

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

2002 Folio No 406

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

COMMERCIAL COURT

B E T W E E N:

THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY

Claimant

-and-

BOWLEY and others

Defendants

SKELETON OPENING

ON BEHALF OF THE NINTH DEFENDANT

| Section | Page |
|--|-------------|
| A INTRODUCTION | |
| About Mr Ranson | 4 |
| The Society's claims against Mr Ranson | 5 |
| Summary of Mr Ranson's case | 7 |
| The manner in which the claim has been brought | 9 |
| B BACKGROUND | |
| Participation in the profits of the Society | 12 |
| Full and Fair Distribution | 13 |
| Asset shares | 15 |
| The absence of an "estate" | 17 |
| Communication of the Society's approach to its policyholders | 18 |
| The origins of the "GAR policies" | 19 |
| The origins of the final bonus payable to GAR policyholders | 22 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Precedent for the differential | 24 |
| The Open Market Option (“OMO”) | 24 |
| The GAR policies as at 1993 | 26 |
| Bonus distribution as at 1993 | 27 |
| The “introduction of the DTBP” | 29 |
| Mr Ranson’s reasons for recommending the DTBP | 30 |
| Subsequent events | 33 |
| | |
| C THE “WANT OF CARE” CLAIMS: Introduction | 34 |
| Preliminary observations | 34 |
| Limitation | 35 |
| The “particularly high risk exposure” of the Society | 37 |
| The Headdon and Soundy correspondence | 38 |
| Policyholders’ reasonable expectations (PRE) | 39 |
| Complaints about the DTBP prior to 1998 | 42 |
| The foreseeable consequences of the DTBP being unlawful | 43 |
| | |
| D WANT OF CARE: as director | |
| Mr Ranson’s place in the Board dynamic | 45 |
| The breach of duty pleaded | 46 |
| Mr Ranson’s case: as at December 1993 | 46 |
| Mr Ranson’s case: as at February 1996 and February 1997 | 51 |
| | |
| E WANT OF CARE: as Appointed Actuary | |
| The position of Appointed Actuary | 54 |
| Duties owed as Appointed Actuary | 55 |
| Breach of duty: preliminary points | 56 |
| Breach of duty: the pleaded case | 57 |
| Breach of duty: Mr Ranson’s case | 58 |
| (1) Failure to ensure that the long-term business of the Society was operated on sound financial lines | 58 |

| | |
|---|----|
| (2) Failure to have regard to the GAR policies and the alleged "GAOs" and their implications for the long-term business and resilience of the Society | 59 |
| (3) Failure to ensure the Board was entitled to "declare" differential terminal bonuses | 59 |
| (4) Failure to provide a written financial condition report | 60 |
| (5) Failure to advise upon the "implications" (for PRE) and contractual or PRE "issues" to which the DTBP gave rise | 61 |
| The expert evidence | 64 |
| Position as at February 1996 and February 1997 | 65 |
| | |
| F WANT OF CARE: Causation and Quantum | |
| Causation | 66 |
| (1) Would a test action have been commenced? | 66 |
| (2) Would bonuses have been cut pending the outcome of the test action? | 68 |
| (3) Would there have been any better chance of a sale? | 70 |
| Quantum | 71 |
| The new case | 71 |
| Other points on the alleged loss | 72 |
| | |
| G BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY | |
| Liability | 73 |
| Causation and quantum | 73 |
| | |
| H RELIEF UNDER s.727 COMPANIES ACT 1985 | 75 |