Kroger

Business

Kroger Company's sexual harassment policy, does not seem to have effect basing on the actions of Misiolek. The store and district managers, ought to forward the complaints to the headquarters as the cases increased. Failure to report these cases, makes the company liable for misconduct since it appears as cover-up (Velasquez, 2006). The company is responsible for any form of misconduct, because the management created the policies. The $33.

3 million penalty was excessive, since the offence was on a single branch. The final $8. 25 million award is reasonable for compensation; however, the complainants seem to have a personal interest, and do not focus on justice. The jury should investigate employee salary; if the salary is below standards, then the penalty should maintain at $33. 3 million.

A penalty minimizes cases of harassment, and not making profits as observed in this case (Velasquez, 2006). Kroger Company is responsible for the past events. The Company failed to observe past events before taking over the supermarkets; thus, the company becomes liable as the rightful owner. Punitive damage, aims at deterring defendant's future harassment to plaintiffs. An award could be unethical, if the plaintiff took advantage of the situation.

Financial awards should be minimal, to discourage false accusation for the sake of personal gains by plaintiffs (Nelson, 2006). Punishment in the form of suspension or degradation, should have immediate effect once the accused is found guilty. Misiolek had an outstanding reputation in making profits, and the company trusted his abilities. The company also allowed Misiolek to manage the stores, as there was lack of actual evidence to prove his unprincipled conduct. The employees might have forced the cases on Misiolek, because of his harsh nature in making profits.