

**SUBMISSION ON POLICY ISSUES RAISED IN ROUND 5**

Submitted By: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Submission for: My Self

Name of other person, business or organisation:

Do you agree to your submission being published: Yes

Do you agree to your full name being published: No

Your submission:

Complaint regarding my disablement benefit paid by my Superannuation, [REDACTED] was an academic in Australian Universities for over 20 years. When I was no longer able to work due to chronic illness, I made a claim through my Superannuation fund, [REDACTED]. They approved a temporary incapacity benefit for 2 years. As my chronic illness continued to prevent me from working, I then became eligible for a permanent disablement benefit, which was paid as a pension for over 10 years. During this time, I had to submit regular medical reports from my doctors to show that I continued to meet the requirements for permanent disablement. On a couple of occasions, the Superannuation fund also required me to attend a specialist appointed by them, which I did, and their reports agreed with those of my treating doctors. However, in 2016, I again submitted medical reports from my treating doctors that said that I continued to be unable to work, but this time [REDACTED] asked me to attend medical assessments with two of their specialists. After I attended the appointments with the two specialists, [REDACTED] told me that one of the reports indicated that I don't satisfy the criteria for disablement. [REDACTED]'s definition of Disablement: Disablement means, in relation to Divisions A, B and C, a state of health which in the opinion of the Trustee renders a Member permanently incapable of performing duties or engaging in employment for which they are reasonably qualified by training and experience where: (a) The Member has been absent from employment through injury or illness for three months within a period of twelve consecutive months immediately prior to ceasing to be in the Service; and (b) The Trustee is satisfied that the state of health is not due to or induced by any wilful action on the part of the Member to obtain a benefit. [REDACTED] told me that I don't meet the second criterion (b), because one of the [REDACTED] appointed specialists said that in his view it was my secondary gain issues from receiving benefits that contributed to my current presentation. I was very insulted that a specialist could make a judgment like that based on meeting me for an hour. I sent another specialist's medical report to [REDACTED] who agreed with my previous doctors' assessment that I was unfit for work, but this was rejected by [REDACTED] and my claim was cancelled. During the whole process, the stress and anxiety each time I received correspondence from [REDACTED] was exacerbating my symptoms, and I was unable to take the claim further due to ill health. I think it is very unfair to be accused of feigning the degree of illness by a superannuation company, based on one person's view, and yet they could disregard my doctors' reports (all three of them). To the insurance company, it is a financial gain if they can reject a claim, but they are adversely affecting people's lives and they should be held accountable.