TEACHING CASE LETS AND CASE-STUDY

Case Developer	**:**	**Dr. Heena Joshi**
Designation	**:**	**Associate Professor**
E-Mail	**:**	**heenakssbm@gmail.com**
Case Title	**:**	**JP Pvt. Ltd.**
Case Subject	**:**	**Business Ethics & Corporate Governance**
Accession Number	**:**	**04**

JP PVT LTD

JP PVT LTD is a medium-sized company that provides financial services. Its goal is to help clients achieve their financial objectives by offering exceptional financial solutions. The business has a clear goal of dominating its sector by upholding the highest standards of morality, competence, and client care.

The company's business operations included Investment management, wealth management, financial planning and banking services; all of which are classified as Financial Services. It is a matter of pride of the company to provide personalized financial solutions tailored to each client's particular requirements among the various individuals, families and businesses that make up the company's clientele. Exceptional service in order to fulfil mission and vision is provided to clients by the highly trained workforce of JP Pvt Ltd. The business makes an investment in the professional growth of its staff members by offering ongoing training and education to keep them abreast of the most recent business trends and best practices.

Rahul, who is a multitalented person with an MBA from a prestigious MBA institute and has been with the company for over five years, is one of the top performers in his department. He consistently exceeds his targets and brings in a large amount of business for the company. His managers value his contributions to the company, and they have often praised him for his hard work. However, his behavior towards his colleagues has become a serious concern for the company. Several of his colleagues have reported feeling uncomfortable and intimidated by his comments and behavior. Some have even said they avoid working with him or attending meetings where he is present.

When the company first became aware of Rahul's behavior, his managers decided to give him a verbal warning. They hoped that this would be enough to encourage him to change his behavior and treat his colleagues with respect. The warning was given privately, and Rahul was told that his behavior was not acceptable and needed to change. Despite the warning, Rahul's behavior has not improved. He continues to make sexist and racist remarks, and his colleagues feel that he is creating a hostile work environment. Some have even reported feeling discriminated against because of their gender or race. The situation has escalated to the point where one of Rahul's colleagues has threatened to file a formal complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The company is aware that this would be a serious matter and could have significant legal and financial consequences.

The management team is now faced with a significant ethical dilemma. On the one hand, they have a responsibility to ensure that all employees are treated fairly and with respect. Rahul's behavior is unacceptable and could be considered a form of harassment. The company has an obligation to take action to address this behavior and prevent any harm to its employees. On the other hand, Rahul is a highly valued employee who brings in a significant amount of revenue for the company. If he were to be fired or reprimanded, it could have significant financial implications for the company. The company may also worry about losing Rahul's expertise and experience, which could be challenging to replace.

Discussion Questions

1. How can the management team uphold the principle of justice and fairness when making a decision regarding Rahul's inappropriate behavior while also considering the potential financial implications for the company?
2. Should the management team prioritize the principle of autonomy and respect for individual rights by allowing Rahul to remain employed, despite his behavior, or prioritize the principle of beneficence by taking action to protect his colleagues from harm?
3. How can the management team ensure that they are upholding the principle of non-maleficence by taking action to prevent Rahul 's behavior from causing harm while also ensuring that their response does not cause undue harm to Rahul?
4. What other theories of ethics you can relate to this situation? How and why?