

OTTOS BAD MONTH.

Research report.



CLAUDIO PERUGINI | LEGAL RESEARCH | 2404394 |
BMLC5008 | 01/05/2026.

CONTENTS PAGE.

Contents Page. 0

AI Statement.....1

Executive Summary. 2

Introduction.....3

Research & Findings. 3

Conclusion.....5

References. 6

End Page. 7

AI STATEMENT.

This report shall include some AI capabilities that include structuring, researching, question answering, data research, planning, preparing if needs be & also on times & particular instances to break massive quantities of text down to a more manageable & concise summary to better understand complex issues.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

INTRODUCTION.

This research report sole purpose is for the purpose & study of workplace harassment & bullying & will also involve the study of negotiation, contracts & acceptance of offer about two separate incidents to report upon. The 1st incident is a workplace dispute involving a senior employee named Otto who has worked at 'Woods Construction Ltd' for a decade whilst providing his services to help the company in its endeavors. Otto has experienced workplace bullying from a new manager named Blue. Otto has had an extremely difficult experience and although he has informed the HR department about Blues behavior the result was that of a verbal addressing from the HR department toward Blue. The behaviour can be seen as harassment & bullying & has continued also involving colleagues who have been found in conversation with Blue who has target Otto giving further evidence to the matter. There is also an incident ongoing on the buying & selling of a laptop with a businessperson named Evan. The problem here to understand is the ongoing bullying from Blue in incident one & also whether Otto has a case on the acceptance of an offer made between himself & Evan. The main objective is to ensure that Otto is to feel safe and reassured that the behaviour he has experienced is completely unacceptable & shall be given good advice to help his current case moving forward. Throughout all this analysis Otto has come to 'LOP' Legal' for legal advice on both incidents & will be treated with deep concern, effort towards the case & empathy for the reputation of Otto & his career moving forward.

RESEARCH & FINDINGS.

Investigating the 1st incident involving Otto, Blue & Woods Construction has led to the point of conduct where both the company & managers behaviour is in question. According to the Advisory Conciliation & Arbitration Service [acas], (2025) guidance on discrimination is important & acknowledging the point of the laws surrounding discrimination & all its consequences is paramount in this situation. The reason for acas is to provide information on such 'protected characteristics' to ensure that there is a criteria for employers to adhere to with 100% commitment to ensure that their workplace is safe & protected from within from discrimination as a conduct. What this links to is the legislation involved and the law can be found in the (*Equality Act 2010*). According to (UK Government, 2015) the (*EA 2010*) provides all the updated legal provisions to protect people against discrimination. The act was enforced to provide a contemporary legal understanding on workplace harassment & discrimination. This can become better understood through the provisions that can protect the 'special characteristics' as associated earlier. In s. 4 of the (*EA 2010*) the 'special characteristics' can be found. The main characteristic to link with from the incident involving Otto, Blue & 'WCLtd' is 'age'. This characteristic can be better understood in s.5 (1)(a)(b) of the (*EA 2010*) proving the point that Blues remarks & conduct are a breach of the provision in the act. According to s. 13(1) of (*EA 2010*) there is a provision that identifies 'direct discrimination' & this is what Otto has experienced. The fact that due to this discrimination as whole Otto has also been a target of less favourable treatment than other employees. The enactment proves this point & I also reinforced in s.13(2) of the (*EA 2010*) proving the point that the only aim from Blue in this matter was to discriminate and also damage Blues workplace reputation due to his age rather than make an example of Ottos long term service of employment at 'WCLtd'. To strengthen the case further regarding 'special characteristics' such as 'age' there is a judgment found by the (UK Government, 2023) in 'Cubbin v Age UK' (2024) the case proves the severity of 'age' related discrimination and also provides a detailed account on the events. What this can provide Otto with is the reassurance that he has succumbed to workplace Harassment & Discrimination both direct & indirect. The claims from Otto can be strengthened after establishing what the 3 elements of harassment are as found in the source above & these comprise of 'unwanted conduct', 'Violating the claimants dignity' & 'related to claimants age'. These 3 elements are proven in the case that was successful with age related discrimination in question. A similar case is that of 'Richmond Pharmacology v Dhaliwal' (2009). Although the case relates to racial discrimination in the workplace it is related to 'special characteristics' in question. The case also provides a remedy of compensation of £1000 proving that there is damage committed by the offending party. Just to add there is a remedy found in the case prior relating to 'Cubbin v Age UK', with a unanimous judgement the claimants age related claim succeeds with a remedy of £4,316.50. Again just proving the point that Otto does have a sufficient claim here (UK Government, 2023).

The above cases can relate to the term 'harassment' & the 3 elements can be found in s. 26(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) of the (EA 2010). What this can determine is the full scope of the misconduct from Blues behaviour justified through legislation & case law. There is also an act found within the brief of the incident involving work delegation that has also affected Otto in general & this was after the fact that Otto had to notify 'WCLtd's' HR department of the direct discrimination received. Indirect discrimination can be found in s. 2(b)(c)(d), 3 of the (EA 2010). Proves the point again relating to the fact that Blue later then was found mentioning to internal staff that he would be delegating the harder jobs toward Otto until he resigns. This can be seen as indirect discrimination and can prove clinical in the case moving forward. Another provision to look at would be s. 27(1) that states a good understanding of victimisation & this is clearly visible again in this case. What this all links toward is the full understanding of what has really occurred here in this incident. It would be a good idea to also examine the acts of 'WCLtd's' HR departments scrutiny towards the complaint made by Otto towards the newly appointed manager & Whether there was a serious investigation to the matter. Although there was an informal verbal procedure commenced by the HR department the question would be was this enough to support Otto & his reputation & wellbeing as long serving employee? A good place to start regarding the HR departments procedures & resolutions for such matters is to always promote the welfare of all its staff and this point seems to have fallen under the standards set as found in s. 2(1) of the (*Health and Safety at Work Act etc. Act 1974*). The provision promotes employee welfare, the treatment towards Otto's welfare could then jeopardise his workmanship that can then deter his health & safety standards that could in turn damage others around him due to distress. The legislation is a good start to understand that the HR department may also be at fault due to its lack of severity to the issue.

CONCLUSION.

REFERENCES.

Advisory Conciliation & Arbitration Services [acas] (2025) Discrimination at work: Discrimination and the Equality Act 2010. Available at: <https://www.acas.org.uk/discrimination-and-the-law> (Accessed: 27 February 2026).

Equality Act 2010, c. 15. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents> (Accessed: 27 February 2026).

UK Government (2015). Guidance: Equality Act 2010: Guidance: Information & guidance on the Equality Act 2010, including age discrimination and public sector Equality Duty. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents> (Accessed: 27 February 2026).

'Richmond Pharmacology' v Dhaliwal' (2009) ICR 724, Lexis Plus UK. Available at: <https://plus-lexis-com.uwtsd.idm.oclc.org/uk/cases-uk/richmond-pharmacology-v-dhaliwal-2009-icr-7/?crd=a04cbabf-5349-434f-bb8b-c09b3fc5afd1&pdiskwicview=false> (Accessed at: 27 February 2026).

UK Government (2023). Employment Tribunals: Case Number 2210200/2023, pp. 1-13. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/66b1e1abfc8e12ac3edb0adc/Mr_Alexander_Martin_Cubbin_v_Age_UK_-_2210200-2023_-_Reasons.pdf (Accessed: 27 February 2026).

UK Government (2023). Employment Tribunals: Record of Preliminary Hearing: Case Number: 2210200/2023, pp. 1-2. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/664dd38a993111924d9d39b0/Mr_Alexander_Martin_Cubbin_v_Age_UK_-_2210200-2023.pdf (Accessed: 27 February 2026).

END PAGE.

