



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr A

Respondent: Royal Mail Group Limited

Heard at: Liverpool

On: 26-29 May 2026

Before: EJ Aspinall

Representation

Claimant: representing himself

Respondent: Mr Chaudhry, solicitor

Reserved Judgment and Reasons

Judgment

1. The claimant did not have the two years' service needed to bring a complaint of unfair dismissal. It is dismissed on withdrawal.
2. The claimant's complaint of harassment is not well founded and fails.
3. The claimant's complaint of direct discrimination is not well founded and fails.
4. The claimant's complaint of failure to reasonably adjust is not well founded and fails.

Background

5. By a Claim Form dated 29 May 2025 the claimant brought claims for unfair dismissal and disability discrimination; harassment, direct discrimination and failure to reasonably adjust.
6. The claimant achieved an ACAS certificate having entered into early conciliation between 28 April and 29 May 2025. The respondent defended

the complaints on 30 July 2025.

7. The matter came to a case management hearing before Employment Judge Thompson on 28 November 2025. Everyone agreed that as the claimant did not have two years service he could not bring a claim for unfair dismissal. Judge Thompson prepared a List of Issues and gave the parties 14 days in which to say if that list was not accurate and complete. Neither side objected to the list. Judge Thompson made case management orders to prepare for the final hearing.

Opening discussion

8. The claimant had made applications for Anonymity and Restricted Reporting Orders. He had made applications to amend and had brought along new documents to be added to the bundle on the first day of the hearing. The documents were added by consent.
9. Following discussion, the List of Issues was amended by consent to reflect
 - (i) an item in the Claim form at paragraph 10 at box 8.2, that had not made it onto the List; that was the claimant's complaint in harassment that the claimant had continued to be contacted by telephone during April and May 2025 after he had said he wanted to be contacted by email only and
 - (ii) the reasonable step in the failure to reasonably adjust complaint was that the claimant should not have been required to attend on-site for updating or training whilst he was signed unfit for work, so that that requirement ought to have been removed completely or delayed.
10. The Tribunal had sent a letter to the parties on 13 May 2026 in response to their correspondences about amendment and anonymity, in which the Tribunal allowed an amendment to include the post Claim Form complaint that the respondent instructed someone to attend at the claimant's home and video record him in October 2025 as part of his harassment complaint. The claimant confirmed that, the video recording issue having been added to his claim, he no longer needed to make applications to amend so that the applications set out in the bundle were withdrawn.
11. The application for anonymisation was heard in private and a case management order made. The reasons for that order are provided separately in a private case management summary document. The claimant is referred to as A. No restricted reporting order was made.

List of Issues

12. The agreed list of issues for final hearing was confirmed by the claimant at 11:56 on day one to accurately and comprehensively reflect everything that he wanted to be decided in this case.
13. The issues from the pleadings were agreed to be as follows:

Harassment

1. Did the respondent do the following alleged things:

(1) On various dates between 14th April 2024 and May 2024 excessively contacted the claimant (by email, text and telephone) in relation to his sickness absence. The individuals involved are Simon Murphy and Joseph Lamb.

(2) On a date in November 2025 the manager Mark instructed a female to attend at the claimant's home address and video him and pass him a letter.

(3) On 27th and 28th April 2025 Simon Murphy shouted at the Claimant on the phone and sent an intimidating email, full particulars of which are at paragraphs 16-18 of the ET1.

(4) Continued to contact the claimant when the claimant had made it clear that he couldn't do phone calls at that time and would prefer emails, it was refused and pressure placed on him to accept calls, even calls that were not scheduled *specifically during telephone calls in April to May 2025 Joseph Lamb and Simon Murphy refused to agree to email contact only whilst the claimant was off sick and placed pressure on the claimant to accept unscheduled calls*

2. If so, was that unwanted conduct?

3. Was it related to disability?

4. Did the conduct have the purpose of violating the claimant's dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for the claimant?

5. If not, did it have that effect? The Tribunal will take into account the claimant's perception, the other circumstances of the case and whether it is reasonable for the conduct to have that effect.

Direct disability discrimination (Equality Act 2010 section 13)

6. What are the facts in relation to the following allegations:

(1) On various dates between 14th April 2025 and May 2025 the respondent excessively contacted the claimant (by email, text and telephone) in relation to his sickness absence. The individuals involved are Simon Murphy and Joseph Lamb.

(2) On a date in November 2025 the manager Mark instructed a female to attend at the claimant's home address and video him and pass him a letter.

(3) On 27th and 28th April 2024 Simon Murphy shouted at the Claimant on the phone and sent an intimidating email, full particulars of which are at paragraphs 16-18 of the ET3.

(4) Continued to contact the claimant when the claimant had made it clear that he couldn't do phone calls at that time and would prefer emails, it was refused and pressure place on him to accept calls, even calls that were not scheduled *specifically during telephone calls in April to May 2025 Joseph Lamb and Simon Murphy refused to agree to email contact only whilst the claimant was off sick and placed pressure on the claimant to accept unscheduled calls*

7. Did the claimant reasonably see the treatment as a detriment?

8. If so, has the claimant proven facts from which the Tribunal could conclude that in any of those respects the claimant was treated less favourably than someone in the same material circumstances without a disability was or would have been treated? The claimant relies on a hypothetical comparison.

9. If so, has the claimant also proven facts from which the Tribunal could conclude that the less favourable treatment was because of disability?

10. If so, has the respondent shown that there was no less favourable treatment because of disability?

Reasonable Adjustments (Equality Act 2010 sections 20 & 21)

11. Did the respondent know, or could it reasonably have been expected to know, that the claimant had the disability? From what date?

12. A "PCP" is a provision, criterion or practice. Did the respondent have the following PCPs:

(1) The requirement for employees to attend the depot in person for operational training.

13. Did the PCPs put the claimant at a substantial disadvantage compared to someone without the claimant's disability, in that he was off sick with PTSD?

14. Did the respondent know, or could it reasonably have been expected to know, that the claimant was likely to be placed at the disadvantage?

15. Did the respondent fail in its duty to take such steps as it would have been reasonable to have taken to avoid the disadvantage? The claimant says that the following adjustments to the PCP would have been reasonable:

(1) Exempt the claimant from attending updating or operational training whilst off sick

(2) Delay any requirement for updating or operational training

(3) Permit the claimant to attend any meetings by email or video.

16. By what date should the respondent reasonably have taken those steps?

Remedy for discrimination

17. Should the Tribunal make a recommendation that the respondent take steps to reduce any adverse effect on the claimant? What should it recommend?

18. What financial losses has the discrimination caused the claimant?

19. Has the claimant taken reasonable steps to replace lost earnings, for example

by looking for another job?

20. If not, for what period of loss should the claimant be compensated?

21. What injury to feelings has the discrimination caused the claimant and how much compensation should be awarded for that?

22. Has the discrimination caused the claimant personal injury and how much compensation should be awarded for that?

23. Is there a chance that the claimant's employment would have ended in any event? Should their compensation be reduced as a result?

24. Did the ACAS Code of Practice on Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures apply?

25. Did the respondent or the claimant unreasonably fail to comply with it by [specify breach]?

26. If so, is it just and equitable to increase or decrease any award payable to the claimant?

27. By what proportion, up to 25%?

28. Should interest be awarded? How much?

Adjustments

14. The claimant has PTSD and anxiety and depression. He can experience panic attacks. It was agreed that if he felt the onset of an attack he would raise his hand in the air so that the hearing could be paused. If he were able to, he would go to the waiting room, and if not he could remain in the court room and practice his breathing exercises to restore calm. He explained that he has increased his medication recently and is confident that he will not need any further adjustments.

15. The Tribunal explained the relevant provisions of the Equal Treatment Bench Book about supporting a litigant in person, albeit a legally qualified one, and seeking to reduce stress and anxiety in the court room. Everyone agreed to avoid legal jargon, to proceed slowly and to signpost what was happening at each stage. A timetable was agreed for the rest of the hearing.

Timetable

16. Day one took place in person at Liverpool. It was agreed that day two would begin at 11.30 by CVP, by way of an accommodation for the respondent's representative who needed to be physically elsewhere. Days three and four were also in person at Liverpool.

17. Overnight from day one to two the claimant sent a letter raising concerns

- a. that questioning the respondent witnesses remotely would be more difficult for him,

- b. would the witnesses have copies of the bundle ?
 - c. what happens to anonymisation and destruction of bundles held by witnesses off site ?
 - d. would Becky Lamb, the person who attended his home at allegation 6 (2) of the List and who has made a statement within the bundle be called ?
18. The concerns were discussed and it was agreed a) cross examination by video can be difficult and would be kept under review b) remote witnesses would have electronic and paper copies of the bundle to be used during the hearing c) the Anonymisation Order has been shared with the respondent and on completion of the hearing electronic and paper copies would be destroyed by the respondent within its own confidential waste processes d) Becky Lamb was not being called and the Tribunal would attach such weight as it saw fit to the account of events when she attended the claimant's home which appeared at page 543 of the bundle.
19. The claimant's worries were allayed; he explained that night-time is difficult for him and he can ruminate and that had caused him to write. He apologised for having raised the concerns. He expressed gratitude for the care being shown to him and said he was happy to continue. The Tribunal explained that he need not apologise and if there were any issues that any party felt affected them having a fair hearing then they must say so. They would be unlikely to be allowed to rely, later, on something that they had gone along with and not raised, as a ground for appeal. The claimant said that he fully understood and was happy that this could be a fair hearing.
20. Cross examination of the claimant began. The claimant experienced increased anxiety at being questioned. The Tribunal provided an aromatherapy pulse oil which the claimant used on the stand with his breathing techniques to help reduce his anxiety and support him to give best evidence. He coped well and said he was grateful for the support given.
21. Day three resumed in person at Liverpool with respondent witnesses being questioned, in person, by the claimant. By way of an agreed adjustment to reduce the claimant's anxiety the respondent witnesses sat in the witness stand further away from him.
22. Day four was closing submissions from 11am – 12.40 pm and deliberation time began. The Tribunal had anticipated moving to oral judgement by 3 pm but, with regret to have to ask them to wait, just after 1pm the clerk conveyed to the parties via email that this would be a Reserved Decision. The Tribunal needed more time to consider the "excessive communication" point.

Documents

23. There was an agreed bundle on liability to which were added two extra documents by consent on day one, and a third extra document relating to PiP payments for the claimant on day two. There was a smaller agreed bundle on remedy.

24. There was a section within the large bundle containing the documents for the Anonymity Application to which the claimant added a further document RM5; a letter from his GP dated 17 March 2026.
25. The respondent had prepared a cast list and chronology.

Oral evidence

26. The claimant gave his evidence in a helpful way. Recalling events was clearly distressing to him and debilitating. He showed courage in managing those symptoms to get through his evidence with his coping strategies. At times, when his responses became rapid and his tone was angrier, the Judge intervened to ask him to pause, take a breath, let her catch up her notes. This worked well so that panic attacks were avoided and he got through his evidence.
27. The Tribunal had no doubt at all about the severity of the claimant's symptoms of PTSD during the hearing and about the impact of that on him.
28. The claimant, when asked in cross-examination in relation to knowledge of disability about why he hadn't mentioned PTSD in his grievances that predated the events in this complaint, said that those grievance letters had been written in haste at a time when he was mentally unwell.
29. The claimant's evidence evolved under cross-examination on the hand delivery of the letter on 8 October 2025 point to include allegations that Becky Lamb had knocked at his door, had turned and laughed at him as she walked away. He added to his evidence in closing submission saying that Becky Lamb had walked around his drive and laughed at him for five seconds. The Tribunal rejects that evolved evidence as not reliable because it is inconsistent with his own evidence at the time and the account of Ms Lamb. The Tribunal prefers her contemporaneous email account given on 9 October 2025 and her photographic account. She did not give evidence and was not cross-examined on her account but still the Tribunal attaches more weight to her account because of its proximity to the event than to the evolved elements of the claimant's account in tribunal 7 months after the event.
30. The claimant's evidence also evolved in relation to the allegation that Mr Murphy shouted at him on the telephone on 28 April 2025. The claimant under cross-examination when taken to his own transcript of the call wanted to amend it. The Tribunal preferred the contemporaneous evidence of the emails and messages that passed between the claimant and Mr Murphy that same day as being more reliable corroboration of the content and tone of the call than evidence given later.
31. The claimant was also not reliable when he alleged in cross-examination, (after being challenged that the letter inviting him to a meeting was not harassment) that there was a subsequent telephone call *after* the letter pressuring him to attend the meeting. The Tribunal found this allegation to be new and wholly unsubstantiated.
32. On day two the Tribunal heard oral evidence from the claimant by CVP with

the Judge sitting in chambers and the claimant present in the Liverpool Tribunal room. The Judge felt it might appear imbalanced if she appeared in the court room with the claimant whilst the respondent's representative was remote. Any glitch in the respondent's link might leave the Judge exposed to suggestion that she had heard from one party in the absence of the other. Everyone agreed to that approach.

33. In closing submission the claimant said that if he had not been impacted by his PTSD during this litigation, which he described as "hell", then he would have:
- a. Called as a witness his NHS therapist with whom he has weekly 90 minute therapy sessions so that she could attest to his having been profoundly impacted by the attendance / delivery at his home on 8 October 2025. There was already evidence from his GP about that impact before the Tribunal.
 - b. Called as a witness his friend who is a criminologist with whom he has had to stay for several days a week to be away from his own home because he feels the home is violated since the home delivery incident.
 - c. Included documents that would have corroborated his position such as:
 - i. Proof that his house is up for sale to corroborate the strength of the feeling of violation since the home delivery. The Tribunal accepts his unchallenged evidence and submission that his home is up for sale because he feels violated living there.
 - ii. More medical evidence from his consultant or GP about the profound effect of all of the harassment on him. (Mr Choudhry submitted that the letter from the GP about impact in October 2025 used exactly the same language as a letter from 2023, so that Mr Chaudhry invited the Tribunal to conclude that there was no worsening of the claimant's symptomatology as a result of events in 2025)
 - iii. The records from his phone of calls made to him in April 2025 from an unidentified mobile number which he believes were made by Mr Lamb so that the Tribunal could see the dates, times, number of the calls and infer from them that the calls were made by Mr Lamb.
34. Guidance was given as to the possibility of an application for adjournment and reconvening later to allow the claimant to put those matters in evidence. The claimant understood the potential impact on the respondent and himself in delay and possibly costs. The claimant did not seek an adjournment so as to put those matters above in evidence because he said he did not want delay. The claimant said that he had felt fully supported throughout the hearing and was 110% satisfied that he had had a fair trial no matter what the outcome and was grateful for that.

35. The respondent's Mr Lamb gave his evidence in a straightforward and helpful way. He was keen to reassure the claimant that he had not called him from unidentified mobile numbers at any time.
36. Mr Murphy took care to be accurate about the exact flow of communication between himself and the claimant, and to point out that apart from his initial introductory call he had been responding to messages from the claimant and seeking to allay concerns.
37. Mr Jackson was clear about the instruction that he had given to Becky Lamb. He did not tell her to video the claimant or his home or car.
38. Ms Alberio gave evidence about HR processes generally, saying that it is not uncommon for letters to people who are off sick to be hand delivered to their homes.
39. Becky Lamb did not give evidence. Her next day account provided by email of what happened when she hand-delivered the letter to the claimant's home was not inconsistent with the photographs the Tribunal saw that she had taken.

The Facts

40. In January 2023 the claimant's father died in traumatic circumstances. In 2023 and 2024 his mother had health problems. He had a history of anxiety and depression and PTSD and from January 2023 experienced increased panic, anxiety, depression, paranoia and hypervigilance.
41. He is a single father of adult children. He undertook legal studies and gained undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications in law. He has undertaken 11 mini pupillages and wishes to pursue a career at the bar. He currently works in social care looking after vulnerable children sometimes on a one to one basis.
42. The claimant worked as a driver for the respondent from 28 May 2024. He applied for the role and did not disclose PTSD as part of the recruitment and selection process.
43. The claimant was provided with a written contract. The respondent operated an App through which its employees had the ability to access all of the respondent's policies and access to its employee assistance programme and employment relations and HR functions. The claimant used the App to look at his payslips.
44. The contract provided

11.1 if you are absent through sickness or injury you must notify Royal Mail as soon as possible that you are unable to work, and of the likely duration of your absence.
45. It referred to the Sick Pay Conditions Policy, which set out arrangements that would apply from time to time. The respondent also had an Attendance Policy and practice of referring employees with mental health absence to

Occupational Health on the first day of reported absence.

46. The Attendance Policy provided that during any period of absence
- regular contact between the manager and the employee who is absent is vital and they should seek to agree an appropriate time and date for reviewing together all but very short absences*
- the aim of maintaining contact during an absence is to encourage an early return to work wherever possible.*
47. The Absence Notification and Maintaining Contact Guide set out absence notification procedures. It included
- employees and managers should agree arrangements for maintaining contact during periods of absence. The purpose of the contact is to understand the issues, offer support and clarify the next steps. The discussions can be face-to-face or by telephone and will vary according to the length and nature of the absence.*
48. It provided that an employee who is unfit for work due to illness must notify the manager as soon as possible and advise the manager of the reason for absence. It went on to say
- where the employee's absence is going to be longer than a few days, the manager and employee should agree how they will maintain contact during the period of the absence, both the level of contact -how often, and the method e.g. email, telephone conversation. This is to ensure that managers are kept fully aware of the situation, can reallocate work and plan ahead where necessary.*
- Where the absence is longer term, it is recommended that contact should be made on at least a weekly basis and that the manager and employee agree a contact plan that should be main throughout the period of absence.*
- It is advisable that this plan is as detailed as possible, with agreed methods and times of contact et cetera, so that both parties are prepared for these discussions. For example, it may be decided that telephone contact will be made twice a week as well as after any key events e.g. medical appointments..*
- Contact should be made by telephone or in-person where practical to support ongoing discussions.*
49. The Guide reinforced that regular contact between the manager and the employee is beneficial to both parties. It made provision for regular contact letters being sent at various stages of absence. It said that the letters could be found in People Case Manager, its intranet, and that managers automatically receive a prompt to complete this activity in their workflow.
50. In the early weeks of his employment the claimant had a manager called Derek. He found Derek to be an experienced, friendly and approachable manager. He confided in Derek his distress at the loss of his father and his

mother's health issues. He did not tell Derek he had PTSD. He did not tell Derek he had anxiety and depression. He told Derek words to the effect that he got wound up sometimes and might need to take five minutes for breaks from time to time and Derek said that was fine so long as he wasn't late with deliveries or collections. Derek asked was the claimant OK to drive and the claimant said he was. He did not show Derek a letter from his GP dated 24 August 2023 citing acute post trauma stress and bereavement. He did not hand Derek the letter and Derek did not hand it back to him.

51. In July 2024 the claimant lodged a grievance (GR1) about conflict with a particular individual at work unrelated to the complaints in this claim. In that grievance he said that Derek had been extremely professional and helpful to him. He said

when I started working with Royal Mail there were many forms to complete. I cannot recall if clicking yes regarding that I have previously suffered any medical issues. I have suffered depression and anxiety and I still suffer. These issues were brought on due to the loss of my father. My condition does not affect me carrying out my job role, and I do not need any adjustments being made for me.

52. The July 24 grievance set out incidents with the colleague that had happened in weeks three and five of employment and during the week commencing 11 July 2024. HR acknowledged the grievance on 12 July 2024 and appointed an investigating manager. On 31 July 2024 the case was closed because the claimant had been able to resolve it with his manager, Derek, locally. Letters acknowledging resolution of that complaint were sent to the claimant by Mr Uddin from the employee relations team and directed the claimant to sources of health and well-being support.

53. In November 2024 the claimant lodged a second grievance (GR2), about badly organised work schedules, unrelated to this complaint. In the grievance the claimant referred to being a single father of two children and wanting to work. The letter made no reference to any health condition or symptomatology. He made no reference to anxiety or depression. His complaint was not upheld and he appealed against it. On 6 November 2024 he withdrew his appeal. The letter acknowledging that withdrawal again referred him to sources of well-being support through the employee assistance programme and directed him to resources on the respondent's Wellbeing Hub.

54. In December 2024 the claimant was carrying out his duties in an enclosed concrete corridor in Liverpool city centre when someone came into a corridor and shot a blank gun. That incident triggered his pre-existing PTSD. He had a panic attack at the scene.

55. On 22 January 2025 the claimant submitted a grievance (GR3), about seat belts and his practice of fastening the seatbelt when the driver seat was empty. The issues in the grievance were unrelated to the complaints in this claim. In that grievance he said

I am suffering depression right now, brought on due to the loss of my father.

I'm also single father caring for two boys.

He did not mention the December incident or PTSD.

Early March 2025 and sickness absence

56. Between 7 and 12 March 2025 the claimant was on annual leave. On 13 March he reported sick. He sent a WhatsApp message to his line manager Mr Lamb. He said

suffering at the moment with depression, it's all hard right now with my mum. I went to London yesterday for (personal medical treatment), no idea why. Got infection....., also no one can look after my mum this week or next I have to be with her as she (personal health issue) it is all so upsetting..... Good news is we have carer and other family members taking over..... It's all taking its toll on me I am on my own with two kids, so difficult. I can return 24th Monday I have requested sicknote from doctors.

One thing I can assure you of is that from 24th there will be no more time off.

I have to do be indoors until weekend till infection goes

I will contact Wellbeing at Royal Mail I have the details

57. Mr Lamb replied to say

I'm here if you need any support. I would recommend using Help at Hand at it's really good, I've used it myself.

First call from Mr Lamb

58. Mr Lamb rang the claimant on the first day of sickness absence 13 March 2025 and they agreed they would speak every Friday on the telephone to keep in touch and that Mr Lamb would refer him to occupational health. The claimant then sent a fit note by whataspp which said depression/anxiety was the reason for absence. It signed him off for 7 days. It did not make any comment on any need for reasonable adjustment. Mr Lamb replied by whatsapp saying *no problem Derek you and your mum's wellbeing are more important.*
59. Mr Lamb referred the claimant to occupational health because it was the respondent's policy to refer people on day one of absence for mental health absence. The claimant consented to the referral and he saw Ms Swan on 18 March 2025.
60. The written OH report dated 18 March 2025 referred to depression and anxiety and recounted what the claimant had said; he was under considerable personal stress, had seen his GP, was on medication, undergoing counselling, experiencing heightened anxiety, panic attacks and low mood. He was not driving at that time and his sleeping and eating were disturbed but he was keen to return to his role.

61. The OH practitioner said she was hopeful that he would return to work within the next four weeks. The only recommendation made was to maintain regular contact. The report said the Equality Act 2010 was not likely to apply. On return to work it recommended supportive check-ins and a driver risk assessment.
62. On 28 March Mr Lamb messaged the claimant asking was he OK for a call at around 2.30pm that day.

Second call from Mr Lamb

63. On 28 March Mr Lamb telephoned the claimant to discuss the report. The claimant explained he was trying new medication. They agreed to speak again in a fortnight.
64. On 3 April 2025 Mr Lamb messaged the claimant to say *Hi Derek how are you doing did you get an updated sick note ?* The claimant replied *just not well right now mate so will update you next week. Have 90 min counselling session tomorrow and GP tomorrow due to bad side effects from the meds.* Mr Lamb replied *sorry to hear this mate it doesn't sound great....hopefully you get something out of tomorrow, fingers crossed for you. if you could email me over the sick note when you get a moment that would be great.* The claimant sent a thumbs up emoji acknowledgment.
65. On 4 April the claimant whatsapp messaged Mr Lamb to ask for access to the Help at Hand App.
66. On 7 April 2025 when the claimant sent his sick note Mr Lamb was on annual leave.
67. On Monday 14 April 2025 Mr Lamb rang the claimant. The claimant did not pick up but he sent a message *dealing with doctors right now Joey. Give me notice of a call and we can schedule a catch up ? Also can I have your email again so I can email you medical evidence and sick note. Thanks* Mr Lamb replied *Hi Derek is tomorrow Ok around 14.00 ?* The claimant replied *no Friday is better, if we can just stick to a Friday. I will email you updates. Email is my preferred method of updating you as this was its easier for keeping a log and easier for me to attach medical evidence.* Mr Lamb replied *yes that's fine. If we could still have a call this Thursday as it is Good Friday that would be great thanks.* The claimant replied at 18.19 saying *Not available Thursday. I have sent an email requesting Fridays and email contact thanks.* This time the claimant signed off with his full name. The tone was different, more distant and formal.
68. Mr Lamb then saw an email from the claimant at 17.18 which said
- Dear Joey*
- I have had a few calls from you without notice. I would much prefer us agreeing when calls will happen etc..*
- I would also prefer and request email contact, as a way of updating you.*

69. The claimant went on to say he was experiencing side effects of medication. He said he would prefer catching up on a Friday every other week. The claimant said

I am still very much unwell and I am currently avoiding driving a vehicle. I do not feel fit to drive at this moment, as the medication needs to settle in, and I also need to get well mentally..... You have requested to call me tomorrow, this is not convenient for me. It is making me feel slightly harassed due to amount of calls without notice et cetera as stated can we stick to a full email update on Fridays please. I just need to concentrate on getting well right now..

70. On 14 April 2025 the claimant attached the fit note that he had obtained on 7 April scanning 1 April to 30 April. It said generalised anxiety disorder and PTSD. He attached a letter from his GP dated 14 April 2025 . It said

As requested I can confirm that the above patient is under the care of Chapelford Medical Centre for symptoms consistent with acute post trauma stress and bereavement. His father sadly passed away in traumatic circumstances in January 2023 and the circumstances of his unexpected death have caused significant distress. This is presented as low mood, impaired concentration, intrusive memories, disassociative reactions, flashbacks and intrusive intense distress after triggers or reminders of his late father. Mr { A } has reported his depression is something he struggles with finding it hard as a single father of two. These symptoms have impacted on his ability to function socially and affecting work and studies. He is accessing specialist support.

71. On 15 April 2025 the claimant emailed Mr Lamb at 1555. He said

I will be communicating via email every other Friday. I am happy to answer any questions that you may have prior to the Friday and email a reply on that scheduled Friday. Email is much better for me right now due to the side effects I am dealing with from my medication et cetera..... You can email me questions and I shall reply by 25 April 2025.

I am dealing with GP and counsellor so often right now so calling me without notice is not appropriate or reasonable conduct I feel. I am off due to depression and anxiety. I am struggling right now. You have a letter and sick note. Email contact with updates makes total sense and it suits me and my current condition

if you can email me the questions may be on the Wednesday and I shall have all completed and ready for Friday. Thanks Joey,

72. Mr Lamb replied by email at 1643. He thanked the claimant for having sent the fit note running to 30 April 2025. He said

I appreciate this may be a difficult time for yourself and that you have stated you feel slightly harassed due to the amount of calls without notice. To confirm, since you went absent on 13 March 2025 I have called you four times; 13 March 2025 the first day of your absence to confirm the reason why you'd reported sick.. 14 March 2025 I called you to discuss your

consent to an occupational health referral. 28 March 2025 this was a prearranged call with yourself. 14 April 2025 following my annual leave last week I attempted to contact you yesterday to discuss your ongoing absence and any additional support you may require. However, you texted me to inform it was not convenient to talk as you are dealing with your GP.

I understand you feel that email contact at this time would be preferable as you can attach evidence of the emails and list your concerns and improvements. Whilst I am willing for us to utilise email as part of your absence management, email contact alone would not be sufficient..

As per your occupational health report dated 18 March 2025 it is recommended management maintain contactin line with absence policy. This would mean some form of telephone contact on a regular basis with yourself. I can agree fortnightly contact with yourself. You have stated Fridays preferable can you please confirm what time on Friday you would prefer. If I do not hear from you then I will confirm a time instead.. In addition to this I can send my questions through to you via email prior to our fortnightly calls so that you are aware of what questions will be asked and will have time to prepare.. Please confirm if you would like me to send questions through emails prior to our calls.

73. Mr Lamb did not contact him by message or telephone after that date. He kept all his communications to written email.

74. On 23 April 2025 Mr Lamb wrote to the claimant. The letter invited the claimant to a meeting on 29 April 2025 at 3pm at Liverpool South depot. The letter suggested that the meeting could be held remotely on Microsoft Teams and asked the claimant to let him know which method was preferred. The purpose of the meeting was stated to be

as well as keeping in touch regarding your current health needs there may be changes within Royal Mail such as the USO reform which will affect the way we work, so these catch-up sessions enable you to be included in that conversation as part of our team..

The letter went on

I understand you feel email contact at this time would be preferable.... Whilst I am able to utilise email as part of your absence management email contact alone would not be sufficient. I can send some questions through to you via email prior to our fortnightly calls.

The letter set out 10 bullet points extracted from the respondent's absence procedures that Mr Lamb said the claimant must comply with whilst on sickness absence. They included

- maintain regular contact with the office. We need to be able to discuss your absence directly with you and I propose a fortnightly telephone call on Fridays at 1600 to maintain contact with you and discuss your absence.

75. The letter informed the claimant about support available through the

respondent's employee assistance programme and the Help at Hand App in the well-being support section.

Grievance 4

76. The claimant replied on 24 April 2025 at 12.29 lodging a grievance, GR4, he said

I will not be attending the depot 29 April 2025 or attending a teams meeting

I am off sick right now and not at all well. You have been provided with a letter from my GP and also a sick note

email only contact suits me right now. There is no legal requirement for me to take calls whilst off work. I am suffering side effects with my medication and I'm very busy with my counselling sessions. In light of what I feel has now reached the scale of harassment I wish to log a grievance with Royal mail please.

My grievance in full

- 1. there have been many calls without notice*
- 2. an unreasonable amount of calls*
- 3. letters refusing to stick to emails and applying duress to me to attend the depot and teams meetings*
- 4. you've caused stress and anxiety as a result of the harassment*
- 5. you are clearly refusing to make reasonable adjustments to suit my disability*

I will await Royal Mail full response to my grievance before I move on to ACAS ready for a tribunal to consider my claim for harassment

77. The claimant went on to say that he thought email was providing regular contact and keeping the respondent updated, he said *I am contactable by email for the fortnightly meetings and anything can be email direct to me. He said I will look forward to your full and final response to my grievance before I then consider moving onto the ACAS stages. I will prepare for the next stages in the meantime. I also make you aware that I have counselling sessions for 25 April 2025 and I'm also trying out new medication which is having a negative impact on me with its side effects but I am available for email contact.* The claimant copied the letter to HR.

Grievance 5

78. The claimant wrote on 25 April 2025 repeating his grievance (GR5) and asked that his grievances (GR4 and GR5) be acknowledged in writing
79. On 25 April 2025 Mr Lamb replied by email acknowledging the grievances under the Raising Concerns process and gave him a reference number for the case. He told the claimant a member of the people Case Support Team

(PCST) would be in touch. He said *I have no control over how they contact you said this may be a phone call or letter rather than email. You can inform them of your contact preferences once they make initial contact.* He said

I want to reassure you we are concerned about your well-being. It is important that our contact continues throughout your absence to enable us to support you at this time and assist your return to work. Further to your email on 24 April 2025 I understand that due to your condition you currently find telephone calls difficult. Therefore I am confirming that we can accommodate an alternative contact strategy.

The alternative contact strategy

80. Mr Lamb agreed to fortnightly email contact which would run until 21 May 2025. He said that at the end of that they would need to be a face-to-face or Teams meeting to review absence including the contact strategy moving forward. Mr Lamb said

Please be aware it was never my intention to make you feel harassed. My telephone contact is only ever been to check on your well-being and in line with our attendance management processes. Nevertheless I am willing to make an adjustment and switch to emails only as outlined above on a temporary basis.

81. Mr Lamb again referred the claimant to the employee assistance programme and their Help at Hand App.

28 April 2025

82. On 28 April 2025 the claimant sent three emails; at 12.44, 13.24 and 13.52 to Mr Lamb and HR asking for an update on his grievances from 24 (GR4) and 25 (GR5) April and attached a further grievance (GR6). It requested a full response to the previous grievances and referred to

Grievance 6

“constant calls out of the blue which are harassing”.

83. The email produced in the bundle has the claimant referring to a call from Mr Simon Murphy, which had not yet taken place.¹
84. Mr Lamb emailed the claimant in response to say that Simon Murphy would be dealing with his grievance.
85. Royal Mail's grievance system is such that once the claimant uploads a

¹ The emails presented in the bundle do not have the correct times on them for the sequence of events on 28 April 2025. This is apparent from their content. The factual findings are constructed from oral evidence and from a common sense approach, for example, an email referring to a telephone call which predates the call cannot possibly have the correct time on it. The Tribunal accepts the call log produced by Mr Murphy to be the most reliable anchor for events of 28 April 2025 and concludes from it the timing of the disputed call at 14.10. The Tribunal finds nothing sinister in the email timings. There is nothing to suggest anyone is trying to mislabel or mislead. It looks as though emails have been forwarded and replied to and perhaps printed and collated from chains so that the timings have gone awry in the printed copies.

grievance, it automatically appears in an email inbox for a member of the employment relations team. Simon Murphy received the email. He read the grievance. He did not see any fit notes. He rang the claimant at 14.10 to acknowledge the grievance and discuss next steps.

Call from Mr Murphy at 14.10 on 28 April 2025

86. The call did not go well. It lasted under a minute. The claimant had not seen Mr Lamb's email introducing Mr Murphy. Mr Murphy's job role is to deal with grievances. He makes calls like this introductory call most days. He uses a format of giving his name, saying which team he is from and that he has rung to acknowledge the grievance, get some more information and discuss next steps. He also has a welfare remit to support the complainant and provide direction to other resources. That was his purpose in making this call. The claimant did not grasp Mr Murphy's name or where he was from. The claimant was asking who Mr Murphy was and where he was from. The claimant became anxious, panicked, he felt overwhelmed and intimidated, he did not appreciate an unsolicited call and hung up.

87. The claimant texted Mr Murphy on the mobile number that had called him;

I would suggest in future reading in detail the employee's issues and needs. I would then write to them introducing myself. Calling out the blue within an hour of letter being sent is bad practice as it gives the employee the impression that you've not had time to first read the issues and take note. which you clearly didn't otherwise I wouldn't be getting further calls without notice I have now emailed. Email moving forward..

88. Mr Murphy replied by text saying

Hi Derek the call was a courtesy call which is a standard we use to introduce ourselves as the person will be dealing with your case and also to find a suitable time and date to hold the meeting. You stated you don't care about Royal Mail Policy but we will need to deal with your case under RM policy. I will be in touch by email and I am also requiring a conversation with you. Normally only require one phone call with the claimant and then I would make my enquiries into your concern. Email can prolong the case.

89. Mr Murphy also replied by email (The Tribunal has inserted the alphabeticised labelling for ease of reference below)

I have just read your text message.

[A] I have noted your concern as it was added to the system that's why I reached out to you.

[B] We also make courtesy calls to introduce ourselves as standard practice.

[C] You suggested I haven't read your concern but I have !

[D] Royal Mail policy states that once a concern is raised it must be acknowledged within five days since your concern was raised on 24th of April at 1315 we are operating within the timelines

90. (At 13 .24 elsewhere timed at 14.25) the claimant wrote to Mr Lamb saying *I have again received calls out of the blue. I am requesting a full written response from Royal Mail and not constant calls out of the blue which are harassing.* He said he would be adding the call to his grievance. He said *Simon does not need to go calling me as he appears to be out driving etc...*
- I will not be harassed no more by Royal Mail it is causing so much stress and upset. I ask you to please stick to email or letters thank you.*
91. Mr Murphy sent an email (timed perhaps erroneously) at 15.10 PM regarding grievance process and communication requirements. He said he would be handling the claimant's grievance which typically necessitates a single phone call or Teams meeting to address concerns. This he explained that a critical step is contacting the individual to arrange a convenient time and date for an investigatory meeting. He said that if the claimant preferred to forego a meeting or phone conversation that he would require a detailed written account of the grievance. Mr Murphy set out questions for the claimant to answer so that he could obtain the detail needed to investigate the grievance as follows
1. dates times of any incidents
 2. individuals involved and when date and times
 3. why you are raising a concern now
 4. what do you want out of this grievance
 5. any evidence pertaining to your concern
 6. copies of any correspondence between yourself and the implicated parties
 7. the policy if any that you say Royal mail is broken
 8. what is your understanding of the Royal mail policy
92. Mr Murphy said *according to the terms and conditions you acknowledge upon signing your Royal Mail contract regular communication via phone or in-person meetings is required during any period of sickness absence. Failure to maintain such communication may result in the suspension of pay. Can you confirm whether this situation has recently occurred ?*
93. The claimant wrote to Mr Lamb
- He said
- I am asking you for the 50th time please can we stick to letters and emails ... You have already and continue to do so because the harm and this is now something that also needs to be addressed. I am now considering moving onto the next stages available to me. I also request that you take the time to read my letter and previous grievances before contacting me.*

This demonstrates respect towards me and makes me feel you've read the concerns in detail. Calling me up whilst you are driving or when out eight minutes after I send a letter is not the way to go, unless your aim is to cause further stress and harassment.

94. The claimant was undoubtedly deeply distressed by responses to his communications. He contacted ACAS and began early conciliation on 28 April 2025. He replied to Mr Murphy's letter by inserting red text under his comments (The Tribunal has followed the alphabeticised labelling introduced above). The claimant said

A: you clearly didn't know my concerns otherwise why are you calling without notice harassing me and with attitude and tone in your voice.

B: I will not be taking calls at this time I well and have requested multiple times email or letter contact. You had tone and almost aggression in your voice and speaking to me when highlighting to me that you will be calling as it is practice.

C: just in case you are unaware an exclamation mark! is a grammatical sign used to express strong feelings such as anger. I take your emails as aggressive and almost intimidating. You called me eight minutes after I sent a letter. You clearly did not read the letter in detail.

D: I have now gained an ACAS reference number and they will be in touch once processing my now claim and I request again no calls please I can request such and you have a duty to provide such adjustment under the Equality Act 2010. This is something that you Royal Mail have already breached countless times

Simon you come across as a loose cannon to me and I suggest you rein in that attitude with me please. You have caused enough fear and intimidation with your aggressive calls already. You have now continued your attitude via email. I am very experienced enough to spot attitude when I see and hear it. I am unwell right now and simply want to be left alone right now other than email or letter. My disability cannot deal with stress right now and cause are an issue right now due to the disability and medication et cetera. I can think more when reading and replying to an email. I will add this to my ongoing claim

95. Mr Murphy replied

your concern has been on the system since 24 April 2025 and I have read what you have put

Any further information required I hope you can provide within the questions I've asked in a previous email.

I am sorry if you believed I was being aggressive, I wasn't. You raised your voice towards me as soon as you acknowledged who I was and our call lasted no more than one minute. Within that minute you asked me to repeat myself three times about who I was and then said you don't care about Royal Mail policies, only yourself.... You then hung up on me

Can we please reset the relationship and I refer you back to my previous email. If you can answer the questions I've asked that would be very much appreciated and enable me to deal with your case in a speedy fashion which hopefully will help with your stress levels.

I also have additional questions

- 1. what is your disability*
- 2. how long have you had this disability when were you diagnosed*
- 3. could you let me know what adjustments you need*
- 4. did you have a risk assessment for your disability has one ever been recommended by medical professional*

96. The claimant replied, again inserting red text under Mr Murphy's text, below the apology comment in particular he said;

I will not be dealing with you personally Simon. You have caused further upset accusing me of raising my voice when I did not. You were aggressive and that is how you made me feel and your emails demonstrate your attitude. You came on the phone and said I am Simon. I said Simon who? And you stated a department and not at one point did you say Royal Mail. It took me to ask three or four times. I ended the call as I was dizzy and upset due to your aggressive tone and attitudes towards me which you are continuing via email..

97. At 15:37 (possibly correct time) the claimant wrote to Mr Lamb to say;

Your member of staff is now too much. I am now considering harassment under criminal sense if he continues. I've now had five or six emails today alone, 2 text messages and calls, all today during a time I am very unwell.

Accusing me of shouting. I have a witness to prove other. I also will not be called a liar. Simon is aggressive and intimidating and I will not be dealing with him due to his behaviour today. No one should have five or six emails in one day texts and calls. It is sickening this now. I want to be left alone I am not well. I have attached a response in red to his previous email..... I am not well and asked to be left alone for two weeks please and only to be contacted via email or letter. You had a GP letter and sick notes and also been told by myself how I am suffering many times over the past 3 to 4 months and you ignored my concerns and requests.

98. Simon Murphy had no further contact with the claimant. Jashim Uddin was appointed to investigate the grievances.

99. The claimant wrote a letter dated 27 April 2025 in the bundle but which contained content referring to events on 28 April 2025. Whilst the date of the letter in the bundle may be unreliable, the content was most probably sent later on 28 April 2025. The letter was headed "grievance" (GR6). The claimant said *I write this letter as a last attempt for you to acknowledge my formal grievance is so far you have ignored and refused to acknowledge*

such. I have sent my formal grievance via email 24 April and 25 April 2025. Both emails have been ignored, despite me copying in my line manager Joseph Lamb, the Well-being team, customer service team, and ERCM team.

100. The letter said

I have been suffering depression, anxiety and PTSD symptoms. This has mostly been brought on from the loss of my father and issues recently with my mother. I am under medication and weekly counselling sessions by the NHS. It was noticed I was unwell and struggling in work for some time but no real help was offered, such as time off work et cetera. I was forced to go off sick and presented my line manager with sicknote and full explanation for why I was off sick.

101. The letter included 11 exhibits showing communications between the claimant and respondent. The latest of the exhibits referred to communications with Simon Murphy and Joseph Lamb on 28 April 2025, suggesting that preparation of the letter (protestations at lack of acknowledgment of grievance) may have begun on 27 April 2025 but that the letter which contained complaints about events on 28 April 2025 may have continued to evolve so that it was sent on 28 April 2025.

102. The claimant alleged harassment in the (dated 27) 28 April 2025 letter. He said there had been

- an unreasonable number of calls
- most calls without notice
- a letter requesting he attend the depot for a meeting about work
- a letter dated 23 April 2025 saying that email contact would not be sufficient (and that this was a rejection of a request for a reasonable adjustment)
- a telephone call from Simon Murphy eight minutes after sending the grievance
- that Simon Murphy had not properly introduced himself for the purpose of the call
- Simon Murphy sent an email with exclamation marks causing the claimant to feel harassed and intimidated
- the claimant received five or six emails, two text messages and calls all in one day 28 April 2025
- the claimant was falsely accused by Simon of shouting during a telephone call
- Simon and the respondent have ignored the claimant's request for email and letter contact only

- continuing pressure was put on the claimant to accept telephone calls even though he'd explained that he couldn't do because of his health and that he would prefer email only.

103. The claimant said he had experienced over four months of harassment via telephone calls. He said

I can pursue remedies through an employment tribunal. The tribunal can order Royal Mail to take specific actions to address the harassment or award compensation.

104. On 12 May 2025 at 15:55 Mr Lamb wrote to the claimant. He said that he was *reaching out* was purely out of care and support and not to cause any distress. He said that as part of the duty to remain in touch during absence he wanted to check in with how the claimant was doing and see if there was anything he could do to support him at the time. He said *please note that this communication aligns with our company policy. Our aim is to ensure you feel heard and supported whilst respecting your current circumstances.*

105. The letter also acknowledged the claimant had at that point been employed for almost a year and that this was a source of celebration.

106. Mr Lamb asked for consent for an occupational health referral. He pointed out that the claimant had outstanding annual leave entitlement that he might wish to use so as to remain on full pay as opposed to being on nil pay whilst off sick. The letter said that the alternative contact strategy would extend for another fortnight from 12 May 2025 to 26 May 2025.

107. The claimant replied on 12 May 2025 at 4:06 PM to say that he could not take calls, attend meetings or zoom meetings right now or for the coming month he said

I am really unwell and struggling. The email method allows me to write back as and when it suits me. I am suffering severe attacks right now and having issues with side-effects from medication.

The claimant said that he would reply to any questions that were sent to him.

108. On 16 May 2025 Mr Lamb wrote to the claimant to ask for consent to an OH referral. He said

our next scheduled contact is on 27 May 2025 but due to the urgency of this matter we are reaching out ahead of time. Please confirm by 20 May 2025 whether you provide consent for the referral simply reply yes or no would be appreciated. If we do not receive a response you may have to consider this as non-cooperation. We value your well-being and want to ensure that you have received the necessary supports. Please let us know your decision at your earliest convenience.

109. On 22 May 2025 the claimant replied to give consent for referral. He explained that he was getting medical assistance by the NHS, getting one-to-one counselling once per week and taking medication, struggling with

side-effects including dizziness and increased anxiety. The claimant again said

this is again why right now I will not be taking calls but I can answer anything via email as I can go on to email when it suits me. I can answer any questions you may have via email on 27 May 2025.. Just leave it with me for 24 to 48 hours and I will get to responding every moment I can..

110. On 27 May 2025 Mr Lamb wrote to tell the claimant that he had referred to occupational health. He said

I understand from your last email that you are still suffering from your anxiety, I am sorry to hear this. Has there been any improvement since? How you getting on with the medication, I know you were suffering from side-effects has this eased? If there is anything I can do to support you in any way please let me know.

111. The claimant did not attend the OH referral appointment on 30 June 2025. The claimant had sent an updated fit note to the respondent covering absence to the end of July 2025 for PTSD and anxiety. Mr Lamb wrote to him to say that the OH appointment had been missed and to ask for a reason for non-attendance. Mr Lamb said that the 18 March 2020 OH report had recommended maintaining regular contact in accordance with RM Absence Policy and Mr Lamb proposed a telephone conversation to better understand barriers preventing with engagement with OH services. Mr Lamb asked the claimant to respond with a suitable date and time for a phone call. Claimant replied on 1 July 2025 to say he would not take telephone calls at this time from work. He said

Right now I am suffering badly. I am having urgent assessments next week due to my ongoing anxiety attacks and PTSD issues. I am currently receiving weekly one-to-one counselling by the NHS. Having talks about work via phone and unscheduled calls spikes anxiety. I need to concentrating on my health right now. This is why I prefer email, as I can go to email when it suits me as I have no idea when anxiety attacks occur, as they can without warning. This is a reasonable adjustment request that I make.

The claimant said he had not had a call from OH on 30 June 2025 but that he had called them and arranged to have a meeting via telephone during the first week of August 2025. The claimant repeated that he had provided fit notes and a GP letter so the respondent had a good understanding of his illness. He said there were barriers for him with engaging with OH and that is why he has arranged a call for the first week of August with them directly.

112. Mr Uddin was getting on with his grievance investigation. He interviewed Mr Lamb on 4 July 2025. He asked the claimant to be interviewed but the claimant declined to meet. Mr Uddin issued his decision on the grievance entitled Raising Concerns Decision Report on 15 July 2025.
113. Mr Uddin, collated the allegations from grievances 4,5 and 6 and presented them as three concerns

1. Derek alleges that Joseph made numerous phone calls without notice when he reported sick on 13 March 2025
 2. Derek alleges that he was sent letters by management refusing to make a reasonable adjustment by not agreeing to engage with him by email and applied duress on him by asking him to attend sickness absence meeting in person or via Microsoft Teams
 3. Derek alleges that management harassed him which is causing stress and anxiety
114. None of those concerns were upheld. In his Raising Concerns Decision Report Mr Uddin recited the communication trails between Mr Lamb, Mr Murphy and the claimant on the relevant dates. Mr Uddin concluded that there was no evidence to support the claimant's claim that Joseph Lamb and Simon Murphy had harassed him. Mr Uddin said *on the contrary the available evidence indicates that both managers followed Royal Mail's procedures and, within reasonable belief, honoured Derek's requests*. The Decision Report concluded

Derek is required to adhere to the Royal Mail Attendance Procedure

Derek is expected to attend his scheduled Occupational Health consultation.

115. The claimant was notified of his right to appeal the grievance outcome
116. The claimant did not appeal. He remained off sick. He did not attend a further OH appointment.
117. The respondents Managing Absence and Disability Guide said

where managers believe that an employee's absence may be as a result of a disability they should discuss this with the employee. When managing an employee with a disability the manager should focus on the impact of the condition on the employee's ability to perform their job, rather than ask for details of their condition as such details are confidential.

The Guide continued

we are required to make reasonable adjustments to the workplace to make sure a disabled employee is not disadvantaged when compared to a non-disabled employee. Therefore, it is important that managers identify and discuss an employee's disability appropriately.

The Guide went on to give guidance on managing and discussing disability.

Non-cooperation

118. On 12 September 2025 the respondent decided to classify the claimant's absence as a non cooperation case and to invited him to a formal meeting at Warrington on 15 October 2025.

119. On 8 October 2025 Mark Jackson, Head of Collections and Distribution, tasked with managing the claimant's absence, asked a senior service manager Becky Lamb to hand deliver a letter to the claimant inviting him to attend a formal meeting to discuss his absence. Mr Jackson did not send this through the normal course of post because he wanted to avoid delay and he wanted proof of delivery without requiring the claimant to attend at a collection centre if there was no contact at the home address. He does this in sickness absence cases to seek to avoid any discomfort or embarrassment for an absent colleague having to attend a workplace depot.
120. Becky Lamb was a passenger in a van that attended at the claimant's home at 18.42. She was wearing a Royal Mail jacket and Royal Mail identity badge on a lanyard. The driver pulled the van across the bottom of the claimant's open driveway. Ms Lamb took a photograph of the driveway and letter and address plaque. The photograph also captured the license plate of the claimant's vehicle. She got out of the passenger seat carrying the letter to be delivered. She took still photographs using a mobile phone device of a plaque on the wall of the claimant's home giving his property number and street address. She approached his front door and took a photograph of a note on his door and of the letterbox, with the letter closely proximate to it.
121. She posted the letter through the letterbox. She turned to walk back to the van and heard the claimant call out *thank you for this*. She turned to say *sorry but I've been asked to deliver it to you*. The claimant replied *okay no problem*. She got back in the van and was driven away.

Grievance 7

122. The claimant replied to the invitation letter making allegations of harassment and went on to say he would not be attending a meeting as he was not well enough to do so and would not attend a meeting before January 2026 but would continue to provide medical evidence and update by email. He said he would not take calls as it would cause stress. He said he was struggling with medication and on an NHS waiting list for trauma focused cognitive behaviour therapy. He said he was due medication review at the end of October and it would make sense to go to OH after that date. He protested about a referral having been made to OH without his consent and said he would contact OH in November to arrange an appointment himself. The claimant said

you have had staff turn up at my home at 7pm on 8 October 2025 knocking on my door handing me further letters. This was not regular post, the letter had no stamp and was hand-delivered by a female recording me on her phone. This is late in the evening and harassing at the highest form. This will not be tolerated. If you knock on my door late again I will be calling the police and making a statement of harassment. I am a single father caring for two. ... It was all caught on doorbell footage. Your staff also blocked a drive outside causing a scene in front of other neighbours as a car asked the van to please move.

123. The claimant's letter was forwarded to Ms Witulska at People Case Advisor. She told Mr Jackson she would take legal advice and said *I will advise on*

next steps as soon as solicitors will get back to me. I suspect the dismissal letter will be the next one as there is no use in rescheduling the invite. She advised Mr Jackson to attach the document to the non-cooperation case and said that it was all evidence that could be used against the claimant at Tribunal.

124. On 17 October 2025 Mr Jackson wrote to the claimant acknowledging the concerns he had raised and saying that it had never been the intention to cause distress or discomfort and that communications had been made in good faith. He said that in light of the claimant's prolonged absence and the lack of medical clarity regarding fitness to return to work the respondent was now reviewing the claimant's employment position. He asked the claimant to respond to 6 questions. He said

- 1. You previously stated you do not require any reasonable adjustments other than being contacted via email only. Can you confirm whether this is still the case whether this has been recommended by a medical practitioner. If so please provide us with a copy of any medical evidence.*
- 2. Do you believe you'll be able to return to work in some capacity in the foreseeable future if so what support or changes would help facilitate this ?*
- 3. Can you provide any medical evidence of professional opinion indicating a likely return to work date or treatment progress ?*
- 4. Are you open to discussing alternative roles, phased return options, or redeployment if available and if suitable for any needs you may have ?*
- 5. Do you understand that your refusal to engage with OH and attend absence meetings limits our ability to assess your fitness to work and explore support options ?*
- 6. Do you understand that while we have made efforts to support your absence we are currently in a position where we do not know if your absence will continue indefinitely ? This poses a concern over the business understanding on when or if you will ever be able to return to work in some capacity.*

125. The claimant replied 1) that he continued to require the reasonable adjustment of email only; that his PTSD is impacted by telephone calls and teams meetings. He said *I will not be tolerating your unprofessional behaviour and harassment no more. Mark, I suggest you read all previous emails and view medical letters and evidence that I have submitted. My side-effects from medication and my spiked anxiety causes me to panic when speaking by phone to the likes of you and other managers, especially when you keep contacting me via unscheduled harassing calls.* 2) *I will be able to return to work however with the current level of harassment you are and have negatively impacted that. I'm aiming to return early 2026. I need to stay on track with my one-to-one NHS counselling sessions and regular review of medication.* 3) *again I highlight and suggest you read more such*

as what I have submitted to yourselves sick notes and GP letters 4) I am open for all other roles but not able to attend work right now as I am off sick I will be happy to discuss any roles in the New Year. 5) please do not gaslight me or accuse me of not engaging with OH.... I will be calling them first week of December 6) I am and have been updating yourselves regularly you have made issues far worse due to your constant harassment which knocks me sick. ... How dare you attend my home uninvited videoing me..

126. As part of an investigation into the claimant's allegation about 8 October 2025 Becky Lamb provided a written statement on Thursday, 9 October 2025 detailing her attendance at his property. She confirmed that she did not knock on the claimant's door. She said she did not make video recordings she attached the three images that she had taken, the first from the van as it was pulling up to show the correct address and the next two images taken at the doorstep showing the plaque, the letterbox and letter. She confirmed that nobody had approached the vehicle asking the van driver to move. She said that as the claimant had said he had a ring doorbell on his property that footage would clearly show what had happened.
127. The claimant never produced the ring doorbell footage. Ms Hollie Albero employment relations case manager was appointed and interviewed the claimant on 17 October 2025 and Mark Jackson on 7 November 2025 about the complaint. She produced her Raising Concerns Decision Report on 18 November 2025. The concern was not upheld. The complaint covered unscheduled calls and the hand delivery to his home address on 8 October 2025.
128. During the investigatory interview the claimant told Ms Albero that he had PTSD following an historic incident. He gave detail of the incident which the Tribunal omits here to avoid jigsaw identification. He said that a woman had attended at his property at 7:20pm and started recording him on her phone while stood at his front door, questioning who he was and handing him a letter. He said that she had been banging on his front door late at night.
129. Mark Jackson had said that he had not instructed Becky Lamb to take photographs, only to hand deliver the letter but that she had taken the photographs of her own initiative as proof of delivery. He referred to Becky Lamb's written contemporaneous account of the delivery.
130. Ms Albero was aware of the claimant's previous grievances about harassment and unscheduled and frequent calls and its refusal to allow contact other than by email. She did not reinvestigate those matters. She noted the claimant's referrals to occupational health on 22 May 2025, 30 June 2025 and 24 September 2025, none of which he had attended.
131. She concluded that hand delivering a letter at around 7pm was not unreasonable and that photographing mail items at doorstep is now common practice within Royal Mail as a method of providing proof of delivery.
132. On 21 November 2025 the claimant's GP provided a letter detailing his

severe post-traumatic stress disorder condition. The letter recounted the highly distressing incident in which his employer attended his home unannounced and uninvited late at night, filming him in the doorway without consent. The GP advised that the event had had a profound and detrimental effect on the claimant's mental health. The letter said

for individuals with PTSD a sense of safety and predictability is essential to maintaining stability. The patient's home environment serves as a critical place of safety, helping to manage symptoms such as hypervigilance, anxiety, and intrusive memories. The unexpected breach of this safe space has resulted in a significant flareup of his PTSD symptoms including

heightened anxiety and hypervigilance

disturbed sleep and nightmares

panic attacks and feelings of fear and loss of security within his own home

133. The GP asked that any further contact be arranged in a planned respectful and trauma informed manner to avoid further psychological harm and to aid recovery.
134. There were further communications between the parties about absence management and attendance at OH. The claimant agreed to attend an OH appointment scheduled for 21 January 2026. On 22 December 2025 the claimant sent a letter to Mark Jackson saying that this was *now beyond harassment and bullying* because the respondent was emailing the claimant with the threat of losing his role at Royal Mail in the week before Christmas when it knew he was a single parent. He asked to be left alone until 6 January 2026. The claimant provided an update on his current condition and attached the GP letter. He reiterated the request for email contact and said that his medication was causing him to be drowsy, at times to slur his words and that this caused him both embarrassment and the inability to think straight. He said he had explained medication side effects and why email worked best. He said

I also need to now consider my position as the harm caused is very much impacting my health. I have not been staying at home due to being paranoid that Royal Mail are outside stalking me constantly, it is wrong. I can't respond anymore currently to lengthy emails that keep arriving in place me under duress to respond during a very testing and difficult time.

135. Mr Jackson replied to say that he checked with OH and they had no record of an appointment for the claimant in January 2026. Mr Jackson said that whilst he had seen the GP letter and it confirmed diagnosis it did not provide any clarity on likely timescales for recovery, for reasonable adjustments or return to work. He said the claimant had been absent a significant period and that ongoing uncertainty about return impacts operational planning. He recited that the claimant had been absent since 13 March 2025 and said that the business was now considering termination of employment on the grounds of some other substantial reason. This was sent to the claimant on 22 December 2025.

136. The claimant then produced a letter from OH acknowledging that an appointment had been made for 21 January 2026 at 1pm.
137. The respondent referred to a letter dated 13 December 2025 from the claimant indicating an intention to resign. The tribunal did not see that letter. The respondent sent a letter to the claimant dated 2 January 2026 thanking him for his email of 31 December 2025 in which it said he had confirmed his intention to resign. Mr Jackson asked *please confirm whether you wish to proceed with your resignation or engage with us in the process of returning to work*. The claimant's employment ended. The claimant started work with the new employer in May 2026.
138. During the course of this litigation the respondent (other than Ms Albero) found out about the traumatic historic incident that left the claimant with PTSD. He has experienced recurring and ongoing symptomatology of that condition. His symptoms are exacerbated by other stressors. Up until this litigation (apart from Ms Albero who found out in the October 2025 grievance investigatory interview about the historic incident) the managers in this complaint had believed that his PTSD related to the death of his father. The claimant had not told his managers and had not told OH about the historic event.

Relevant Law

139. Section 26 Equality Act 2010 contains the statutory provisions on harassment as follows:

26 Harassment

- (1) A person (A) harasses another (B) if:
- (a) A engages in unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, and
 - (b) the conduct has the purpose or effect of:
 - (i) violating B's dignity, or
 - (ii) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for B.
- (2) ...
- (3) ...
- (4) In deciding whether conduct has the effect referred to in subsection (1)(b), each of the following must be taken into account—
- (a) the perception of B;
 - (b) the other circumstances of the case;
 - (c) whether it is reasonable for the conduct to have that effect.

140. Having established on the evidence what was the conduct of the particular individual or individuals in question, the employment tribunal has to apply

an objective test in determining whether it was 'related to' the protected characteristic in issue; the intention of the actors concerned might form part of the relevant circumstances but will not be determinative of the question the tribunal has to answer.

141. In Richmond Pharmacology v Dhaliwal [2009] IRLR 336 the EAT said it may be sensible for a tribunal to address whether or not the conduct was related to the protected characteristic as the first issue, since if the conduct does not relate to a protected characteristic then the other questions do not arise. In Nazir and Aslam v Asim and Nottinghamshire Black Partnership [2010] ICR 1225, the EAT pointed out that in the context of shifting the burden of proof under section 136 Equality Act 2010 when a tribunal was considering whether facts have been proved from which it could conclude that harassment was on a prohibited ground, it was always relevant, at the first stage, to take into account the context of the conduct which is alleged to have been perpetrated on that ground. That context may in fact point strongly towards or against a conclusion that it was related to any protected characteristic.
142. Section 26 requires the unwanted conduct related to the characteristic to have had the purpose or effect of creating the harassment environment. In Dhaliwal the EAT said the alternative bases of purpose or effect must be respected so that, for example, a respondent can be liable for effects, even if they were not his purpose (and vice versa).
143. Further, in Dhaliwal, the EAT gave guidance on the effect of an act of unwanted conduct. Even if the conduct has had the proscribed effect, it must also be reasonable that it did so.

There is of course a subjective element ('... having regard to ... the perception of that other person ...') but ultimately the proviso can deal with cases of unreasonable proneness to take offence. Although 'purpose' is not determinative, it can be a factor: 'the same remark may have a very different weight if it was evidently innocently intended than if it was evidently intended to hurt'. Ultimately, this is all 'quintessentially a matter for the factual assessment of the tribunal'.

144. The EAT gave a warning that the concept of harassment does have its boundaries:

"We accept that not every racially slanted adverse comment or conduct may constitute the violation of a person's dignity. Dignity is not necessarily violated by things said or done which are trivial or transitory, particularly if it should have been clear that any offence was unintended. While it is very important that employers, and tribunals, are sensitive to the hurt that can be caused by racially offensive comments or conduct (or indeed comments or conduct on other grounds covered by the cognate legislation to which we have referred), it is also important not to encourage a culture of hypersensitivity or the imposition of legal liability in respect of every unfortunate phrase.

145. The law on reasonable adjustments is at Section 20 Equality Act 2010.

20 Duty to make adjustments

- (1) Where this Act imposes a duty to make reasonable adjustments on a person, this section, sections 21 and 22 and the applicable Schedule apply; and for those purposes, a person on whom the duty is imposed is referred to as A.

- (2) The duty comprises the following three requirements.
 - (3) The first requirement is a requirement, where a provision, criterion or practice of A's puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, to take such steps as it is reasonable to have to take to avoid the disadvantage.
 - (4) The second requirement is a requirement, where a physical feature puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, to take such steps as it is reasonable to have to take to avoid the disadvantage.
 - (5) The third requirement is a requirement, where a disabled person would, but for the provision of an auxiliary aid, be put at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, to take such steps as it is reasonable to have to take to provide the auxiliary aid.
 - (6) Where the first or third requirement relates to the provision of information, the steps which it is reasonable for A to have to take include steps for ensuring that in the circumstances concerned the information is provided in an accessible format.
 - (7) A person (A) who is subject to a duty to make reasonable adjustments is not (subject to express provision to the contrary) entitled to require a disabled person, in relation to whom A is required to comply with the duty, to pay to any extent A's costs of complying with the duty.
146. The words "provision criterion or practice" (PCP) are not defined in The Equality Act 2010. The Commission Code of Practice paragraph 6.10 says the phrase "should be construed widely so as to include for example any formal or informal policy, rules, practices, arrangements or qualifications including one off decisions and actions".
147. The importance of a Tribunal going through each of the constituent parts of the provisions relating to the duty to make reasonable adjustments was emphasised by the EAT in Environment Agency –v- Rowan [2008] ICR 218 and reinforced in The Royal Bank of Scotland –v- Ashton [2011] ICR 632.
148. The question of what will amount to a PCP was considered by the Employment Appeal Tribunal in 2018 in Sheikholeslami v The University of Edinburgh UK EATS 2018 Mrs Justice Simler considered the comparison exercise. At paragraph 48:

"It is well established that the duty to make reasonable adjustments arises where a PCP puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage compared with people who are not disabled. The purpose of the comparison exercise with people who are not disabled is to test whether the PCP has the effect of producing the relevant disadvantage as between those who are and those who are not disabled, and whether what causes the disadvantage is the PCP. That is not a causation question...There is no requirement to identify a comparator or comparator group whose circumstances are the same or nearly the same as the disabled person's circumstances."

"The PCP may bite harder on the disabled group than it does on those without a disability. Whether there is a substantial disadvantage is a question of fact assessed on an objective basis and measured by comparison with what the position would be if the disabled person in question did not have a disability."

149. In Ishola v Transport for London [2020] EWCA Civ 112 Lady Justice Simler

considered what might amount to a PCP at para 35:

“The words “provision, criterion or practice” are not terms of art, but are ordinary English words...they are broad and overlapping, and in light of the object of the legislation, not to be narrowly construed or unjustifiably limited in their application.”

150. And at paragraph 37:

“In my judgment, however widely and purposively the concept of a PCP is to be interpreted, it does not apply to every act of unfair treatment of a particular employee. That is not the mischief which the concept of indirect discrimination and the duty to make reasonable adjustments are intended to address. If an employer unfairly treated employee by an act or decision and neither direct discrimination nor disability -related discrimination is made out because the act or decision was not done/made by reason of disability or other relevant ground, it is artificial and wrong to seek to convert them by a process of abstraction into the application of a discriminatory PCP.”

151. As to whether a disadvantage resulting from a provision, criterion or practice is substantial, Section 212(1) defines substantial as being “more than minor or trivial”

152. The Equality and Human Rights Commission Code of Practice on Employment (2011) provides in relation to reasonable adjustments at paragraph 6.24

“There is no onus on the disabled worker to suggest what adjustments should be made (although it is good practice for employers to ask)”

And at paragraph 6.28

“The following are some of the factors which might be taken into account when deciding what is a reasonable step for an employer to have to take:

- Whether taking any particular steps would be effective in preventing the substantial disadvantage
- the practicability of the step
- the financial and other costs of making the adjustment and the extent of any disruption caused
- the extent of the employer’s financial or other resources
- the availability of the employer financial or other assistance to help make adjustment (such as advice through Access to Work) and
- the type and size of the employer

153. The law on direct discrimination is Section 13 Equality Act 2010.

13 Direct discrimination

- (1) A person (A) discriminates against another (B) if, because of a protected characteristic, A treats B less favourably than A treats or would treat others.

154. Direct discrimination complaints require a comparator, either actual or hypothetical whose circumstances are not materially different from those of the claimant. The Tribunal must then consider if there has been less favourable treatment, conduct that the complainant might reasonably see as detrimental. In Warburton v Chief Constable of Northamptonshire [2022] ICR 925 Griffiths J in the EAT restated the test on detriment:

“The key test is: “Is the treatment of such a kind that a reasonable worker would or might take the view that in all the circumstances it was to his detriment?” Shamoon v Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary [2003] ICR 337 HL, applied. Detriment is to be interpreted widely in this context.”

155. The House of Lords in Shamoon v Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary 2003 ICR 337 HL said that an “unjustified sense of grievance” does not qualify as a disadvantage. In Shamoon the disadvantage was that a Chief Inspector’s standing amongst her colleagues would be diminished once they knew that her responsibility for conducting appraisals had been taken away from her. In Williams v Trustees of Swansea University Pension & Assurance Scheme [2018] UKSC 65 the Supreme Court accepted that there was no need for a fine distinction between the concept of unfavourable treatment and the concept of detriment.
156. If detriment is established then the question arises as to the relationship between the protected act and the detriment. Use of the term causation is to be deprecated. The correct test is one of “significant influence”.
157. In London Borough of Islington v Ladele [2009] IRLR 154 at paragraph 40 of the EAT’s judgment (as upheld by the CA- citation [2010] IRLR 211).

“The following propositions with respect to the concept of direct discrimination, potentially relevant to this case, seem to us to be justified by the authorities:

(1) In every case the tribunal has to determine the reason why the claimant was treated as he was. As Lord Nicholls put it in Nagarajan v London Regional Transport [1999] IRLR 572, 575—“this is the crucial question”. He also observed that in most cases this will call for some consideration of the mental processes (conscious or subconscious) of the alleged discriminator.

(2) If the tribunal is satisfied that the prohibited ground is one of the reasons for the treatment, that is sufficient to establish discrimination. It need not be the only or even the main reason. It is sufficient that it is significant in the sense of being more than trivial: see the observations of Lord Nicholls in Nagarajan (p 576) as explained by Peter Gibson LJ in Igen v Wong [2005] EWCA Civ 142, [2005] ICR 931, [2005] IRLR 258 paragraph 37.

Applying the Law

158. This judgment uses the items from the List of Issues as subheadings for its reasoning. The respondent conceded that the claimant was at all times disabled by reason of PTSD.

Harassment

Did the respondent do the following alleged things:

On various dates between 14th April 2024 and May 2024 excessively contacted the claimant (by email, text and telephone) in relation to his sickness absence. The individuals involved are Simon Murphy and Joseph Lamb.

159. Mr Lamb initiated contact with the claimant on 13 March 2025 when the claimant first went off sick, on 14 March 2025 to obtain consent for an OH referral, on 28 March 2025 by text to initiate a conversation and then 28 March 2025 to have that conversation. Mr Lamb called the claimant on 14

April 2025 but the claimant did not pick up so he then sent a text message. He called the claimant on 14 April 2025 and then emailed on 15 April 2025. His final contact was on 23 April 2025 when he invited the claimant by email to attend a Teams catch up meeting on 29 April 2025.

160. Mr Murphy contacted the claimant on receipt of the grievance by telephone to have an introductory courtesy call. He then had an email exchange with the claimant on 28 April 2025. The claimant did not want Mr Murphy handling his grievance. Mr Murphy had no further contact with the claimant.
161. The respondent's Policy provided for contact during sickness absence, for keeping in touch and for a means of regular communication to be agreed. It was the respondent's practice for prompt contact to be made on receipt of a grievance.
162. The Tribunal has considered whether or not the contact was excessive in relation to content and finds that it was not. The Tribunal accepts the oral evidence of Mr Lamb and Mr Murphy corroborated by the contemporaneous documentation that the contact from Mr Lamb and Mr Murphy was courteous and appropriate in tone and content. In terms of volume or frequency the contact was not excessive. Mr Lamb agreed to email contact when it was made clear to him that the claimant was finding telephone contact distressing. The contact was for a good reason on each occasion. It was reasonable of the respondent to seek to maintain contact, to keep in touch to support the claimant whilst he was off sick.
163. The claim of harassment in relation to excessive contact must fail on its facts because the Tribunal, having heard the oral evidence, reconstructed the time line of contact and scrutinised the documents to which it was taken in the bundle, finds that the contact was not excessive.

On a date in November 2025 the manager Mark instructed a female to attend at the claimant's home address and video him and pass him a letter.

164. The date was 8 October 2025. Having heard his oral evidence and seen Ms Lamb's contemporaneous account the Tribunal finds that Mr Jackson did not instruct Becky Lamb to take a video or to deliver the letter to the claimant in person. The only instruction was to deliver the letter to the address by hand. Ms Lamb took it upon herself to take photographs of the delivery as is customary in delivery practice for Royal Mail.
165. Mr Jackson's purpose in giving the instruction to hand deliver was to achieve certainty, avoid discomfort or embarrassment and to save time. The letter contained an invitation to a meeting on 15 October 2025. Mr Jackson wanted to be sure that the claimant had had the letter and did not want to risk the letter being delayed in the postal system or the claimant having to attend an office to collect it if a delivery were missed which might again cause delay and prejudice the meeting going ahead on 15 October 2025.
166. The Tribunal accepts the oral evidence of Mr Jackson and Ms Albero that letters of this kind are often delivered by hand and that deliveries are often photographed.

167. The claim must fail on its facts because the Tribunal accepts
- a. The oral evidence of Mr Jackson as above and
 - b. the witness statement supported by photography of Ms Becky Lamb that she did not video and did not pass the letter to the claimant in person.
168. The Tribunal prefers the oral evidence of Mr Jackson and the statement and photographs of Ms Lamb to the oral evidence of the claimant. He became angry and opened the door to call out to Ms Lamb. The Tribunal finds his account less reliable than that of Ms Lamb. The Tribunal has had regard to the fact that he is a litigant in person, albeit a legally educated one, and considered whether if the allegation had been drafted differently so that hand delivering a letter at all had been the allegation of harassment, would it have succeeded. It would not. The Tribunal would have found the objecting to a hand delivery at 7pm or thereafter at night in the circumstances in this case and saying it was harassment, would be to trivialise anti-discrimination law.

On 27th and 28th April 2024 Simon Murphy shouted at the Claimant on the phone and sent an intimidating email, full particulars of which are at paragraphs 16-18 of the ET1.

169. Mr Murphy did not shout. The Tribunal was persuaded by his oral evidence that he makes calls introducing himself and acknowledging grievances on an almost daily basis and that part of his remit is to provide support and information. The Tribunal finds it is not plausible that Mr Murphy, even in a difficult call with the claimant, would resort to shouting. The Tribunal had regard to the text message and email that Mr Murphy sent immediately after the call. His tone was placatory and seeking to reassure the claimant. He apologised. He asked for a reset. Every indication in the contemporaneous communication was that he wanted to be supportive, to provide and gather information from the claimant.
170. The claimant provided an account of that call written up in transcript format that he had prepared. He did not have a recording of the call. The Tribunal does not doubt that the claimant's subjective experience of that call was unpleasant. He had asked not to be called. He had not grasped who was calling or why. He was experiencing paranoia about calls from work and feeling harassed. Nonetheless, his version of events about the call is not reliable.
171. Mr Murphy's email, at which the claimant took offence, included an exclamation mark. The Tribunal accepts Mr Murphy's oral evidence that this was used to give emphasis to the fact that *of course* he had read the grievance before calling the claimant. The claimant's case here was that the use of an exclamation mark alone was intimidating and harassing. The Tribunal rejects that assertion as an overreaction.
172. The complaint about shouting fails on its facts. The complaint about the use of an exclamation mark proceeds on its facts because it did happen.

During telephone calls in April to May 2025 Joseph Lamb and Simon Murphy refused to agree to email contact only whilst the claimant was off sick and placed pressure on the claimant to accept unscheduled calls

173. This did not happen. Mr Lamb agreed an alternate contact strategy which was adhered to during the weeks in respect of which it had been offered and Mr Lamb explained why some telephone contact would be also needed. There was no pressure placed on the claimant. The frequency and content of communication was in accordance with the respondent's policy aims of supporting people who are off sick and meeting service needs to plan for service delivery. The complaint must fail on its facts.

If so, was that unwanted conduct?

174. LOI: 1.1 There was no unwanted conduct. The claim failed on its facts.
175. LOI:1.2 in relation to the 8 October 2025 delivery, if Mr Jackson had instructed Ms Lamb to (i) video the claimant and (ii) hand deliver the letter to him in person, which he did not, then that would have been unwanted conduct. As it did not happen, there was no unwanted conduct.
176. LOI: 1.3 if there had been shouting on the phone which there was not, on 28 April 2025, then that would have been unwanted conduct. The use of an exclamation mark did not amount to unwanted conduct. It was ordinary use of punctuation and if it did not fail here it would fail below for unreasonable proneness to take offence.
177. LOI: 1.4 during telephone calls between April and May 2025 it was stated that calls would be needed and emails would not be offered as a way of contact despite the claimant saying he couldn't do phone calls and would prefer emails that request was refused and pressure was placed on the claimant to accept even calls that were not scheduled. If that allegation had been found to have happened as a fact then it would have been unwanted conduct. It did not happen so there was no unwanted conduct.

Was it related to disability?

178. In Dhaliwal the EAT gave guidance as set out above on a tribunal assessing whether or not conduct is related to a protected characteristic. The Tribunal finds:
- a. LOI: 1.1 the contact was related to absence, not disability. It was part of the sickness absence management applied to all staff. Until 14 April 2025 the respondent did not know that the claimant had a disability.
 - b. LOI:1.2 the delivery by hand was because the respondent wanted to be sure that the letter reached the claimant in good time for the planned meeting. It was related to absence and not disability.
 - c. LOI: 1.3 There was no shouting from Mr Murphy and in so far as it was an unpleasant call the Tribunal finds that what happened in the phone call with Mr Murphy was not related to the claimant's disability but related only to miscommunication, with the claimant failing to

grasp the identity of the caller and his purpose, during the usual initial contact in grievance handling.

- d. LOI: 1.4 pressure to accept contact other than email contact in April and May 2025 failed on the facts as there was no pressure. It was again part of the usual sickness absence management process for anyone off sick and was not related to disability.

The Tribunal finds none of the alleged harassment conduct was related to the protected characteristic of disability. The complaints must fail at this point if they had not already failed on the facts.

Did the conduct have the purpose of violating the claimant's dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for the claimant?

- 179. The Tribunal finds that neither Mr Lamb, Mr Murphy nor Mr Jackson had a discriminatory purpose of creating an environment of harassment for the claimant. Mr Lamb was motivated to manage the claimant's absence in accordance with policy, referring him immediately to OH to support him with mental health related absence, trying to get him to use Help@Hand employee assistance and even shared that he had used it himself and found it helpful. Mr Murphy had very little dealing with the claimant beyond acknowledging his grievance. He had no discriminatory purpose as was clearly evident in his response when the claimant had reacted badly to the phone call. Mr Murphy wanted an immediate re-set. He wanted to provide information and reassurance. The Tribunal accepts the oral evidence of Mr Jackson that he was a senior person tasked with progressing sickness absence management and just wanted to be sure that a letter reached the claimant in good time for a meeting.

If not, did it have that effect? The Tribunal will take into account the claimant's perception, the other circumstances of the case and whether it is reasonable for the conduct to have that effect.

- 180. The claimant stated in his email to Mr Lamb that he was feeling harassed by contact from the respondent. He provided a letter to the Tribunal about the impact of the home delivered letter on him.
- 181. The respondent submitted that effect was not proven. The Tribunal rejects that submission in all but the exclamation mark allegation part of 1.3. It accepts the oral evidence of the claimant, supported in allegation 1.1 and 1.4 by his contemporaneous written allegation of harassment and his grievances GR4, GR5 and GR6 of the effect of harassment on him. In relation to allegation 1.2 the hand delivery the Tribunal accepts his oral evidence of effect supported by the GP letter about the importance of the safety of home for a person with PTSD. In relation to the shouting on the phone allegation at 1.3, it did not happen. The Tribunal rejects the claimant's assertion that he experienced the effect of harassment by the use of an exclamation mark.
- 182. The Tribunal must take into account his perception, all the circumstances and, objectively, whether or not it was reasonable for the conduct to have that effect.

183. The Tribunal has taken into account the claimant's perception. The EHRC Code provides that the claimant's mental health and capacity are relevant factors to be taken into account when considering effect. He felt his home was violated by the home delivery and has not felt safe there. He had a history of PTSD, he was experiencing anxiety and depression, described himself as paranoid and hypervigilant and the contact made him feel vulnerable to attack.
184. The circumstances were that he was off sick and resistant to contact. He was sending unpleasant correspondence accusing management of harassment, telling them how to do their job, initiating grievances with overlapping content in a short period of time, 7 in an 18 month employment and the last 4 in the last 6 months. On occasions he was initiating contact and then objecting saying it was harassment when the respondent engaged with it and responded to it. The claimant agreed to attend OH and then failed to attend appointments. He was becoming disengaged. The respondent was entitled to manage the sickness absence including keeping in touch, acting on the OH guidance to maintain regular contact, doing that in accordance with its own Policy preferably in a way that was agreeable to both parties, and referring him to OH with his consent and meeting with him to keep him up to date and feel connected to the workplace. Mr Lamb agreed alternate contact by email only for a period but as the sickness absence progressed the respondent was reasonable, in the absence of any medical evidence to the contrary, to want to have telephone and Teams contact to better support and manage the claimant through the absence.
185. There is an objective element to the test of harassment. The Tribunal must consider whether the claimant was reasonable to perceive the respondent's actions as having the effect of harassment on him. The claimant submitted that seeing a missed call from work placed him under duress, that a missed call is harassing in effect. He made submissions based on first instance cases that showed email whilst off sick, could be harassment, unannounced home visits could be harassment and that contact whilst off sick must be necessary and even if done in good faith can be harassment. The Tribunal does not dispute those broad propositions but must look not solely at the claimant's subjective perception but at the circumstances and the objective reasonableness of his perception in this case.
186. The Tribunal finds the claimant was hypersensitive to the sickness absence management and grievance handling processes. It was unreasonable to perceive any of the interventions at LOI 1.1 -1.4 as harassment. If the complaints had not failed on the facts and/or for want of the respondent's conduct being related to disability or for want of effect they would each have failed here. The claimant was prone to an excessive and unreasonable response to normal management interventions. To find otherwise would trivialise the important statutory protection against harassment.

Direct disability discrimination (Equality Act 2010 section 13)

187. The Tribunal repeats its fact finding from above. If a harassment complaint succeeds there is no need to go on and reason it as direct discrimination. Where the harassment fails the Tribunal goes on to consider if the same

allegations succeed as acts of direct discrimination.

Did the claimant reasonably see the treatment as detriment / Was there less favourable treatment

188. LOI: 1.1 Excessive contact by Jospeh Lamb and Mr Murphy in April – May 2025. There was no excessive contact so the complaint fails on its facts.
189. LOI: 1.2 Applying Shamoon, the claimant has an unjustified sense of grievance about the delivery of the letter to his home address. No reasonable employee would take offence at a hand delivered letter being posted through his letterbox in the evening. Whilst the claimant reacted badly to it there is an objective element to the test. The Tribunal finds the delivery does not amount to less favourable treatment.
190. LOI: 1.3 The claim has failed on its facts, Mr Murphy did not shout at the claimant but if it had happened then this would have amounted to less favourable treatment. The claimant has an unjustified sense of grievance about the use of the exclamation mark in Mr Murphy's letter. It is an excessive overreaction in these circumstances to suggest that use of punctuation can found a claim in direct discrimination. No reasonable worker would consider it detrimental in the circumstances in this case. It shows the Tribunal the claimant's hyper-sensitivity to ordinary communication at that time and to the date of the hearing.
191. LOI: 1.4 The claimant being contacted other than in his preferred way could amount to less favourable treatment. It could ordinarily be said to be disadvantageous to him to have communications continue in a way that he had said was harmful to him.

Knowledge of disability

192. In order to discriminate against someone because of a protected characteristic the respondent has to know, or in relation to disability be in a position in which it ought reasonably to have known, that the person has that characteristic. The claimant says the respondent ought to have known he was disabled from a date in the first two weeks of his employment in May 2024. The Tribunal rejects his evidence on this point.
193. In cross-examination the claimant said there was an incident in work in May 2024 as a result of which he was upset ("triggered") and went to see his manager Derek and showed Derek a letter that he happened to have with him that day, that diagnosed PTSD. The Tribunal finds it is not plausible that the claimant just happened to be carrying a GP letter with him on a day that an incident occurred causing the claimant to talk to Derek about getting wound up, and further not plausible that if the claimant had shown such a letter to a manager, that manager, operating in the context of the respondents prescriptive Policies and Guides, reading the following extract from the GP letter

... The circumstances of his unexpected death have caused Mr { A } significant distress. This has presented as low mood, impaired concentration, intrusive memories, the associative reactions, flashbacks

and intrusive intense distress after triggers or reminders of his late father.

The symptoms have impacted on his ability to function socially and affecting work and studies. He is accessing specialist support

would not have sought guidance from HR, referred the claimant to OH and sought specific guidance about driving and safety.

194. Under questioning the claimant accepted that the incident he had referred to about blank bullets being fired was later, December 2024 and not the incident which had triggered him and prompted him to talk to Derek in May. When asked to explain how he happened to have a letter with him when he could not have known in advance that there would be an upsetting incident in May, he then said *I knew I was upset and would need to talk to him so I wanted to cover myself, I was paranoid about losing my job.* The claimant said he gave the letter to Derek and does not know if a copy was made or not but that the letter was immediately returned to him and Derek asked him was he safe to drive. The claimant said he was. He said they spoke about the claimant's bereavement and Derek was supportive. The Tribunal accepts above in the fact finding that there was a supportive conversation about the claimant being upset and about bereavement but it rejects the claimant's evidence that a letter was shown diagnosing PTSD, as not being plausible. That position is corroborated by a pattern of failures to disclose PTSD: The claimant did not disclose PTSD on application or appointment. It did not appear in his grievance in July 2024 or November 2024 or January 2025 (which mentions depression following bereavement) nor did he mention that he had told Derek he had PTSD in May 2024 in any of those grievances. It was not on his personnel file. It was not on his first fit note on 13 March 2025; that recorded depression. He did not tell OH on 18 March 2025 that he had PTSD, he only reported depression and anxiety.

195. The claimant asked his GP to send a letter to the respondent and the letter was prepared and dated 14 April 2025 which records

Symptoms consistent with acute post trauma stress and bereavement

That letter was copied to Mr Lamb on 14 April 2025. He knew of the claimant's PTSD diagnosis for the first time that day. He thought it related to bereavement. Mr Murphy when contacting the claimant about his grievance did not know of the claimant's PTSD. PTSD first appears on the fit note sent to Mr Lamb on 7 May 2025 which says *generalised anxiety disorder and PTSD.*

The respondent had knowledge of disability for PTSD from 14 April 2025. Anything that happened before that date could not be because of disability. Taking the issues in chronological order:

LOI: 1.1 The excessive contact allegation prior to 14 April 2025 must fail in direct discrimination for lack of knowledge.

LOI:1.3 The 28 April 2025 Mr Murphy phone call and intimidating email allegation were at a time when the respondent had knowledge of disability.

LOI: 1.4 Pressure to accept contact other than email contact in April and May 2025. Some of this alleged discriminatory conduct, that which falls after 14 April 2025, was at a time when the respondent had knowledge of disability.

LOI: 1.2 On a date in November 2025 the manager Mark instructed a female to attend at the claimant's home address and video him and pass him a letter, this fell at a time when the respondent had knowledge of disability.

If so, has the claimant proven facts from which the Tribunal could conclude that in any of those respects the claimant was treated less favourably than someone in the same material circumstances without a disability was or would have been treated? The claimant relies on a hypothetical comparison.

If so, has the claimant also proven facts from which the Tribunal could conclude that the less favourable treatment was because of disability?

If so, has the respondent shown that there was no less favourable treatment because of disability?

196. The burden of proof lies with the claimant to prove facts from which the Tribunal could conclude there was discrimination. When that first stage burden of proof is met then the burden shifts, (under Section 136 Equality Act 2010 this is known as the reverse burden of proof) to the respondent to show a non discriminatory reason for the less favourable treatment.
197. LOI :1.1 The events complained about happened at a time when the respondent did not know the claimant was disabled. Even if it had known the claim fails on its facts above and if it had happened the Tribunal would have found that there were insufficient facts to shift the burden of proof. If there had been knowledge and less favourable treatment then the Tribunal would have found, acting on the evidence of Mr Lamb and its sight of the respondent's policies, that this was not less favourable treatment because of his disability. The claimant's disability was not the reason why he was being contacted, prior to 14 April 2025 the respondent did not know he was disabled and thereafter it was not the reason why he was being contacted in the format the respondent chose. This was exactly the same treatment as would have been given to a non disabled OPG off work sick with a mental health issue. Disability was not a significant factor in the contact, following the Policies for anyone off sick with a mental health issue was the reason why the claimant was contacted. The complaint fails for all the reasons above.
198. LOI :1.2 The home delivery happened. The Tribunal has found that it did not amount to less favourable treatment. Deliveries from Royal Mail happen as a matter of course and are photographed. The burden of proof has not shifted. The complaint has failed above but in the alternative the respondent has a non discriminatory reason for the treatment, the letter was not hand delivered because the claimant was disabled. The reason why it was hand delivered was because Mr Jackson wanted certainty of a delivery having happened in good time.
199. LOI :1.3 The complaint has failed above in relation to shouting. It did not happen. If it did then it was not because of disability because Mr Murphy

himself did not know the claimant was disabled at the time of the call. His contemporaneous email shows him *after* the call asking for information about an disability. Even if he had had knowledge, and any voices had been raised, it is more plausible that that would have been because of miscommunication; the claimant failing to grasp who was calling and why, than because the claimant was disabled.

200. The use of the exclamation mark complaint has failed above. The burden of proof did not shift. If it did then the Tribunal accepts the oral evidence of Mr Murphy that his use of the exclamation marks was to emphasise that he had read the claimant's grievance, in circumstances in which the claimant was suggesting that he had not. He wanted to say *of course I have read your grievance, that's why I called you*. The Tribunal accepts his evidence because his position that he was wanting to reassure and build confidence is corroborated by the timing and content of his other communications with the claimant that day. He was apologising if the claimant felt upset and was wanting to reset the relationship after the first call had not gone well. Disability was not the reason why Mr Murphy used an exclamation mark.
201. LOI:1.4 The complaint about contact not being in the claimant's preferred format could have amounted to less favourable treatment but the reason for it was not disability. The Tribunal accepts the respondent's oral evidence corroborated by its Policy documentation that the treatment was the same as for any employee off sick with mental health issues. The respondent made contact to offer support, to provide management, to ensure contact was maintained both for wellbeing and service delivery reasons. It had a policy of immediate referral to OH. It advanced good non discriminatory reasons for its actions.
202. This decision was reserved because the claimant's undoubted strength of response to being contacted at the time and in recounting in evidence about what he saw as excessive communication caused the Tribunal concern. What was it the respondent had done that could have had such impact ? The Tribunal of its own volition took extra time to read all communications and construct its own timeline of communication, as best it could from evidence provided, and saw nothing to alert it to discriminatory or oppressive contact in this case at all. This may have been different IF which was not the case here, (i) there had been medical evidence to show that the contact was harmful to the claimant at that time and (ii) having considered that and balanced it with its duty of care to the claimant and service needs it proceeded to contact the claimant in a way that damaged his health. That evidence was not present here. It was not enough for the claimant to say *I don't want you to contact me other than by email* and not enough for the claimant then, when not getting his preferred method of contact, to say that that amounted to discrimination. His reactions at the time and the impact on him at Tribunal have been disproportionate. He has shown heightened sensitivity to innocuous acts and is prone to unreasonable reaction. Disability was not the reason why the respondent was contacting him, it was not a significant factor, the respondent managed his absence in accordance with its policy as it did for any other employee off sick with a mental health issue.

203. Even if in all the instances above the burden of proof had shifted the Tribunal would have found, as set out in the harassment reasoning above, that the respondent had non discriminatory reasons for the treatment in its proper absence management of the claimant.
204. In relation to the home delivery, at first sight this looked oppressive as characterised by the claimant. The Tribunal does not doubt the deep distress that this caused the claimant such that he is planning to move house. However, the evidence showed, as found above, there was no instruction to video the claimant, no instruction to hand deliver to him in person, just a delivery request. The Tribunal accepts with some irony the evidence of Mr Jackson, that the post may not have been relied upon to reach the claimant in time and that the respondent did not want an unsuccessful delivery to mean that the claimant had to attend respondent premises whilst off sick as this might cause him discomfort or embarrassment. This was a good non discriminatory reason for the home delivery.
205. The complaints of direct discrimination fail.

Reasonable Adjustments (Equality Act 2010 sections 20 & 21)

Did the respondent know, or could it reasonably have been expected to know, that the claimant had the disability? From what date?

206. The reasoning on knowledge of disability is set out above. The respondent's Mr Lamb knew and Mr Murphy ought to have known that the claimant's anxiety and depression and PTSD were a disability from 14 April 2025.
207. The OH report itself was not determinative of knowledge of disabled status. The claimant did not tell Ms Swan his history of PTSD.

A "PCP" is a provision, criterion or practice. Did the respondent have the following PCP: The requirement for employees to attend the depot in person for operational training.

208. The language from the ET1 is that *instead of leaving me alone to get well I am sent a letter just 10 days after my submitted GP letter and sicknote requesting that I attend the depot for a meeting about work*. This referred to Mr Lamb's invitation letter of 23 April 2025 to a meeting on 29 April 2025. The Tribunal with no objection from the respondent uses the broader language from the ET1 and is not constrained by the narrower drafting of the complaint in the agreed List of Issues which is a tool to assist the Tribunal.
209. The Tribunal finds that the claimant was not required to attend for operational training. He was being invited to a keep in touch meeting. The claimant was aggrieved that Joseph Lamb wanted him to come in to work or to a Teams meeting for a review and update on 29 April 2025. The claimant had been absent since 13 March 2026. The Tribunal finds that there was an invitation to attend a meeting. This was a requirement imposed by Mr Lamb's letter and this operated as a PCP.

Did the PCPs put the claimant at a substantial disadvantage compared to someone without the claimant's disability, in that he was off sick with PTSD?

210. The claimant was not substantially disadvantaged in being invited to attend a meeting as compared to someone who did not have anxiety, depression and PTSD. He was off sick. The OH report had set out that the claimant was under considerable personal stress, had seen his GP, was on medication, undergoing counselling, experiencing heightened anxiety, panic attacks and low mood. He was not driving at that time and his sleeping and eating were disturbed but he was keen to return to his role. The OH practitioner said she was hopeful that he would return to work within the next four weeks. The only recommendation it made was to maintain regular contact.
211. His letters had explained that anything other than email contact was adding to his distress. The GP had said on 14 April 2025 that the claimant was *bereaved and experiencing significant distress. This is presented as low mood, impaired concentration, intrusive memories, disassociative reactions, flashbacks and intrusive intense distress after triggers or reminders of his late father. Mr { A } has reported his depression is something he struggles with finding it hard as a single father of two. These symptoms have impacted on his ability to function socially and affecting work and studies. He is accessing specialist support.* Importantly, for these purposes, it did not say he could or should not be contacted other than by email. The respondent had OH guidance to tell it to maintain regular contact, a request from the claimant (repeatedly and made fervently) that he be contacted by email only and no such recommendation or request from the GP. There was nothing to show that inviting the claimant to a keep in touch type meeting in person or by Teams, as in Mr Lamb's letter, would substantially disadvantage the claimant as compared to a non disabled person who had been off sick for around six weeks at that time.

Did the respondent know, or could it reasonably have been expected to know, that the claimant was likely to be placed at the disadvantage?

212. The Tribunal scrutinised what the claimant was saying at the time. He was clearly deeply distressed, angry, communicating excessively himself, exaggerating and exasperated and just wanting to be left alone. There was no substantial disadvantage, but if there had been the respondent could not have been expected to know from the communications it had at that time that the claimant would be substantially disadvantaged. The key missing piece of information was medical evidence that being asked to come in was detrimental to the claimant's health.

Did the respondent fail in its duty to take such steps as it would have been reasonable to have taken to avoid the disadvantage? The claimant says that the following adjustments to the PCP would have been reasonable:

Exempt the claimant from attending operational training or updates whilst off sick

Delay any requirement for operational training

By what date should the respondent reasonably have taken those steps?

213. The complaint has failed for want of substantial disadvantage but if it had not then the complaint would fail at this point because the respondent did not fail to take reasonable steps. When the claimant declined to attend the

respondent did not insist the claimant attended. The Tribunal saw the invitation letter as set out in the facts above. On 23 April 2025 Mr Lamb wrote to the claimant. The letter invited the claimant to a meeting on 29 April 2025 at 3pm at Liverpool South depot. The letter suggested that the meeting could be held remotely on Microsoft Teams and asked the claimant to let him know which method was preferred. The purpose of the meeting was stated to be

as well as keeping in touch regarding your current health needs there may be changes within Royal Mail such as the USO reform which will affect the way we work, so these catch-up sessions enable you to be included in that conversation as part of our team..

The letter went on

I understand you feel email contact at this time would be preferable.... Whilst I am able to utilise email as part of your absence management email contact alone would not be sufficient. I can send some questions through to you via email prior to our fortnightly calls.

214. This was pro-active absence management. The invitation came 5 - 6 weeks into the absence. The absence was covered by a fit note and GP letter and the OH report which anticipated a prompt return. The invitation may have been a little peremptory given the anticipated return at that time but the respondent was under an obligation to consider adjustment to its usual policy and practice. The duty to reasonably adjust requires a bespoke approach to each situation that considers the needs and wants of the claimant and the needs and wants of the business, balancing them reasonably and proportionately.
215. The Tribunal accepts the oral evidence of Mr Lamb that he was trying to keep in touch, to keep the claimant informed of changes in the workplace, to get him in and to check on him. Mr Lamb had previously had a good working relationship with the claimant. The Tribunal saw messages between them that showed that relationship; they were able to talk about personal matters, health and the use of the respondent's app to assist with mental health issues. Mr Lamb recommended it saying he had used it himself. There had been a more formal tone from the claimant after he made his harassment allegation but overall Mr Lamb had been supportive. The Tribunal considered the reasonableness of the steps the respondent took. It was reasonable to invite the claimant to a keep in touch meeting on 23 April 2025 after 5-6 weeks of sickness absence in a context in which OH had said *maintain regular contact* and it did nothing when he could not attend. It did not move to disciplinary action or take any steps in response to his refusal. Its invitation and response when the invitation was declined to not insist on attendance was balanced and amounted to a reasonable step.
216. The complaint related to the events of April and May 2025. The Tribunal looked broadly at the conduct of the sickness absence management in this case and requirements to attend meetings. Beyond the April 29 invitation the claimant was not invited to attend any meetings. OH appointments were

made which he failed to attend. The claimant brought grievances which were addressed and which undoubtedly delayed what had begun as pro active sickness absence management. The claimant disengaged so that six months in, the respondent treated the case as one of non-cooperation. The claimant remained in employment until his own resignation nine months post absence in December 2025.

217. The complaint evolved during the claimant's submissions to a complaint that the failure to agree to contact by email only was a failure to reasonably adjust in itself. That adjunct was not part of the drafted PCP, not in the List of Issues and had not been put to the respondent's witnesses as anything other than harassment. The claimant made no application to amend to include the respondent contacting him other than by email as a failure to reasonably adjust complaint. If one had been made it would most likely have been declined, in accordance with the overriding objective, as being late, disproportionate to have to recall witnesses and to overrun the trial window and because the balance of prejudice would lie with the respondent at that late stage in proceedings. The Tribunal, if the complaint had been added, would most probably have found no failure to reasonably adjust because there was no medical evidence as to the impact of contact other than by email. At its highest the complaint was that the claimant did not get his preferred means of communication indefinitely.
218. The complaint for failure to reasonably adjust as presented in relation to the Teams meeting invitation fails. It was not a failure to reasonably adjust to ask someone to a meeting and when they decline to attend whilst off sick, take no further steps.

Conclusion

219. All complaints fail so that no remedy issues arise.
220. The Tribunal is grateful to the claimant and the respondent for their conduct of the hearing, their detailed submissions and their patience in awaiting this reserved decision.

Employment Judge Aspinall

Date: 3 August 2026

RESERVED JUDGMENT & REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

3 August 2026

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/>