

Hot coffee case (mc donalds)

[Food & Diet](#), [Coffee](#)



First of all let's clarify what is the story is, what are the facts? There was this woman (Stella Liebeck) who poured a cup of coffee (Mc Coffee) into her lap. Because of that she suffered third-degree burns. Her medical expenses worth \$10, 000 and the end of the case she got \$ 2. 7 million. Sounds a bit strange isn't it?! Here come my ethical problems. Did her permanent scars, the \$10, 000 medical bill and all that torture she went through worth that hell of a lot of money compensation? Well my opinion, of course not!! The judge's opinion that's the exact amount of money she regards to get. Sure if I were her I wanted to get at least as much money as she did, but that doesn't mean that, it would've been a right, correct decision. Nobody can put a price label on a person or a person's injury, that's impossible. Also nobody can put a borderline between what is too much and what is " still not enough" compensation. Would the price of the compensation be the same if that cup of coffee would come from a small coffee shop company which has only two shops in town??

I don't think so is it FAIR?? So many questions we never gonna get answer for. There's no black and white in this case, these were just a couple of ethical problems from the top of my head. The stake holders are all the people having McCoffee, Stella Liebeck, the McDonald's management. The alternatives for the problem is probably the final decision and consequences what have happened, after the case has been shut down.

Which is a compensation for Stella Liebeck and a solution for the too hot coffee and the " easy going" cup's lid. As a " Utilitarian" perspective's point of view this is the best what could happen, because at the end of the day they solved the problem and produced a proper cup with a proper lid. Maybe

the final decision not the most fair because like I mentioned before \$2.7 million is a bit more than she should've got. What would be the correct amount? I think it's a very hard question.

The practical constraints, as we're talking about the USA, I don't think there is any :) I think this case happened at the beginning of the 1990's, around 1992 and that was the early stage of the compensation cases when people started to get huge amounts of compensation after a reasonably "small" injury. Finally I don't think Stella Liebeck should get \$2.7 million after what happened to her. According to my opinion it is way too much money for her, because if \$2.7 million would be the right amount then I would not be here writing this and it wouldn't be such a big deal!!