

EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS



Claimant
Ms J Baines

v

Respondent
**Gangmaster Labour Abuse
Authority**

OPEN PRELIMINARY HEARING

Heard at: London South by CVP

On: 1 July 2024

Before: Employment Judge Truscott KC

Appearances:

For the Claimant: In person
For the Respondent: Mr P Bownes solicitor

JUDGMENT on PRELIMINARY HEARING

1. The claimant's application to add a whistleblowing claim by amendment is refused because it was presented outside the primary time limit contained in section 48(3)(b) of the Employment Rights Act 1996 and it was reasonably practicable for the claim to be presented within the primary time limit.
2. The claimant's application to add a claim for reasonable adjustments in the disability discrimination claim is refused because it is not just and equitable to extend the period within which the claim falls to be lodged.

REASONS

Preliminary

1. This preliminary hearing was fixed on 2 February 2024 by EJ McLaren to address the following issues:
 - a) the claimant's application to amend the claim form;
 - b) any changes to the list of issues since today's hearing;
 - c) whether any guidance with regard to the number of or length of witness statements is required;
 - d) if the length of the final hearing remains appropriate;
 - e) the listing of any judicial mediation/ alternative dispute resolution; and
 - f) any outstanding matters between the parties.

2. There was a bundle of documents to which reference will be made where necessary.

3. At the previous case management hearing, EJ McLaren narrated as follows [115]:

53. The claimant had also provided further particulars. She had originally done so in a document on 2 October 2023. She then sent a further document on 7 November 2023. The claimant confirmed that we were to disregard the October document as it was a draft. 7 November document contains the full particulars that she wishes to rely on in addition to her claim form.

54. It was the claimant's primary position that nothing in the document on 7 November was new and that her claim form should be understood as containing the claim for whistleblowing and reasonable adjustments and all the detail that supports these. The respondent disagreed and considers that these are matters which would require an amendment application.

55. We went through the claim form together and I confirmed to the claimant that ticking a box to refer to the regulator being notified is not sufficient without anything more to identify a whistleblowing claim is being brought. Further, reference to documents that were not provided was not sufficient to identify a claim where there is no other reference on the face of the form to this claim. I'm satisfied that within the ET1 the claimant has raised only three matters. Her claims are therefore, subject to a successful amendment application, a claim for constructive unfair dismissal, a claim for discrimination and a claim for unpaid wages.

Findings

1. The claimant was employed by the respondent as Senior Investigating Officer for South East and London, from 6 January 2020 until 29 September 2023.

2. She resigned on 18 July 2023.

3. The claimant produced a draft timeline of events [91] which is set out here (the full narrative has been edited by the Tribunal and emphasis added to focus on matters relevant to this hearing):

Date Event

May - July 2022 Change in behaviour noted in claimants direct report Paul Armstrong, over a period of time around conduct with another staff member and other issues.

05/07/2022 Paul Armstrong lodges grievance against claimant and Ian Waterfield for bullying, harrassment and discrimination.

06/07/2022 Emma Coxon submits Paul Armstrongs grievance to Home Office PSU for investigation.

06/07/2022 Emma Coxon seeks advice regarding the claimant asking about submitting a 'counter grievance'. Richard Murray advises based on this question.

07/07/2022 Claimant submits formal grievance against Paul Armstrong for bullying, harrassment, discrimination and false/vexatious/malicious allegations against her.

8/7/22 - 17/7/22 Claimant on leave

19/07/2022 Claimant requests update on progression of grievance submitted 7/7/22. Emma Coxon had not notified Paul Armstrong of the grievance against him. Emma Coxon suggests mediation.

Jul-22 Claimant notes that Paul Armstrong is self tasking and actioning investigations without authorisation, within claimants area. Claimant sends images of daybook records 29/6/22 30/7/22-1/8/22 Claimant makes a protected disclosure to respondent. 4/8/22 - 18/8/22 Claimant on sick leave - Multiple sclerosis symptoms intensified due to stress and anxiety dealing with events to date.

August - October 22

Claimant and Ian Waterfield still requesting response to management requests sent to Paul Armstrong in June. Paul Armstrong on long term sick leave due to broken finger. Emma Coxon makes decision that explanation is satisfactory.

21/09/2022 Meeting with Daniel Scully regarding the protected disclosure and legal issues around the disclosure.

Oct-22 Mid-term PADR appraisal and further request for reasonable adjustments.

Oct-22 Witness list provided to Emma Coxon for use in the grievance investigations.

Ongoing discussions regarding outstanding management requests and actions.

07/10/2022 Official complaint made to respondent regarding Emma Coxon's behaviour toward claimant. Complaint on the basis that claimant is being treated differently throughout the grievance process, reasonable adjustments not implemented and lack of policy adherence.

Nov-22 Claimant attends grievance meeting scheduled by Glynn Parry regarding Paul Armstrongs grievance against claimant. Full account provided, questions answered, evidence offered. Further allegations against claimant of shouting at Paul Armstrong.

Dec-22 Emma Coxon re sifts and re scores claimants recruitment applications.

Nov 22 - Feb 23 Updates requested regularly regarding suspension of Paul Armstrong re protected disclosure, Protected disclosure outcome, grievance reports.

Regular discussion with Ian Waterfield regarding ill health issues and impact of work.

13/02/2023 Grievance investigation report into Paul Armstrongs grievance dated 5/7/22 received by respondent.

Feb-March 23 Await decision from DM Daniel Scully regarding grievance outcome.

29/03/2023 Meeting with Daniel Scully regarding grievance outcome.

31/03/2023 Decision outcome letter received - claimant goes on sick leave. Claimant requests explanation around decision made

31/3/23-29/9/23 Claimant on sick leave 31/3/23 - 29/9/23 (last day of service due to resignation)

17/04/2023 Claimant requests update around her grievance submitted on the 7/7/22 - still not in progress

18/04/2023 Claimant requests meeting with CEO to discuss a way forward in returning to work around the way that HR had dealt with the grievances, Daniels decision, ongoing stress and ill health. Lays out clear reasoning as to why claimant feels unsafe at work and unable to carry out her role without finding a way forward.

28/04/2023 Claimant seeks further update around grievance progression. Emma Coxon replies, stating PSU have no capacity and she wishes to allocate the investigation to one of her staff. Claimant disputes this as inappropriate. Requests independent investigator.

04/05/2023 Claimant meets with Elysia McAffrey

11/05/2023 Emma Coxon allocates Gary Ward (External) to investigate grievance submitted 7/7/2022. Emma has previously worked with Gary - claimant has no further alternatives.

12/05/2023 Claimant agrees to attend consultation meeting regarding TOM programme. Programme looks to reduce SIO roles from 6 to 4. Claimant attends meetings whilst on sick leave.

18/05/2023 Meeting with Investigation manager Gary Ward

18/05/2023 Claimant asks ACAS for assistance around treatment

31/05/2023 End of year bonus not paid. No notification or reasoning received as to award entitlement. Not aware of PADR box marking – claimant requests clarification

07/06/2023 Claimant notified by 'grapevine' that Paul Armstrong was found to have 'no case to answer' around the PD investigation, due to lack of HR record keeping and had submitted resignation for a promotion to another government department.

9-19/6/23 PADR Box marking chain Excess hours worked in addition to TOIL/Flexi already accrued.

09/07/2023 Claimant requests update regarding grievance investigation. Follow up meeting arranged.

14/07/2023 Meeting with Gary Ward investigation manager.

14/07/2023 Notified by Gary Ward that he has been informed that the Decision maker in the grievance will be Elysia Mcaffrey. Claimant informs respondent/s that this is felt inappropriate as claimant had already had lengthy discussions around the issues and in addition Elysia Mcaffrey was Emma Coxons line manager, whom claimant had complained about.

17/18/7/2023 Claimant informed by colleague Andrew Davies that the respondent is refusing to investigate a different complaint made about Emma Coxon.

18/07/2023 Letter of resignation submitted. Letter details reasons for resignation.

27/07/2023 Email regarding 240 hours excess to be paid and outstanding annual leave. Respondent declines to pay excess hours worked.

04/08/2023 Chase outstanding excess hours request.

09/08/2023 Respondent agrees to pay 37 out of 207 hours (adjusted) owed after appeal process.

24/08/2023 Claimant requests grievance investigation update

04/09/2023 Respondent receives grievance investigation report

08/09/2023 Informed by Elysia Mcaffrey (DM) that Gary Ward finds no points upheld.

13/09/2023 Claimant collates representations and areas of failure against report and submits to respondent

15/09/2023 Elysia Mcaffrey finds no case to answer outcome. Claimant appeals decision. Requests Home Office appeal manager due to process followed. Allocated Michelle CEO SIA

25/09/2023 Claimant still chasing response to end of year bonus reasoning and process followed. Claimant receives email evidence from respondent giving rise to further allegation against Ian Waterfield.

26/09/2023 Claimant raises grievance against Ian Waterfield for PADR process discrimination and failures April 22- March 2023. (Claimant making enquiries from May 2023 – ongoing sequence)

20/11/2023 Appeal manager provides decision around grievance submitted 7/7/22 - grounds partially upheld. No further route of appeal. Appeal manager advises policy review and apology to claimant for excessive delays.

24/11/2023 Investigation manager Phillip Cain GLAA provides report upholding discrimination by way of disability against Ian Waterfield. Recommends policy review.

24/11/2023 Claimant requests respondent make decision regarding bonus payment for year ending March 2023 (Ongoing request from May 2023)

16/01/2024 Claimant receives outcome of decision - respondent agrees to pay end of year bonus.

Law

Amendment

4. In the case of **Selkent Bus Company Limited v Moore** [1996] ICR 836 the Employment Appeal Tribunal (“EAT”) set out the test to be applied by a Tribunal in deciding whether to exercise its discretion to grant an amendment. It said the Tribunal should take into account all the circumstances and should balance the injustice and hardship of allowing the amendment against the injustice and hardship of refusing it. The EAT in **Selkent** also set out a list of factors which are certainly relevant, which are usually referred to as the “**Selkent** factors”. In brief they are:

- (1) The nature of the amendment i.e. whether the amendment sought is one of the minor matters or is a substantive alteration pleading a new cause of action;
- (2) The applicability of time limits. If a new complaint of cause of action is proposed to be added by way of amendment it is essential for the Tribunal to consider whether that complaint is out of time and if so whether the time limit should be extended; and
- (3) The timing and manner of the application. An application should not be refused solely because there has been a delay in making it. There are no time limits laid down in the rules for making amendments, but delay is a discretionary factor. It is relevant to consider why the application was not made earlier and why it is now being made (for example the discovery of new facts or new information).

5. In the case of **Vaughan v Modality Partnership UKEAT/0147/20/BA** the EAT reminded parties and Tribunals that the core test in considering applications to amend is the balance of injustice and hardship in allowing or refusing the application. The exercise starts with the parties making submissions on the specific practical consequences of allowing or refusing the amendment. That balancing exercise is fundamental. The **Selkent** factors should not be treated as if they are a list to be checked off.

6. Although **Selkent** says it is essential for the Tribunal to consider whether a complaint is made out of time and if so whether the time limit should be extended, in **Galilee v Commission of Police of the Metropolis [2018] ICR 634** the EAT held it is not always necessary to determine time points as part of an amendment application. A Tribunal can decide to allow an amendment subject to limitation points being determined at a later stage in the proceedings, usually at the final hearing. That might be the most appropriate route in cases where there is alleged to be a continuing act and the Tribunal needs to make findings of fact on this issue.

7. The assessment of the balance of injustice and hardship may include an examination of the merits but there is no point in allowing an amendment if it will subsequently be struck out. That extends to cases not only which are utterly hopeless but also to ones where the proposed claim has no reasonable prospect of success. The authority for that is **Gillett v Bridge 86 Limited [2017] 6 WL UK 46**.

Reasonably practicable

8. Section 48(3)(a) of the Employment Rights Act 1996 provides:
“(3) An [employment tribunal] shall not consider a complaint under this section unless it is presented—
(a) before the end of the period of three months beginning with the date of the act or failure to act to which the complaint relates or, where that act or failure is part of a series of similar acts or failures, the last of them, or
9. A Tribunal may only extend time for presenting a claim where it is satisfied of the following:
“It was “not reasonably practicable” for the complaint to be presented in time. The claim was nevertheless presented “within such further period as the Tribunal considers reasonable”

Just and equitable extension

10. Section 123(1)(b) of the 2010 Equality Act permits the Tribunal to grant an extension of time for such other period as the employment tribunal thinks just and equitable. Section 140B of the Equality Act 2010 serves to extend the time limit under section 123 to facilitate conciliation before institution of proceedings.
11. The Tribunal has reminded itself of the developed case-law in relation to what is now section 123 of the Equality Act 2010. That has included a group of well-known judgments setting out the underlying principles to be applied in this area, together with recent occasions on which those principles have been applied and approved by later courts and tribunals. Particular attention has been paid to the historical line of cases emerging in the wake of the case of **Hutchinson v. Westwood Television** [1977] ICR 279, the comments in **Robinson v. The Post Office** [2000] IRLR 804, the detailed consideration of the Employment Appeal Tribunal in **Virdi v. Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis et al** [2007] IRLR 24, and, in particular, the observations of Elias J. in that case, as well as the decision of the same body in **Chikwe v. Mouchel Group plc** [2012] All ER (D) 1.
12. The Tribunal also notes the guidance offered by the Court of Appeal in the case of **Apelogun-Gabriels v. London Borough of Lambeth & Anr** [2002] ICR 713 at 719 D that the pursuit by a claimant of an internal grievance or appeal procedure will not normally constitute sufficient ground for delaying the presentation of a claim: and observations made by Mummery LJ in the case of **Ma v. Merck Sharp and Dohme** [2008] All ER (D) 158.
13. The Tribunal noted in particular that it has been held that 'the time limits are exercised strictly in employment ... cases', and that there is no presumption that a tribunal should exercise its discretion to extend time on the 'just and equitable' ground unless it can justify failure to exercise the discretion; as the onus is always on the claimant to convince the tribunal that it is just and equitable to extend time, 'the exercise of discretion is the exception rather than the rule' (**Robertson v. Bexley Community Centre** [2003] IRLR 434, at para 25, per Auld LJ); **Department of Constitutional Affairs v. Jones** [2008] IRLR 128, at paras 14–15, per Pill LJ) but LJ Sedley in **Chief Constable of Lincolnshire Police v. Caston** said in relation to what

LJ Auld said “there is no principle of law which dictates how generously or sparingly the power to enlarge time is to be exercised.” See also the comments of Judge Tayler in **Jones v. Secretary of State for Health** 2024/EAT/2

14. The Tribunal’s discretion is as wide as that of the civil courts under section 33 of the Limitation Act 1980; **British Coal Corporation v. Keeble** [1997] IRLR 336; **DPP v. Marshall** [1998] IRLR 494. Section 33 of the Limitation Act 1980 requires courts to consider factors relevant to the prejudice that each party would suffer if an extension was refused, including:

- the length and reasons for the delay;
- the extent to which the cogency of the evidence is likely to be affected by the delay;
- the extent to which the party sued had co-operated with any requests for information;
- the promptness with which the claimant acted once he knew of the possibility of taking action; and
- the steps taken by the claimant to obtain appropriate professional advice once they knew of the possibility of taking action.

Although these are relevant factors to be considered, there is no legal obligation on the Tribunal to go through the list, providing that no significant factor is left out; **London Borough of Southwark v. Afolabi** [2003] IRLR 220.

15. The Tribunal has additionally taken note of the fact that what is now the modern section 123 provision contains some linguistic differences from its predecessors – which were to be found in various earlier statutes and regulations – concerning the presentation of claims alleging discrimination in the employment field. However, the case law which has developed in relation to what is now described as “the just and equitable power” has been consistent and remains valid. The Tribunal has therefore taken those authorities directly into account in its consideration.

16. It is also a generally received starting proposition that it is for the claimant who has presented his or her claims out of time to establish to the satisfaction of the Tribunal that the “just and equitable” discretion should be exercised in the particular case.

DISCUSSION and DECISION

17. In an email of 7 November 23, the claimant said:

- I suffer from a severe, critical illness that has significantly impacted my cognitive and neurological abilities.
- I have been overwhelmed and incapacitated by the events and treatment that led to this claim.

The Tribunal took this into account when addressing the submissions.

18. For the purposes of this hearing, the claimant tabulated her reasonable adjustment claim at pages 124-125. Box RA1 shows the claim is made for the period from July 2022 until the internal procedures were concluded in November 2023. Box RA2 shows the claim is made for period October 2022 to July 2023 until the internal

procedures were concluded in January 2024. She agreed that that box RA 3 added nothing to box RA2 and that it should be deleted. She tabulated her whistleblowing claim at pages 125-126 as being raised in August 2022 and not being concluded until 2024.

19. The Tribunal took the claimant through her resignation letter (which was not available to the Tribunal) which was based on her grievance (which was also not available to the Tribunal) along with the terms of her ET1 and paper apart [4 and 16] which she said reflected the narrative in her grievance and resignation and contained her two additional claims.

20. The ET1 was itself a detailed document. The rubric at section 8.2 of the ET1 says "Please set out the background and details of your claim in the space below. The details of your claim should include the date(s) when the event(s) you are complaining about happened. Please use the blank sheet at the end of the form if needed." The claimant then proceeded to attach 12 pages of Particulars of Claim. The claimant's claim was lodged in July 2023. The Tribunal concluded that there was no mention at all of whistleblowing, alleged protected disclosures or reasonable adjustments within the ET1.

21. The Tribunal finds that these are new claims and addressed them as such. The claimant applied for permission to amend on 2 October 2023, shortly after the respondent provided Grounds of Resistance to the claim, set out in the ET1. The claimant's own timeline shows that on 13 September 2023 and thereafter she was addressing issues with her employer and could have addressed the two claims missing from her ET1. It is not sufficient for her to say that she was awaiting the outcome of the internal grievance investigation particularly since she ceased to be employed on 29 September 2023.

22. The claimant's submission on whistleblowing is now:

Whistleblowing detriment under section 47B of the Employment Rights Act 1996 and Victimisation under section 27 of the Equality Act 2010.

In August 2022, Mrs Baines divulged sensitive information to her employer regarding an employee who was allegedly involved in potentially illegal activities, that could have compromised government security and misused sensitive systems for personal gain. The employee ran two private investigation firms that offered services like tracking and surveillance, which reasonably required access to police intelligence systems. Mrs Baines made the disclosure following due process, supported by evidence, and in the public interest. The matter warranted immediate action and should also have been referred to IOPC. There were risks to stakeholders, departmental employees, the organization, and the general public.

Mrs Baines was made aware of this information when one of her staff alerted her to certain statements made by the employee and the alleged threats he posed against her. Mrs. Baines was profoundly concerned for her safety and that of her family. It came to light that the employee had not declared his directorship or involvement in the businesses on his conflict-of-interest declaration, as required by his contract.

Mrs. Baines reported the matter to her line manager, who subsequently escalated it to HR.

However, Emma Coxon, the HR personnel in charge, humiliated her after the referral was made, by criticising her intentions. She frequently spoke poorly of Mrs Baines to her line manager Ian Waterfield and treated her in a demeaning and hostile manner. Consequently, Mrs Baines felt troubled about approaching HR for help, advice, or support.

Despite the significant risks involved, the referral was not recorded as a protected disclosure, and the employee, the subject of the investigation, was cleared of any wrongdoing. There were concerns regarding GLAA's record-keeping practices as stated by the Chief Operating Officer Daniel Scully. Mrs Baines found it alarming that someone involved in criminal investigations would be allowed to run two private investigation firms concurrently. The lack of adequate investigation may have led colleagues to believe that anything was permissible, which was not appropriate for a law enforcement department.

In October 2022, Mrs Baines lodged a complaint against Emma Coxon, but her line manager advised her not to pursue it, citing the hostile work environment that she was already experiencing. Emma remained non-committal on Mrs Baines grievance and refused to progress reasonable questions that she had raised. Emma Coxon also inappropriately got involved in Mrs Baines grievance and acted contrary to her interests. Emma further victimized her by treating her dismissively and implying that she was of low intellect, did not understand the grievance resolution policy and did not merit the same rights enjoyed by other employees.

Emma's conduct has been detrimental to Mrs Baines well-being and has made it challenging to engage with HR. It has also proven problematic in terms of addressing complaints of discrimination or requesting a prompt, fair and impartial grievance investigation.

23. The whistleblowing upon which the claimant relies took place in July, August and October 2022 and any claim for detriment at those times would have been out of time at the date of presentation of the original ET1.

24. The claimant says that she intended to raise whistleblowing within the ET1. She also said that she did not want to disclose sensitive information but serious allegations such as putting government security at risk or the claimant allegedly being scared for the safety of her family would be important to make at the earliest juncture and cannot be said to be hidden in the ET1. She herself said that her disclosures warranted immediate action. It is also a fundamentally different cause of action with different applicable legal principles

25. Within paragraphs 51-55 of her case management summary EJ McLaren has recorded her decision as to what was in the ET1 and what the claimant told her about the circumstances of presenting the ET1. There is no reason that the claimant could not have included any detail regarding a whistleblowing claim within her actual Particulars of Claim, as she did for numerous other matters. It was reasonably practicable to do so.

26. If it was not reasonably practicable for the claim to be presented in time, the question for the Tribunal is was the claim presented within such further period as the

Tribunal considers reasonable. Having regard to the timeline in this case, the tribunal concludes that it was not.

27. Her submission on reasonable adjustments now is:

Failure to make reasonable adjustments under Sections 20 and 21 of the Equality Act 2010.

Mrs. Baines has provided evidence of the respondent's failure to consider and provide reasonable adjustments to manage her disability under the Equality Act 2010.

The failure to comply with sections 20 and 21 of the Equality Act 2010 manifested in various ways, including neglecting the request for an immediate and prioritized investigation of grievances due to disability (PPMS) impact; this failure occurred in July 2022 and recurred in August 22, October 22, and March 23. The agreed OH referral made in November 22 was not progressed, and the support, as well as the assessment of decisions that caused harm, such as grievance delays, resource issues, and excessive working hours kept, were absent.

Furthermore, there was a disregard of disability and reasonable adjustment support requests and mitigation strategies in March and April 2023 that addressed physical spasms or facial expressions; this disregard led to a failure to provide necessary support or measures to adjust for disability symptoms perceived as offensive, thus increasing the risk of termination. Additionally, there was a lack of fair and relevant provisions for disabilities and the symptoms caused on the PDR process, affecting box markings/outcomes.

28. The reasonable adjustments complaint appears to be about a decision in 7 October 2022. The claimant says she was made aware of relevant facts in January 2024 but she is pointing to a grievance outcome. The particulars identified by EJ McLaren as those which the claimant seeks permission to add by amendment found within her document of 7 November 2023 explicitly say that alleged failures happened in July 2022, August 2022, October 2022, November 2022, March 2023 and April 2023. All of those dates considerably pre-date the submission of the ET1. There was nothing preventing the claimant from including these within her ET1 had she wanted to. Looking at page 2 of the Particulars of Claim, for example, the claimant notes that she has raised a grievance and sets out various issues contained within that grievance. If the claimant was able to raise those matters within her ET1 there is no reason why other matters could not similarly have been addressed. The claimant set out her specific claims at the time and these two claims were not included. The reasonable adjustments claim is not merely a relabelling exercise from the monetary claim to one of disability discrimination, it is a fundamentally different cause of action with different applicable legal principles.

29. The communication of a grievance outcome after she ceased employment is not the start of the time limit for an act or omission in 2022. What occurred was an act with continuing consequences with the time limit running from that date, not a continuing detriment constituting a continuing act which means the time does not run while it is ongoing.

Balance of prejudice

30. In relation to prejudice generally, the respondent will have the prejudice of having to defend a claim which is not specified in any detail and which is well out of time. Because it is it is a fundamentally different cause of action with different applicable legal principles, additional witness evidence will be required along with consideration of those legal principles.

31. There is a final hearing listed for 21-29 July 2025. The addition of a reasonable adjustments claim in the form it is made, may cause that hearing to overrun or be cancelled, to be relisted later. In either event, the next hearing would be even further away and this takes no account of any separate hearing on remedy. The claimant accepted that this turn of events would be to her prejudice.

32. On the basis of the guidance set out earlier and weighing all the relevant factors, the Tribunal considers that it is not proportionate to resolve that issue when it is out of time, accordingly it is not just and equitable to extend the time for lodging the claim and the claim of reasonable adjustments is struck out.

28. Turning to the remaining items on the agenda for this hearing, the Tribunal decided it was not necessary to add to the case management already carried out. Accordingly,

- b) any changes to the list of issues since today's hearing; No.
- c) whether any guidance with regard to the number of or length of witness statements is required; No
- d) if the length of the final hearing remains appropriate; It should remain as listed.
- e) the listing of any judicial mediation/ alternative dispute resolution; No and
- f) any outstanding matters between the parties. None.

Employment Judge Truscott KC

Dated: 4 July 2024