



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr A G Laing
Respondent: Sheffield City Council
Heard at: Sheffield Employment Tribunal
On: 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 24, June 2026
Before: Employment Judge S Shore

Representation

For the Claimant: Mr C Canning, Counsel
For the Respondent: Mr A Serr, Counsel

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

The judgment of the Employment Tribunal is that: -

The claimant's complaints are determined as follows:

1. Direct discrimination because of race under section 13 of the Equality Act 2010 about the following:

1.1 The claim that on 12 November 2021, the respondent sent the claimant home but did not send Rachel Heffernan or other members home fails.

- 1.2 The claim that between 10 December 2021 and March 2025, the respondent paid the claimant basic salary is dismissed upon withdrawal by the claimant.**
- 1.3 The claim that the respondent did not make regular contact with or provide updates to the claimant during his suspension fails.**
- 1.4 The claim that the respondent suspended the claimant for an unjustified and prolonged period of time fails.**
- 1.5 The claims relating to the disciplinary investigation are determined as follows:**
 - 1.5.1 The claim that the respondent did not rely on and misplaced documents the claimant submitted on 11 April 2023 is dismissed upon withdrawal by the claimant.**
 - 1.5.2 The claim that the respondent did not interview Carly Speechley and Paul Dempsey is dismissed upon withdrawal by the claimant.**
 - 1.5.3 The claim that the respondent withheld an EDT report which confirmed that the claimant was not asked to leave the premises on 29 October 2021 fails.**
 - 1.5.4 The claim that the respondent delayed the process which resulted in individuals leaving the business and not being interviewed fails.**
 - 1.5.5 The claim that the respondent subjected only the claimant to a disciplinary procedure for allegations of failure to follow and implement safety plans and complete notes despite the allegations applying to others fails.**
 - 1.5.6 The claim that the respondent took until 29 July to complete the investigation fails.**

- 1.6 The claim that the respondent dismissed the claimant on 22 October 2024 fails.**
- 1.7 The claim that the respondent failed to deal with the claimant's grievances dated 15 October 2024, 22 November 2024, and 19 December 2024 regarding unauthorised deductions from wages fails.**
- 1.8 The claim that the respondent failed to address the allegations of race discrimination during his dismissal appeal hearings on 17 and 25 January 2025 is dismissed upon withdrawal by the claimant.**
- 1.9 The claim that the respondent delayed communication and arranging the claimant's return to work following the disciplinary appeal outcome on 14 February 2025 fails.**
- 2. Victimisation under section 27 of the Equality Act 2010 about the following:**

 - 2.1 The protected acts relied upon by the claimant are:**

 - 2.1.1 His allegations of race discrimination in the appeal meeting on 17 January 2025, which the respondent agrees was a protected act; and**
 - 2.1.2 His allegations of race discrimination in the appeal meeting on 27 January 2025, which the respondent agrees was a protected act.**
 - 2.2 The claim of detriment is determined as follows:**

 - 2.2.1 The claim that the respondent delayed the claimant's return to work following his appeal outcome fails.**
- 3. Unauthorised deduction from wages under section 13 of the Employment Rights Act 1996 ("ERA") about the following:**

 - 3.1 The claim that an unauthorised deduction was made in respect of the claimant's period of sickness absence between**

10 December 2021 and 7 June 2022 was presented out of time when it was reasonably practicable to have done so, fails. The claim would also have failed on its merits.

3.2 The claim that an unauthorised deduction was made in respect of the period of the claimant's suspension between 21 June 2022 and 22 October 2024 fails.

3.3 The claim that an unauthorised deduction was made in respect of the period after dismissal and before reinstatement between 23 October 2024 and 14 February 2025 fails.

4. As all claims have been dismissed, the Tribunal will not go on to determine remedy.

Approved by
Employment Judge S Shore

Dated 24 June 2026

Sent to the parties on:

.....
For the Tribunal Office:

.....

Notes

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 51) and any written full reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at [Employment tribunal decisions - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions) shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimants and respondents.

Oral Summary Reasons were given at the hearing. A party may request written Summary Reasons within 14 days of the date of the sending of this Judgment to the parties (Rule 60(4)).

If a Tribunal hearing has been recorded, you may request a transcript of the recording. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, you will have to pay for it. 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: [Practice Directions and Guidance for Employment Tribunals \(England and Wales\) - Courts and Tribunals Judiciary](#)