

ARE YOUR IPs PREPARED FOR THE SURPRISING BITE OF THE NEW HEALTH & SAFETY ENFORCEMENT REGIME?

27 January 2016

The new sentencing guidelines for health & safety offences are in force from 1 February 2016. The sentences are now based on turnover and will dramatically increase the level of fines, particularly for larger organisations. This could be very serious for the larger IP firms, now facing potential fines in excess of £100million for health & safety breaches.

Worse still, IPs are particularly vulnerable to criminal prosecution as individuals because they take appointments in a personal capacity and they are an attractive prosecution target. Unintended consequences of the way punishments are now calculated mean that IPs are much more likely to be imprisoned for breaching health & safety laws.

The 4 Inflations

For most health & safety and food hygiene breaches, the criminal law laid down by Parliament does not set an upper limit to the size of the fine, so it is left to judges and magistrates in Court to decide how the fine should 'fit the crime'. To help the Court set a fair, transparent and consistent tariff for these offences, the eminent judges and lawyers on the Sentencing Council have created a specific set of guidelines now coming into force.

1

Close inspection of the new sentencing guidelines shows that 4 inflationary factors are going to increase radically the level of fines, yet only 1 of these factors was intended. Similarly, the threshold for imprisonment will be reached very much more easily than before. Let's look briefly at the 4 inflationary factors:

1st Inflation

The sentencing guidelines introduce a structured approach that the Court must follow. This involves plugging 'culpability', 'likelihood' and 'harm' factors into a series of tables to reach recommended starting point fines, as well as ranges of fines above and below the starting points. Similarly for imprisonment of individuals, a table stipulates ranges of prison sentences above and below various starting points.

These tables were calculated by reviewing past sentences and then increasing the punishment. This 1st inflation was intended. It was designed to accommodate the Court of Appeal's repeated view that health & safety fines have generally been too low and need to be increased sufficiently to send a message to directors and shareholders. Indeed, the Court of Appeal envisages fines exceeding £100million for the worst health & safety breaches by the largest organisations.

But the Court of Appeal has not recommended massive increases across the board, even for less serious offences by smaller companies and by individuals. Yet this will be the effect of the next 3 inflations.

2nd Inflation

The sentencing guidelines switch from a mainly outcome based approach (*what was the seriousness of the injury*) to a risk based approach (*how serious was the harm that was risked*). There are justifiable reasons for this switch but its inflationary effect on sentences was not factored into the calculations. How does this 2nd inflation work?

Suppose an IP is organising an asset sale at a factory and the purchaser of a hydraulic press allows it to drop from a first floor ledge, crushing the toes of someone below. Traditionally, that would be prosecuted and sentenced very much more leniently than if the same object had hit someone's head and caused a fatality. Under the new risk based approach, the toe injury is seen as having involved a high risk of death or disability and is plugged into the computation at the level calculated for a fatality.

The majority of non-fatal incidents could have been more serious, so these will be inflated up to the level of fine corresponding to that more serious injury.

3rd Inflation

If the offence exposed not just one but a number of people to the risk of harm, the Court is directed to ramp the punishment up to the next level. As a specialist health & safety defence lawyer, I struggle to think of a case where the breach only exposed one person to a risk of harm. For example, if other people could have been hit by the hydraulic press falling from the ledge, this 3rd inflation will apply.

4th Inflation

Finally, if there was actual harm (unless more minor than could be expected), the Court is also directed to ramp the punishment up to the next level. Since most prosecutions arise after someone has been injured, this 4th inflation will usually apply.

In summary, the combined effect of these last 3 unintended inflations will mean that criminal sentences will tend to converge at the higher end of a scale that has already been substantially increased by the 1st intended inflation. The Court is given some discretion but not enough to depart materially from the stipulated calculations.

For example, it is going to be difficult for an individual convicted offender to escape a jail sentence if he or she was aware of a risk of being in breach, nobody suffered an injury but several people were exposed to a 'medium' likelihood of death or disability. This is a very significant reduction in the threshold for imprisonment for health & safety offences.

This means it has never been more important to train IPs and their staff on what to do to protect their firm from the greatly increased potential fines and to keep them out of jail. I have done this with face to face training for IPs around the UK and, more recently, by creating a computer based health & safety training designed specifically for IPs and their staff.

Simon Joyston-Bechal, Director

27 January 2016

For Further information about Turnstone Law and its computer based training on essentials of health & safety for IPs and their staff, please see <http://www.turnstonelaw.com/training.html> , email sjb@turnstonelaw.com or call +44 (0) 20 3664 8226.