



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant Laura Hancock
Respondent Bersted Green surgery

Heard at: Southampton (by telephone, publicly available at Bristol CC)

On: 30 April 2020

Before: Employment Judge Rayner

Appearances

For the Claimant: Mr. S Shepherd, Counsel
For the Respondent: Mr. R Prais, Solicitor

Judgment

1. This has been a remote hearing consented to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was an Audio (fully remote) telephone prehearing in person. A face to face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and all issues could be determined in a remote hearing. The documents that I was referred to are in a bundle of pages, the witness statement of the claimant, and the skeleton arguments of the parties, the contents of which I have recorded. The order made is set out below.
2. The claimant was a disabled person within the meaning of section 6 Equality Act 2010 by reason of bronchiectasis, at the material times.
3. The claimant's claim of disability discrimination will be set down for a final hearing and case management orders will be sent out separately from this judgement.

Employment Judge Rayner

Southampton
Dated 30 April 2020
Sent to the parties on

Note: online publication of judgments and reasons

The ET is required to maintain a register of all judgments and written reasons. The register must be accessible to the public. It has recently been moved online. All judgments and reasons since February 2017 are now available at:
<https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions>.

The ET has no power to refuse to place a judgment or reasons on the online register, or to remove a judgment or reasons from the register once they have been placed there. If you consider that these documents should be anonymised in any way prior to publication, you will need to apply to the ET for an order to that effect under Rule 50 of the ET's Rules of Procedure. Such an application would need to be copied to all other parties for comment and it would be carefully scrutinised by a judge (where appropriate, with panel members) before deciding whether (and to what extent) anonymity should be granted to a party or a witness