



C33 Arson or Accidental Flashback? Sorting Fact From Fiction

Thomas Gillman, BSc*, T.H. Gillman & Assoc., Ltd., 202-2025 Corydon Avenue, Winnipeg, MB R3P 0N5, Canada

The goal of this presentation is to provide some insight into the objective evaluation of expert witness opinions by providing a guide to forensic engineers on major issues of credibility, expert opinion, and accuracy of work conducted.

There is an increasing reliance on experts in the assessment, reporting, and resolution of insurance loss episodes, and of claims and counterclaims arising from such loss episodes. Regardless of how the resolution of such a

matter is attained by various parties, be it settlement, mediation, arbitration, or trial in a court of law, the expert's opinion will frequently be a key factor in determining the outcome.

The fact that different experts may express differing opinions on the same matter, will present a dilemma to those who would rely on expert opinion to guide the resolution of a matter under dispute to a true and just decision. Added to this delicate balance is the fact that some experts may – either by accident or by design – present an opinion which is intended to serve the interest of their client before serving the interest of truth and justice. When such an opinion is packaged in the shroud of scientific and engineering jargon, it may appear to be quite convincing even though it is not completely accurate.

A forensic expert will periodically be faced with the challenge of identifying, explaining, and unmasking the flaws of an opposing opinion, an opinion that, in reality, is a partisan statement.

This presentation will review the salient details of a case history that was resolved at trial. The matter before the court dealt with a fire loss that resulted in an insurer denying a claim on the basis that the insured had committed arson. The insured claimed that the fire was caused accidentally, and denied that arson was committed and sued the insurer for breach of contract.

Furthermore, as is often the case in such matters, the insured had been previously charged with the criminal offence of arson, but was acquitted at trial because the benefit of reasonable doubt is given. At the criminal trial, no expert or expert opinion was introduced to the court on behalf of the accused.

In preparation for the subsequent civil trial, counsel for the insured now retained the services of an expert. The plaintiff's expert put forward the notion of accidental flashback as an explanation for the cause of the subject fire, thereby negating the allegation of arson by the insured.

In a civil trial, while the plaintiff must prove their case, the final decision will be made on the balance of probabilities, as compared with a criminal trial, where there is a presumption of innocence, and hence the accused must be given the benefit of doubt. If a scientific opinion can be introduced by the plaintiff's expert in a civil trial that will materially alter the balance of probabilities, this may be sufficient for the plaintiff's case to succeed at trial. This is a delicate process which could work, if it effectively strengthens the plaintiff's case by simply weakening the defendant's case. Note that in so doing, no overwhelming factual evidence need be introduced by the plaintiff's expert. That is, the plaintiff's case was not strengthened by the introduction of important evidence, but rather by simply diluting the strength of the defendant's case.

As will be demonstrated in this presentation, the careful and objective forensic engineering assessment of every detail associated with the plaintiff expert opinion and hypothesis concerning flashback resulted in identifying a subtle but important flaw. Once exposed, and removed from the hypothesis, the flaw rendered the hypothesis of flashback as being not merely improbable, but clearly impossible.

Finally, it was absolutely necessary that the identified flaw be checked and cross-checked to assure its validity. This presentation will explain how, through the use of parallel forensic experts, the flaw was checked, tested and confirmed absolutely. When the flawed hypothesis was exposed in a clear, concise, and objective manner at trial, the plaintiff's case was totally destroyed and his claim was dismissed.

Arson, Expert, Flashback