

Fact:

A diamond studded watch was stolen. Loss Prevention/ Security Manager, Mike, thought the company's employee Todd stole it, however, Mike didn't have any direct evidence to prove that Todd had stolen the watch. For this reason, Mike told Human Resources Manager Susan to check Todd's employment file to determine if there were some reasons for firing him.

Todd's application and sworn bonding form are different from the prior information such as previous employment.

Todd was the only one who handled the watch that day.

Todd was the only person who fail the test when asked if he stole the watch.

Issues:

1. There aren't any direct evidence to prove that Todd stole the watch.
2. Todd's application and sworn bonding form do not exactly reflect the same prior information such as previous employment. But, Susan didn't notice when she hired him.
3. If loss prevention manager Mike catches the burglar, it means he's doing well at work and he may be rewarded. Therefore, he tried to prove that Todd was the thief.

Harm:

1. The loss prevention manager Mike might be punished for negligence because he had no way to find the thief.
2. Todd's reputation would be seriously damaged if he was fired as a thief.
3. Human resources manager Susan might face penalties because she didn't seriously check the authenticity of employees' information
4. The company's reputation might be damaged by wrongdoing its employees, if Todd wasn't a thief and the company dismissed him

Choices:

1. Todd is fired for being considered a thief.
2. Todd is fired for inconsistent information.
3. Call the police, let them judge whether Todd should be dismissed base on police

investigation

Consequences:

1. Todd is fired for being considered a thief. If Todd isn't a thief and the company fired him for stealing, the loss prevention manager Mike might be prosecuted for defamation. In addition, the company will eliminate the most likely person who stole the watch.

2. If Todd is fired for inconsistent information, the human resources manager Susan will get into trouble because of negligence of duty. In addition, this is a warning to other employees. Companies can take this opportunity to check whether other employees' information is authentic or not.

3. If they call the police, the policemen can check if Todd stole the watch and find out the real thief. If he was, the company could fire him and claim compensation. When the police find out that his information is inconsistent with the previous one, the company can also fire him. However, the police may not be able to find the real thief and the company's valuables are still in danger of theft.

Action:

If I were Susan, to protect the store's profit, I would suggest dismissing Todd for information fraud, although I might face penalties because of negligence of duty. Because that will eliminate the people who were most likely to be the thief. In addition, I would tell Mike to strengthen the security of the store in order to reduce the risk of theft. If the valuables of the company continue to be stolen, I'll call the police to deal with it.

Index of comments

- 1.1 very good list of facts. well stated. you chose all of the relevant points from the case to include here.
- 1.2 excellent!
- 1.3 very good. you considered all parties from the case, as well as the company overall. you think like a business person!
- 2.1 Great list. very good business insight.
- 2.2 excellent course of action chosen. you supported your choice with many relevant details from the case. nice work!!