

Minutes of the Meeting of the EMPLOYEES COMMITTEE (APPEALS)

Held: THURSDAY, 26 JANUARY 2017 at 10:15 am

PRESENT:

Councillor Westley (Chair)

Councillor Alfonso Councillor Fonseca

* * * * * * * *

36. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

38. PRIVATE SESSION

RESOLVED:

that the press and public be excluded during consideration of the following item in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, because it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in the paragraph detailed below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information:

PARAGRAPH 1

Information relating to any individual

39. APPEAL AGAINST DISMISSAL

The Committee considered an appeal against dismissal from employment with the City Council.

Louise Pinnock (HR Team Manager) and Chris Burgin (Director of Housing) were present as advisors to the Committee.

The management representative was Mike Evans, (Service Manager, Placements and Commissioning). Parvathi Jaganmohan (HR Advisor) was present as HR advisor to management.

The appellant was present and was accompanied by Andy Betts of the GMB trades union.

Neither the appellant nor management called any witnesses.

The Committee considered at length the representations made and the evidence, (including a tape recording), put to it, upon which it was able to ask questions.

RESOLVED:

That the appeal be rejected and the management decision to dismiss the appellant upheld.

Reasons:

- As a manager, the appellant had a responsibility to set an example in terms of acceptable behaviour and to challenge and address inappropriate behaviour. By the appellant's own admission, they discussed confidential matters and made inappropriate comments about members of their team.
- 2) In addition to the above, the appellant failed to address inappropriate comments made, thereby condoning such behaviour and in the appellant's representations they did not offer any mitigation for their actions.
- 3) The comments made were of a serious nature, which breached Leicester City Council's Code of Conduct, Corporate Equality and Diversity Strategy and Equal Opportunities Policy and, on that basis, the appellant's behaviour and failure to deal with the matter was not acceptable, particularly given the appellant was a manager.
- 4) The Committee was satisfied that the City Council's Disciplinary Procedure had been fairly applied.

40. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 1.45 pm