

AUSTRALIAN  
AIRPORTS  
ASSOCIATION

**AIRPORT  
SAFETY  
WEEK**

14 - 18 October 2024

THE HEARTS & MINDS OF SAFETY LEADERSHIP

# MOCK TRIAL BRIEFING DOCUMENT



This Mock Court is designed to leverage the power of role-playing and storytelling to vividly illustrate both management and individual responsibilities in fostering a psychologically safe workplace.. The exercise serves as a powerful tool to emphasise the legal and ethical duties employers and colleagues have in preventing workplace harassment, stress, and bullying.

# MOCK COURT OBJECTIVES, BRIEF & OVERVIEW

## MOCK COURT OBJECTIVES & KEY TAKEAWAYS

### 1 Recognising Psychosocial Hazards:

Understand that managing safety at work includes addressing **both physical and mental health risks**, with a focus on preventing workplace bullying, harassment, and excessive job demands.

### 2 Legal Responsibilities:

Learn about the **Work Health and Safety (WHS) laws** and the legal obligation to provide a work environment free from psychosocial hazards such as poor workplace relationships, lack of role clarity, and poor procedural justice.

### 3 The Role of Leadership:

Emphasise how **managers and supervisors play a crucial role** in creating a safe workplace by ensuring professional boundaries are respected and providing support when stressors are identified.

### 4 Procedural Fairness:

Highlight the importance of **clear processes for addressing complaints and grievances**. Effective procedures should be in place to ensure all worker concerns are taken seriously, documented, and acted upon.

### 5 Mitigating Psychosocial Risks:

Demonstrate how **consultation with workers** is essential in identifying and managing psychosocial risks. It is the responsibility of the organisation to provide resources such as training, mental health support, and clear communication to mitigate these risks.

## MOCK COURT BRIEF: AVIATION PSYCHOSOCIAL SAFETY CASE

### Court Case Title:

Plaintiff vs. Denison Regional Airport (DEN)

### Scenario:

The small, tightly-knit team at Denison Regional Airport is being accused of enabling a workplace that is psychosocially unsafe. Denison (DEN) is a leisure destination in Queensland and supports a range of domestic and regional airlines. The Plaintiff, a long-time employee, is suing Denison Regional Airport for workplace bullying, harassment, and long-term psychosocial damage.

### Overview of the Case:

With fewer than 40 employees, the team at DEN is a close-knit group who have worked together for years. However, the small size and familiarity among staff have led to a problematic blending of personal and professional boundaries.

Mr Kevin Ryan, the Plaintiff, who has worked at DEN for over 7 years, claims they have suffered long-term psychological damage due to a combination of workplace bullying, harassment, and persistent operational pressures. Mr Ryan the Plaintiff asserts that due to the small team's dynamics, personal aspects of their life became the subject of ridicule and that jokes and insinuations about their sexual preferences and alleged racial background have exacerbated the work-related stress. The Plaintiff also alleges that the Manager's micromanagement style and unrealistic expectations worsened the situation. As a result, the Mr Ryan claims they are now unable to work due to severe psychological trauma and is seeking compensation for damages, including mental health deterioration and loss of income.



MOCK TRIAL  
BRIEFING DOCUMENT

# THE JUDGE

(MS SAM BETZIEN)

The Judge in this case is tasked with assessing whether Denison Regional Airport (PCBU), its Officers, the Plaintiff's Manger, and the Plaintiff's workmate have met their responsibilities under the **Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (WHS Act)**, and also evaluating the Plaintiff's eligibility for compensation under the **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003** and the **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Regulation 2014**.

## KEY AREAS OF ASSESSMENT UNDER WHS LAW

### 1 Primary Duty of Care (Section 19 of the WHS Act)

The judge will examine whether Denison Regional Airport, as the PCBU, met its **primary duty of care** under Section 19 of the WHS Act by taking **reasonably practicable** steps to:

- **Provide a work environment without risks to health and safety**, particularly focusing on **psychosocial risks** like workplace bullying, harassment, and chronic operational pressures.
- Implement **safe systems of work**, which would encompass measures to prevent workplace bullying, support worker mental health, and address complaints of harassment.
- Ensure that the health of workers was **monitored** to prevent psychological harm, particularly where complaints were raised about inappropriate workplace behaviour.
- Provide **adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision** to protect workers from workplace risks, including the mental health risks associated with a close-knit and under-resourced work environment.

### 2 Officers' Due Diligence (Section 27 of the WHS Act)

The judge will also determine whether the officers of the PCBU exercised **due diligence** in meeting their obligations. This includes:

- **Keeping up-to-date knowledge** on WHS matters, including how psychosocial risks manifest in small, high-pressure teams.
- Ensuring the PCBU had **adequate resources and processes** to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety. In this case, the judge will assess if there were policies in place for addressing workplace bullying, stress, and micromanagement.
- Having **appropriate processes for receiving and considering information** about incidents or complaints, such as the Plaintiff's concerns about harassment. If these complaints were not addressed adequately, this could indicate a failure to meet due diligence requirements

### 3 Supervisor's Responsibility (Section 28 of the WHS Act)

The Plaintiff's supervisor (The Manager) will be evaluated based on whether they:

- Took **reasonable care** to ensure their actions (e.g., micromanagement, dismissal of complaints) did not adversely affect the Plaintiff's health and safety.
- Ensured the Plaintiff complied with **reasonable instructions** for workplace safety and maintained a safe working environment, particularly concerning psychosocial safety.
- Addressed **workplace harassment and boundary violations**. If the supervisor failed to intervene, the judge will consider this a potential breach of WHS responsibilities.

# THE JUDGE

(MS SAM BETZIEN) ... continued

## 4 Workmate's Responsibility (Section 28 of the WHS Act)

The judge will also evaluate whether the Plaintiff's colleague (Witness 1):

- Took **reasonable care** that their participation in workplace banter and failure to intervene did not contribute to the Plaintiff's psychological harm.
- Complied with any **policies or procedures** related to harassment or workplace safety.

## ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPENSATION UNDER WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW

In addition to WHS obligations, the judge will evaluate the Plaintiff's eligibility for compensation under the **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003** and the **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Regulation 2014**.

## KEY AREAS OF ASSESSMENT

### 1 Whether the Plaintiff's psychological injury was significantly contributed to by employment

- The judge will assess whether the Plaintiff's psychological injury (diagnosed as severe anxiety and depression) was **significantly contributed to by their employment** at Denison Regional Airport. This includes considering the operational pressures, workplace bullying, and micromanagement described in the Plaintiff's claim.
- Evidence, such as medical reports and testimonies from the Plaintiff, workmates, and supervisors, will be scrutinised to establish the **direct connection between the work environment** and the Plaintiff's psychological injury.

### 2 Exemption of Reasonable Administrative Action

- Under **Section 32(5)** of the **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003**, psychological injuries are not compensable if they result from **reasonable management action** taken in a reasonable way, such as performance management, transfers, or disciplinary action.
- In this case, the judge will need to determine if the **reasonable administrative action exemption** applies. However, as the Plaintiff was not being **performance managed**, and their claim does not arise from management actions like discipline or restructuring, this exemption is not likely to apply.
- Instead, the Plaintiff's claim centres around **bullying, inappropriate workplace behaviour, and unreasonable operational demands**, which would not fall under the exclusion for reasonable management action.

### 3 Assessment of personal liability

The judge will also ascertain if the duty of care of the Manager has been so profound that they may also carry personal liability. That is that despite the limitations of the DEN organisation's support, they were basically derelict in their management responsibilities to provide psychosocial risk management and as a result the Plaintiff has duly suffered.

# THE PROSECUTOR

## (MR DAMIEN TOOHEY)

The Prosecutor will seek to prove that the PCBU failed to implement appropriate controls over a range of commonly understood psychosocial hazards, ultimately causing severe psychological harm to the Plaintiff. The PCBU allowed a workplace to develop that crossed critical boundaries resulting in an environment rife with psychological hazards.

## PROSECUTOR'S ARGUMENT

Under the Work Health and Safety (WHS) Act 2011, DEN, as the PCBU, had a duty to:

- **Provide a Safe Work Environment:** Ensure that the workplace was free from hazards, both physical and psychosocial, including bullying, harassment, unreasonable job demands, and poor workplace relationships (Section 19).
- **Implement Safe Systems of Work:** Establish policies and procedures to prevent psychosocial hazards, such as harassment and operational pressures, and address them when they occur (Section 19).
- **Monitor Worker Health:** Continually monitor the mental health of workers and respond appropriately to concerns, complaints, and reports of stress, bullying, or harassment (Section 19).
- **Consult with Workers:** Engage with employees when assessing risks, especially psychosocial hazards, and take steps to minimise or eliminate them (due diligence under Section 27).

The following details the psychosocial hazards experienced by the Plaintiff DEN, highlighting how these factors contributed to their psychological injury.

### 1 It's just harmless banter

The Plaintiff was married with kids, but a joke was started that he had hidden sexual preferences, and referring to this became regular "entertainment" in the Airport. This included the use of nicknames that were intended to reference this allegation. There were Post It notes on the Plaintiff's locker, an employee profile article in the DEN staff newsletter that included a range of fictitious anecdotes regarding personal lifestyle activities, even jokes made on the CTAF using the ground to air radio. It was seen as good banter by the DEN workforce, and the Plaintiff had little choice but to endure this **bullying and harassment** or face complete exclusion.

### 2 You're not from here

Racial innuendoes were seamlessly woven into everyday chatter, often characterised as "it's just jokes mate." One nickname, mocking the Plaintiff's family heritage, stuck. In an attempt to find acceptance through submission, the Plaintiff wrote this nickname on the back of their Vis Vest. This backfired and became a licence for the **racism** to go to a whole new level.

### 3 Toughen up princess

When the Plaintiff formally raised their hurt, anger and sense of isolation, the Manager held a couple of one on one meetings where he listened and seemed to take notes." The immediate reaction from the Manager was that the Plaintiff needed "to not be a Princess and toughen up a bit", furthermore "that's how we operate out here in the bush". The Plaintiff continued to raise concerns up to GM level and finally the Manager took action. They held some one on one meetings with the Plaintiff and took some handwritten notes but there was **poor procedural justice** and these meetings seemed to just intensify the problem. They raised the Plaintiff's concerns at the weekly team meeting (which was deeply embarrassing and isolating), and then they corrected the use of the nickname on the CTAF. They even brought in a Consultant to do cultural awareness training however this resulted in a backlash with workmates, enabled but the silence of the Manager, using elements of the training to do the exact opposite of the advice it provided.

# THE PROSECUTOR

## (MR DAMIEN TOOHEY) ... continued

### 4 We all wear many hats

Like every worker at DEN, Plaintiff was thrown from task to task, many without adequate training or requisite qualifications or equipment. From mowing the airfield grass, fixing apron lighting, patching asphalt, marshalling passengers, climbing the pole to untangle the windsock etc. This was a source of angst for all the DEN front-line team, who felt the Airport was exploiting their goodwill and handyman capabilities. When the Manager and the GM were asked to fix the **lack of role clarity**, the response was that there was not budget and we've always done it this way.

This frustration was a unifying force between the Plaintiff and his workmates; however, because of the fragile predisposition of his mental health, it only added to the general anxiety that was being triggered.

### 5 It's like a family here

Being a small team (DEN employed a total of 40 people with 15 reporting to the same Manager as the Plaintiff), many with long tenure and with family connections within the airport community, the sense of familiarity went too far and privacy vanished. The **poor workplace relationships** were allowed to fester through the cultivation of distortions that were naturally present through long tenure of key individuals as well as husband and wives, dad's and sons working together. Things often seemed like favouritism and this special treatment was never available to the Plaintiff.

### 6 It's an ops job mate, you gotta love it

There was a lack of systems based management at DEN and so there was an inadequate log to hand over between shifts, minimal checklists for tasks, passwords were randomly handed out for systems access etc. A lot of informal systems and organisational knowledge was kept in people's heads, and consequently, there were late-night calls for basic operational information, urgent but basic fixes, and constant pressure on the individual to "keep things smooth" and pushed the Plaintiff to their limit. This lack of structure, systems and process created the need for the Plaintiff to call their workmates and the Manager out of hour (as it did for everyone) however which when combined with the Plaintiff's sense of isolation intensified the anxiety **job demands being too high**.

### 7 Hold your breath until I patch this hole

The DEN terminal was an old building and it was well known that the Bag room walls contained Asbestos. Occasionally tugs or other equipment would damage these walls and because of the Plaintiff's asthma, they were extra concerned about the personal health risk this imposed. Despite multiple reports being submitted by the Plaintiff, and the asbestos is universally known to create a **hazardous working environment**, minimal action was taken outside of posters being put up to remind the Ground Handler to drive carefully. The invisible threat heightened the Plaintiff's already overwhelming anxiety.

### 8 Hey mate, you work at the airport, right?

Airline reliability at DEN is not good and it is a source of frustration for the residents of the township of DEN who rely on the services to get to and from Brisbane or Cairns. It was a common experience for all the Airport employees to bear the brunt of this frustration, and they would often incur abuse when in town at the shops or at the local footy on the weekend. This **harassment** was not targeted at the Plaintiff specifically, but it hurt them deeply. Especially when it occurred in front of their wife and kids in a non-work environment. Whilst Management had little to no control of the airline's performance, and indeed, they also were subject to similar harassment, they provided no advice or support to the Plaintiff regarding strategies on how to cope with it.

# WITNESS 1 - THE PLAINTIFF'S WORKMATE

## (MS NICOLE SEALE)

### CHARACTER OVERVIEW

Witness 1 is the Plaintiff's workmate, having worked alongside them for over 13 years at DEN. The workmate admits to participating in the workplace culture of banter, not fully realising the emotional toll it took on the Plaintiff. However the workmate is quick claim fellow victim status and lays blame on the Manager, the GM and DEN for the culture it enabled of which he believes he was an innocent participant.

### BACKSTORY FOR WITNESS 1

Witness 1's role within DEN was similar to that of the Plaintiff, facing the same operational pressures and expectations. They acknowledge that the team's small size led to a lack of structure and clarity, fostering an environment where personal and professional lines were regularly blurred.

Witness 1 remembers the workplace banter vividly—jokes were shared about everyone, and it was seen as a way to cope with the stress of the job. They admit to contributing to the teasing and jokes aimed at the Plaintiff. They even admit to being the source of the more creative nicknames. However in hindsight, they can now see that it contributed to the Plaintiff's distress.

Witness 1, like others at DEN, also felt the pressure of being constantly on-call and managing various tasks and now blames the DEN Management for the lack of clear guidance or formal training. However, they didn't recognise how much these demands, combined with the teasing, were affecting the Plaintiff until it was too late.

### WITNESS 1'S PERSPECTIVE ON THE EVENTS AT DEN

- **Banter and Blurred Boundaries:** The workmate admits that the informal, close-knit culture at DEN led to a lack of professional boundaries. Witness 1 recalls thinking that everyone, including themselves, was fair game for this kind of teasing.
- **Participation in Workplace Jokes:** While the workmate didn't intend any harm, they acknowledge that they made jokes about the Plaintiff, but were led by the Manager.
- **The Pressure of Operational Demands:** The workmate shares that working at DEN was often "full on". Staff were expected to handle a variety of tasks without formal training or clear role definitions. Everyone, including Witness 1 and the Plaintiff, was expected to be on-call and solve problems quickly.
- **Manager's Role in the Banter:** The workmate recalls how the Manager not only tolerated but sometimes participated in the banter, making it feel acceptable. Witness 1 also acknowledges they didn't stand up and support the Plaintiff even though they recognised that they were "pretty stress out at times"
- **Safety and the Influence of Leadership:** The workmate now recognises that the safety culture at DEN was shaped by the behaviour of its leaders. The Manager's failure to set clear professional boundaries or to address workplace harassment contributed to an environment where psychological safety was compromised. Witness 1 sees that leaders at DEN were supposed to model safe practices, but instead, they helped normalise unhealthy interactions.

### KEY TESTIMONIES FOR THE WORKMATE

#### 1 Describing the Culture

The workmate will provide testimony on the informal culture at DEN, where personal jokes were commonplace, and



# WITNESS 1 - THE PLAINTIFF'S WORKMATE

(MS NICOLE SEALE) ... continued

professional boundaries were often ignored. They will describe how the small team fostered an environment where familiarity led to excess banter, often at the expense of individuals like the Plaintiff.

## 2 Admitting Involvement

The workmate will admit to making inappropriate comments, including jokes about the Plaintiff's sexual preferences and background.

## 3 Operational Pressures

The workmate will discuss the intense operational pressures at DEN, where employees were expected to manage disruptions and handle multiple tasks without clear roles or adequate support from management.

## 4 Normalising the Manager's Participation

The workmate will share that the Manager's participation in the banter made it seem acceptable, even to them.

## 5 Participating in bullying and harassment

Witness 1 will confirm that it was them who put the fragments of gyprock in the Plaintiff's locker in an attempt to make it look like bits of the damaged, asbestos-infused, bathroom wall.

# WITNESS 2 - THE PLAINTIFF'S MANAGER

## (MR MARK FRANKLIN)

### CHARACTER OVERVIEW

The Manager, the Plaintiff's Manager, is a long-serving supervisor at DEN who has worked there for over 30 years. He's known as old school and has high standards and perfectionist tendencies. He sees himself as a mentor and leader and is deeply invested in the operational success of the airport. This focus on outcomes sometimes blinds them to the emotional needs of their team. The Manager is not callous, but is overwhelmed by the pressures of running an airport that is far larger than when he started. This, along with increasing regulations and CASA oversight, means he feels pressured into maintaining increasing standards with limited resources.

His responsibility is for the day-to-day operations and managing a team of 15 people who work both airside and landside doing maintenance and operational support. The Manager's character would reflect someone who is well-meaning but has low EQ. They see Safety at the airport as entirely in the domain of aircraft operations. They have an interest in people safety but secretly see fall from heights harnesses and other such risk controls as modern excesses. They are almost entirely ignorant of psychosocial safety and the legal obligations they have in this area.

They are conscious of mental health only when it comes to Depression in men (thanks to experiences they have had with some of their mates) but see psychosocial safety as someone else's problem... probably the HR department. They genuinely believe that the flexibility and camaraderie required to keep things running smoothly were strengths of the team. However, they now realise that these same strengths became weaknesses when professional boundaries were crossed, and staff, including the Plaintiff, were left unsupported. The Manager is grappling with the understanding that their well-meaning efforts were not enough to protect the Plaintiff from harm.

### BACKSTORY FOR THE MANAGER

Over his 30 years in the role, the Manager has seen DEN through many changes, from its early days as a small regional airport to its current size and complexity. As the Manager he acknowledges that he holds high expectations for the team, especially in terms of flexibility, multitasking, and after-hours availability. These demands were borne from operational necessity as they failed to transform the systems and processes along with the increase in airport growth.

The Manager believed they have been fostering a "team culture, like that of a footy team" where banter, nicknames, sledging and a bit of yahoing allowed for people to let off steam and feel comfortable to be themselves.

The Manager didn't fully appreciate the harmful impact this had on the Plaintiff, especially when jokes about the Plaintiff's personal life and background became routine. The Manager believes he made reasonable attempts to address concerns as he raised the need to control excess teasing at Toolbox briefings, he held RUOK Day every year, and he even got a Consultant in to do cultural awareness training.

### THE MANAGER'S PERSPECTIVE ON THE EVENTS AT DEN

- **Operational Pressures:** The Manager will testify that the small size of the team required staff to be highly flexible and available beyond normal working hours. The Manager will defend this approach by explaining that DEN's limited resources and constant disruptions meant that everyone, including the Plaintiff, had to wear multiple hats. The Manager saw this as a privilege and part of being in aviation and believed it was part of the job.
- **Management Style:** The Manager takes pride in their hands-on approach, regularly providing constructive and expecting

# WITNESS 2 - THE PLAINTIFF'S MANAGER

## (MR MARK FRANKLIN) ... continued

the team to "self-train" in new tasks. While they recognise that these expectations were high, the Manager argues that the job's demands required staff to be quick learners and adaptable. However, they now acknowledge that they did not fully consider the psychological toll this took on the Plaintiff.

- **Addressing Complaints:** The Manager admits that the Plaintiff raised concerns about the workplace environment, but at the time, these were dismissed as misinterpretations of the ops team's informal culture. The Manager took some actions, such as one-on-one meetings with the Plaintiff and addressing team-wide issues in staff meetings, but these efforts were more surface-level and did not address the root causes of the Plaintiff's distress. The Plaintiff would have accessed an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and said as much to the Manager. However, the Manager wasn't really sure what an EAP was and instinctively felt it was something that would be associated with a large organisation and not something that DEN would offer.
- **Workplace Banter:** The Manager viewed the informal, joking culture as a way to bond the team, just like you do with footy. The Manager acknowledges that comments about the Plaintiff's sexual preferences and ethnic background were made but insists that these were not intended to be harmful. The Manager now admits they underestimated the impact of this behaviour on the Plaintiff.
- **Safety Culture and Role Clarity:** The Manager will defend the lack of formal systems and procedures at DEN by stating that the airport's size and operational demands required improvisation. While there were no formal job descriptions or structured feedback processes, The Manager believed the team understood their roles through experience and the informal nature of operations. The Manager acknowledges that this lack of structure contributed to some of the confusion and stress experienced by the Plaintiff but argues that role uncertainty is everyone's problem at DEN from the GM down.

## BACKSTORY FOR THE PLAINTIFF

The Plaintiff, an Aerodrome Reporting Officer, started working at DEN about 7 years ago. Over time, a DEN expanded the pressures grew and Plaintiff's workload and span of expectations increased significantly. This was compounded by a toxic work environment where personal details about their life became fodder for workplace jokes. The Plaintiff was often expected to be "on-call" after hours due to the small team size and operational demands, which resulted in overwhelming stress. Although the workload here was evenly shared, it didn't account for the distance each employee lived from the airport or the out of work responsibilities they had.

Micromanagement by their Manager who was obsessed with detail and perfectionistic in nature kept the Plaintiff feeling permanently inadequate. At first this was tolerable as it was a shared problem with other peers but when it became coupled with the workplace's excessive familiarity and joking, it led to sense of isolation and ultimately escalating to mental health issues.

The Plaintiff, therefore, claims that the relentless pressures from management (without support) combined with repeated jokes about their personal life (without protection), coupled with professional pressures (without role clarity or proper training), have caused severe psychological trauma, eventually leading to an inability to work. The Plaintiff has been diagnosed with severe anxiety and depression and is therefore suing Denison Regional Airport for failing to address these issues in the workplace, despite numerous attempts to raise concerns.

# NARRATOR

Welcome, everyone, to today's **Mock Court**. We are here to examine the case of **Plaintiff vs. Denison Regional Airport (DEN)**, where we will explore the serious consequences of a workplace that fails to address **psychosocial safety**. This is a case that reflects the growing recognition that managing health and safety at work must include not only physical hazards but also **mental health risks**, such as **bullying, harassment, and operational pressures**.

Denison Regional Airport is a small, regional airport located in Queensland, Australia, with fewer than 40 employees. The Plaintiff, a long-time employee of 7 years, is part of the ops team the is about 15 people. They work both airside and landside and collectively comprised of AROs, building and grounds maintenance, equipment repair and maintainance etc. has accused DEN of allowing a toxic workplace culture to develop—a culture that blurred personal and professional boundaries and resulted in long-term psychological harm.

This case focuses on the following key aspects:

- **Workplace Bullying and Harassment:** The Plaintiff claims they were subjected to persistent jokes about their sexual preferences and ethnic background, which were not only tolerated but actively participated in by colleagues and even their Manager.
- **Operational Pressures:** The Plaintiff, along with their colleagues, faced excessive job demands, unrealistic expectations, and the expectation to be constantly on-call. These pressures were worsened by a lack of role clarity and inadequate training, which added to the Plaintiff's stress.
- **Leadership Failures:** The Plaintiff's Manager, while well-meaning, failed to provide the necessary support, neglected to intervene in the workplace bullying, and perpetuated the informal and unhealthy workplace culture.

Throughout this case, we will examine the **legal obligations** of Denison Regional Airport under the **Work Health and Safety (WHS) Act 2011**. The WHS Act places a clear responsibility on employers to ensure a safe working environment—free from physical and psychosocial risks. The court will also assess whether the **Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003** applies, particularly regarding whether the Plaintiff's psychological injury was significantly contributed to by their employment and whether compensation is warranted.

## Key Characters

- **The Plaintiff:** A former employee who claims they suffered long-term psychological damage as a result of workplace bullying, harassment, and operational pressures.
- **The Judge:** Tasked with determining whether Denison Regional Airport fulfilled its legal duties under the WHS Act and whether the Plaintiff is entitled to compensation under Workers' Compensation law.
- **The Prosecutor:** Will argue that Denison Regional Airport failed to implement controls over psychosocial hazards, ultimately causing severe psychological harm to the Plaintiff.
- **Witness 1 (The Plaintiff's Workmate):** Will testify about the informal culture at DEN and their own involvement in the jokes and teasing that contributed to the Plaintiff's distress.
- **Witness 2 (The Plaintiff's Manager):** Will defend their management style and claim that while some attempts were made to address issues, they failed to fully grasp the depth of the Plaintiff's distress.

# NARRATOR

... continued

## Objectives and Key Takeaways:

By the end of this Mock Court, the audience should:

1. Recognise the importance of addressing **both physical and mental health risks** in the workplace, with a focus on preventing bullying, harassment, and job-related stress.
2. Understand the **legal responsibilities** that employers have under WHS laws to mitigate **psychosocial hazards** such as poor workplace relationships, lack of role clarity, and poor procedural justice.
3. Realise the critical role of **leadership** in maintaining professional boundaries and supporting employees' mental health.
4. Learn about the importance of **procedural fairness** and the need for clear, effective processes to address worker complaints and grievances.
5. Acknowledge the value of **consultation with workers** to identify and manage psychosocial risks and the organisational responsibility to provide the necessary resources, including training and mental health support.

We are about to witness how **psychosocial hazards**—if ignored—can lead to a catastrophic outcome for both the employee and the organisation. The case we will explore today is not just about the Plaintiff's experience, but a lesson for all workplaces in managing mental health, leadership responsibilities, and the importance of creating a safe, supportive environment for all employees.

Let's begin the proceedings.