



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Ms E Williams

Respondent: (1) Middlesex University
(2) Ana Rodriguez

Heard at: Watford on the papers

On: 28 April 2026

Before: Employment Judge Bartlett

JUDGMENT

1. The application by Ms Dankyi for anonymisation of the Judgment of 21 November 2022 is refused.

REASONS

2. On 24 July 2025 Ms Doreen Dankyi made an application to the Employment Tribunal for reduction/ anonymisation of her name which is included in the Employment Tribunal judgment in this case which is on the public register.
3. The application is said to be made under rule 50 of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013. On the face of it this application appears to be drafted with the help of AI.
4. Ms Dankyi submits that she was a private individual, not involved as a party and had a reasonable expectation of privacy. Publicly identifying her in relation to sensitive workplace matters interferes with her rights under Article 8 ECHR particularly where there is no overriding public interest in revealing her identity. Reference is also made to the Data Protection Act 1998 and it is alleged that continued publication may constitute unlawful data processing. She refers to no compelling reason why she should be identified and that reduction would protect her from going harm and distress.
5. This application was sent to the parties by the Employment Tribunal and they were asked for their comments. Comments were only received on behalf of the first respondent but the second respondent is said to have confirmed her agreement to its contents.

6. The comments from the first respondent can be summarised as follows:
 - 6.1. they do not object to the application and do not wish to formally contest it or be required to engage in litigation relating to it;
 - 6.2. it queries whether the application meets the threshold for anonymity. Rule 50 now rule 49 refers to an application by a party to proceedings and Ms Dankyi was not a party to proceedings;
 - 6.3. the application is very late. The judgement was handed down on 21 November 2022 and has been publicly available for almost 3 1/2 years now;
 - 6.4. the applicant is named in 11 places in the judgement. 10 of the 11 references are purely factual in nature and only one reference is observations by the tribunal in relation to Ms Dankyi's behaviour is relevant to the tribunals decision;
 - 6.5. a brief Internet search for the applicants name was made and the case did not appear in search results but another employment tribunal case to which the applicant was a party does appear;
 - 6.6. case law indicates that indefinite anonymisation is rarely ordered particularly in relation to a published judgement where the principle of open justice is strongest.
7. This correspondence relating to the application was first sent to me on 13 April 2026. I requested further documentation which was said to me from the Employment Tribunal.
8. Rule 49 of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2024 sets out the following:

“Privacy and restrictions on disclosure

49.—(1) The Tribunal may, on its own initiative or on the application of a party, make an order with a view to preventing or restricting the public disclosure of any aspect of proceedings so far as it considers necessary in the interests of justice or in order to protect the Convention rights of any person.

(2) In considering whether to make an order under this rule, the Tribunal must give full weight to the principle of open justice and to the Convention right to freedom of expression.

(3) Any order made under this rule may require—

(a) that a hearing that would otherwise be held in public be conducted, in whole or in part, in private;

(b) that the identities of specified parties, witnesses or other persons referred to in the proceedings should not be disclosed to the public, by the use of anonymisation or otherwise, whether in the course of any hearing or in its listing or in any documents entered on the Register or otherwise forming part of the public record;

(c) that measures are to be taken to prevent witnesses at a public hearing being identifiable by members of the public;

(d) that a restricted reporting order is in place within the terms of section 11 (restriction of publicity in cases involving sexual misconduct) or 12 (restriction of publicity in disability cases) of the Employment Tribunals Act;

(e) that the name, address or other information of, or relating to, any person be redacted from a claim form, response form, witness statement or any other document in the proceedings.

(4) Any party, or other person with a legitimate interest, who has not had a reasonable opportunity to make representations before an order under this rule is made may apply to the Tribunal in writing for the order to be revoked or discharged, either on the basis of written representations or, if requested, at a hearing.

(5) Where an order is of the kind mentioned in paragraph (3)(d), the order—

(a) must specify the person whose identity is protected,

(b) must specify the duration of the order,

(c) may specify particular matters of which publication is prohibited as likely to lead to that person's identification, and

(d) may specify that it also applies to any other proceedings.

(6) The Tribunal must ensure that a notice that an order has been made under this rule in respect of particular proceedings is displayed on the notice board of the Tribunal with any list of the proceedings taking place before the Tribunal, and on the door of the room in which the proceedings affected by the order are taking place.

(7) "Convention rights" has the meaning given to it in section 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998(1)."

9. I have considered the application and I have decided to reject it. I have given careful consideration to rule 49 of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2024. Though the applicant was not a party in the case, Rule 49 envisages the possibility of making this sort of order sought by the applicant.
10. Rule 49 makes reference to the importance of open justice which is a fundamental principle in all courts and tribunals. The applicant has made reference to protecting her privacy and avoiding unnecessary reputational and personal harm. She also refers to Article 8 ECHR which is a qualified right to respect to her private life. The party who seeks to place limitations upon the principle of open justice bears the burden of restricting open justice and clear and cogent evidence is needed. As is set out above there are only 11 references to the applicant in the Judgment and one of those make some findings on her behaviour that are not entirely positive.
11. For the principle of open justice to be outweighed there must be weighty other considerations. I find that the applicant has failed to identify sufficient considerations to outweigh the principle of open justice. Further, I consider that the lateness of the application acts against the merits of it. The judgement was published almost 3 1/2 years ago, the applicant has failed to identify any negative consequences that she has experienced because of the publication or that she expects to experience. Many thousands of people appear as witnesses in the Employment Tribunal every year and are named in decisions that are public. There is simply nothing in this case to merit anonymisation or redaction.
12. The reference to the GDPR in the application in relation to the employment tribunal judgment is mistaken and without merit.
13. The application is refused.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Bartlett

Dated: 1 May 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
12 May 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE