



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Respondent

v

Mr S Hussey

Air Liquide (Home Care) Ltd

Judgment

Heard at: Southampton (CVP)

On: 22 January 2021

Before: Employment Judge Rayner

Appearances

For the Claimant: Mr S Hussey (Claimants son)

For the Respondent: Miss J Duane Counsel

1. The case was heard remotely over CVP. It was held in Public with the parties and the Judge attending by video link. It was heard in this manner because of the ongoing pandemic and the need to maintain social distance and with the consent of the parties.
2. The claimant was a disabled person within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010 at the material times by reason of a right shoulder impairment with osteoarthritis.
3. The claimant was not disabled by reason of depression and anxiety at the material times.
4. The claimant was not disabled by the separate condition of Arthritis at the material times

Employment Judge Rayner

Southampton

Dated 22 January 2021

Sent to the parties on 1 February 2021

Notes

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

Note: online publication of judgments and reasons

The ET is required to maintain a register of all judgments and written reasons. The register must be accessible to the public. It has recently been moved online. All judgments and reasons since February 2017 are now available at:
<https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions>.

The ET has no power to refuse to place a judgment or reasons on the online register, or to remove a judgment or reasons from the register once they have been placed there. If you consider that these documents should be anonymised in any way prior to publication, you will need to apply to the ET for an order to that effect under Rule 50 of the ET's Rules of Procedure. Such an application would need to be copied to all other parties for comment and it would be carefully scrutinised by a judge (where appropriate, with panel members) before deciding whether (and to what extent) anonymity should be granted to a party or a witness