



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr M Ferguson

Respondents: Bristol City Council

Heard at: Bristol

On: 1, 2, 3 and 4 September 2020

Before: Employment Judge Hargrove with Members Mr J Howard and Mr E Beese.

Representation

Claimant: Ms A Johns of Counsel

Respondents: Mr D Stewart of Counsel

JUDGMENT

The Unanimous Judgment of the Tribunal is as follows:

1. The claim of discrimination arising from disability under section 15 of the Equality Act in respect of medical suspension from January to October 2017 is dismissed as having been presented out of time and it would not be just and equitable to extend time.
2. The claims of failure to make reasonable adjustments are dismissed as not well founded.
3. The claims of unfair dismissal and of discrimination arising from disability in respect of the dismissal of the claimant from employment (on 25th of April 2019) is well founded.
4. The tribunal defers making any findings as to the consequences of the dismissal, and more particularly as to the Polkey and Chagger points, pending further evidence to be heard at a remedies hearing, as to which further directions have been given.

Employment Judge Hargrove

Date 4 September 2020

Online publication of judgments and reasons

The Employment Tribunal (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 written reasons since February 2017 are now available online and therefore accessible to the public 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 anyway 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.