



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr M Mahmood

Respondent: National Wealth Fund Limited

Heard at: Leeds

On: 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25,
26, 27, 28, 31 March 2025.
1 and 4 April 2025, 17 July
2025 (in chambers).
18 July 2025.

Before: Employment Judge D N Jones
Mr R Webb
Ms GM Fleming

REPRESENTATION:

Claimant: Mr F Mortin, counsel

Respondent: Mr M Humphrys, counsel

JUDGMENT

1. By not progressing the request of the claimant for a pay review after 11 March 2022 the respondent subjected the claimant to a detriment which was an act of direct sex discrimination.
2. By not progressing the request of the claimant for a pay review after 27 June 2022 the respondent subjected the claimant to a detriment which was an act of victimisation.
3. By seeking immediately to terminate the contract of the claimant on 28 June 2022 the respondent subjected the claimant to a detriment which was an act of victimisation.
4. By making a decision not to extend the claimant's contract from as early as 29 July 2022 (a decision which was subsequently reversed) the respondent subjected the claimant to a detriment which was an act of victimisation.
5. By providing the claimant with feedback which was factually incorrect on 21 October 2022, in an extract of an earlier email dated 18 August 2022, the respondent subjected the claimant to a detriment which was an act of victimisation.

6. The above acts were conduct which extended over a period which ended more than 3 months before the complaint was presented to the Tribunal, but they were presented within such further period the Tribunal thinks was just and equitable.

7. By providing the claimant with feedback which was factually incorrect on 21 October 2022, in an extract of an earlier email dated 18 August 2022, the respondent subjected the claimant to a detriment on the ground the claimant had made a public interest disclosure, namely that its Finance Director had perpetuated a culture of bullying and blaming individuals. The complaint was presented more than 3 months after this act and is out of time, because it was reasonably practicable for the claimant to have presented the claim within that period. The complaint is dismissed.

8. All remaining complaints are not well found and are dismissed.

Employment Judge Jones

Date: 21 July 2025

Note

Reasons for the judgment were given orally at the hearing. Written reasons will not be provided unless a party asked for them at the hearing or a party makes a written request 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.

Recording and Transcription

Please note that if a Tribunal hearing has been recorded you may request a transcript of the recording, for which a charge may be payable. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral judgment or reasons given at the hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings, and accompanying Guidance, which can be found here:

<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/>