Case: 1810155/2018



## **EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS**

Claimant: Gemma Boylan

Respondent: DL Insurance Services Limited

## AT A HEARING

Heard at: Leeds On: 10<sup>th</sup>, 11, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> June 2019

Before: Employment Judge Lancaster

Members: Mrs LJ Anderson-Coe

Mr M Brewer

Representation

Claimant: In person

Respondent: Miss N Joffe, counsel

## **JUDGMENT**

- 1. The Claimant was disabled from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018, the date when it became likely that the substantial adverse effects of mental impairment which had resulted in her absence from 12<sup>th</sup> February 2018 would, in fact, last for at least 12 months.
- 2. All complaints of disability discrimination or harassment prior to 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018 are therefore dismissed because the Claimant was not at that time disabled.
- 3. The Respondent knew or ought reasonably to have known that the Claimant was disabled from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018.
- 4. The Respondent could not reasonably have known that the Claimant would be subject to any disadvantage by not being allowed to record the grievance meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018 and that complaint of failure to make a reasonable adjustment is dismissed.
- 5. The complaints of harassment for a reason related to disability after 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018 are dismissed.
- 6. The complaints of a failure to make reasonable adjustments and/or indirect disability discrimination by not permitting the Claimant, after 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018, to work permanently from home rather than in the office, by not offering her a trial period of working from home and of not re-deploying her are dismissed.
- 7. The complaints of associative disability discrimination or harassment are dismissed.
- 8. The Claimant did a protected act on 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 4<sup>th</sup> May, 8<sup>th</sup> May and 10<sup>th</sup> May 2018. She was not however treated unfavourably because she had done any of those things. The complaints of victimisation are dismissed.
- The complaint of direct sex discrimination in respect of not being offered second product training in 2016 is out of time. It is not an act extending over any period beyond May 2016 and it is not just and equitable to extend time. This complaint is dismissed.

Case: 1810155/2018

- 10. The Claimant has not established any facts from which we could conclude that in not being give fixed shifts/compressed hours she has been subjected to less favourable treatment that a relevant comparator because of her sex, her age or her race. All these complaints of direct discrimination are dismissed.
- 11. The Claimant was not constructively dismissed. The complaint of unfair dismissal is dismissed.
- 12. By agreement with the parties written reasons for this reserved decision will follow separately.

EMPLOYMENT JU DGE LANCASTER

DATE 18th June 2019

## Public access to employment tribunal decisions

Judgments and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.