

Injury to feelings awards

Case	Borg-Neal v Lloyds Banking Group Plc ET/2202667/22
Summary	Mr Borg-Neal was a long-standing employee at the respondent. During a racial awareness training session in which employees had been encouraged to speak freely, he asked a question in which he used the N-word in full to illustrate an example about the use of unacceptable language. The employer accepted that Mr Borg-Neal's question was valid, that he meant no malice, that he had immediately apologised and that he had not repeated the word. However, it considered that he should have known better than to use the word in a professional environment. It also took into account that the trainer had taken 4-5 days off work as a result of the incident. The respondent therefore dismissed Mr Borg-Neal for these reasons. The employment tribunal upheld Mr Borg-Neal's claim for unfair dismissal. In addition, it found that Mr Borg-Neal had been discriminated against for reasons arising out of his disability (dyslexia). The tribunal accepted that this condition hampered Mr Borg-Neal's ability to express himself and had contributed to him using the offensive word in full, without finding a way around it.
Top, middle or lower	
Case	Eddie Stobart Ltd v Graham [2025] EAT 14
Summary	Ms Graham, a planner for Eddie Stobart Ltd, announced her pregnancy in October 2021. In March 2022, the company began a redundancy process. Ms Graham believed she had a preferential right to a transport shift manager (TSM) vacancy under regulation 10 of the Maternity and Parental Leave etc Regulations 1999. The employer disagreed, deeming the role unsuitable. Ms Graham attended a competitive interview for the TSM position but was unsuccessful. Her grievance about the redundancy process was blocked by the employer's firewall and went unread. Despite mentioning this at a consultation meeting and being advised to resend it, the grievance remained unaddressed. She was subsequently notified of her redundancy. Ms Graham filed employment tribunal claims for unfair dismissal, unlawful detriment, pregnancy and maternity discrimination, and victimisation. The tribunal rejected most claims, agreeing the TSM

	role was unsuitable. However, it found the employer's failure to address her grievance constituted unlawful detriment and discrimination.
Top, middle or lower	
Case:	Acheson v Avon Fire and Rescue Service ET/1400826/2022 and ET/1402825/2022
Summary	Ms Acheson worked as a firefighter with Avon Fire and Rescue Service. She resigned after a campaign of discrimination by Dean Davies, a Crew Manager, but also suffered discrimination as a result of a misogynistic culture. She was successful in claims of constructive dismissal, direct discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The tribunal found that the acts of discrimination included: belittling her; ignoring what she said but praising a male firefighter who repeated it; male colleagues openly and frequently making sexist comments; sexist banter (sometimes started by managers); asking, about a new female recruit, "is she fit?"; Mr Davies telling colleagues he and Ms Acheson had watched porn together; suggesting a female colleague's place was in the kitchen rather than the gym; and various other acts of discrimination and victimisation. The tribunal found that Ms Acheson had intended to remain in the Fire Service for the rest of her career and that she viewed her work not as a job, but as a vocation. The discrimination had had a significant impact on her mental health and she had suffered PTSD as a result.
Top, middle or lower	