



Singapore Flight SQ321 LHR-SIN 21 May 2024 June Update

Preliminary payments

The airline has begun reimbursing passengers' treatment, accommodation and repatriation etc expenses upon production of the expense invoices.

When notifying your acceptance of the payments together with your bank account details, be sure to include the following words: *My/our acceptance of this sum is entirely without prejudice to my compensation rights.*

If you experience any difficulties in having your refunds approved, please contact our team.

Return to seat announcement; illumination of seatbelt signs

Despite suggestions from airline that a return to seat announcement had been made and the seatbelt sign illuminated prior to the incident, the evidence from those passengers we represent is to the contrary.

These things did not occur until after the turbulence event, passengers say. There were no announcements about recommending wearing seat belts while seated other than at takeoff.

Initial report

The Transport Safety Investigation Bureau (TSIB) issued a press release last week as to its initial findings.

The report to which the press release relates has not been released. The report and our own investigations reveal major safety concerns that are discussed below.

Liaising with airline's liability insurer

We are in the course of establishing communications with the lawyers acting on behalf of the airline's insurer to notify them of those passengers for whom we act in relation to injury compensation recovery. We will keep passengers and their families updated in that regard.

Working theory

Carter Capner's working theory is that the aircraft flew through the top of a cumulonimbus thunderstorm or in close proximity to one as it passed over an area notorious for thunderstorm activity in the Inter Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ).

This is supported by the brief statement in the press release that the aircraft was "likely flying over an area of developing convective activity".

Compensation consequences

Carter Capner believes – by reason of the above - Singapore Airlines will likely be unable to prove the accident occurred without any element of fault on its part.

This opens up the second tier of Montreal Convention compensation to seriously injured passengers whose cost of future care and treatment; and their future loss of earning capacity cost exceeds USD\$175,000.

Unanswered questions

To put passengers' minds at rest, the airline can and should answer many of the below questions now.

1. Who were the operating aircrew at the time and if not the captain, what was the experience level of the first officers at the controls?
2. What is the distance mandated in the airline's operations manual for pilots to stay clear of thunderstorms?
3. What were the pilots doing at the time of the onset of the incident and in particular how carefully were they monitoring the weather radar to ensure accurate radar returns?
4. Why didn't the crew divert from track to avoid proximity to thunderstorms?
5. When precisely in the sequence of events was the autopilot disengaged by the crew and what were the control inputs by the crew after that occurred?

4 June 2024

Peter Carter

Director of travel & airline accident compensation

Kayla Milana

Seniors Associate: Commercial & Class Actions