



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr L J Dodsworth

**Respondents:** (1) Platform 81 Ltd  
(2) Mr Nicholas James Martin Wroe

**Heard at:** Manchester Employment Tribunal  
**On:** 8 May 2024

**Before:** Employment Judge Eeley

## **Representation**

**Claimant:** Mr S Shipton, Trade Union Representative  
**Respondent:** Ms L Halsall, counsel

# JUDGMENT

The judgment of the Tribunal is as follows:

1. From 1 August 2022 the claimant was a disabled person as defined by section 6 Equality Act 2010 because of mixed anxiety and depression.
2. The claimant's complaint against the first respondent of being subjected to a detriment for making a protected disclosure (where the detriment complained of was dismissal) is dismissed upon withdrawal by the claimant.
3. The respondents' application (pursuant to rule 37(1)(a)) to strike out the claimant's complaint against the second respondent of being subjected to a detriment for making a protected disclosure (where the detriment complained of was dismissal) is refused.
4. The respondents' application for a deposit order in relation to the claimant's complaint against the second respondent of being subjected to a detriment for making a protected disclosure (where the detriment complained of was dismissal) is refused.
5. The respondents' application for a deposit order in relation to the claimant's complaint of harassment related to sexual orientation is

refused.

6. The respondents' application for strike out (pursuant to rule 37(1)(a)) of the claimant's complaint against the first respondent of automatically unfair dismissal because of protected disclosures (section 103A Employment Rights Act 1996) is refused.
7. The respondent's application for a deposit order in respect of the claimant's complaint against the first respondent of automatically unfair dismissal because of protected disclosures (section 103A) Employment Rights Act 1996) is refused.
8. The respondents' application for strike out or a deposit order in relation to the complaint of disability related harassment in respect of the comments made by Ms Meredith, is refused. The Tribunal will decide at the final hearing whether or not the claim was presented within the applicable time limit and/or whether it is just and equitable to extend the time limit for bringing the claim.

Employment Judge Eeley

Date: 8 May 2024

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

Date: 16 May 2024

.....  
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

### **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.

### **Public access to employment tribunal decisions**

Judgments and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at [www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions](http://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/>