



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Ion Ciobotea
Respondent: Steer Automotive Group Limited.

Heard at: Watford Employment Tribunal (by CVP)
On: 6, 7 July and 7 September 2026
Before: Employment Judge Alliott

Representation

Claimant: In person (assisted by an interpreter: Romanian)
Respondent: Mr James Kapadia (counsel)

RESERVED JUDGMENT

The judgment of the tribunal is that:

1. The respondent has made unauthorised deductions from the claimant's wages and is ordered to pay him the gross sums of:
 - (i) £138 for 5 June 2024.
 - (ii) £140.10 SSP 12-22 August 2024
 - (iii) £1,092.50 deducted in August 2024.Subject to tax and National Insurance as appropriate.
2. The claims of race discrimination are dismissed.

FULL REASONS

Introduction

1. The claimant was employed by the respondent as a Multi-skilled Technician from 10 October 2023 until he resigned with effect on 30 August 2024. By a claim form presented on 22 November 2024, following a period of early conciliation from 10 October until 21 November 2024, the claimant presents complaints of unauthorised deduction of wages and, following a preliminary hearing heard on

16 December 2025, a complaint of race discrimination. The respondent has conceded some arrears of pay but defends the race discrimination claims.

The issues

2. The issues were set out in a record of preliminary hearing by Employment Judge Gould following a preliminary hearing heard on 16 December 2025. They are as follows:-

“Jurisdiction - Time limits

Unauthorised deduction from wages

- 1 Was the unauthorised deductions complaint made within the time limit in [section 23 of the Employment Rights Act 1996? The Tribunal will decide:
 - 1.1 Was the claim made to the Tribunal within three months (plus early conciliation extension) of the date of payment of the wages from which the deduction was made?
 - 1.2 If not, was there a series of deductions and was the claim made to the Tribunal within three months (plus early conciliation extension) of the last one?
 - 1.3 If not, was it reasonably practicable for the claim to be made to the Tribunal within the time limit?
 - 1.4 If it was not reasonably practicable for the claim to be made to the Tribunal within the time limit, was it made within a reasonable period?

Discrimination

- 2 Were the discrimination complaints made within the time limit in section 123 of the Equality Act 2010? The Tribunal will decide:
 - 2.1 Was the claim made to the Tribunal within three months (plus early conciliation extension) of the act to which the complaint relates?
 - 2.2 If not, was there conduct extending over a period?
 - 2.3 If so, was the claim made to the Tribunal within three months (plus early conciliation extension) of the end of that period?
 - 2.4 If not, were the claims made within a further period that the Tribunal thinks is just and equitable? The Tribunal will decide:
 - 2.4.1 Why were the complaints not made to the Tribunal in time?
 - 2.4.2 In any event, is it just and equitable in all the circumstances to extend time?

Unauthorised deductions from wages (Part II Employment Rights Act 1996)

- 3 Did the respondent make unauthorised deductions from the claimant's wages and if so how much was deducted?
- 4 Has the Claimant suffered any other financial loss as a result of the unauthorised deductions complained of?
 - 4.1 If so, should any compensation be awarded to reflect these losses?
 - 4.2 If yes, how much compensation should be awarded?

Direct race discrimination (section 13 of the Equality Act 2010)

- 5 The Claimant is Romanian.
- 6 Did the Respondent do the following things:
 - 6.1 David Pink failing to acknowledge him and/or making him wait around 2 hours before allowing him to go to hospital following his welding accident on 5 **[by agreement should be 11]** June 2024;
 - 6.2 David Pink failing to record or approve the Claimant to be paid for the hours he worked on 5 June 2024;
 - 6.3 On a date between 22 August 2024 and 30 August 2024, David Pink telling the Claimant to resign as it would not be accepted, tricking him into resigning from the Respondent's employment.
 - 6.4 The Respondent, likely David Pink, telling the Claimant's new employer words to the effect that the Claimant was not a good worker.
- 7 Was that less favourable treatment?
 - 7.1 The Tribunal will decide whether the claimant was treated worse than someone else was treated. There must be no material difference between their circumstances and the claimant's.
 - 7.2 If there was nobody in the same circumstances as the claimant, the Tribunal will decide whether s/he was treated worse than someone else would have been treated.
 - 7.3 The claimant has not named anyone in particular who he says was treated better than he was.
- 8 If so, was it because he is Romanian?

Remedy for direct race discrimination

- 9 Should the Tribunal make a recommendation that the respondent take steps to reduce any adverse effect on the claimant? What should it recommend?
- 10 What financial losses has the discrimination caused the claimant?
- 11 Has the claimant taken reasonable steps to replace lost earnings, for example by looking for another job?
- 12 What period of loss should the claimant be compensated?
- 13 What injury to feelings has the discrimination caused the claimant and how much compensation should be awarded for that?
- 14 Is there a chance that the claimant's employment would have ended in any event? Should their compensation be reduced as a result?
- 15 Did the ACAS Code of Practice on Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures apply?
 - 15.1 If so, did the respondent or the claimant unreasonably fail to comply with this Code?
 - 15.2 If so is it just and equitable to increase or decrease any award payable to the claimant?
 - 15.3 By what proportion, up to 25%?
- 16 Should interest be awarded? How much?"

The law

Race discrimination

3. Sections 13, 23 and 136 of the Equality Act 2010 provide:-

"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.

...

23 Comparison by reference to circumstances

- (1) On a comparison of cases for the purposes of section 13, there must be no material difference between the circumstances relating to each case.

...

136 Burden of proof

- (1) This section applies to any proceedings relating to a contravention of this Act.
- (2) If there are facts from which the court could decide, in the absence of any other explanation, that a person (A) contravened the provision concerned, the court must hold that the contravention occurred.
- (3) But subsection (2) does not apply if A shows that A did not contravene the provision.”

The evidence

4. I had a respondent’s hearing bundle running to 170 pages and a claimant’s hearing bundle running to 121 pages.
5. On the morning of day 2 the respondent provided three further documents. A printout from an HR information system setting out the date holiday was requested and the last action date in relation to any such request, and two pages of WhatsApp texts between David Pink and the claimant on 5 July, 12 August, and 22 August 2024.
6. I had witness statements and heard evidence from the following:-
 - 6.1 Mr David Pink, Business Leader and the claimant’s line manager.
 - 6.2 Ms Jade Sheppard, HR Business Partner.
 - 6.3 Mr Paul Willmott, Regional Operations Manager.
 - 6.4 Mr Ranveet Sandhu, a Customer Service Advisor and also a trained First Aider.
7. The case management summary from the preliminary hearing on 16 December 2025 states the following:-
 - “5. I did not have a copy of the Claimant’s witness statement, which he stated he had sent to the Respondent and the Tribunal. Mrs Sheppard also confirmed she had not received the Claimant’s witness statement.”

And

- “46. The Claimant has prepared a witness statement for use at the final hearing. The Claimant has permission to provide an additional or amended witness statement for himself and any other witness who will give evidence for him at the final hearing.”
8. The case management order then made clear that the claimant needed a witness statement and there was a direction that all witness statements had to be exchanged by 8 June 2026.
9. Notwithstanding the assertions that the claimant already had a witness

statement, the claimant has not produced any witness statement for this hearing.

10. Following the amendment to introduce the claims of race discrimination, the respondent was given permission to serve and file an amended response. This the respondent did. The claimant took it upon himself to serve and file a document which is headed in English:

“Response to the amended grounds of response and response to the respondent’s written submissions.”

11. The claimant has served a number of documents written by him in the Romanian language. One of these Romanian language documents is the response to the amended grounds of response and response to the respondent’s written submissions. The Romanian language document is 12 pages long whereas the English document is eight pages long, although they are both divided into 42 paragraphs.
12. The claimant told me that he had used Google translate to translate the Romanian document into English and then had used ChatGPT further to modify or streamline his statement.
13. As such, it was impossible for the respondent and myself to ascertain whether the English version was the same as the Romanian version and equally impossible for the claimant to verify the English version on oath.
14. Notwithstanding this unsatisfactory state of affairs, I declined to rule that the claimant's document was inadmissible evidence and I declined to strike out the claimant’s claim on the basis that he had no evidence. In my judgment, a fair trial of this case is still possible and, consequently, I decided to proceed on the basis that the claimant could rely on his English version pleading as his de facto witness statement subject to submissions as to what probative value I could place on it.
15. I heard oral evidence from the claimant via an interpreter.

The facts

16. The claimant is Romanian.
17. The claimant was employed on 10 October 2023 as a Multi-skilled Technician.
18. The claimant’s normal hours of work were 47.5 per week. He worked 9.5 hours per day and his hourly rate was £23. Consequently, the claimant’s gross earnings per day were £218.50.
19. The claimant’s contract of employment included the following:-

“17 Deductions from pay

- 17.1 Whilst employed by the company, you agree that deductions from your pay will be made for the following costs.

The company expressly reserves the right to make these deductions:

...

- Any holiday pay relating to leave you have taken in excess of that which you have accrued at the point of termination.”

20. The respondent's holiday policy provided as follows:-

20.1 The holiday year was the calendar year and the claimant's holiday entitlement was 29 days.

20.2 “Clause 4: Normally, no more than two consecutive weeks' holiday may be booked and taken at any one time, unless previously agreed with your regional director.

Holiday requests are sent to your manager via the PeopleHR system for approval. Once approved, you will be able to check the status of your request through the PeopleHR App.

You should not make any firm holiday arrangements until your request has been approved as there may be circumstances where the company cannot approve requests due to business needs. The company is not liable for any loss you may incur such as loss of deposits etc if these are incurred prior to the holiday period approval.”

20.3 “Clause 11 Leaving the company

If you have exceeded your pro-rata entitlement to holidays at the time you leave your employment, this will be deducted from your final pay, subject to the maximum that your final pay permits.”

21. The respondent's Sickness Absence policy contains the following:-

“Notification of absence

If you are unable to attend work through sickness or injury, please contact your line manager as soon as possible before the start of your shift on the day of absence or follow the local procedure for your place of work.”

21.1 “The company retains the right to use discretion when applying company sick pay and the following exclusions may apply (this list is not exhaustive)

- Not following sickness absence notification requirements.”

Race discrimination

22. On 5 June 2024, the claimant had a medical appointment at Northwick Park Hospital in relation to a hearing issue. The appointment was scheduled for 9.15 am.

23. The claimant states that he informed David Pink that he would be late for work on 5 June 2024. When that was put to David Pink he said he could not remember.

24. On 5 June 2024, David Pink texted the claimant as follows at 12.51:

Good morning Ion

Please advise if you are coming into work today

Regards

Dave”

25. The claimant replied at 14.09: “I’m here.”
26. That exchange suggests that, if David Pink had been told that the claimant was going to be absent on 5 June due to a hospital appointment, then he had forgotten.
27. It would appear that due to the claimant not coming to work on time he was marked as being absent. In fact, the claimant clocked in at work at 10.58 am and finished at 17.03.
28. Jade Sheppard gave evidence that the internal planner tracking holiday and absence chart has a clipboard icon indicating that the claimant had clocked in on 5 June. However, she stated that the reason that the absence was not removed was because the system did not have that functionality.
29. Be that as it may, the respondent has accepted that the claimant was not paid for the six hours that he worked and that that money is due and owing. 6 hours at £23 per hour = £138 gross.
30. Issue 6.2 is:-

“David Pink failing to record or approve the claimant to be paid for the hours he worked on 5 June 2024.”
31. I find that David Pink did not fail to record the hours worked by the claimant on 5 June as he had clocked in and it was on the system. Further, I find that David Pink did not fail to approve the claimant to be paid for the hours he worked on 5 June 2024 because it was on the system. Accordingly, I find that the facts alleged in issue 6.2 are not proved.
32. It is the respondent’s case that this was an unfortunate oversight. In any event, the claimant gave evidence that he did not consider this incident to have been an act of racism or due to his race. Hence, even if the facts were found proved, I find that any less favourable treatment was not because of the claimant’s race.
33. Issue 6.1 is:

“David Pink failing to acknowledge him and/or making him wait around two hours before allowing him to go to hospital following his welding accident on 11 June 2024.”
34. On 11 June 2024, the claimant had an accident whilst welding. Despite wearing protective glasses, the claimant states that the welding machine malfunctioned and, as he puts it, caused an explosion which resulted in a fragment of hot welding material entering his eye.
35. The claimant’s pleaded case puts it as follows:-

“On that day, I was ignored by my manager for approximately two hours, despite his awareness of my medical condition. When I complained to colleagues that I was in pain and was not being allowed to attend hospital, they told me that this was happening because I am Romanian and that this was why I was not being taken seriously by my superiors.”

36. The claimant's oral evidence painted a very different picture of this event. The claimant told me that he reported the incident to “Terry,” a colleague who was in the office with David Pink. He told me that he was advised to wash his eye at the eyewash station.
37. The claimant accepted that he never actually spoke to David Pink on that day. The claimant said that he thought he was not allowed to go to hospital as no one cared about him.
38. When it was put to the claimant that he could have gone to hospital immediately if he wanted to, his reply was as follows:-

“Initially I thought it was a small problem so I carried on but with the passing of time my eye hurt more things have worsened.”

39. The claimant said that he went to the office to say he wanted to go to hospital as his eye was hurting more and “Terry” gave him the address of the hospital.
40. The respondent's evidence is that they had trained first aiders to deal with such incidents and that, if an individual wanted to go to hospital then they would be free to do so or provided with a driver to take them or, if the injury was extremely serious, an ambulance would be called.
41. I find that when the claimant initially reported the accident he thought it was a small problem and was advised to deal with it at the eyewash station. I find that thereafter, from the management perspective, the matter had been dealt with. However, I find that the claimant's eye gradually deteriorated and that he wrongly assumed that he could not go to hospital. I find that when he did raise the issue with management he was advised to go to hospital and, indeed, provided with the address.
42. Consequently, I find that David Pink did not fail to acknowledge the claimant and did not make him wait around two hours before allowing him to go to hospital. I find that the claimant was never prevented from going to hospital. Consequently, I find the facts alleged in Issue 6.1 are not proved.
43. The claimant was due to return from holiday on 5 July 2024. Unfortunately, he missed his flight back from Romania and was marked as absent on 5 July. The claimant accepted that he had been absent.
44. On 18 June 2024, the claimant requested three weeks' (15 days) holiday from 29 July until 16 August. David Pink accepted that he and the claimant talked about the claimant wanting three weeks in Romania and that David Pink told the claimant that normal company policy was that he could only have 10 working days and that if he needed more he would have to request it on the app.

45. Jade Sheppard gave evidence that employees would apply for their holiday on the app and could see if it had been accepted or rejected on the app. In addition, they would be sent an automated email to their preferred email address.
46. The document produced by the respondent on day 2 of the hearing indicates that the claimant's request for the third week of holiday (incorrectly recorded from 13 August (should be 12 August) – 16 August 2024 was rejected on 29 July 2024.
47. In his oral evidence, the claimant suggested that he was only informed that his holiday request had been rejected in a text message on 9 August 2024 from David Pink. That text message has not been disclosed but the claimant quoted from it saying it read:-

“Your leave has now ended and the five days of holiday have been rejected.”

48. However, on the second day of the hearing, the respondent produced screenshots of David Pink's text messages to the claimant which covered the period 5 July – 12 August 24 and no such message appears. The 12 August 2024 message reads:-

“Morning Ion Hope you enjoyed your holiday when are you back into work.”

49. Whilst the claimant may have been expecting that the third week of holiday request would be approved, I find that it was not approved and that consequently the claimant was absent without leave from 12 August 2024.
50. On 19 August 2024, the claimant's wife rang David Paink and told him that Ion has not been well and would be driving back from Romania this week at some point.
51. To an extent, the issue as to whether the claimant should have been granted holiday for the week 12-16 August 2024 is academic. This is because by the time of the claimant's resignation on 30 August 2024 he had accrued 19.5 days annual leave. As of that date the claimant had taken 17 days annual leave along with six bank holidays, total 23 days. As such, pursuant to the terms of the claimants contract of employment, he stood to have 3.5 days deducted from his final pay. Had I found that the claimant was entitled to five days holiday pay for the period 12-16 August 2024, then the amount to be deducted from the claimant's final pay would have increased to 8.5 days and so the claimant would recover nothing. As it is, the respondent has elected to treat the nine days as qualifying for statutory sick pay and so, in reality, the claimant is better off. The claimant did not qualify for company sick pay as the method of reporting it was not in accordance with the policy.
52. There is an issue between the parties as to whether the claimant returned from holiday on 22 or on 23 August 2024. In my judgment not a great deal turns on this. The respondent has recorded the claimant as absent for nine days from 12 to 22 August and has accepted that statutory sick pay should be paid for the 22nd in any event.
53. It is common ground that on Friday 23 August 224 the claimant had a meeting with David Pink.

54. The claimant's pleaded case is that on his first day back at work he complained about the situation and requested an explanation as to why the additional five days of leave had not been approved. He states:-

"On 23 August 2024, I attended a meeting in the conference room with Mr Pink to further discuss my situation, and he informed me verbally that he would contact senior management and make a decision. Subsequently, on Monday, 26 August 2024, he informed me that nothing could be done regarding the nine days of absence and that the only solution was for me to submit my resignation, which he would then reject, and compensate me for the days recorded as unauthorised absence.

Mr Pink expressly stated that if I submitted my resignation, it would not be accepted and that he would arrange payment for the days in question. As I do not speak or write English well, Mr Pink provided me with a draft and instructed me to copy it and submit the resignation to him, assuring me that it would not be approved.

On Tuesday, 27 August 2024, I attended work and submitted my written resignation as instructed."

55. David Pink totally rejects the claimant's account. He states that when the claimant returned to work on Friday 23 August 2024 he brought with him a written resignation contained in a sealed envelope. In his witness statement he puts it as follows:-

"He asked whether he would be paid for the period of absence. I explained the three day waiting period for sickness, and I explained that holiday pay could not be used to cover sickness absence retrospectively. He responded by stating that he intended to leave his employment.

We then had a discussion during which I advised him not to make any decision that he might later regret. I suggested that he take the bank holiday weekend to discuss the matter with his wife and consider his position carefully."

56. The claimant accepted that his reference to Monday 26 August 2024 was incorrect as it was a bank holiday and that it had in fact been on 27 August 2024 that he was alleging that he was told to resign and tricked into resigning.

57. The resignation letter is handwritten by the claimant and reads as follows:-

"Dear David Pink

Please accept this letter as formal of my intention to resign from my position multi-skilled technician la [?] at Steer last day 30.08.2029

I would like to thank for all of the opportunities and support presented to me within the period of my employment yours sincerely

Ion Ciobota"

58. I place no significance on the fact that this is written in English and that the spelling is correct as the claimant is clearly proficient in the use of Google translate.

59. In deciding this issue, I have relied on two answers that the claimant gave when

cross examined about this topic. Due to the fact that the interpreter was providing the answer, I was careful to ensure that I had recorded the answer accurately.

60. Firstly, when the claimant was asked what it is that David Pink had said to him on 23 August 2024 he replied, "If you're not going to be paid best thing for you is to resign." I find that that is significantly different to the pleaded case that David Pink told him to resign and that it would not be accepted and that in some way this would prompt him being paid.
61. Secondly, although the claimant denied coming with his resignation letter, when it was put to him that David Pink had told him to take the weekend to think about it, his reply was as follows:-

"He said to me to think over the weekend what I wanted to do after that."

62. When I tried to ascertain from the claimant what it is that David Pink had asked him to think over the weekend, the claimant provided no satisfactory answer. He suggested that it was being told that he would not have unauthorised holiday absence after that holiday or that he should think about what he would do in the future.
63. I reject the claimant's evidence that he was in some way tricked into resigning and I prefer the evidence of David Pink that the claimant returned to work with his resignation letter written out. I make this finding for the following reasons:
 - 63.1 I find that the claimant was probably annoyed at not being granted five extra days holiday and that that was what prompted him to resign in the event that he would not be paid for it.
 - 63.2 I do not understand how the claimant resigning and having his resignation refused would prompt or enable David Pink to pay the claimant retrospectively for five days holiday.
 - 63.3 The claimant's English is limited and so the scope for misunderstanding is high.
 - 63.4 The answers given by the claimant in oral evidence are incompatible with his pleaded case that he was tricked into resigning and are more compatible with the evidence of David Pink. In particular, I find that the reference to being invited to think over the weekend what he wanted to do was probably in response to the claimant suggesting he would resign.
 - 63.5 On 27 August 2024 David Pink sent an email which contains the following:-

1. "Ion returned to the business on 23-9-24 after 9 days AWOL and said in the Return to Work interview on Friday 23rd August that he was handing his notice and I accepted and he said he would speak to his wife over the weekend..."

There is therefore contemporaneous evidence that the claimant resigned on the Friday.

64. Issue 6.3 is:

On a date between 22 August 2024 and 30 August 2024, David Pink telling the claimant to resign as it would not be accepted, tricking him into resigning from the respondent's employment."

65. For the above reasons, I find that issue 6.3 is not proved.

66. Issue 6.4 is:-

"The respondent, likely David Pink, telling the claimant's new employer words to the effect that the claimant was not a good worker."

67. The claimant's evidence on this is thin. He states that, during an interview with a new employer, he informed them that he had worked for the respondent and that the interviewer informed him that references and assessments would be requested from his former employer. He states that on his final day of the trial period he was told by his recruitment agent that he would begin employment with the new employer on the next Monday after his trial period. He states that:-

"However, on my last day, my manager at that company informed me that it would be my final day and that I would not be offered employment.

When I asked for an explanation, I was told that a previous employee would be returning to the role. However, as there was also a Romanian colleague working in the same position, that colleague later informed me – approximately six months later, when we met by chance – that I have not been hired because my former employer, Steer, had provided negative references and assessments."

68. All the respondent's witnesses deny that a reference was requested or provided by the respondent. When questioned why he had not provided any evidence from this Romanian colleague, the claimant said he had gone back to Romania and he did not have his telephone number.

69. The claimant has produced text messages between himself and the recruitment agent. The following exchanges took place on 1 November 2024:

Recruitment agent: "That's great. Are you working with them on Monday?" 11.40

Claimant: "Yes thank you." 12:50

Claimant: "I don't know what you understood, but he told me it was the last day of work" 15:03

Recruitment agent: "They have only just told us the panel beater is coming back. Piam is contacting other clients to book you more interviews for next week."

Claimant: "Fine" 12.52

Recruitment agent: "Are you happy" 12.53

Claimant: "Yes" 12.58

70. Thus, the evidence from the claimant and the text messages is that on the Friday he was told that another panel beater was returning and that his services were no longer required.
71. I place no probative value on the untested self-serving hearsay evidence of a Romanian colleague six months after the event.
72. I find that the claimant has failed to prove that the respondent informed the prospective new employer that the claimant was not a good worker. I find that the reason his employment was terminated was probably because of the return of an employee who he had been covering for.
73. Accordingly, issue 6.4 is not proved.
74. Even if an adverse reference had been provided, I find that the claimant has not proved that it was because of his race. In my judgment, it would be more probable due to his absence record.
75. Accordingly, the direct race discrimination claims are dismissed.
76. Due to my findings on the facts, so I do not need to deal with the time issue.

Unauthorised deduction of wages

77. On 1 July 2024 payslip, the claimant had one day deducted for absence (5 June 2024). As already recorded, the respondent accepts that the claimant is due to be paid for six hours, i.e., £138 gross.
78. On the 30 August 2024 payslip, the claimant was deducted 15 days. 3.5 days is said to represent a deduction in relation to holiday as already recorded. However, the 3.5 days was also separately deducted and consequently has been counted twice in error. 9 days represents the absence from the 12 August until 22 August 2024. The respondent has accepted that the claimant should have been paid statutory sick pay in the total sum of £140.10.
79. 1 day represents 5 July absence.
80. Consequently, I find that 10 days deductions were justified.
81. The respondent has been unable to account for the further 1.5 days deducted. Adding back 3.5 days and 1.5 days, the respondent accepts that the claimant should be paid $5 \times £218.50 = £1,092.50$.
82. The last of the deductions was on 30 August 2024 which is within three months of the issue of these proceedings on 22 November 2024 and is therefore in time.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Alliott

Date: 9 September 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

23 September 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Notes

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

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

www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/