

Ability / TYRant

(a) TYR has shown a complete lack of respect, courtesy and good faith to AB (77.7.i), and continues, through that attitude to create an uncomfortable and uncooperative environment when they work together on projects (77.6). This is neither fair to AB (77.1.i) nor upholding the ideas of personal honour or professional integrity (77.1.iii).

TYR's continuously vexatious comments towards AB would, to any reasonable person, be thought of as being unwelcome and certainly would, and have, interfered with their professional relationship (even likely straining AB's relationship with others at the firm). Accordingly, TYR has been harassing AB (72.1) and this is clearly professional misconduct (72.2.n).

(b) Although AB has tried to discuss these matters with TYR, it is falling on deaf ears. AB should consider immediately contacting the PEO to make them aware of this unethical and unprofessional behaviour on the part of TYR (77.8).

(c) [this simply goes over the same 'moonlighting' issues as were discussed in the prior question. Remember – when discussing the COE and DOPM aspects of moonlighting, ALSO keep in mind the professional practice issues of a coa and professional insurance!]

Egoist / Sly

(a) I have an obligation to inform any co-worker/colleague of a review of any work they are still connected to (77.7.ii) – aside from that specific ethical obligation, making them aware of the review is a natural expression of courtesy and good faith (77.7.i) and shows fairness to my colleague (77.1.i). If I were to agree to this secret review, my conduct would likely be seen, in the circumstances, as dishonourable and unprofessional and therefore professional misconduct (72.2.j).

Therefore, I would tell Sly that I could not proceed as proposed, but could certainly do the review as long as Egoist were made aware that the review is taking place.

(b) Egoist has been rude and selfish in the relationship with BigBucks. Apart from the fact that BB is paying all the fees (and therefore Egoist should be more respectful), Egoist has obligations to be fair and loyal to the client (77.1.i) and to act with professional integrity (77.1.iii) – he appears to have clearly failed in those obligations. Although we are not told all the details of the conversation(s) that took place, it may be that Egoist might be sanctioned for professional misconduct in dealing with BB, demonstrating disgraceful and unprofessional behaviour in the circumstances (72.2.j).

Clearly, Egoist, in upholding his ethical obligations, should have listened to the client and engaged them in a neutral, thoughtful and diplomatic discussion about their concerns – this would certainly show the fairness, loyalty and professional integrity that was actually lacking.