Case No: 1401120/2019 V



## **EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS**

**Claimant: Miss C Phillips** 

**Respondent: Crystals UK Ltd** 

Heard at: Southampton, by Video On: 25 September 2020

Before: Employment Judge Dawson

### Representation

Claimant: Ms Coles, Law Clinic representative Respondent: Mr Henry, non-practising barrister.

# **JUDGMENT**

- 1. By reference to the claimant's Public Interest Disclosures Schedule dated 4 December 2019, it is determined that:
  - a. the disclosures numbered 1, 2 and 8 amounted to protected disclosures within the meaning of section 43A Employment Rights Act 1996,
  - b. the disclosures numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 did not amount to protected disclosures within the meaning of section 43A Employment Rights Act 1996.
- 2. The respondent's application for reconsideration of paragraph 1 of this judgment is refused on the basis that there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked.

| 10.2 Judament - rule 61 | February  |
|-------------------------|---|
| e-mail only             | JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON 2 October 2020 by |
|                         | Date 25 September 2020                            |
|                         | Employment Judge Dawson                           |

Case No: 1401120/2019 V

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

#### <u>Notes</u>

#### Reasons

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

#### 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.

#### **CVP**

The hearing was conducted by the parties attending by Video Platform. It was held in public in accordance with the Employment Tribunal Rules. It was conducted in that manner because a timely face to face hearing was not possible in light of the restrictions required by the coronavirus pandemic and the Government Guidance and it was in accordance with the overriding objective to do so; both parties consented.