



## EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant**

Miss H Kingham

v

**Respondent**

The Parochial Church Council of  
Winklebury and Worting

**Heard at:** Southampton

**On:** 14,15 and 16 September 2020

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

**Appearances**

**For the Claimant:** Mr K Williams, CAB Volunteer adviser

**For the Respondent:** Mr A Griffiths, Counsel

This has been a remote hearing which has been consented to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was video [CVP]. A face to face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and the parties consented to a hearing by video. The documents that we were referred to are contained in a joint bundle provided

## Judgment

1. The Claimant was constructively and unfairly dismissed.
2. The Claimant was automatically unfairly dismissed within the meaning of section 99 ERA 1996.
3. The claimant was discriminated against on grounds of pregnancy within the meaning of section 18 Equality Act 2010.
4. The Respondent will now pay to the Claimant the total sum of **£9030.92** calculated as follows:

<b>Basic award</b>	£496.65	£496.65
<b>Compensatory award</b>		
Loss of statutory rights	£500	
Loss of pension contributions	£100 (4 months x £25)	
16 weeks loss of earnings	£3178.56	
20% uplift on compensation for failure to follow	£755.71	

ACAS code (grievance)		
Total compensation award		£4534.27
<b>Injury to feelings award</b>		£4000.00
<b>Total award now payable</b>		<b>£9030.92</b>

5. The recoupment provisions apply to this judgment.

**Employment Judge Rayner**

Southampton

Dated 17 September 2020

Sent to the parties on

25<sup>th</sup> September 2020

By Mr J McCormick

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