



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant
Ms S Cowley

Respondent
v Auto Sleepers Group Ltd (t/a Marquis
Leisure)

Judgment

Heard at: Southampton

On: 5,6,7 and 8 October 2020

Before: Employment Judge Rayner
Ms C Lloyd-Jennings
Mr P Flanagan

Appearances

For the Claimant: Mr. Wright (Lay representative)

For the Respondent: Mr. Tunley (Counsel)

1. The Claimant was wrongfully dismissed.
2. The Claimant was discriminated against in that she was subject to harassment for a reason related to sex contrary to section 26 (1) Equality Act 2010;
3. The Claimants claim that she was discriminated against on grounds of sex contrary to section 13 Equality Act 2010 is dismissed.
4. By consent the Respondent is ordered to pay the Claimant compensation the sum of £15000.00

Employment Judge Rayner
Dated: 8 October 2020
.....

Notes

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.

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