



## EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

### Claimant

Ms L Chapman

### Respondents

1. John Lewis PLC
2. Adrian Young
3. Laura Sturgess
4. Tanya Weakley

**Heard at:** Southampton (by CVP)

**On:** 21, 22, 23 June 2021

**Before:** Employment Judge Dawson, Mr Spry-Shute, Mr Shah MBE

### Appearances

**For the claimant:** Representing herself

**For the respondents:** Mr MacPhail, counsel

## JUDGMENT

1. The first respondent failed to make reasonable adjustments for the claimant in that it rostered her to work over her break times on four occasions.
2. The fourth respondent failed to make reasonable adjustments for the claimant in that she rostered her to work over her break times on two occasions.
3. All other claims of the claimant are dismissed.
4. The first respondent is ordered to pay compensation to the claimant of £2500 in respect of injury to feelings.
5. The first respondent is ordered to pay interest to the claimant of £300.82.
6. At the request of the claimant no compensation is awarded against the fourth respondent.

**Employment Judge Dawson**

**Date: 24 of June 2021**

Judgment sent to the Parties: 01 July 2021

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

### Notes

### 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](http://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 Cloud Video Platform. It was held in public in accordance with the Employment Tribunal Rules. It was conducted in that manner because a face to face hearing was not appropriate 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.

### Recoupment

The recoupment provisions do not apply to this judgment.