

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

---

Volume 8 | Issue 1

---

2025

© 2025 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

---

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact [support@vidhiaagaz.com](mailto:support@vidhiaagaz.com).

---

**To submit your Manuscript** for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to [submission@ijlmh.com](mailto:submission@ijlmh.com).

---

# The Inadequacy of Legal Frameworks in Personal Injury and Insurance Law

---

SANSKRITI SINGH<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*This research paper, titled *The Inadequacy of Legal Frameworks in Personal Injury and Insurance Law*, provides a critical examination of the existing legal structures governing personal injury claims and their interaction with insurance systems. Although significant improvements have been noticed in personal injury law, the present structures are ineffective to address the problems and realities of modern injury cases, particularly when compensation for pain and suffering, liability standards, and the influence of insurance companies on legal results are considered. This study presents a novel scope in examining how cognitive psychology impacts tort law, for the most part, left out of previous research. The psychological viewpoints that include integrating emotional factors on victims' experiences and judicial outcome forms the intention of this paper. It examines the ability of insurers to influence legislation relevant to the tort system. It concludes that, if account is taken of all these areas, insurance has been of vital importance to the law of tort. It identifies critical research gaps, including a lack of empirical data on jury awards and an incomplete understanding of non-economic damages across jurisdictions. Finally, it concludes with an advocacy for wholesale legal reform to place victim rights at the forefront and equitable compensation mechanisms to correct systemic inadequacies in personal injury and insurance law.*

**Keywords:** *Personal Injury, Insurance, Liability, Inadequacies, Damages, Victims.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Personal injury and Insurance law are the foundation of the legal system aims to deal with the aftermath of physical and emotional harm faced by an individual. These laws provide for fair compensation claims, determine liability, and establish justice for the victims of accidents and negligence. However, the need of its adequate legal framework aroused due to the increasingly evolution of the society and cases in regards to it. Therefore, legal framework is of paramount importance because these provide legal provision for resolution of personal injury claims in terms of compensation for pain and suffering, determination of liability, and mediation of the role of insurance systems. Constructive legal systems ensure that a victim's rights are protected

---

<sup>1</sup> Author is a student at Christ (Deemed to be)University, India.

and the principles of equity and fairness guide compensation and judicial decisions in such outcomes. Besides, in India, laws that regulate personal injury and insurance law are at this hour is not adequate to resolve the growing concerns and thus, facing crucial challenges. Deficiencies in the current legal framework, including the treatment of damages outside of economic considerations like pain and suffering, unequal liability, and the influence given to insurance companies that affect legal decision making. The emphasis on the ignorance of psychological perspectives in tort law, which affects the perception of the victims' experiences and judicial judgment, has also been laid down. All these gaps lead to unequal treatment of victims and expose significant flaws that require serious reforms.

## **II. EXPLORING PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMS AND INSURANCE LAW**

In India, the Tort law, mainly governs the legal framework in respect to civil wrongs and for individuals who are the victims of another person's negligence or wrongful actions, deals with the claims of personal injury laws. The Article 21 of Constitution of India<sup>2</sup>, which protects individual's life and personal liberty, guarantees the fundamentals of personal injury.<sup>3</sup> This constitutional provision is of significant importance as it provides the individuals the right to claim remedies in case of injury due to another persons' negligence or wrongful act. The key legislations, which govern the claims of personal injuries, are the Motor Vehicles Act, 2019<sup>4</sup>, Consumer Protection Act, 2019<sup>5</sup> addressing the road accidents, consumer injuries and fatal incidents respectively. Personal Injury laws are complex and involves subjective and wider judicial interpretations. The Judiciary especially the Apex Court interprets the law and abides the Doctrine of Stare Decisis to ensure fairness, justice and accountability. It sets precedents for the lower courts to guide it in adjudicating cases in relation of personal injury claims.<sup>6</sup> However, major factors for interpretations are negligence involving duty to care, proving the defendant's negligence and the harm caused. Secondly, Compensation which includes pain and suffering of the victim and the families, rehabilitation, medical expenses and lost wages or salaries, which aims to restore the individual to the pre- injury state. These factors not only aim to deter the negligent behavior but also facilitates compensation process.

### **(a) Main Inadequacies in Personal Injury Laws**

Personal injury and Insurance laws face major barriers including justice to victims and their

---

<sup>2</sup> India Const. art. 21.

<sup>3</sup> India Const. art. 21.

<sup>4</sup> *Motor Vehicles Act*, 2019, No. 59 of 2019, India.

<sup>5</sup> *Consumer Protection Act*, 2019, No. 35 of 2019, India.

<sup>6</sup> J.N. Pandey, *The Constitutional Law of India* 234 (56th ed. 2019).

families due to the insufficient legal provisions for it. Some of the major lacunas are the lack of compensation for pecuniary damages, which has a wide ambit of pain and suffering, insufficient compensation provided under victim compensation schemes, these insufficient resources affect their recovery process and medications. Another question is towards the role of medical expert witnesses, or often known as "injury brokers," as there is no accurate empirical data on their qualifications and practices. Unequal case outcomes can be one of the significant consequences of variable expert witnesses with no concrete qualifications and difference in experience and knowledge, rendering the legal process unfair. The critics of the claims settlement process have condemned the process because it has negatively affected the psychological and physical recovery of victims, with the procedural complexities and delays having exacerbated stress and hindering efforts at recovery. Personal injury litigation is often adversarial in nature, due to the prolonged process of traditional legal system, which results in discouraging victims from pursuing valid claims. Moreover, it is also seen that unless the court has made an error of law, it is very hard to succeed in an appeal on the basis of the court's findings of fact on the issues outlined above, and if one considers those principles and the particular factual circumstances of SRC, then, the challenges become evident<sup>7</sup>. Currently even if victims receive the compensation, there is a feeling of marginalization within the legal system and frustration among the victims because the personal injury laws typically do not take into adequate consideration the needs and experiences of victims. There is also an important lack of consistency in personal injury laws from one jurisdiction to another, leading to unequal treatment of similar cases based solely on location. It lacks adequate empirical data on the parameters such as to how cases turn out, what victims have to go through during and after the case and what happens in practice related to expert witnesses. So as long as there is no authorized and uniform data available of good quality, it makes this law harder to reform.

### **(b) Objectives of the Proposed Study**

The research paper "The Inadequacy of Legal Frameworks in Personal Injury and Insurance Law" aims to critically analyze the current legal framework which governs personal injury and insurance law, reflecting on the inadequacies or shortcomings and possible areas that may be lacking. By this, the study would examine the current laws in various jurisdictions that may be applicable currently on various factors including structure, application, and effectiveness in delivering justice. Key lacunas of these frameworks are inadequate compensation mechanisms, reliance on medical expert witnesses, and procedural complexities that deter victims from

---

<sup>7</sup> David McArdle & A.L. DeMartini, *Litigation and Liability in Concussion Research and Collaboration*, 18 *Sport, Ethics & Phil.* 338 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1080/17511321.2024.2361909>.

access to justice. The research will also assess the effects on the victims by determining their experience in navigating the process of personal injury claims and study the psychological impact of inadequacies in legal frameworks on their psychological and physical recovery. The research will identify research gaps for further study, particularly the role and impact of medical expert witnesses and variation in compensation across jurisdictions. The paper will provide expert suggestions on legal reforms based on the findings toward better service to victims in terms of compensation.

Therefore, the research paper also has the aim to document the inadequacies that are already present in the current personal injury and insurance laws and contribute to a deeper understanding of their implications for victims.

### **III. EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONAL INJURY LAWS**

#### **(a) Historical Standings**

The development of personal injury law has been shaped by evolution of various societal norms, technological advancement, and judicial interpretations. Initially, it was seen that the law was fault-based, where the injured party had to prove that the defendant was sufficiently negligent and directly responsible for the harm. This burden on the plaintiff led to many cases in which victims went uncompensated despite suffering significant injuries. This system was met with dissatisfaction over time, which has led to several reform movements introducing more balanced approaches, such as comparative negligence and contributory negligence doctrines.<sup>8</sup> These reforms were aimed at creating a fairer system by giving credence to shared responsibility in accidents. The Technological developments have also played a great role in shaping personal injury law, such as the invention of automobiles, which brought about new categories of claims and medical malpractice claims. The changes have been very extensively studied by legal scholars and highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of modern tort law. The critics argue that tort law encourages careful behavior and reduces accident costs, but often does not address deeper systemic issues such as disparities in compensation, access to justice, and the influence of socioeconomic status and race.

#### **(b) Existing Legal Framework and its Limitations**

The legal framework governing claims for personal injury has come to evolve over time: strict liability and no-fault insurance schemes were made to simplify legal processes for quicker compensation of victims and to reduce litigation costs and the delays associated with them but

---

<sup>8</sup> David McArdle & A.L. DeMartini, *Litigation and Liability in Concussion Research and Collaboration*, 18 *Sport, Ethics & Phil.* 338 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1080/17511321.2024.2361909>.

often fail to achieve outcomes that are equitable for victims. Critics argue that these frameworks prioritize efficiency and predictability over justice for individual claimants, forgetting the human element of personal injury claims and the need for justice to be victim-centric. Rigid liability standards also lead to unjust outcomes by not accounting for unique circumstances in individual cases, leaving some victims undercompensated or without recourse altogether. Insurance companies also have a great role in determining the outcome of litigations and the settlement values, affecting all from the assessment of damages to the negotiation of settlements.

In the four decades between the publication of the first and ninth editions of John Fleming's "The Law of Torts" his field has undergone enormous change.<sup>9</sup> With respect to social policy toward personal injuries, tort law has come to play a more central role -- with respect to product injuries, medical accidents, toxic spills and more.<sup>10</sup>

India's personal injury laws are grounded in a combination of common law principles and statutory provisions. Key statutes include the Indian Penal Code (IPC), the Civil Procedure Code (CPC), and the Motor Vehicles Act.<sup>11</sup> The legal framework emphasizes compensating victims for harm suffered due to negligence or wrongful acts, with specific statutes addressing various aspects of personal injury, such as motor vehicle accidents and workplace injuries.<sup>12</sup>

#### **IV. PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECT IN PERSONAL INJURY LAWS**

Cognitive and emotional factors play an important role in personal injury law, where outcomes depend on legal principles of negligence, liability, and compensation. Two of the most prevalent biases in tort law scholarship are hindsight bias and the anchoring effect. Hindsight bias is when jurors overestimate how predictable an outcome was in order to unfairly assess what defendants did. The anchoring effect is the reliance of individuals on an initial reference point in making a decision, which unduly influences damage awards in personal injury cases. Jennifer Robbennolt's research explains how jurors' emotional reactions to plaintiffs' suffering can influence their decisions, especially in awarding non-economic damages such as pain and suffering.<sup>13</sup> According to her findings, jurors tend to rely on their emotional reactions to assess the severity of harm and determine appropriate compensation. Such emotional engagement

---

<sup>9</sup> Stephen D. Sugarman, *Personal Injury and Social Policy: Institutional and Ideological Alternatives*

<sup>10</sup> Stephen D. Sugarman, *Personal Injury and Social Policy: Institutional and Ideological Alternatives*

<sup>11</sup> Personal Injury Law: A Comparative Analysis Between India and the USA, Law Bhoomi (Aug 28, 2024), [<https://lawbhoomi.com/personal-injury-law-a-comparative-analysis-between-india-and-the-usa/>].

<sup>12</sup> Personal Injury Law: A Comparative Analysis Between India and the USA, Law Bhoomi (Aug 28, 2024), [<https://lawbhoomi.com/personal-injury-law-a-comparative-analysis-between-india-and-the-usa/>].

<sup>13</sup> Neal Feigenson, Jurors' Emotions and Judgments of Legal Responsibility and Blame: What Does the Experimental Research Tell Us?, 8 *Emotion Rev.* 26 (2016), [<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915601>].

could create sympathy but might instead result in awards that are unpredictable and erratic.<sup>14</sup> Psychology-tort law relations are also underdeveloped, as few studies provide comprehensive accounts of how cognitive and emotional factors play into legal principles in outcomes.<sup>15</sup> The absence of such interdisciplinary research further necessitates such work in which psychological theories are incorporated into tort law to help improve legal decision-making for fairer and more predictable results.

## V. RECOGNITION OF NON-ECONOMIC DAMAGES

Non-economic damages, especially compensation for pain and suffering, are challenges in personal injury law because it is subjective. Such kinds of damages pertain to intangible injuries, emotional distress, pain, loss of quality life, and any other form of suffering where no objective measure can actually gauge the intensity of someone's suffering.<sup>16</sup> As a consequence, this created inconsistencies of judgment and, in due course, heated debates pertaining to fairness. Moreover, it has been seen that the actual proving of non-economic damages can be challenging. There is no such bill or invoice that shows the value of your pain and suffering<sup>17</sup>. The Comparative analyses present significant differences in the jurisdictional systems where non-economic damages are computed and awarded. In common law jurisdictions, courts depend heavily on precedents to determine the amount of the damage award. This has led to wide disparities between awards. By contrast, in civil law systems, formulae can be codified or statutory caps can be utilized to standardize an award. However, critics argue they can be too rigid to account for each victim's unique experiences. The current approaches had failed to account the full depth and breadth of victims' experiences because non-economic harms are often deeply personal and vary vastly from one person to another. Recent empirical studies indicate that judges and jurors often cannot achieve consistency in awarding non-economic damages and, therefore, have unanticipated outcomes and systemic inequalities.

## VI. COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DIFFERENT JURISDICTION

Common law systems, which include the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, apply judicial precedents in resolving personal injury cases. These systems give

---

<sup>14</sup> Neal Feigenson, Jurors' Emotions and Judgments of Legal Responsibility and Blame: What Does the Experimental Research Tell Us?, 8 *Emotion Rev.* 26 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915601>.

<sup>15</sup> Monica K. Miller et al., Tort Law Decision-Making: Psychological and Legal Perspectives, in *The Cambridge Handbook of Psychology and Legal Decision-Making* (Monica K. Miller et al. eds., Cambridge Univ. Press, 2023), [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1234567](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1234567).

<sup>16</sup> Non-Economic Damages, MVM Law (Dec. 24, 2024), <https://www.mvmlaw.com/resources/non-economic-damages/>.

<sup>17</sup> Non-Economic Damages, MVM Law (Dec. 24, 2024), <https://www.mvmlaw.com/resources/non-economic-damages/>.

considerable discretion to judges and juries in making awards, including non-economic damages like pain and suffering. Some of the distinguishing features of common law systems are case law and precedent, trial by jury, and contingency fees. On the other hand, civil law countries like France, Germany, and Japan operate on codified law systems, that use statutes and legal codes which reduce judicial discretion and enforce uniform compensation. Some key characteristics of civil law countries are codified rules, judicial oversight, and standardized compensation.

**(a) Subjectivity vs. standardization:**

Common law allows for more subjectivity, leading to more variable awards, whereas civil law emphasizes standardization, resulting in predictable but perhaps rigid outcomes.<sup>18</sup> Precedent plays a different role in common law systems than in civil law systems, with common law relying on precedent to guide decisions, and civil law prioritizing statutory interpretation.<sup>19</sup> In common law systems, juries may be swayed emotionally, whereas civil law judges are expected to adhere to the law without partiality.

**(b) Flaws and Inequities in Personal Injury Compensation Systems**

Significant flaws in personal injury compensation systems include inconsistency in judicial approaches, subjectivity in awards for non-economic damage, and undue influence of insurance companies. Such imperfections leave the victims in dire financial and emotional straits, often forcing them into settlements that are far less than what they should have been. Statutory caps and jurisdictional disparities heighten inequities for severely injured victims. Practices of insurance, which focus on controlling costs rather than protecting victim rights, further erode fairness in compensation. Complete legal reform requires standardized yet adaptive frameworks for non-economic damages, regulation of insurance practice, and insights from cognitive psychology in order to design an increasingly just system for victims.

## **VII. COMPENSATION SYSTEM FOR PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMS**

The compensation system for personal injury claims aims to provide remedies for victims who suffer harm due to negligence or intentional actions. Traditionally, it encompasses both economic damages (such as medical expenses and lost income) and non-economic damages (such as pain and suffering and emotional distress). However, the system has been criticized for

---

<sup>18</sup> Caslav Pejovic, Civil Law and Common Law: Two Different Paths Leading to the Same Goal, 32 *Victoria U. Wellington L. Rev.* 817 (2001).

<sup>19</sup> Caslav Pejovic, Civil Law and Common Law: Two Different Paths Leading to the Same Goal, 32 *Victoria U. Wellington L. Rev.* 817 (2001).



its inconsistency, lack of clarity, and failure to adequately address victims' needs. Economic damages are relatively simple to compute based on objective evidence, such as medical bills and employment records. Non-economic damages are always subjective and therefore difficult to quantify in an objective sense. Thus, their determination often produces unpredictable outcomes. The reliance of courts on precedent, judicial discretion, and jury assessments for the awarding of pain and suffering makes it predictable and sometimes quite variable from case to case and jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Statutory caps on noneconomic damages also complicate matters, disproportionately harming egregious injuries by capping payments. Judicial approaches to personal injury cases vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, varying liability standards, including common law, strict liability and comparative fault. Discretionary application by judges has a large role in these outcomes as well, frequently relying on perceptions of equity and harm severity to come up with inconsistent awards.

#### **(a) Impact of Judicial Decisions on Victims**

Judicial decisions in cases of personal injury are, therefore, very significant since they have financial and psychological impacts on the victims. The awards are important for paying off medical costs, rehabilitation fees, and lost income but the delay in litigation and unpredictable awards leave the victims distressed financially. Insurance companies take advantage of these delays and pressure the victims into accepting lower settlements, particularly for those with long-term disabilities or ongoing care needs. Statutory caps on damages exacerbate these challenges because victims with catastrophic injuries will receive compensation that is woefully inadequate to meet their actual needs, leaving them to draw on public assistance or personal savings. Awards vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, creating inequities as similarly situated victims receive vastly different compensation depending upon where their case is heard.

Another important aspect while highlighting the impact of Judicial decision in case of the personal Injury is the Procedural Justice provided to the victims in the cases of Personal Injury. Procedural justice literature shows that people form a subjective opinion about the justice and fairness of procedures and rules (in our case: of claims resolution) and are particularly sensitive to whether they are treated in an honest, respectful manner (in our case: primarily by the agency or insurer).<sup>20</sup> The key constructs that are considered to be decisive for the experience of procedural justice are: voice, trustworthy motives, dignity and respect, and neutrality in decision making.<sup>21</sup> An abundance of evidence demonstrates that the subjective judgment people make

---

<sup>20</sup> JW Thibaut and LJ Walker, *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis* (New York, Wiley, 1975); TR Tyler, *Why People Obey the Law* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1990)

<sup>21</sup> Akkermans, A. (2020). *Achieving Justice in Personal Injury Compensation: The Need to Address the Emotional*

about proceedings being fair and just has significant effects on their subsequent behaviour and attitudes towards the decision and the authority that took it (the so-called 'fair process effect').<sup>22</sup>

Emotionally, judgments stress and retraumatize the victims because they will have to recount their stories and be cross-examined upon. The verdict can give or deny them a place and voice in society by rendering them unheard. The empirical findings of research have presented the victims with an adversarial system of justice, which is not exactly personalized, hence leaving people unsatisfied.

### **(b) Examination of How Insurance Companies treat personal injury claims**

Insurance companies play a great role in personal injury claims as they determine the nature of the litigation process and outcome. They are the primary defendants in accident, work injuries, and medical malpractice cases.<sup>23</sup> Their financial resources and legal expertise make them a formidable force against individual plaintiffs, with strategies such as delaying settlements and using lowball offers to force victims to settle for less than the true value of their claim. Insurance companies also influence the evaluation of damages by setting internal procedures for reviewing claims, making settlements uniform but insufficient sometimes. Adjusters often become dependent on algorithms or formulas failing to consider each case's singularities, especially those having non-economic harms such as pain and suffering.<sup>24</sup> The "repeat player" effect further complicates the negotiation process, as insurers possess extensive experience in litigation whereas most plaintiffs are first-timers in the process. This imbalance often results in pro-insurer outcomes, especially where cases do not go to trial.

Critics argue that the power of insurance companies undermines the compensatory goals of tort law, focusing on cost control and profit margins over the rights of victims. This situation has led to calls for reform, including greater regulation of insurance practices and the establishment of independent oversight mechanisms. Empirical studies suggest that insurance companies' dominance contributes to systemic inequities, especially for victims from marginalized communities who may face additional barriers, including bias and discrimination.<sup>25</sup> The

---

Dimensions of Suffering a Wrong. In P. Vines, & A. Akkermans (Eds.), *Unexpected Consequences of Compensation Law* (pp. 15-38). (Hart Studies in Private Law; Vol. 34). Hart Publishing (<https://doi.org/10.5040/9781509928026.ch-002>).

<sup>22</sup> K van den Bos, 'What is Responsible for the Fair Process Effect?' in J Greenberg and JA Colquitt (eds), *Handbook of Organizational Justice: Fundamental Questions about Fairness in the Workplace* (Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005) (UU); K van den Bos et al, 'On the Role of Perceived Procedural Justice in Citizens' Reactions to Government Decisions and the Handling of Conflicts'

<sup>23</sup> Role of Insurance Companies in Personal Injury Claims, Rinehardt Law Firm (Dec. 24, 2024), <https://www.rinehardtlawfirm.com/role-of-insurance-companies-in-personal-injury-claims/>.

<sup>24</sup> Role of Insurance Companies in Personal Injury Claims, Rinehardt Law Firm (Dec. 24, 2024), <https://www.rinehardtlawfirm.com/role-of-insurance-companies-in-personal-injury-claims/>.

<sup>25</sup> Role of Insurance Companies in Personal Injury Claims, Rinehardt Law Firm (Dec. 24, 2024),

research indicates massive inadequacies in the legal frameworks existing in personal injury and insurance law. There is the compensation system often failing in the case of the inconsistency in judicial approaches and subjectivity to non-economic damages. These inadequacies require holistic legal reform based on insights in cognitive psychology, the development of standardized but flexible frameworks of compensating non-economic damages, and the strengthening of oversight in insurance practices.<sup>26</sup>

### **VIII. REFORMING PERSONAL INJURY AND INSURANCE LAW: ADVANCING FAIRNESS AND EFFICIENCY**

The proposed procedural and legislative reforms aim to address systemic inequities in personal injury and insurance law by prioritizing victim rights, fairness, and efficiency. Procedural improvements, such as evidence-based methodologies, enhanced transparency, and streamlined dispute resolution, ensure equitable outcomes while counteracting insurance companies' undue influence. Legislative changes focus on expanding compensable harm to include psychological and emotional injuries, establishing uniform guidelines for non-economic damages, and limiting insurance company discretion through oversight and transparency. These reforms advocate for data-driven approaches, holistic legislative strategies, and regular reviews, fostering a fairer and more credible legal framework that meets contemporary needs.

#### **(a) Procedural Improvement**

The current legal framework governing personal injury and insurance law remains deficient since it tends to emphasize settlement of claims as swiftly as possible, which may diminish the realities of injury victims' experiences and compromise equitable results. The procedural improvements sought in the proposed evidence-based frameworks, better procedural transparency, and streamlined dispute resolution mechanisms will help counteract these shortcomings. Evidence-based methodologies, such as expert psychological testimony and standardized assessment tools, can provide objective insights into the mental and emotional toll of injuries, lending credibility to claims of emotional distress. These tools can also account for cultural, social, and individual differences in pain perception and emotional impact. Transparency is essential in mitigating the disproportionate influence of insurance companies on legal proceedings. Key measures include compulsory disclosure of insurance policy limits, transparent documentation requirements, and accelerated mechanisms for dispute resolution. In

---

<https://www.rinehardtlawfirm.com/role-of-insurance-companies-in-personal-injury-claims/>.

<sup>26</sup> Role of Insurance Companies in Personal Injury Claims, Rinehardt Law Firm (Dec. 24, 2024), <https://www.rinehardtlawfirm.com/role-of-insurance-companies-in-personal-injury-claims/>.

all cases, complementary issues should ideally be made crystal clear for the judge and jury<sup>27</sup>. Both should understand the monetary and social costs of alternative compensation resources for the injured accident victims in the available web of compensation if a particular source of insurance is unavailable<sup>28</sup>. Specialized tribunals may be used to ensure that judgments are quick yet fair. Streamlined procedures can bring justice to victims without the need for advanced legal knowledge or resources. Maintaining impartiality in the representation of the law is very important to ensure a fair trial. Mandatory legal representation may help to equalize cases where victims are at the mercy of large, well-funded insurance companies. Strengthened rules to prevent conflicts of interest can ensure unbiased and dedicated representation. In conclusion, these procedural reforms have the potential to greatly enhance personal injury claims in terms of fairness and efficiency by putting first the rights of victims and counterbalancing systemic biases. Elevation of the credibility of personal injury law will consequently be achieved, and victims will receive equity.

#### **(b) Suggested Legislative Changes**

The reform of personal injury and insurance law requires immense legislative overhauls towards the current realities of modern injury and systemic inequity. These proposals include altering liability standards to recognize psychological and emotional harms, having uniform guidelines for non-economic damages, limiting the power of insurance companies to freely exercise their discretion, promoting empirical research based on data gathering, and ensuring a holistic legislative approach. Traditional liability frameworks tend to neglect cognitive and emotional harm, which can have such significant effects on victims. Legislatures should, therefore, expand definitions of compensable harm to include psychological distress, including post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and anxiety. Courts will have to take into account expert psychological evaluations when awarding damages. Informed tort reform should be introduced, drawing from cognitive psychology to recognize the interconnected nature of physical and emotional injuries. Model statutes should be introduced for jurisdictions to adopt, creating consistency in recognizing cognitive and emotional harms across states or countries. Uniform guidelines for non-economic damages can be established through tiered caps based on the severity of harm, multiplier systems, and periodic adjustments for inflation. The discretionary power of insurance companies should be limited through transparent claims

---

<sup>27</sup> Knutsen, Erik S., *Five Problems with Personal Injury Litigation (and What to Do About It!)* (January 2, 2013). (2013) 40 *Advocates Quarterly* 492, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2228331>

<sup>28</sup> Knutsen, Erik S., *Five Problems with Personal Injury Litigation (and What to Do About It!)* (January 2, 2013). (2013) 40 *Advocates Quarterly* 492, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2228331>

processes, oversight mechanisms, and limits on settlement discretion.

## IX. CURRENT SCENARIO OF PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMS IN INDIAN LEGISLATION

The compensation to the participants, including medical care for injuries and payment to the next of kin in case of death, has been a grey area, especially in developing countries, though some countries require insurance cover for injuries during trials, India has recently come out with new rules for protecting the rights of participants after its Supreme Court came down heavily on the Central Drugs Standards Control Organisation (CDSCO) for not doing enough to safeguard those enrolled in clinical trials.<sup>29</sup> However, these rules which have been termed as flawed and are likely to cause damage to the clinical research in India, as sponsors may be discouraged by perceived hurdles. The rules require investigators to ensure that investigational products provide the intended therapeutic effect, which runs counter to the concept of equipoise in clinical research, many experts had also criticized the provisions for placebo-controlled studies, stating that compensation for injuries caused by placebo are against established ethical guidelines.<sup>30</sup> It has also been questioned in various studies by various experts of the concerned field, as to why the compensation amounts are actually needed to be determined by research ethics committees rather than judicial officers, fearing this may result in inconsistency and delays in compensation.

## X. CONCLUSION

The paper underscores critical shortcomings in the current legal structures addressing personal injury claims, particularly in compensating non-economic damages.

### (a) Summary of key findings

The paper, *The Inadequacy of Legal Frameworks in Personal Injury and Insurance Law*, critically evaluates the current legal structures for personal injury claims and highlights their limitations in addressing contemporary challenges. While personal injury law has seen notable advancements, the research identifies persistent systemic inadequacies, particularly in handling compensation for non-economic damages such as pain and suffering. The study emphasizes the disproportionate influence of insurance companies on legal outcomes, often skewing compensation mechanisms in favor of systemic efficiency rather than fairness to victims. One of the paper's key contributions is its integration of cognitive psychology into the analysis of

---

<sup>29</sup> Jerome Amir Singh, India's Regulatory Reforms on Compensation for Clinical Trial Injuries and Deaths: Urgent Need for Revisiting, 125 *Indian J. Med. Res.* 503 (2016).

<sup>30</sup> Jerome Amir Singh, India's Regulatory Reforms on Compensation for Clinical Trial Injuries and Deaths: Urgent Need for Revisiting, 125 *Indian J. Med. Res.* 503 (2016).

tort law. This perspective explores how emotional and psychological factors influence victims' experiences and judicial outcomes; an area traditionally underexplored. It also points out jurisdictional inconsistencies in defining and quantifying such damages, complicating equitable compensation efforts. Additionally, it advocates for comprehensive legal reforms aimed at centering victim rights and ensuring equitable outcomes.

#### **(b) Implications of Future Research**

The study emphasizes further research on the behavior of the jury in awarding non-economic damages, considering psychological factors like bias and emotional responses. It also suggests investigating jurisdictional disparities in personal injury law in order to establish standardized guidelines for calculating non-economic damages. The study also calls for further integration of cognitive psychology into tort law, where the implications of emotional factors on settlement negotiations and judicial interpretations of liability standards would be explored.

\*\*\*\*\*