

From: Justice Minister
To: Holmes, Janis M
Date: 2010-05-10 11:00 AM
Subject: Fwd: LAC MEMBERS - COPY LETTER SENT TO PREMIER - REQUESTING RECONSIDERATION BILL 52

more from Ms. Woodman

>>> jeanette woodman <jmwoodman@hotmail.com> 5/6/2010 1:17 PM >>>

LAC MEMBERS . FYI. I had sent this letter to the Premier.

From: jmwoodman@hotmail.com
To: premier@gov.ns.ca
Subject: FW: BILL 52- INSURANCE ACT - INNOCENT VICTIMS PENALIZED
Date: Tue, 4 May 2010 09:50:20 -0300

PREMIER,

Our family voted for you and the NDP party during the recent election. We were first time NDP voters and driven to support the NDP by your Party's public statement wrt a review of the Insurance Act. The NDP proposed a solution that we thought fair and reasonable and discussed a probable fee of \$10,000.00 to pursue claims, in an effort, to deter fraudulent cases. OK. We thought, a fair enough, compromise. It would let innocent victims, like our daughter Morgan, have a reasonable option to address the injuries she still suffers from being rear-ended by a 3 ton truck.

As a family we are very distressed with the ramifications of the current BILL 52, as currently proposed. Bill 52 will penalize innocent victims like my daughter, Morgan Woodman, who was rear-ended by a 3 ton truck in 2006. Morgan still suffers from chronic muscular pain and chronic headaches. Yet these injuries are soft tissue and are not recognized with any level of seriousness by opposing legal firms. We have been treated terribly by Shelley A. Wood, Lawyer with Stewart McKelvey, Purdy's Wharf Tower One, Halifax, representing Petes Froutique, because they happily parade out the current Insurance Act and treat Morgan and her complaints with utter disrespect and disregard. They are, after all, protected by the current law. MORGAN is NOT. BILL 52, will continue to protect clients of firms like McInnis Cooper, who are able to "hide behind the law" while our daughter has no protection under the current law and NEITHER will Bill 52, as proposed, offer Morgan any further options.

Bill 52, as proposed will NOT recognize Morgan within the newly proposed guidelines simply because of IT'S "NON-RETROACTIVE POLICY". Perhaps this clause offers some level of appeasement to the Insurance Industry. While its intentions may be honourable, it penalizes innocent victims, like Morgan.

Please reconsider further amendments to Bill 52 that will prevent innocent, and legitimate victims from "falling through the cracks" because of an arbitrary time frame. I would prefer to support the "original" NDP proposal that a significant deduction of \$10,000 be a pre-requisite for anyone considering pursuing legitimate claims. At least, the original NDP proposal, does not exclude REAL victims and provides an "equal opportunity" for all who have been legitimately injured.

As Premier, we request your wise, reconsideration and support of BILL 52, which penalizes a small group of injured car crash victims who are suffering, simply, because of an arbitrary "TIME FRAME" that fails to recognize "RETROACTIVITY" from 2006, when the current law was in place BUT will recognize a car crash victim tomorrow based upon a distinctly different definition. If a filed claim, has already been made, then these victims are obviously serious, and should be considered as validly, retroactive and "Grandfathered" into BILL 52 as proposed. OR Bill 52 should be considered for further amendments.

Regards,
Jeanette Woodman
on behalf of
Morgan Woodman