WRIGLEYS
SOLICITORS

EMPLOYMENT LAW BULLETIN

JANUARY 2022

Welcome to Wrigleys' Employment Law Bulletin, January 2022.

In our first article this month we report on the interesting case of ***Hope v British Medical Association*** in which the EAT considered whether a dismissal for raising a series of informal grievances and refusing to formalise them was fair in all the circumstances. This case provides helpful guidance on when a dismissal for conduct which is not gross misconduct may be found to be fair.

In ***Wells Cathedral School Ltd v Souter & Leishman***, the EAT considered whether it was just and equitable to extend the time limit to bring discrimination claims. In this case, the claimants argued their delay was due to their wish to resolve their concerns through an internal grievance process.

Readers will be aware that staff working in care homes are now subject to a Care Quality Commission requirement to be vaccinated against Covid-19 or to have a valid medical exemption. However, before this requirement was brought into force a number of care sector employers issued management instructions requiring their staff to be vaccinated. We report on a recent employment tribunal decision, ***Ms C Allette v Scarsdale Grange Nursing Home Limited***, which considered whether a care home worker was fairly dismissed for refusing to comply with a management instruction to be vaccinated.

And in the next in our series of **Wrigleys' Essential Guides**, we share some top tips for those undertaking the investigation stage of the disciplinary process.

It would be great to see you at our next free **Employment Brunch Briefing on 1 February** which is a useful data protection update for employers from our regular guest speaker, Ibrahim Hasan of Act Now Training. Please see the link below to book your place or to access recordings of our past Employment Brunch Briefings.

We are always interested in feedback or suggestions for topics that may be of interest to you, so please do get in touch.

– Alacoque Marvin, Editor **alacoque.marvin@wrigleys.co.uk**

Forthcoming webinars:

Employment Brunch Briefing

Data protection update for employers

1 February 2022 | 10:00 - 11:15

Guest Speaker: Ibrahim Hasan, solicitor and director of Act Now Training Limited

Click here for more information or to book

Employment Brunch Briefing

To be confirmed

5 April 2022 | 10:00 - 11:15

Speaker: *Sue King, partner & Micahel Crowther solicitor at Wrigleys Solicitors*

Click here for more information or to book

If you would like to catch up on previous webinars, please follow this link.

Contents

Employee fairly dismissed for using grievance process as a 'repository of unresolved complaints'

Article published on 19 January 2022

EAT decision highlights that abuse of the grievance process may give employers grounds to dismiss.

Every employer should have a grievance policy. These are designed to act as a way for employees to raise issues on a wide range of topics concerning their employment, from their terms and conditions and treatment to broader issues including leadership and culture.

For this reason, they are a useful pressure release valve designed to allow an employee's voice to be heard via a constructive process and also to alert the employer to issues that, if left unchecked, might otherwise lead to conflict, liabilities and claims.

However, a good grievance policy will point out that it is not there to be abused and that 'vexatious or frivolous' complaints may be treated as disciplinary issues. A recent EAT decision has highlighted an example of this type of behaviour and when it may lead to grounds for dismissal.

Case: ***Hope -v- British Medical Association [2021]***

Mr Hope submitted comments to his line manager about a report written by another manager, Ms Dunn. These were seen by Mr Jethwa, Ms Dunn's line manager, who fed back to Mr Hope that some of the comments were inappropriate and that the tone of them was dismissive of Ms Dunn.

A grievance was raised by Mr Hope with his line manager seeking reassurance that management did not share Mr Jethwa's views. The grievance and subsequent appeal were not upheld.

Mr Hope separately wrote to his line manager raising concerns that he was not being included in certain management meetings, asking that these concerns be dealt with informally. The same issue was raised at least two more times but when asked if he wanted to make a formal complaint, Mr Hope refused but stated that he did not wish to 'give up his ability to do so'. Mr Hope was told to decide by a particular date whether he wanted to pursue a formal hearing. In response, Mr Hope raised a grievance against being subjected to an 'arbitrary deadline' and asked that the time limit be withdrawn.

Several more complaints were made informally by Mr Hope against Ms Dunn and Mr Jethwa, but each time he refused to bring a formal complaint. Ms Dunn began to feel that Mr Hope's constant criticism of her amounted to harassment and when Mr Jethwa offered to try and resolve the situation via informal means, Mr Hope refused. Mr Jethwa made clear that if the informal complaints persisted the matter may be considered under the disciplinary procedure. Mr Hope wrote to Mr Jethwa to raise an informal concern about the threat of disciplinary action.

Eventually, Mr Hope was informed that if these matters could not be resolved informally then a formal process would be undertaken. Mr Hope was warned that if a formal process found his complaints to be frivolous or vexatious, it could result in disciplinary action. Mr Hope was then invited to a formal grievance meeting, but he refused to attend. It was held in his absence and his complaints were found to be frivolous, vexatious and disrespectful and that his actions were insubordinate.

A disciplinary hearing was then held at which it was decided to dismiss Mr Hope, who was paid in lieu of notice.

The Employment Tribunal concluded the dismissal was fair on the basis that, during the disciplinary hearing, the BMA had made reasonable findings that Mr Hope had persisted in

making multiple informal grievances without either withdrawing them or taking them to a formal hearing, that he had refused reasonable line management instructions and had failed to attend the grievance hearing convened. The Tribunal found BMA was entitled to conclude this was unreasonable conduct and found that dismissal was within the band of reasonable responses in these circumstances because Mr Hope's actions undermined the working relationship and amounted to conduct which was likely to breach the implied term of trust and confidence.

EAT decision

Mr Hope's chief grounds of appeal were that the Tribunal had erred by concluding his actions could be gross misconduct because they were not deliberate wrongdoing or gross negligence, as directed by case law on the subject. He also claimed that the decision to find his dismissal fair was perverse because it set a precedent that employees may be obliged to bring formal complaints if they raised a matter informally.

The EAT dismissed all grounds of appeal. On the issue of gross misconduct, the EAT highlighted that the concept was a contractual one which may be used by employers as a basis on which to dismiss employees without notice or pay in lieu of notice where specific acts deemed to be gross misconduct by the employer were established to have taken place. The EAT noted that in this case, BMA did not need to consider if Mr Hope had deliberately or wilfully contravened his contractual terms as this was not the issue at hand. Rather the question was whether BMA's decision to dismiss met the requirements of s.98(4) Employment Rights Act 1996, which in this case the Tribunal had established the BMA had done.

On perversity, the EAT judge concluded that on the facts of the case it was clear that raising multiple informal complaints but refusing to resolve them could amount to misconduct. This finding did not undermine grievance procedures because grievances should either be withdrawn or resolved formally if an informal approach does not resolve them. In the EAT's view, Mr Hope was abusing the process by treating it as a 'repository of unresolved complaints' that he could save and dredge up at a later time.

Comment

It is easy to see how situations like the one in this case could arise. Grievance policies do not usually set out the need to either withdraw or resolve a grievance because the working assumption is that the party raising one would do so in good faith. Without this clarity in writing employers may be put in a difficult position, considering whether taking action against the employee would breach the employer's duty of implied trust and confidence to the employee to deal with a grievance, or be taken as retaliation (or a detriment) for raising the grievance, and potentially result in claims.

Although the precise reasons for doing so are not clear, Mr Hope was pushing his employer into an increasingly difficult position by refusing to engage with the grievance process properly. It should not go unnoticed that Mr Hope's actions were being interpreted as harassment by Ms Dunn, putting further pressure on his employer to resolve the matter.

BMA were able to be proactive in dealing with this issue, rather than tie itself in knots trying not to offend Mr Hope, and in doing so recognised its duties to other employees affected by Mr Hope's actions.

The decision in this case will be welcomed by employers, but it should not be seen as a licence to mistreat employees who raise grievances. As well as potentially being a breach of trust and confidence, failure to deal with grievances is a breach of the ACAS Code. If the matter came to a court or tribunal, compensation awards would be subject to a 25% uplift as per ACAS guidance.

Was pursuing an internal grievance process sufficient reason to extend the time limit to bring discrimination claims?

Article published on 13 January 2022

In some cases, delaying legal proceedings to pursue a grievance process will mean it is just and equitable to extend time.

How long do claimants have to bring a discrimination claim?

The time limit for employees to bring claims under the Equality Act 2010 to an employment tribunal is three months from the date of the act complained of, or the date of the last in a series of discriminatory acts. In practice, this means that potential claimants must notify Acas of their complaints within three months of this date for the purposes of early conciliation before proceeding with a claim to an employment tribunal.

Unlike unfair dismissal claims, Equality Act claims can be brought during employment and employees may decide to begin legal proceedings before any internal processes are concluded to ensure that their claims are not out of time.

When will the time limit for discrimination claims be extended?

In general, time limits in the employment tribunal are strict and there is a presumption that the time limit will not be extended.

Employment tribunals can decide to allow Equality Act claims to proceed which they consider have been presented within a further "just and equitable" period after the normal time limit. The onus will be on the claimant to persuade the tribunal that there is some good reason why it would be just and equitable to extend time in the given case.

This is a discretionary decision for the tribunal to make but there are some common factors which are usually considered based on case law. These include:

- the prejudice to the claimant in not being able to pursue time-barred claims;
- the prejudice to the respondent in having to defend claims which would otherwise be time-barred;
- the extent of the delay;
- the reasons for the delay; and
- whether the claimant had taken legal advice and was aware of the time limits.

Case law has made clear that there is no automatic extension of the time limit where the delay is due to an internal grievance process.

A recent decision of the EAT has provided useful guidance on when tribunals will decide it is just and equitable to extend time because of an internal grievance process.

Case details: ***Wells Cathedral School Ltd v Souter & Leishman***

Mr Souter and Ms Leishman (a married couple) were employed by Wells Cathedral School as Head of Strings and a visiting violin teacher respectively. Ms Leishman was diagnosed with cancer and had an extended period of absence. She alleges that on her return to work, she was subject to discriminatory acts including that she was not permitted to return to her full teaching roster and was subjected to an informal capability process. She submitted a data subject access request. Mr Souter then had sight of documents which he alleged showed that he had been discriminated against in relation to his wife's disability. Some of their allegations dated back to 2016.

Ms Leishman presented an internal grievance in August 2018, assisted by her solicitors. The grievance outcome of October 2018 was not in her favour. On appeal, the original grievance decision was upheld on 21 December 2018. Ms Leishman resigned on 4 January 2019. She completed Acas early conciliation and presented her discrimination and constructive dismissal claims on 26 April 2019.

Mr Souter was signed off work with stress from January 2018 and presented his own grievance in July 2018, again assisted by solicitors. Grievance hearings were held in February and March 2019, but the panel appointed to consider his grievance withdrew in April 2019 and it was not concluded. Mr Souter resigned on 25 April 2019. Following completion of the Acas early conciliation process, he presented his discrimination and constructive dismissal claims on 26 July 2019.

The factors considered by the employment tribunal

The employment tribunal had to consider at a preliminary stage whether the claimants were out of time to bring their Equality Act claims. The tribunal decided that both claimants had brought their claims within a just and equitable period and so their claims could continue to a full hearing.

In making this decision the tribunal considered the following factors which weighed against allowing the extension:

1. The delay was considerable in this case, being some months in respect of many of the allegations, and years in the case of others;
2. The claimants were aware of the relevant facts by Spring or Summer of 2018; and
3. The claimants did not argue that they had received negligent advice and appeared to have taken deliberate decisions not to issue legal proceedings sooner.

However, the following factors in the claimants' favour weighed more heavily and were the basis of the tribunal's decision to allow an extension of time:

4. Although a grievance does not automatically make it just and equitable to extend time, it can be a relevant factor. The tribunal stated that the grievances were relevant in two ways
   a. they showed the claimants' desire to pursue an internal process with a view to resolving their differences with their employer and this was to be encouraged; and
   b. more importantly, they served to "crystallise" the allegations and put the employer on notice that the claimants considered that their treatment had been discriminatory, that they had received advice, had contemplated proceedings and were pursuing internal procedures first. This allowed the employer to take steps to investigate and preserve evidence around the allegations.

5. When considering prejudice to the respondent, the tribunal took into account that it had notice from Summer 2018 that the claimants considered they had discrimination claims, and there was no suggestion that the cogency of either oral or documentary evidence had been affected by the delay.

The EAT decision

The EAT dismissed the employer's appeal against this preliminary decision.

It made clear that tribunals have a wide discretion to decide whether it is just and equitable to extend time in discrimination claims, and held that the tribunal was entitled to find from the facts in this case that there was no significant prejudice to the respondent caused by the delay. However, it made clear that this will not be the same in every case, that there is no automatic extension of time where an employee raises a grievance, and that there will be cases where delay because of a grievance process will not mean it is just and equitable to extend the time limit.

The EAT also noted that the tribunal had considered the prejudice to the respondent in having to defend otherwise time-barred claims and had taken into account that many of the allegations

would need to be considered in any event in relation to the constructive dismissal claims.

The window of uncertainty

The time limits for bringing claims in the employment tribunal provide employers with some certainty as to when the risks of a claim will subside. However, as can be seen in this case, there are circumstances where claimants will be allowed to present claims after the normal time limit. Employers should be alert to this extended period of uncertainty and ensure that document retention policies and risk management procedures take this into account.

In other employment claims, such as unfair dismissal, tribunals must rather decide whether it was "not reasonably practicable" for the claimant to bring the claim within the normal time limit. It is arguably easier for claimants to persuade a tribunal to extend time in discrimination claims because the tribunal has wider discretion and can take any factors into account when deciding on what is a just and equitable period in which the bring the claim.

Employers should also be aware that the time limit for bringing a discrimination claim can be extended by further allegedly discriminatory acts, including allegations of victimisation relating to previous complaints about discrimination. This might include the way a grievance process has been handled, or the grievance outcome itself. Readers may be interested in our recent article on a related topic: Is there a risk of discrimination claims where disability is first raised in a post-dismissal grievance process (available on our website).

Care home worker fairly dismissed for refusing Covid-19 vaccination

Article published on 31 January 2022

Employee's genuine fear and scepticism did not override the vaccination requirement.

In the first year of the pandemic, care home operators in particular were placed in an extremely difficult position, trying to protect their (often vulnerable) residents from the outbreak whilst also juggling staff exhaustion and illness.

Whilst the arrival of a vaccine gave hope, employers were left to navigate between doing what they felt was best to protect residents and staff in the face of vaccine hesitancy. In 2021 we saw the government make it compulsory for care home workers to become vaccinated unless otherwise exempt, with all frontline NHS staff now facing a mandatory vaccination deadline in April 2022.

Whilst mandatory vaccination creates its own challenges (see our article 'Can employers insist that employees are vaccinated', available on our website), it does at least make it more straight-forward for employers to say to staff that if they do not get vaccinated they are at risk of losing their jobs because otherwise the employer would be in breach of the law. Until mandatory vaccinations came in, employers had to consider whether staff refusing the vaccine could be fairly dismissed. A recent employment tribunal decision considering events from early 2021 has provided a useful insight into the factors engaged in such a scenario.

Case: ***Ms C Allette -v- Scarsdale Grange Nursing Home Limited [2022]***

Ms Allette was employed by the Home as a Care Assistant which involved her attending to the personal care needs of residents, many of whom suffered from dementia. In December 2020 the UK government began approving the use of new covid-19 vaccinations and at the same time plans were made to target the vaccination programme at the most vulnerable and to frontline NHS and care home staff.

The Home's owners, Mr and Mrs McDonagh, arranged for all staff to have the vaccine and began consulting staff about their proposal to offer it to staff and to gather information needed to book it. Ms Allette did not provide her NHS number to receive a vaccine. At about this time Mr McDonagh was in contact with the Home's insurers who relayed to him that the home would not be covered if unvaccinated staff contracted Covid-19 and either died or suffered other consequences from infection, including passing it on to residents who died or otherwise suffered lasting effects from it.

Days before the vaccines were due to be administered to staff, the Home suffered a serious Covid-19 outbreak, resulting in the death of several residents and half of staff being required to self-isolate at home.

Considering the risk to residents, the input of the insurers and also having experienced the outbreak at the Home, Mr and Mrs McDonagh made vaccination for the Home's staff compulsory. Mr McDonagh spoke with Ms Allette on the phone to ask why she had not provided her NHS details for the vaccine and it soon became apparent Ms Allette did not want to take it.

Mr McDonagh discussed Ms Allette's reluctance, stressing that if she refused it her job would be at risk. Ms Allette explained her reluctance on information she found on the internet alluding to the vaccine being unsafe due to the speed at which it had been developed and that government information concerning the vaccine was inaccurate and the risks of the vaccine were not being reported. Mr McDonagh relayed the information he had been provided from Public Health England, the NHS and elsewhere in an effort to convince Ms Allette to get vaccinated. Ms Allette would need to get vaccinated the next day and Mr McDonagh asked her to 'sleep on it'.

Ms Allette did not get vaccinated and the next time she reported to work she was suspended and informed she was invited to a disciplinary hearing to face allegations of refusing reasonable management instructions by not taking the vaccine. At the hearing, Ms Allette claimed she was hesitant to take the vaccine for religious reasons, but when pressed about this admitted she had not mentioned this in her previous conversation with Mr McDonagh. Mr McDonagh concluded her real reason for refusing the vaccine was her scepticism based on online information she had read. Mr McDonagh concluded this was not a valid reason for refusing the instruction and ultimately dismissed her for gross misconduct.

Ms Allette appealed the decision, but her appeal was dismissed. Ms Allette then brought claims for unfair dismissal, part of which included a ground that her rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) to respect for a private life had been infringed. She did not bring any discrimination claim.

Tribunal decision

The tribunal concluded that the Home was entitled to dismiss Ms Allette in the circumstances of the case. Though there was no contractual right to require the vaccination, nor any clear consequences for refusing it in the disciplinary policy, the tribunal considered that the Home had a reasonable legitimate basis for requiring staff to be vaccinated, not least for the protection of staff and residents but also for the fact that if staff failed to do so the employer would be left open to liabilities due to the requirements of their insurers.

The tribunal concluded that Article 8 ECHR had been engaged by the requirement to be vaccinated, but that Ms Allette's rights in this respect had to be balanced in light of the Article 8 rights of the other staff members and residents (in relation to the risks of having an unvaccinated person in the home). Given those factors, and the factual background and circumstances of the Home and the UK in general in the winter of 2020/2021, the tribunal concluded Ms Allette's Article 8 rights had not been breached. Her claims were dismissed.

Conclusion

This case will be of interest to employers who were faced with similar circumstances to the Home. In particular, it is worth noting that the tribunal considered the specific perils faced by the care home and its residents at the time Ms Allette refused the vaccine. Although the tribunal was keen to point out the importance of the specifics of the case, a few useful insights can be highlighted:

1. The situation created by the pandemic required employers to act and apply new rules and requirements on staff, even where there was no explicit contractual or policy basis for them;
2. Whilst employers were obliged to consider alternatives to dismissal, they were not obliged to furlough staff to avoid the conflict created by a refusal to vaccinate;
3. The employee's reasons for refusing to vaccinate were important. In Ms Allette's case, her grounds were based on unsubstantiated claims found on the internet rather than on any religious belief. She could not produce reliable reports or data to back up her scepticism;
4. Not following the ACAS code on disciplinaries is not fatal to a defence in these circumstances, provided there were good reasons for these; and
5. Clear and precise notes were crucial – Mr McDonagh's version of events were preferred by the tribunal due to them being taken contemporaneously and consistency. These helped to show the tribunal precisely why decisions were being taken which was ultimately why the tribunal was able to show they were fair.

Whilst indicative of whether or not a dismissal was fair in these circumstances, it should be noted that this first-instance decision is not binding. It will therefore be interesting to see whether this case, or one similar, reaches the EAT to set out any specific precedent.

Wrigleys' Essential Guide The Disciplinary Process

Article published on 3 December 2021

How thorough should an investigation be?

In this series of articles, Wrigleys' employment team explores the disciplinary process, offering guidance on key steps for employers.

In this article, we look at the steps an employer should take to ensure the initial investigation of a disciplinary matter is fair.

If a disciplinary issue arises an employer cannot proceed straight to disciplinary action. Employers must take reasonable steps to identify relevant facts and evidence that will allow them to decide whether to proceed to a formal disciplinary hearing and, if so, that will allow the hearing manager to determine whether the allegations are upheld or not.

For this reason, conducting a thorough investigation is key to an employer being able to demonstrate that they acted fairly in coming to a disciplinary decision, which will be important if the matter is ever subject to tribunal proceedings.

Striking the right balance can be difficult for employers – just how thorough is thorough enough?

1. Preparation and setting up the investigation

The investigator must ensure they are clear about the allegation(s) they are tasked to investigate. They should also consider in advance what type of information will be needed to allow them to decide if there is a case to answer and create an investigation plan to structure the investigation process.

Investigators should not set out to 'prove' or 'disprove' a specific allegation, but rather seek out and gather the facts and evidence which will allow them to weigh up whether there is a specific case to answer. Remember, it is the disciplinary hearing manager(s) who will ultimately decide if the allegations are upheld or not.

Where it is clear that the misconduct complained of could result in serious disciplinary consequences, such as dismissal, the investigator should prepare from an early stage to go into detail on the facts and events surrounding the alleged misconduct. The more serious the potential consequences, the more thorough the investigation needs to be (more on this below).

2. Gathering evidence

i) Witnesses

Most disciplinary investigations will involve at least one meeting with the employee accused of misconduct but may include meetings with witnesses. Investigation meetings should record the date, place and time of the interview, those present and an accurate record of the key points that arose. This will usually be better served by either having a note-taker present at the meeting or an employer might consider taking a recording of the meeting, providing the parties present are happy with this. Witnesses should be asked to sign an agreed copy of the minutes / transcript of the interview, or a written statement setting out their evidence.

The investigator should carefully consider who to call as a witness. For example, asking every employee in the team risks wasting time and spreading rumours about the employee that can cause problems for both the employer and employee. For this reason, witnesses should be carefully selected for their relevance to the facts which need to be established.

Investigators should also stick to relevant topics and questions with a witness and draw upon any other evidence gathered prior to the meeting. An investigator should always consider following up on any leads or claims made by a witness and can invite witnesses back for further meetings to test any evidence arising during the investigation. Witnesses referred to in the investigation meeting with the employee should usually be interviewed, unless it is reasonable to conclude that their evidence would not be relevant.

ii) Other evidence

An investigator should gather all the relevant evidence they can, including witness evidence, documentary evidence, digital evidence and physical evidence in the time available. Thought should be given to the type of evidence likely to be needed, whether it is available and how it can be accessed. What type of evidence will be collated will depend on the nature of the allegation. For example, some misconduct will only be apparent after reviewing documentary evidence (e.g. timesheet fraud or accounting misconduct) whereas other forms of misconduct may rely more heavily on witness evidence (harassment, bullying or violence).

It is also important to make sure that an investigator has taken steps to gather evidence that would undermine the allegations and clear the employee of wrongdoing, where this exists.

iii) Thoroughness

A good investigator should seek to establish facts with multiple sources of evidence. Multiple sources of evidence of different types which support one another can provide context and strengthen the case. For example, witness evidence can be biased and unreliable, and individual written documents may be partial or misleading, but witness evidence and written documentation which are consistent with each other are likely to be more reliable in establishing facts.

Precisely how thorough an investigator should be will in part depend on the seriousness of the

misconduct. For example, if misconduct were upheld, will it result in dismissal or, as in some cases, disbarment from a professional body or regulated activity (e.g. nurses, carers or teachers) putting their future career at risk. Where the potential consequences are this serious, investigators should make extra efforts to gather all relevant evidence they can.

3. Making findings of fact

An investigator should go in search of evidence that shows the employee did not commit the suspected allegations. For this reason, it is common that investigators will find contradictory evidence. Where possible, an investigation report should make findings of facts on the balance of probabilities. This means drawing conclusions about where the weight of the evidence points and, if possible, determine which versions of events or pieces of evidence are preferred and on what basis. Where there is contradictory witness evidence, this will often mean taking into account evidence which supports or undermines a witness' credibility.

It is not for the investigator to reach conclusions about culpability or appropriate sanctions, and so the investigator should not give an opinion or view about this.

4. Is there a case to answer?

Once all evidence has been collected, an investigator should review and weigh the evidence and consider whether the facts established by the investigation suggest there is a case to answer.

An investigation report should be put together to summarise the evidence collected, highlight key evidence and set out the specific misconduct allegations the evidence points towards before providing a recommendation of whether or not to put the allegations to the employee in a disciplinary hearing.

The result of a good disciplinary investigation should be an investigation report that clearly sets out:

- Whether there are any disciplinary allegations to answer
- What those allegations are
- What the evidence for and against those allegations is, with an indication of the key evidence supporting and (if any) undermining the allegation is
- Where the evidence was found or gathered from

This will assist the hearing manager to identify early where the key matters of a disciplinary hearing will be and thus help them to prepare a fair hearing and, ultimately, come to a fair outcome.

For further information, please refer to Acas guidance: Conducting Workplace Investigations.

If you would like further information on how to carry out a thorough investigation, it is always a good idea to speak to a professional HR adviser or employment law specialist before carrying out your investigation.

If you would like to contact us please email
alacoque.marvin@wrigleys.co.uk

www.wrigleys.co.uk

Wrigleys Solicitors LLP, 19 Cookridge Street, Leeds LS2 3AG. Telephone 0113 244 6100 Fax 0113 244 6101