

**IN THE MANCHESTER EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL**

**Case No. 2402737/2015**

**BETWEEN: -**

**MR M. MIGLIORATO**

**Claimant**

**v**

**UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER**

**Respondent**

**SCOTT SCHEDULE**

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
1.	29/11/2011	The Claimant met with a student, [REDACTED] and later was confronted by her fiancé, Mr J. [REDACTED] who subjected the Claimant to racial abuse shouting "where do you come from?". Mr [REDACTED] insulted the Claimant who reported the matter to his head of school the following day. Nothing was done as far as the Claimant is aware.	MM, JB and AG	Any person who is not Italian and/or not from the UK, and/or is subject to racial stereotyping	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
2.	24/07/2012	Professor Halsall complains in an email about the Claimant's libido to Professor Hamilton.	MM, MH and BH	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>3. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>
3.	03/09/2012	Professor Hamilton secures anonymity for himself to make a large number of derogatory, insulting and racially stereotypical allegations about the Claimant to Mrs O'Neill and Professor Webb. Professor Hamilton alleged that the Claimant had a reputation with female administrative staff who called him "dirty Max". On 21 October 2014 the Respondent eventually admitted that the statements had no truth in them and were unsubstantiated criticism of a kind that the Respondent would not condone. Further, the Respondent would not condone the actions of Mrs	MM, BH, AO and AW	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>

No	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (If appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		O'Neill and Professor Webb in being receptive to such hearsay comments during a formal investigation.					
4.	15/10/2012	A meeting was scheduled for 9am and the Claimant was falsely accused that indecent material was on his laptop which was to be seized. The Claimant was subject to intimidatory conduct. BH had provided false information about the Claimant, and it was incorrect what AO had stated, i.e. that information had been provided by a witness.	MM, AO, AW, RW	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination, linked with other allegations above and below	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>
5.	22/10/2012	The Claimant received correspondence from Professor Halsall who makes racially stereotypical remarks in the form that the Claimant's problem is his Latin mentality.	MM, MH, AO, AW	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.
6.	13/11/2012	The Claimant receives the final report in the student's complaint, again containing racially stereotypical comments, noting remarks about concerns about the Claimant's attitude towards women and sex. The comments had been included in the final report, even though the Claimant had never seen them before, nor had been asked to respond to them. When investigating the student's complaints the process had been flawed for reasons which included AO and AW attempting to challenge evidence from Dr Pal, and they prompted the student to change dates in her evidence to the Claimant's detriment. The report included a recommendation that the Claimant's Line Manager Professor	MM, BH	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		Hamilton and his Head of School should address the Claimant's attitude towards women and sex.					
7.	15/11/2012	The Claimant complained verbally to Mrs Field, noting that the Respondent had acted on hearsay, and that the allegation linked to the Claimant's laptop was in fact untrue. The Claimant referred to formalising his complaint against HR arising from the way he had been treated, noting that he had been humiliated and subject to allegations from anonymous witnesses. The Claimant told Mrs Field that this was happening because he is Italian, and during an interview in March 2013 Mrs Field referred to the Claimant's belief that he was being persecuted.	MM and SF	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination, and a protected disclosure	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)  Employment Rights Act 1996; s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5 The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p>

No	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
8.	Late November 2012	The events described above had an impact on the Claimant's health, but despite requests to have consideration for his health, nothing had been done. The Claimant believes that Mrs Field had made promises in this regard. Then, a day before the Claimant was leaving for work in China he received a telephone call from HR Partner Louise Jordan to inform him that hundreds of images had been found on his laptop and that they needed to see the Claimant as soon as possible. The Claimant considers the timing of this to relate back to the first protected disclosure made to Mrs Field 2 weeks previously (see point 7).	MM, SF and LJ	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination, and detriment arising from protected disclosure	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)  Employment Rights Act 1996; s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a) s47B(1)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5 The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegations do</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claims as they are time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
9.	13/12/2012	The Claimant was summoned to a meeting and believes that this was motivated because of the protected disclosures made to Mrs Field. The Claimant repeated his earlier allegations of dishonesty in the process and of race discrimination.	MM, LJ and TO	N/A, this is relevant to protected disclosure	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(8)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
10.	18/12/2012	The Claimant was summoned to a further meeting with Ms Jordan and was subject to unreasonable questioning about matters on his laptop. The Claimant was in a poor state in terms of his health, but this appears to have been disregarded by Ms Jordan.	MM, LJ and GB	N/A, this relates to the protected disclosure	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
11.	20/12/2012	The Claimant calls into question the quality of the Respondent's investigation of his complaints, and whether the investigations were undertaken in good faith to try to discover the truth about what had occurred. This included the fact that Professor O'Brien did not ask the Claimant any questions about an incident involving Professor Halsall, even though this was important by reference to	MM and TO	N/A, this relates to the protected disclosure	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a</p>



No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		the facts in about 2009 when the Claimant did not have a laptop issued by the Respondent. On or about this date the Claimant wrote to TO to provide information about the incident with MH. A further example of the Respondent's motivation in relation to the investigation involved the Claimant meeting with Mrs Field on or about 21 December 2012 when she showed a lack of concern in relation to the truth of evidence provided by an anonymous witness. The Claimant expressed concerns of dishonesty and race discrimination.					detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
12.	06/01/2013	Mrs O'Neill refused to give information to the Claimant in relation to the anonymous witness even though this caused a detriment to the Claimant in relation to the investigation and his complaints, including a verbatim statement of the allegation.	MM and AO	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race Discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)  Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident". 2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all. 4. The Respondent submits that the claim

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							<p>is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
13.	09/01/2013	A Subject Access request was made under the Data Protection Act by the Claimant, and this was refused unreasonably, with the impact being that the Claimant was further unable to obtain evidence and to defend himself against allegations.	MM, AO and MC	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	<p>Detriment associated with protected disclosure</p> <p>Race Discrimination</p>	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)</p> <p>Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)</p>	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							<p>over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(8)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
14.	12/01/2013	The Claimant filed a formal grievance under the Respondent's Dignity at Work and Study Policy referring to the issues arising from the investigation, and also earlier discrimination. The case was referred ultimately to Director of HR Karen Heaton.	MM and KH	N/A this is a protected disclosure	Protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996: s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	<p>1. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>2. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p>
15.	13/01/2013	Mrs O'Neill wrote to Ms Clare warning her that if the Respondent disclosed the witness statements	MM, AO and MC	This relates to the protected disclosure and a comparator	Detriment for making protected disclosure and	Employment Rights Act 1996: s43B(1)(b)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		requested it would undermine the current investigations. Mrs O'Neill was the subject of the Claimant's complaint, but she was still being allowed by the Respondent to interfere with the investigation and the Claimant's ability to defend himself.		would be any person who is not subject to investigation or complaints linked to racially stereotypical comments.	race discrimination	<p>s43B(1)(c)</p> <p>s43C(1)(a)</p> <p>s47(1)</p> <p>The Equality Act 2012:</p> <p>s13(1)</p> <p>s39(2)(d)</p> <p>s123(1)</p> <p>s123(3)(a)</p>	<p>claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(8)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
16.	13/01/2013	The Claimant was informed that the case against him concerning IT misuse had been escalated to the Dean of Faculty following the conclusion of the investigation. The Claimant contends that this was because he had made protected disclosures and that it was an act of race discrimination.	MM, TO and LJ	This relates to the fact of the protected disclosure, and would impact upon a person with the Claimant's characteristics facing allegations linked to racially stereotypical conduct.	Detriment for making protected disclosure and race discrimination.	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996:</p> <p>s43B(1)(b)</p> <p>s43B(1)(c)</p> <p>s43C(1)(a)</p> <p>s47(1)</p> <p>The Equality Act 2012:</p> <p>s13(1)</p> <p>s39(2)(d)</p> <p>s123(1)</p> <p>s123(3)(a)</p>	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123(3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
17.	January 2013	The Claimant was told by his Head of School Professor Brown, and his Line Manager Professor Hamilton that the School had decided not to support the Claimant for promotion that year	MM, BH and TB	This relates to the protected disclosure and relates also to the Claimant's personal characteristics associated with racially stereotypical conduct	Detriment for making protected disclosure and race discrimination.	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a) s47(1)  The Equality Act 2012:  s13(1) s39(2)(b) s39(2)(d)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.  5. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
						<p>s123(1) s123(3)(a)</p>	<p>as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
18.	29/01/2013	The Claimant met with Karen Heaton and identified untruths stated by Ms O'Neill, and Ms Heaton was also advised about racial stereotyping in the outcome document on the student complaint (November 2012). The Claimant explained that his Italian heritage was a likely cause of what was happening and stated	MM and KH	N/A, this is part of the protected disclosure process	Part of the protected disclosure process	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996:</p> <p>s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)</p>	<p>1. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>2. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		further that Mrs O'Neill had made up the allegation about him from the anonymous witness. This later turned out to be true.					s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.  3. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
19.	13/02/2013	During a disciplinary hearing Professor Bailey refused the Claimant permission to challenge the witness statements to any extent. He acted in an unreasonable and intimidatory manner towards the Claimant who was suffering from ill-health. This was known to the Respondent. Professor Bailey's approach confirmed that he did not understand the issues being considered. He also made threats to increase the charges against the Claimant from minor to serious misconduct. The Claimant questions whether	MM and CB	This relates to the Claimant's protected disclose and the Claimant's characteristics associated with racial stereotyping.	Detriment for protected disclosure and race discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a) s47(1)  The Equality Act 2012:  s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.



No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		CB was acting in good faith. The Claimant had concerns throughout that the outcome of the investigation was predetermined, namely that he would face a disciplinary hearing which would be resolved against him.				s123(3)(a)	<p>5. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
20.	13/02/2013	After only 5 minutes of deliberation Professor Bailey announced that the Claimant was guilty of misconduct for possession of the deleted thumbnails, and he was given a written and final warning. The Claimant was also ordered to submit any IT equipment	MM, RW and CB	This relates to the Claimant's protected disclose and the Claimant's characteristics associated with racial stereotyping	Detriment for protected disclosure and race discrimination	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996:</p> <p>s43B(1)(b)</p> <p>s43B(1)(c)</p> <p>s43C(1)(a)</p> <p>s47(1)</p>	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		for checks every month for 2 years. The Claimant's representative, Mr Walden was angry and it was confirmed that an appeal would be submitted. CB refused to provide written reasoning of the decision to assist with the appeal, despite repeated requests.				<p>The Equality Act 2012:</p> <p>s13(1)</p> <p>s39(2)(d)</p> <p>s123(1)</p> <p>s123(3)(a)</p>	<p>detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(8)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
21.	On or	The Claimant complained to	MM and AE	Any person not	Race	Equality Act 2010	1. No admission is made in respect of this

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
	about 20/02/2013	Professor Aneez Esmail about race discrimination		from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Discrimination, and detriment arising from protected disclosure	s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)  Employment Rights Act 1996; s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a) s47B(1)	<p>incident.</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>6. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							<p>contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
22.	About 20/02/2013	The Claimant met Professor Bailey on a staircase, and he did not want to talk to the Professor, leading the Claimant to be accused of unprofessionalism.	MM, CB and JP	N/A, this relates to the protected disclosure	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996;  s43B(1)(b)  s43B(1)(c)  s43C(1)(a)  s47B(1)</p>	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
23.	Early 2013	The Claimant believes that Professor Bailey ordered Professor Brown to put the Claimant on a full teaching load ASAP, although this was declined by Professor Brown as he understood the Claimant's wellbeing and the risk to it if the decision had been implemented.	CB and TB	N/A, this relates to the protected disclosure	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a) s47B(1)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
24.	Early March 2011	The Claimant was told by Dr Majewski that Professor Halsall was using a racial slur about the Claimant namely that the problem with the Claimant was his Latin mentality, who does he think he is acting like Berlusconi. The Claimant reported this to his Head of School and Ms Heaton, but nothing was done.	MM, KH and LM	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area and Italy	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. No admission is made as to what Dr Majewski is alleged to have said to the Claimant about what Professor Halsall had said to Dr Majewski. This is hearsay.</p> <p>2. The Respondent further denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>3. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>4. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>
25.	March 2013	The Claimant met with Mrs Heaton and his evidence from the incident on 15 October 2012 was challenged. The Claimant submits a contemporaneous account and later submits additional information and repeats the fact that he is the victim of discrimination, and how his civil rights were	MM and KH	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		being breached by not being allowed to know or challenge the statement of Professor Hamilton.					Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.
26.	April 2013	A colleague of the Claimant, namely Dr Chakraborty informed him that Professor Hamilton had once said to him that the Claimant and Professor Missous were the axis of evil in the group and that they had to be crushed.	MM, SC and PMM	Any person not from Italy (or German)	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	1. No admission is made as to what Dr Chakraborty is alleged to have said to the Claimant about what Professor Hamilton once said to Dr Chakraborty. This is hearsay.  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.
27.	28/04/2014	During the appeal against the disciplinary sanction Professor Bailey was asked about his working relationship with Professor	MM and CB	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		Hamilton and whether he knew about the Claimant's grievance before the matter was escalated to a full disciplinary hearing. This was denied, but the Claimant knew that this was not correct as Professor Bailey had been involved at an early stage in the process.		would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.  5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
28.	01/05/2013	The Claimant's appeal is rejected by Professor Coombs, despite ignoring clear evidence from a digital forensics expert Ms Cisek. All of the appeal points were dismissed.	MM and RC	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)  Equality Act 2010;	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident". 2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 3. The Respondent denies that the alleged



No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
				not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Discrimination	s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(8)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
29.	11/05/2013	The Claimant's grievance was dismissed by Mrs Heaton. Although a complaint of breach of privacy was upheld, it was deemed to be of no consequence. The Claimant considers that Mrs Heaton did not even consider the complaints of race	MM and KH	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical	<p>Detriment associated with protected disclosure</p> <p>Race Discrimination</p>	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)</p> <p>Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d)</p>	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		discrimination and concluded that reminding the Claimant of the proper behaviour towards women was appropriate.		allegations.		s123(1) s123(3)(a)	detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the Incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.  5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
30.	May 2013	The Claimant lodges an appeal against the decision of Mrs Heaton, and he refers to allegations of continued race discrimination and he requests that they stop immediately.	MM and KH	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Protected Disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident." 2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							Interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.
31.	Between March and June 2013	The Claimant was informed by Mrs Field that his School's recommendation for an award for exceptional contribution had been rejected by the Faculty of EPS.	MM and SF	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race Discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1) Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>2. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5 The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
32.	June 2013	Professor Bailey refused to sign to approve the Claimant's application for sabbatical leave for the academic year 2013-14. The Claimant was told by Professor Brown that the real reason for turning down the request was that he wanted to see the Claimant in Manchester the following year. The Claimant appealed the decision.	MM and CB	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race Discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)  Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>2. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5 The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
33.	June 2013	The Claimant complained to Mrs Heaton in relation to the sabbatical issue, stressing that it was a further example of the	MM and KH	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		discriminatory treatment that the Claimant had been suffering for several months, but he received no reply.		would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.  5 The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
34.	June 2013	The Claimant was told that the appeal of his grievance outcome would be undertaken by Dr David Barker by way of a review. The Claimant agreed that he did not need to be	MM, KH and DB	This matter concerns the protected disclosure.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident." 2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 3 The Respondent denies that the Claimant

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		Interviewed, but Dr Barker did not explain that he intended to discuss the appeal in person with Mrs Heaton. The Claimant only discovered this when he received the outcome in July 2013, meaning that he had been placed at a disadvantage.					suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a) ERA 1996).
35.	June 2013	The Claimant complains to the Information Commissioner's Office over the handling of his Subject Access Request and in December 2013 the ICO will assess the Respondent to have acted in breach of the Data Protection Act.	MM	This matter concerns the protected disclosure.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	1. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 2. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a) ERA 1996).
36.	05/07/2013	Dr Barker turns down the Claimant's appeal and he refused to accept that Mrs O'Neill and possibly others had lied about the subject	MM and DB	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator	Detriment associated with protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident". 2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		matter. The Claimant found out that Dr Barker had accepted the explanations given to him personally by Mrs Heaton, including that most of what had happened was of the Claimant's own doing.		would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(8)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
37.	07/07/2013	The Claimant contacted Dr Barker and explained that he was subject to double standards as regards the disclosure of witness evidence relevant to his complaints. The Claimant later discovered that the	MM and DB	This is part of the protected disclosure process	Part of the protected disclosure process	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		allegation reported by Mrs O'Neill did not reflect the true allegation made by Professor Hamilton in September 2012.					as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.
38.	In about August 2013	Professor Georghiou turned down the Claimant's appeal concerning sabbatical leave. He upheld the right of Professor Bailey to make the decision, and advised the Claimant to take up Professor Bailey's offer of a meeting, which the Claimant confirmed to him had never been made. The Claimant heard nothing further about this even though he confirmed that he would consider any such offer of a meeting if it was received.	MM and LG	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race Discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)  Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5 The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to</p>



No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
39.	October – December 2013	The Claimant asked for a meeting with his Head of School and recorded that evidence relating to Professor Hamilton's statement contained lies. The Claimant is aware that Professor Brown passed on the issue to Mrs Heaton, and then it was passed on to Mrs Field, but the Claimant believes that nothing happened. The Claimant then managed to arrange for about 35 staff and students (mostly female) to write to his Head of School to clarify that the statements from Professor Hamilton were nothing but lies, in particular the reference to dirty Max	MM, TB, KH and SF	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>
40.	09/12/2013	The Claimant submits a formal grievance under the Respondent's statutes and ordinances. The two main allegations were that Professors Hamilton and	MM	N/A, this is a protected disclosure	Protected Disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b)	1. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of

No	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		Halsall had deliberately lied about the Claimant and that the lies had poisoned the rest of the proceedings.				s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.
41.	December 2013 – January 2014	The Respondent continues to have Professor Hamilton as part of the promotion committee, leading the Claimant not to apply for promotion by the deadline of early January 2014.	MM	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	1. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 2. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all. 3. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123(3)(a) as alleged or at all.
42.	29/01/2014	The Respondent failed to organise a grievance meeting within the 10 day time limit, with the meeting eventually arranged for 29 January, 50 days after the grievance had been submitted. During the course of the meeting the Claimant made many references to race discrimination and victimisation by Professor	MM, DJ and AM	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race Discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)  Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident". 2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only. 3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.



No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		Respondent refused to investigate the matters further or to take any action in relation to the issues raised.					<p>Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
44.	16/04/2014	The Claimant received the grievance outcome which was turned down, but the Respondent admitted for the first time that there was no truth in the allegations of Professor Hamilton. The Claimant again appealed as the content of the response was flawed. The outcome included inappropriate conclusions concerning justification of Professor Halsall's use of racial references to the Claimant's Latin mentality and temperament. This included	MM and DJ	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	<p>Detriment associated with protected disclosure</p> <p>Race Discrimination</p>	<p>Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)</p> <p>Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)</p>	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as</p>

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		incorrect reference to the Claimant's temper fluctuations.					alleged or at all.  5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).
45.	July 2014	The Claimant made several allegations of dishonesty, corroborated by documentary evidence to Martin Conway, Clerk to the Board of Governors.	MM and MC	N/A, this is a protected disclosure.	Protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.
46.	August 2014	The Respondent continued to promote those involved	MM, MH and BH	Any person not from Italy,	Race Discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
		in the process even though appeals were ongoing, this being to the benefit of Professor Hamilton and Professor Halsall. The Claimant's career was at a standstill.		noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.		s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.
47.	29/09/2014	The Claimant has his appeal and makes an allegation that Mrs O'Neill had tampered with documents protected by the original subject access request. The Claimant produced supporting evidence and mentioned race discrimination and evidence concerning the discrimination.	MM, AO and SI	N/A, this concerns the protected disclosure	Protected disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
48.	01/10/2014	The Claimant complains that Ms S. Hesp, a Solicitor of the Respondent, had edited the contents of a Report prepared by Professor Jackson, and that this was unethical, and involved serious conduct issues.	MM and SH	N/A, this was a protected disclosure	Protected Disclosure	Employment Rights Act 1996:  s43B(1)(b) s43B(1)(c) s43C(1)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of the incident."  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to a protected disclosure as alleged or at all. The Claimant has failed to specify what, if any, aspect of the "gist of the incident" amounts to a qualifying disclosure which in the reasonable belief of the Claimant was made in the public interest and/or in good faith and which tends to show the requirements of s43B(1)(b), and/or s43B(1)(c) as alleged or at all.
49.	21/10/2014	The outcome to the second grievance appeal was issued and was critical of many procedures and policies, but no link was made to the detriments suffered by the Claimant. No direct or clear answers are provided to the majority of the issues raised, and reported, and the Claimant's disappointment reflected the fact that he had submitted extensive evidence in support of his complaints.	MM and SI	This matter concerns the protected disclosure, and a comparator would be any person who is not subject to racially stereotypical allegations.	Detriment associated with protected disclosure  Race Discrimination	Employment Rights Act 1996; s47B(1)  Equality Act 2010; s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".  2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.  3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.  4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as

No.	Date of Incident	Gist of Incident	Parties & Witnesses	Comparator (if appropriate)	Legal Categorisation	Statutory Provision	Respondent's Comments
							<p>alleged or at all.</p> <p>5. The Respondent denies that the Claimant suffered any detriment under s47(B)(1) as alleged or at all because of any alleged protected disclosure. If, which is denied, the Claimant's allegation does amount to a detriment, the Respondent contends that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear such claim as it is time barred. The time limit for bringing a detriment claim under section 47B is three months from the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates (section 48(3)(a), ERA 1996).</p>
50.	Ongoing	The Claimant continued to be subject to the unjust disciplinary sanction well into 2015, and his career has still been stalled with promotion being refused again in the recent past.	MM	Any person not from Italy, noting the language is linked to stereotypes of males from the Mediterranean area.	Race discrimination	Equality Act 2010 s13(1) s39(2)(d) s123(1) s123(3)(a)	<p>1. The Respondent denies the Claimant's account of the "gist of incident".</p> <p>2. This allegation is not contained in the claim form and should therefore be permitted as background evidence only.</p> <p>3. The Respondent denies that the alleged incident amounts to direct discrimination under s13(1) of the Equality Act 2010 or that the Claimant was subject to a detriment under s39(2)(d) of the Equality Act 2010 as alleged or at all.</p> <p>4. The Respondent submits that the claim is time barred under section 123(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and denies that the incident amounts to conduct extending over time for the purposes of s123 (3)(a) as alleged or at all.</p>



