Case No: 1302657/2024



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr L Jones

Respondent: British Transport Police

Heard at: Midlands West

On: 28, 29, 30 and 31 July, 1 and 4 August 2025

20 August 2025 (panel only, for deliberations)

29 September 2025 (for judgment)

Before: Employment Judge Faulkner

Mrs E Shenton Mr E Stanley

Representation: Claimant - in person

Respondent - Mr H Menon (Counsel)

JUDGMENT

- 1. The Respondent did not breach section 39 of the Equality Act 2010 by directly discriminating against the Claimant or discriminating against him because of something arising in consequence of disability in any of the following respects:
- 1.1. On 28 November 2023, by Lisha Kaur referring during a grievance investigation meeting to an email the Claimant sent to Sergeant Walsh on 13 March 2023.
- 1.2. On 25 August 2023, by Lisha Kaur describing the Claimant's conduct at a meeting on 18 August 2023 as "borderline person and threatening".
- 1.3. On 25 August 2023, by Lisha Kaur sending an emoji to a team WhatsApp chat in response to a message from the Claimant.
- 1.4. By Lisha Kaur requiring the Claimant to attend a meeting on 21 September 2023 regarding alleged unsatisfactory performance and conduct.
- 1.5. On 21 September 2023, by Lisha Kaur making multiple allegations regarding the Claimant's performance.

Case No: 1302657/2024

1.6. On 31 October 2023, by Lisha Kaur emailing the Claimant making allegations related to his not carrying out actions and/or not following guidelines.

- 2. The Respondent did not breach the duty to make reasonable adjustments in relation to any of the following alleged provisions, criteria or practices ("PCPs"):
- 2.1. An expectation to work in the office twice a week.
- 2.2. A requirement to inform Vulnerability Coordinators if it was believed there were any discrepancies in the work they sent to Vulnerability Development Officers.
- 2.3. A requirement not to update colleagues by screenshotting guidance and sending it to them.
- 2.4. An expectation that the Claimant would go to its London office to collect a work mobile telephone.
- 2.5. An expectation that the Claimant would complete a personal development review in an hour on 31 October 2023.
- 3. The Respondent did not victimise the Claimant in any of the following respects:
- 3.1. On 10 November 2023, by Kimberley Sach inviting the Claimant to a first stage performance/disciplinary meeting.
- 3.2. On 4 December 2023, by Kimberley Sach sending the Claimant a revised invitation to a first stage performance/disciplinary meeting.
- 3.3. On 15 December 2023, by Kimberley Sach providing the Claimant with a first stage outcome letter.
- 3.4. On 11 January 2024, by Ashley Cooper providing the Claimant with a first stage appeal outcome letter.
- 3.5. On or around 1 or 4 December 2023, by Kimberley Sach informing the Claimant that he was required to go to its London office to collect a work mobile telephone.
- 3.6. On 14 November 2023, by Kimberley Sach referring the Claimant to its Professional Standards Department.
- 4. The Respondent did not breach section 40 of the Equality Act 2010 by any of the matters referred to at paragraphs 1.1 or 1.3 to 1.6 above.
- 5. The following complaints are dismissed on withdrawal:
- 5.1. The complaint of failure to make reasonable adjustments based on the alleged PCP that the Respondent expected the Claimant to update colleagues as to changes in guidance.
- 5.2. The complaints of direct discrimination and discrimination arising from disability based on the matters referred to at paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4 above.

Case No: 1302657/2024

5.3. The complaint of victimisation based on a telephone call with the Claimant's temporary line manager on 24June 2024, in which the Claimant says he was told that his manager had been informed by Human Resources that working from the office twice a week would remain compulsory.

Employment Judge Faulkner Approved on: 29 September 2025

This was a remote hearing. There was no objection to the case being heard in part remotely. The form of remote hearing was V - video.

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 parties 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/