has been rare to see compensation for pain and suffering exceeding \$200,000.

5. Primary versus Secondary injuries

Section 28LJ of the *Wrongs Act* states that *"in assessing a degree of impairment of a person... regard must not be had to any psychiatric or psychological injury, impairment or symptoms arising as a consequence of, or secondary to, a physical injury."*

Therefore, in order for a psychological injury to qualify as a significant injury it must be:

- + A diagnosable psychiatric disorder;
- + Not explained as a consequence of (or secondary to) a physical injury;
- + An injury which leads to impairment that is permanent; and
- + Causally linked to the circumstances of the injury.

6. Assessing a psychiatric injury in the claims process

In order to determine if a claimant has a 'significant injury' they are required to undergo an assessment with an approved independent medical examiner. If the injury is determined to satisfy the requisite threshold, the claimant is issued with a certificate which states that they have sustained a 'significant injury' in accordance with the *Wrongs Act*.

Assessments are based on permanent injuries and as such assessments of injuries typically do not take place until at least 12 months after the date of the injury (or diagnosis).

When a claimant has a psychiatric injury caused in circumstances of alleged negligence they are required to attend an appointment with a duly qualified assessor. During this process, the claimant is asked several questions regarding their injury and the relevant consequences, including (but not limited to): the incident or the injury, what treatment has been undertaken, what the impact of the psychiatric injury has been on the claimant having regard to active symptomology and effects on marriage, children, relationships and other interests as well as general family information, background (such as schooling and employment).

The issuing of a Certificate does not form the end of the determination of a significant injury having been sustained by the claimant. The respondent to a claim has the option to refer the “medical question” in relation to the impairment arising from the injury to the Medical Panel, who can make a final and binding determination as to the impairment level to a claimant.

The Medical Panel process requires a subsequent discussion of usually traumatic circumstances, injury, and consequences in front of a Panel (two to three psychiatrists) whom are independent, and the claimant has not met previously.

Certainly, there are default provisions (or a process) aimed to ensure that there is timely resolution to determine a claimant’s impairment. However, in practice this does not always eventuate for claimants who have sustained a psychiatric injury. There are two key reasons underlying this position:

- + As the legal landscape currently stands there is no provision which prevents multiple defendants (ie: more than one party) referring the claimant to the Medical Panel to make subsequent and potentially different assessments regarding issues of impairment and significant injury.
- + In circumstances where an injury is considered not yet stable, the claimant is required to attend the Medical Panel again for further assessment at a later determined date.

This onerous process can facilitate a degree of re-traumatisation for claimants, when they are required to restate their story, their psychological condition, their treatment and articulate how the incident has profoundly impacted on them.

Psychiatric injuries, by comparison to physical injuries, including spinal injuries, are subject to unreasonably high thresholds which disproportionately restricts the rights of claimants who have suffered mental harm.

Further, in circumstance where the assessments must disregard any impairment that is from unrelated causes or pre-existing in nature, the threshold does not fairly align with the purpose of ensuring a consistent scheme of assessment for injuries that are psychiatric in nature.

Rather, it facilitates a system where psychiatric injuries are more harshly assessed ultimately leading to under-compensated claims or claims where compensation is denied in its entirety for pain and suffering.

7. Nervous Shock claims

In the event of death of a loved one in circumstance of negligence, family members may bring a nervous shock claim if they have a genuine psychiatric illness or injury as a result of the loss.

In the public liability space, this will at times involve assisting parents with making a claim for a psychiatric injury following the death of their child. This in and of itself highlights the manner in which the system can be improved so as to ensure it supports claimants suffering from a genuine psychiatric illness.

It is our position that such a loss should be deemed a “significant injury”.

There are a number of reasons that inform this position. Firstly, the death of a child in circumstances of alleged negligence has typically already involved significant investigation by various bodies, which could include Victoria Police, the Coroners Court, Government bodies or departments, and Worksafe, all before the commencement of any personal injury claim. This results in claimants “reliving” the circumstances involving the death of a child repeatedly.

The process as it currently stands, requires that after such a loss it must be proven that there is a genuine psychiatric injury, which is then at the respondent’s election reviewed by the Medical Panel before a determination is made as to whether a significant injury has been sustained. This can mean attendance at numerous medical assessments before it is determined that “pain and suffering” may be claimed following the loss of a child.

A grieving parent must face the ignominy of the process, to satisfy thresholds despite the nature of the circumstances which have irrevocably altered their lives forever.

By way of example:

- + A young family lost their son and brother in a tragic incident where he was killed in a factory setting following a malfunction in the machinery used.
- + The teenage brother of the deceased had suffered majorly following the traumatic and sudden loss of his younger brother and proceeded to investigate a nervous shock claim.
- + After undergoing a traumatising assessment and satisfying that he had a significant psychiatric injury, the brother was referred to the Medical Panel for a further assessment.
- + However, when undergoing the Medical Panel appointment he was uncommunicative and unforthcoming, finding it difficult to speak and came across as being dismissive of his condition due to nerves and feeling overwhelmed by the process of further discussing the traumatic loss of his brother.
- + He was found not to have a significant injury and therefore was unable to claim pain and suffering damages in relation to the loss of his brother.

In a similar vein, our clients attending psychiatric assessments have faced difficulty in balancing the requirement to express their suffering from a medical standpoint while balancing their personal cultural mourning traditions, customs and rituals, some of which limit the periods of mourning following the loss of a loved one. These can vary of course, based on location, sect and religious belief

system and can dramatically impact on the level of treatment or medication a claimant has had, which in large part forms the basis of an assessment.

It is fair to submit that a psychiatric injury in those circumstances could be more accurately looked at through a combined assessment by a treater and an appropriate narrative test assessment, which can encapsulate the multifaceted aspects of a psychiatric injury.

8. Time Limitations

The *Limitations of Actions Act 1958* sets time limits for which a claimant must have brought their claim. It is typically three (3) years from the date an injured person discovers, or should have discovered the following facts –

- + The fact that an injury has occurred;
- + The fact that the injury was caused by the fault of another;
- + The fact that the injury is sufficiently serious to justify bringing a claim.

A time limit of six (6) years applies if you are injured when under the age of 18 (or under a disability).

On 1 July 2015 the *Limitation of Actions Act 1958* was amended so as to abolish all time limits for persons to commence legal proceedings in circumstances where the physical, psychological or sexual abuse occurred when they were a minor.

This was a small step in the removal of some of the barriers the personal claims process presents to people suffering with a psychiatric injury. An abolishment of time limits for claimants who suffer a psychiatric injury whilst under the age of 18 would be appropriate to ensure access to justice for claimants who suffered mental harm in instances of negligence.

9. Our observations

Slater and Gordon's experience has shown that at times, after being advised of the legal requirements of proof in relation to their psychiatric injury to enable a claim for pain and suffering damages, claimants ultimately elect not to proceed with a potential claim. In our experience the prospect of enduring such a process is too painful and places unnecessary barriers for claimants who can ultimately be denied compensation due to the high psychiatric injury thresholds despite the legitimacy of their claim and subsequent suffering.

Our experience has shown that at times due to the increased scrutiny placed on claimants with a psychiatric injury, they have been denied or provided limited compensation, or have had their claims process frustrated and obstructed due to the high thresholds they must meet to bring a claim.