



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
EMPLOYEES COMMITTEE (APPEALS)

Held: THURSDAY, 19 JULY 2018 at 10.15am

P R E S E N T:

Councillor Shelton (Chair)

Councillor Alfonso  
Councillor Kitterick

\* \* \* \* \*

**11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**13. 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

**14. APPEAL AGAINST DISMISSAL**

The Committee considered an appeal against dismissal from employment with

the City Council under the Council's disciplinary policy.

Louise Pinnock (HR Team Manager) and Caroline Tote (Director of Children's Social Care and Early Help) were present as advisors to the Committee.

The management representative was Julia Conlon (Head of Early Help, Specialist Services). Parvathi Jaganmohan (Human Resources Advisor) was present as HR advisor to management.

Management called Mike Evans,(Service Manager, Looked After Children), as a witness.

The appellant was present and was accompanied by Valerie Wallbrook, of Unison trades union. The appellant did not call any witnesses.

The Committee considered the written submissions and discussed and took into account the evidence from management, the appellant and the witness in coming to its decision.

**RESOLVED:**

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

Reasons:

- 1) Based on the evidence presented, the City Council's Disciplinary Policy had been fairly applied and the decision to dismiss was reasonable given the circumstances of the case.
- 2) The appellant's conduct whilst employed by Leicester City Council left the Authority in a vulnerable position and had the potential to damage the reputation of the City Council.
- 3) In particular, in relation to allegation 4, accessing and saving inappropriate content on the Council's IT system was wholly inappropriate.

## **15. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 4.40 pm