

Pleaf Decision

Soletin render has bileng bler den seeld
be til decipies (Royle it biller) bester
and ording my smooth (1), types (file

What's in it for the audience? clini is here a isomopoid their pattern per near one operation into experience in the insulanal ord their agreed that he do into thick is first added that above agreed that he do into thick is forth and their above many and their particles and make and areas in said both she, hit is just the height of the figures in the contract of the contract of the contract for their contract of the contract of the contract for the contract of the contract of the contract for the contract for

> Qualions for year on would you appearsh the situation (f is more fastin or Soil?

Reinsurance Negotiation: Confidential Information for JLT Insurance Company Thecasesolutions.com Technically Mike is stealing. Thecasesolutions.com

Summary of the Case

Mike, an equipment manager has taken advantage of the company credit card, yet his boss is his brother.



Ethical Questions

- 1) Does Mike deserve to be punished for his actions?
- 2) Is it right for Mike's boss (his brother) to hand down a punishment?

What is the debate?

Mike is practically stealing, Justin who works in the accounting department feels obligated to take action, but isn't sure what to do considering thier boss is Mike's brother.

Solution 1: Confront Mike

- Consequentialist: Makes Mike aware without any consequences.
- Rights Approach: Mike doesn't get in trouble.
- Non-Consequentialist: Would be the best case scenario for Mike.
- Common Good: Could potentially stop Mike from using the company card.
- Virtue Approach: You would want to confront someone in this scenario as well.
- Ethics of Care: It helps everyone involved in some way.

Solution 2: Tell Higher Authority

- Consequentialist: Fixes the budget problem.
- Rights Approach: Helps elimnate the problem with the budget.
- Non-Consequentialist: Most fair for those in the athletic department.
- Common Good: Budget problem is likely eliminated.
- Virtue Approach: Is what most would do in this situation.
- Ethics of Care: Potentially affects Mike negatively but everyone else positively.

Solution 3: Ignore the Situation

- Consequentialist: Mike would continue doing things the way he does them.
- Rights Approach: It saves the relationships involved.
- Non-Consequentialist: No new impact on anyone involved.
- Common Good: No new impact.
- Virtue Approach: Myself: neutral
- Ethics of Care: Helps Mike but not the finances of athletics.