

Ethical dilemma – business ethics essay

[Business](#), [Business Ethics](#)



Robert Gertsen Prof. Orkin At first glance, it seems to be clear that this is in essence, an unethical issue that is occurring. According to Brigham Young University's Exchange Magazine's categories of ethical dilemmas, stating something that is not true constitutes an unethical action. The customer's lawyer attempt to strike a deal in which you state in a court of law that no sign was placed in place would be a false statement. However, before delving into any assumptions, it is imperative to explore various aspects of the dilemmas surrounding this problem.

According to Jennings' steps for analyzing ethical dilemmas, you must observe from the perspective of each person involved in the case and the effect that this has on them. As the manager of the supermarket, it would be morally correct to refuse the lawyer's request for deal and proceed with a normal litigation. However, from the manager's perspective, it would extremely negative for his career if his company ended up being sued for money by the plaintiff. He would most likely lose his job and as a result, his financial situation would be in ruin. If he had a family, they would be affected as well.

There is a conflict of interest. The manager must also consider the effects of his actions on other parties. Also, other parties would be negatively affected. If the supermarket were sued, the financial loss would affect employees, shareholders, and owners of the company, all of whom have personal responsibilities and family as well. And from the lawyer's point of view, her client has no insurance, has large medical bills and cannot work. The only

way to possibly win any sum of money would be to sue just for medical costs, which the insurance company would cover.

Is it ethical to proceed with this even though the client is in such a dire situation? If the lawyer doesn't proceed with the plan, her client will be unable to work, and will also run into huge financial problems. An employee at the supermarket you manage mopped one of the aisles in the store and placed signs at the ends of the aisle to warn people not to use the aisle until the floor dried. One customer walked around the sign, slipped, fell, and suffered serious injuries. Her lawyer comes to you with the following story.

She says that she is going to sue the store for the negligence that led to the customer's injuries. However, she says that she doubts that she can win, since case law in the state makes it clear that the sign is considered a reasonable warning so that contributory negligence by the customer would eliminate the liability of the store. This means that the customer will get nothing, but one can never be completely sure. The worst part is that the customer has no insurance, has incurred large hospital bills, cannot work for several months, and has no source of support. The lawyer makes the following deal.

She will forgo any fee for the case and will sue only for an amount equal to the medical costs incurred and the wages lost, if you will agree to testify that there was no sign in place to warn that the floor was wet. The payment will be made by the insurance company. This will not affect your position with the insurance company, and you will save attorney's fees. Should you make such a deal? What if you knew that the law in most states would provide an

award because their laws hold that warning signs are insufficient and a complete physical barrier has to be in place? Discuss the ethical issues.