SAMPLE: Ms R Ashdown v Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd

Case No: 6099999/2026
In the Employment Tribunals
Final hearing, 3-5 March 2027 (fictional case)

INDEX

Tab	Date	Document	Pages
A. Pleadings and tribunal orders			**2**
A1	2 Oct 2026	ET1 Particulars of Claim	2-4
A2	30 Oct 2026	ET3 Grounds of Resistance	5-7
A3	4 Nov 2026	Case Management Order	8-9
A4	18 Nov 2026	Agreed List of Issues	10
B. Documents			**11**
B1	22 May 2019	Statement of main terms of employment	11-14
B2	4 Mar 2023	Sickness Absence Policy v4	15-20
B3	1 Jan 2024	Grievance Procedure	21-23
B4	14 Jan 2026	Email from Imogen Tate to Rosa Ashdown: RE: Night cover on bay 2	24
B5	1 Feb 2026	Shift rota Feb-Apr 2026	25-27
B6	9 Mar 2026	Occupational Health Report	28-30
B7	2 Apr 2026	handwritten note of call	31
B8	6 Apr 2026	Claimant's formal grievance	32
B9	10 Apr 2026	Email from Imogen Tate to Rosa Ashdown: Grievance meeting - 17 April	33
B9.1	10 Apr 2026	Invitation to grievance meeting	34
B10	17 Apr 2026	Grievance meeting notes 17.04.2026	35-37
B11	1 May 2026	Grievance outcome letter	38-39
B12	19 Jun 2026	Investigation report - attendance	40-46
B13	3 Jul 2026	Invitation to capability hearing	47
B14	24 Jul 2026	Capability hearing notes 24 July 2026	48-50
B15	14 Aug 2026	Dismissal letter	51
B16	19 Aug 2026	Appeal against dismissal	52-53
B17	9 Sep 2026	Appeal outcome letter	54-55
C. Remedy			**56**
C1	28 Jun 2026	Payslips June-July 2026	56
C2	14 Aug 2026	Schedule of Loss	57

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

IN THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS
Case No: 6099999/2026

ROSA ASHDOWN Claimant

v

CORVEL LANE LOGISTICS LTD Respondent

PARTICULARS OF CLAIM

1. The Claimant was employed by the Respondent as a Warehouse Shift Supervisor from 3 June 2019 until her dismissal on 14 August 2026.

2. The Claimant brings claims of unfair dismissal (ss.94-98 Employment Rights Act 1996) and of a failure to make reasonable adjustments (ss.20-21 Equality Act 2010).

3. The transport planner accepted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout. The team leader disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and asked for this to be minuted. The investigating officer confirmed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The shift rota explained that the stock count started forty minutes late according to the rota printout. The team leader did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice in an email the following day.

4. The site director confirmed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser agreed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays according to the rota printout. The shift rota did not recall whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays in an email the following day. The yard supervisor accepted that the forklift refresher training was overdue according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place which was recorded on the shared drive.

5. Her line manager accepted that the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date. The transport planner explained that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days and that this was raised again at the meeting. The investigating officer confirmed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The claimant disputed that the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and asked for this to be minuted.

6. The night team did not recall whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The team leader agreed that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day. The claimant was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer explained that the handover notes were not kept in one place in an email the following day. The site director accepted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January although no note of this was made at the time.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

7. The claimant said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team disputed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and asked for this to be minuted. The transport planner was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 during the second interview. The investigating officer later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice.

8. The union representative noted that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually during the second interview. The night team said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February. The claimant was asked whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and that this was raised again at the meeting. The claimant confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The warehouse manager did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout.

9. The yard supervisor later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant said in interview that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days which was recorded on the shared drive. The warehouse manager said in interview that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days which was recorded on the shared drive. The union representative said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout. The HR adviser accepted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time.

10. The warehouse manager did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained. The claimant agreed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval which was recorded on the shared drive. The night team confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. Her line manager was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager disputed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023.

11. The claimant disputed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The site director said in interview that the handover notes were not kept in one place during the second interview. The occupational health adviser said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays but could not give a date. The team leader did not recall whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged although no note of this was made at the time. The team leader was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023.

12. The team leader confirmed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager explained that the rota software had been changed in February. The team leader did not recall whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager noted that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant explained that the handover notes were not kept in one place

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

during the second interview.

13. The claimant later wrote that the duty manager left early that night which was recorded on the shared drive. The team leader accepted that the handover notes were not kept in one place and asked for this to be minuted. The union representative noted that the duty manager left early that night although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps in an email the following day. The transport planner accepted that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days.

14. The payroll team disputed that the forklift refresher training was overdue and that this was raised again at the meeting. The union representative noted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager was asked whether the sickness procedure had not been explained in an email the following day. Her line manager disputed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January but could not give a date. The investigating officer did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained according to the rota printout.

15. The union representative did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps in an email the following day. The claimant was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March. The payroll team noted that the duty manager left early that night which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser agreed that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The payroll team was asked whether the rota software had been changed in February and that this was raised again at the meeting.

16. The HR adviser explained that the sickness procedure had not been explained during the second interview. The HR adviser was asked whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps during the second interview. The investigating officer agreed that the overtime list had been posted late in March during the second interview. The occupational health adviser was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and that this was raised again at the meeting. The site director did not recall whether the duty manager left early that night although no note of this was made at the time.

17. The Claimant seeks a declaration, compensation and a recommendation.

Dated 2 October 2026

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

IN THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS
Case No: 6099999/2026

ROSA ASHDOWN Claimant

v

CORVEL LANE LOGISTICS LTD Respondent

GROUNDS OF RESISTANCE

1. The Respondent admits that the Claimant was employed from 3 June 2019 and was dismissed on 14 August 2026.

2. The reason for dismissal was capability, a potentially fair reason under s.98(2)(a) ERA 1996.

3. The site director was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice according to the rota printout. The claimant said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time. The warehouse manager accepted that the overtime list had been posted late in March although no note of this was made at the time. The investigating officer later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending during the second interview. The occupational health adviser was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day.

4. Her line manager accepted that the overtime list had been posted late in March. The payroll team explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time. The site director did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps. The night team did not recall whether the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day. The HR adviser agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January which was recorded on the shared drive.

5. Her line manager said in interview that the flexible working request was still pending. The union representative was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The site director disputed that the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day. The warehouse manager disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled. The yard supervisor later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval.

6. The payroll team accepted that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant agreed that the handover notes were not kept in one place in an email the following day. The shift rota was asked whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled in an email the following day. Her line manager later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place in an email the following day. The shift rota did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

7. The shift rota explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled during the second interview. Her line manager confirmed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The transport planner agreed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled in an email the following day. The HR adviser noted that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. Her line manager later wrote that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date.

8. The union representative disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the following day. The HR adviser later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The team leader said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and asked for this to be minuted. The team leader did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser noted that the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time.

9. The union representative was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The warehouse manager later wrote that the sickness procedure had not been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting. The site director later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The warehouse manager said in interview that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled according to the rota printout. The transport planner said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and asked for this to be minuted.

10. The transport planner explained that the rota software had been changed in February. The transport planner disputed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged during the second interview. The union representative confirmed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and asked for this to be minuted. Her line manager agreed that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day. The team leader explained that the sickness procedure had not been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting.

11. The team leader noted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later. The payroll team accepted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later although no note of this was made at the time. The yard supervisor said in interview that the meeting notes were typed up a week later according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled during the second interview. The union representative was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice which was recorded on the shared drive.

12. The shift rota accepted that the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team confirmed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice which was recorded on the shared drive. The team leader agreed that the sickness procedure had not been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

had not been logged. The transport planner disputed that the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive.

13. The investigating officer accepted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays in an email the following day. The union representative did not recall whether the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time. The night team confirmed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The night team noted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The night team later wrote that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time.

14. The night team was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March in an email the following day. Her line manager did not recall whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled during the second interview. The HR adviser later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place according to the rota printout. The occupational health adviser later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days according to the rota printout.

15. Her line manager noted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date. The transport planner did not recall whether the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The transport planner confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending. The team leader noted that the stock count started forty minutes late although no note of this was made at the time. The shift rota explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout in an email the following day.

16. The claims are denied in their entirety.

Dated 30 October 2026

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

IN THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS
Case No: 6099999/2026

ROSA ASHDOWN Claimant

v

CORVEL LANE LOGISTICS LTD Respondent

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDERS

Made by Employment Judge Varga at a preliminary hearing (case management) by video on 4 November 2026.

1. The final hearing will take place over 3 days from 3 March 2027, in person.

2. The parties shall exchange lists of documents by 2 December 2026.

3. The Respondent shall prepare the hearing file, with an index, and send an electronic copy to the Claimant by 13 January 2027, in accordance with the Presidential Guidance on electronic documents.

4. Witness statements shall be exchanged by 10 February 2027.

The occupational health adviser noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The union representative noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview. The warehouse manager accepted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later during the second interview. The shift rota noted that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted. Her line manager was asked whether the sickness procedure had not been explained.

The night team did not recall whether the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time. The shift rota was asked whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting. The claimant noted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The HR adviser disputed that the overtime list had been posted late in March and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team explained that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout.

The investigating officer confirmed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout. The night team noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting. The investigating officer disputed that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The payroll team was asked whether the duty manager left early that night although no note of this was made at the time. The night team agreed that the flexible working request was still pending.

The yard supervisor disputed that the stock count started forty minutes late in an email the following day. The warehouse manager disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled. The yard supervisor agreed that the sickness procedure had not

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted. The team leader said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day.

Employment Judge Varga
Sent to the parties on 6 November 2026

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

IN THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS
Case No: 6099999/2026

ROSA ASHDOWN Claimant

v

CORVEL LANE LOGISTICS LTD Respondent

LIST OF ISSUES

Agreed between the parties on 18 November 2026.

Unfair dismissal

1. What was the reason for dismissal? 2. Did the Respondent act reasonably in treating it as a sufficient reason?

Reasonable adjustments

3. Did the Respondent apply a PCP of requiring supervisors to work rotating night shifts?

The shift rota confirmed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date. The claimant noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March during the second interview. The payroll team explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled in an email the following day. The team leader disputed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview.

The night team explained that the meeting notes were typed up a week later but could not give a date. The union representative did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained during the second interview. The claimant said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The occupational health adviser noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays but could not give a date.

The team leader agreed that the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted. The night team noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 although no note of this was made at the time. The shift rota later wrote that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview. The night team explained that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps during the second interview.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Statement of Main Terms of Employment

Employer: Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd. Employee: Rosa Ashdown. Start date: 3 June 2019.

Job title: Warehouse Shift Supervisor. Place of work: Halbridge distribution centre.

Hours: 40 hours a week on a rotating pattern of days and nights as set out in the rota.

The night team disputed that the forklift refresher training was overdue during the second interview. The claimant later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place in an email the following day. The HR adviser noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The shift rota noted that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The yard supervisor disputed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and that this was raised again at the meeting. The investigating officer explained that the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day. The night team was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day.

The night team explained that the rota software had been changed in February but could not give a date. The claimant later wrote that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout. The warehouse manager confirmed that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview. The site director noted that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout.

The transport planner said in interview that the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting. The yard supervisor was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted. The payroll team was asked whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser confirmed that the forklift refresher training was overdue which was recorded on the shared drive.

The transport planner explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor agreed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted. The site director noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays which was recorded on the shared drive. The team leader confirmed that the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time.

The HR adviser noted that the stock count started forty minutes late in an email the following day. The transport planner did not recall whether the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout. The shift rota said in interview that the

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days in an email the following day. The HR adviser explained that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays according to the rota printout.

The claimant agreed that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The claimant confirmed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days although no note of this was made at the time. The warehouse manager later wrote that the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted. The night team noted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive.

The site director did not recall whether the forklift refresher training was overdue during the second interview. Her line manager said in interview that the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time. The occupational health adviser accepted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date. Her line manager later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date.

The claimant was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager disputed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date. The team leader accepted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day. The team leader was asked whether the sickness procedure had not been explained and asked for this to be minuted.

The night team agreed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps. The union representative said in interview that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The union representative disputed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps according to the rota printout. The night team was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview.

The night team agreed that the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time. The occupational health adviser disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The team leader noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained according to the rota printout. The site director later wrote that the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive.

The yard supervisor confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending. The site director later wrote that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually during the second interview. The shift rota explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout in an email the following day. The yard supervisor later wrote that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged but could not give a date.

The payroll team explained that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The warehouse manager disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place during the second interview. The team leader disputed

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays. The payroll team accepted that the sickness procedure had not been explained.

The occupational health adviser noted that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. Her line manager said in interview that the handover notes were not kept in one place and that this was raised again at the meeting. The team leader noted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The site director noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained.

The shift rota disputed that the forklift refresher training was overdue during the second interview. The night team was asked whether the sickness procedure had not been explained during the second interview. Her line manager did not recall whether the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date. The shift rota said in interview that the forklift refresher training was overdue.

The shift rota did not recall whether the duty manager left early that night according to the rota printout. The team leader noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained according to the rota printout. The transport planner did not recall whether the duty manager left early that night. The union representative was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted.

The occupational health adviser said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps. The payroll team noted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser later wrote that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The payroll team did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained during the second interview.

The HR adviser noted that the forklift refresher training was overdue and that this was raised again at the meeting. The investigating officer later wrote that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 although no note of this was made at the time. The HR adviser later wrote that the stock count started forty minutes late. The investigating officer accepted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout.

The HR adviser confirmed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 although no note of this was made at the time. The site director confirmed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time. The site director later wrote that the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting. The team leader accepted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January but could not give a date.

The warehouse manager disputed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged. The night team said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant accepted that the handover notes were not kept in one place. The team leader noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

The site director explained that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date. The site director was asked whether the forklift refresher training was overdue according to the rota printout. The team leader confirmed that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date. The transport planner disputed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged but could not give a date.

The transport planner was asked whether the duty manager left early that night. The occupational health adviser said in interview that the sickness procedure had not been explained according to the rota printout. The shift rota said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview. The team leader confirmed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later but could not give a date.

The union representative explained that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and asked for this to be minuted. The transport planner noted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January. The night team was asked whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota agreed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice.

The yard supervisor did not recall whether the handover notes were not kept in one place during the second interview. The union representative later wrote that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending during the second interview. The warehouse manager confirmed that the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time.

Signed for the employer on 20 May 2019 and by the employee on 22 May 2019.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Sickness Absence Policy (version 4, March 2023)

1. Purpose

The investigating officer did not recall whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and that this was raised again at the meeting. Her line manager did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time. The HR adviser said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice. The claimant disputed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days and asked for this to be minuted.

The warehouse manager said in interview that the handover notes were not kept in one place and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team agreed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date. The team leader said in interview that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview. The warehouse manager did not recall whether the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The claimant agreed that the sickness procedure had not been explained in an email the following day.

The yard supervisor explained that the forklift refresher training was overdue which was recorded on the shared drive. The night team agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted. The night team noted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps during the second interview. The HR adviser accepted that the sickness procedure had not been explained but could not give a date. The warehouse manager noted that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually but could not give a date.

2. Reporting absence

The transport planner explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The occupational health adviser explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged. The team leader confirmed that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date. The yard supervisor later wrote that the rota software had been changed in February.

The night team did not recall whether the handover notes were not kept in one place. The HR adviser agreed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually but could not give a date. The team leader was asked whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later. The team leader agreed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and asked for this to be minuted.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

The HR adviser confirmed that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota agreed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps. The yard supervisor was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager agreed that the forklift refresher training was overdue and that this was raised again at the meeting.

3. Fit notes

The HR adviser confirmed that the duty manager left early that night in an email the following day. The claimant explained that the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team said in interview that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days although no note of this was made at the time. The occupational health adviser disputed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time. The site director noted that the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive.

The occupational health adviser noted that the stock count started forty minutes late. The night team agreed that the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout. The site director confirmed that the rota software had been changed in February but could not give a date. The site director said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps. The site director accepted that the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The yard supervisor explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant accepted that the flexible working request was still pending. The shift rota disputed that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The team leader agreed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and asked for this to be minuted. The union representative disputed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time.

4. Return-to-work meetings

The transport planner noted that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval in an email the following day. The warehouse manager explained that the handover notes were not kept in one place according to the rota printout. The claimant did not recall whether the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time. The yard supervisor confirmed that the duty manager left early that night and asked for this to be minuted. The shift rota agreed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The union representative agreed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The investigating officer said in interview that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The yard supervisor later wrote that two

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The shift rota said in interview that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time. The site director was asked whether the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time.

The HR adviser did not recall whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays in an email the following day. The yard supervisor confirmed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting. The site director agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The yard supervisor noted that the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late according to the rota printout.

5. Absence triggers

The occupational health adviser was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The claimant accepted that the overtime list had been posted late in March. The investigating officer later wrote that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged but could not give a date. The claimant agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged although no note of this was made at the time. The payroll team later wrote that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The team leader accepted that the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout. The transport planner explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. Her line manager confirmed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time. The team leader was asked whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota disputed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time.

The shift rota explained that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser accepted that the duty manager left early that night which was recorded on the shared drive. The payroll team accepted that the sickness procedure had not been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting. The yard supervisor was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 which was recorded on the shared drive. The warehouse manager was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 which was recorded on the shared drive.

6. Occupational health

The yard supervisor later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. Her line manager later wrote that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

disputed that the sickness procedure had not been explained and asked for this to be minuted. The transport planner confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time. The site director accepted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted.

The site director accepted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team disputed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and asked for this to be minuted. The yard supervisor later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days in an email the following day. The investigating officer explained that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the following day. The occupational health adviser said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February which was recorded on the shared drive.

The site director was asked whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time. The transport planner was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The HR adviser accepted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023. The night team disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive. The occupational health adviser agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January.

7. Reasonable adjustments

The union representative confirmed that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The night team agreed that the stock count started forty minutes late according to the rota printout. Her line manager was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant did not recall whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023. The shift rota confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted.

The night team explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted. Her line manager did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer accepted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and asked for this to be minuted. The investigating officer later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time. The shift rota did not recall whether the flexible working request was still pending during the second interview.

The team leader explained that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March. The occupational health adviser disputed that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The investigating officer disputed that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date. The warehouse manager confirmed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays.

FICTIONAL EXAMPLE

8. Capability meetings

Her line manager confirmed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time. The HR adviser accepted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota agreed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date. The warehouse manager said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps in an email the following day. The investigating officer disputed that the stock count started forty minutes late although no note of this was made at the time.

Her line manager noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice which was recorded on the shared drive. The occupational health adviser confirmed that the duty manager left early that night in an email the following day. The shift rota said in interview that the stock count started forty minutes late during the second interview. The team leader later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The team leader noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained.

The team leader was asked whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later. The night team disputed that the stock count started forty minutes late in an email the following day. The night team noted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and that this was raised again at the meeting. Her line manager confirmed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser did not recall whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and asked for this to be minuted.

9. Appeals

The HR adviser said in interview that the claimant had raised workload informally in January but could not give a date. The site director disputed that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview. The yard supervisor disputed that the overtime list had been posted late in March. The site director did not recall whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually which was recorded on the shared drive. The payroll team did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The investigating officer accepted that the flexible working request was still pending. The shift rota explained that the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time. The transport planner accepted that the overtime list had been posted late in March. The shift rota accepted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting. The union representative confirmed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted.

The HR adviser disputed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice according to the rota printout. The team leader did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date. The team leader confirmed that the

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting. The yard supervisor noted that the duty manager left early that night and that this was raised again at the meeting. The warehouse manager explained that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Grievance Procedure (issued 1 January 2024)

1. Informal resolution

The transport planner was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota was asked whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota was asked whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day. The claimant noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023. The payroll team said in interview that the overtime list had been posted late in March according to the rota printout.

Her line manager explained that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The union representative confirmed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date. The union representative explained that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually which was recorded on the shared drive. The warehouse manager said in interview that the overtime list had been posted late in March in an email the following day. The HR adviser noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays.

The transport planner later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place during the second interview. The union representative accepted that the duty manager left early that night and asked for this to be minuted. The yard supervisor disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later although no note of this was made at the time. The night team did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained during the second interview. The warehouse manager explained that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview.

2. Formal grievance

The payroll team disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and asked for this to be minuted. The transport planner explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The union representative explained that the stock count started forty minutes late. The transport planner did not recall whether the forklift refresher training was overdue which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time.

The site director did not recall whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager agreed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023. The transport planner agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day. The warehouse manager later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager later wrote that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

The investigating officer did not recall whether the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant did not recall whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The night team noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 although no note of this was made at the time. The union representative accepted that the sickness procedure had not been explained and asked for this to be minuted. The investigating officer disputed that the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time.

3. The grievance meeting

The HR adviser was asked whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The union representative explained that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser said in interview that the flexible working request was still pending although no note of this was made at the time. The payroll team noted that the forklift refresher training was overdue according to the rota printout. The night team did not recall whether the handover notes were not kept in one place and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The night team did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout during the second interview. The shift rota confirmed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The union representative did not recall whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled which was recorded on the shared drive. The claimant confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer said in interview that the overtime list had been posted late in March but could not give a date.

The yard supervisor said in interview that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor did not recall whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually but could not give a date. The occupational health adviser accepted that the handover notes were not kept in one place during the second interview. The site director was asked whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later and that this was raised again at the meeting. The site director did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time.

4. Outcome

The night team said in interview that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview. The shift rota agreed that the stock count started forty minutes late in an email the following day. The occupational health adviser accepted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January. The site director later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place. The night team disputed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time.

The union representative did not recall whether the claimant was told the vacancy had

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

been filled and asked for this to be minuted. The team leader agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The HR adviser later wrote that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled. The occupational health adviser was asked whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted. The site director later wrote that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time.

The site director disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and asked for this to be minuted. The occupational health adviser confirmed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays. The team leader said in interview that the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted. The investigating officer noted that the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date.

5. Appeal

The night team said in interview that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The payroll team said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged but could not give a date. The warehouse manager accepted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date. The claimant disputed that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The transport planner said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive.

The payroll team disputed that the flexible working request was still pending during the second interview. The transport planner did not recall whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later according to the rota printout. The occupational health adviser noted that the stock count started forty minutes late although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant confirmed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted. The HR adviser noted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January during the second interview.

The claimant said in interview that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and that this was raised again at the meeting. The occupational health adviser was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The yard supervisor said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting. The yard supervisor agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager was asked whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

From: Imogen Tate <imogen.tate@corvel-lane.example>
To: Rosa Ashdown <rosa.ashdown@corvel-lane.example>
Cc: Daniel Pryce <daniel.pryce@corvel-lane.example>
Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2026 11:30:00 -0000
Subject: RE: Night cover on bay 2

Rosa, Daniel,

Thanks for copying me in. Rosa, I'd suggest an occupational health referral so we get proper advice on the shift pattern. I'll send the form today. Daniel, please hold the February rota until we have the report.

Imogen

-----Original Message-----
From: Rosa Ashdown <rosa.ashdown@corvel-lane.example>
Sent: Tuesday, 13 January 2026 08:47
Subject: RE: Night cover on bay 2

> Daniel,
>
> Thank you. For the record, this is the third time I have asked since November. I'm copying Imogen so HR are aware.
>
> Rosa
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Daniel Pryce <daniel.pryce@corvel-lane.example>
> Sent: Monday, 12 January 2026 16:02
> Subject: RE: Night cover on bay 2
>
> > Rosa,
> >
> > Understood. I can't promise days at the moment as we are two supervisors down, but let me look at the February rota and come back to you by Friday.
> >
> > Daniel
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Rosa Ashdown <rosa.ashdown@corvel-lane.example>
> > Sent: Monday, 12 January 2026 09:14
> > Subject: Night cover on bay 2
> >
> > > Hi Daniel,
> > >
> > > I have now done six nights in a row on bay 2 because the cover rota keeps falling through. My GP has told me my sleep is the main thing making my condition worse. Could we look at keeping me on days for the next two months while I get this under control?
> > >
> > > Thanks,
> > > Rosa

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Halbridge DC - supervisor rota - February 2026

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
R Ashdown	O	D	D	D	O	N	N	N	D	N	D	D	D	N	N	D	D	N	N	D	N	O	N	D	O	N	O	N
D Pryce	D	N	O	D	N	D	O	O	N	O	D	N	D	D	N	D	O	D	N	N	N	D	N	N	D	O	N	D
K Lowe	N	D	N	N	O	O	D	D	O	D	N	O	N	N	O	D	O	N	D	N	N	O	D	D	O	D	O	O
S Amin	D	D	N	D	O	O	D	O	D	N	N	N	O	D	D	D	O	N	O	D	D	D	O	O	D	D	N	O
J Farrell	N	N	O	D	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	O	D	D	D	O	N	N	D	N	D	O	N	D	D	O	N	O
P Novak	D	D	D	D	O	D	D	N	O	D	O	D	N	O	N	N	N	N	D	N	D	D	D	D	D	O	N	N
T Bevan	O	O	D	O	N	N	N	N	N	D	O	O	O	O	N	O	D	D	D	O	O	N	O	O	D	D	O	D
L Quist	O	D	N	O	D	O	D	D	O	O	D	O	D	N	O	D	O	D	D	N	D	D	D	N	N	O	N	D

D = day 06:00-18:00 N = night 18:00-06:00 O = off

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Halbridge DC - supervisor rota - March 2026

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
R Ashdown	N	N	N	D	D	N	N	O	N	N	D	D	O	N	N	N	O	D	N	N	N	D	D	O	N	D	D	O
D Pryce	D	N	D	D	O	O	D	O	D	D	O	D	D	N	D	D	O	N	D	N	O	O	D	D	D	O	O	O
K Lowe	O	O	D	O	O	D	D	O	N	O	N	N	O	D	D	O	D	D	D	D	O	O	O	N	D	N	D	D
S Amin	O	N	D	O	O	N	N	D	D	D	N	O	N	N	O	D	D	O	D	D	O	D	O	O	N	N	N	O
J Farrell	O	N	D	O	O	N	D	D	D	D	N	O	O	O	O	N	D	O	N	O	D	O	D	N	O	D	N	N
P Novak	D	N	N	O	N	N	O	D	O	N	D	O	D	D	D	D	N	D	N	O	O	O	D	D	O	D	O	O
T Bevan	N	D	D	O	O	O	N	O	O	N	D	N	D	N	N	N	O	N	D	O	O	O	D	D	N	D	O	N
L Quist	N	O	D	D	N	O	D	O	N	N	N	D	N	O	D	O	D	D	N	N	N	D	O	N	D	N	N	N

D = day 06:00-18:00 N = night 18:00-06:00 O = off

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Halbridge DC - supervisor rota - April 2026

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
R Ashdown	D	D	D	D	D	D	O	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	D	D	D	N	N	D	N	O	N	D	D	N	N	D
D Pryce	D	D	N	N	D	D	D	D	O	O	N	N	N	N	D	D	O	D	N	D	N	O	N	O	N	D	D	O
K Lowe	D	D	D	D	N	D	D	D	D	N	D	O	O	N	N	O	D	O	N	O	N	D	O	D	D	D	N	D
S Amin	O	D	O	N	N	D	N	O	D	D	D	O	D	D	D	D	D	D	N	D	O	D	D	O	N	O	O	O
J Farrell	O	N	D	D	D	D	O	D	D	O	O	D	N	N	N	O	O	D	N	D	D	D	N	D	D	N	N	D
P Novak	N	D	O	D	O	D	N	O	D	O	D	D	O	D	D	N	O	D	O	D	O	N	D	N	O	D	O	D
T Bevan	N	D	D	O	D	N	D	O	D	D	D	D	O	D	D	O	N	N	D	N	O	D	D	N	N	D	D	D
L Quist	D	N	O	D	D	O	D	D	N	D	D	N	N	D	D	N	D	O	O	O	D	N	N	O	D	D	D	O

D = day 06:00-18:00 N = night 18:00-06:00 O = off

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Occupational Health Report

Report date: 9 March 2026. Referral from: Imogen Tate, HR. Employee: Rosa Ashdown.

Summary of advice

In my opinion the employee is likely to be considered disabled for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010. A temporary move to day shifts for 12 weeks is recommended.

The HR adviser was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser did not recall whether the handover notes were not kept in one place according to the rota printout. The night team said in interview that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval. The yard supervisor noted that the flexible working request was still pending. The claimant disputed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day.

The warehouse manager later wrote that the overtime list had been posted late in March in an email the following day. The night team accepted that the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout. The shift rota said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer accepted that the flexible working request was still pending although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager did not recall whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date.

The investigating officer explained that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The payroll team noted that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The warehouse manager agreed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser confirmed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice in an email the following day. The site director confirmed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted.

The transport planner noted that the duty manager left early that night and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota said in interview that the duty manager left early that night although no note of this was made at the time. The yard supervisor noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The investigating officer was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time. The union representative was asked whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually.

The transport planner disputed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The team leader explained that the rota software had been changed in February but could not give a date. The yard supervisor was asked whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout. The night team explained that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview. Her line manager confirmed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled in an email the

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

following day.

The warehouse manager confirmed that the sickness procedure had not been explained and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser agreed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time. The team leader noted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the following day. The yard supervisor confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March and that this was raised again at the meeting. The union representative did not recall whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later.

The yard supervisor agreed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually during the second interview. Her line manager did not recall whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and that this was raised again at the meeting. The transport planner explained that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval. The night team explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged during the second interview. The investigating officer disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The team leader explained that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager agreed that the sickness procedure had not been explained but could not give a date. The warehouse manager agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager confirmed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The investigating officer agreed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled.

The site director confirmed that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted. The site director did not recall whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor disputed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and asked for this to be minuted. Her line manager accepted that the rota software had been changed in February but could not give a date.

The yard supervisor said in interview that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted. The team leader disputed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and that this was raised again at the meeting. The transport planner said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps in an email the following day. The occupational health adviser confirmed that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The site director said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged.

The payroll team confirmed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays which was recorded on the shared drive. The occupational health adviser agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the following day. The payroll team

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

confirmed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled. The site director did not recall whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays which was recorded on the shared drive.

The team leader noted that the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time. The team leader confirmed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 in an email the following day. The night team explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The warehouse manager later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place in an email the following day. The warehouse manager noted that the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive.

The night team did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice in an email the following day. The night team later wrote that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The occupational health adviser said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps in an email the following day. The union representative was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged in an email the following day. The night team agreed that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview.

The yard supervisor noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March but could not give a date. The transport planner did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps in an email the following day. Her line manager said in interview that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually according to the rota printout. The shift rota was asked whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The transport planner disputed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January during the second interview.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

2 April 2026 - call with Rosa

- still on nights wk of 30/3

- says OH advice ignored

- wants formal grievance

- told her to put it in writing

- will send policy link

DP

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Formal grievance - Rosa Ashdown - 6 April 2026

I am raising a formal grievance about the way my request to move to day shifts has been handled since November 2025.

Occupational health advised on 9 March 2026 that I should work days for 12 weeks. I was put back on nights from 30 March 2026.

The night team noted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota confirmed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval in an email the following day. The team leader agreed that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The occupational health adviser confirmed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled according to the rota printout.

The yard supervisor later wrote that the rota software had been changed in February and that this was raised again at the meeting. Her line manager did not recall whether the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The transport planner was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending but could not give a date. The investigating officer agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the following day.

The team leader later wrote that the meeting notes were typed up a week later although no note of this was made at the time. The site director explained that the overtime list had been posted late in March according to the rota printout. The payroll team disputed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and that this was raised again at the meeting. The claimant said in interview that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time.

The site director noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and that this was raised again at the meeting. The site director later wrote that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive. The union representative was asked whether the forklift refresher training was overdue and asked for this to be minuted. The site director disputed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days according to the rota printout.

The occupational health adviser was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March during the second interview. The site director later wrote that the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager noted that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The investigating officer said in interview that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually but could not give a date.

I would like the grievance heard under the Grievance Procedure, and I would like to be accompanied by my union representative.

Signed: R. Ashdown

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

From: Imogen Tate <imogen.tate@corvel-lane.example>
To: Rosa Ashdown <rosa.ashdown@corvel-lane.example>
Date: Fri, 10 Apr 2026 14:05:00 -0000
Subject: Grievance meeting - 17 April
Attachments: Invitation to grievance meeting.pdf

Dear Rosa,

Please find attached a letter inviting you to a grievance meeting on 17 April 2026. Let me know who will accompany you.

Kind regards,
Imogen Tate
HR Business Partner

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd
Unit 4, Fenwick Road
Halbridge HB2 7QT

10 April 2026

Ms Rosa Ashdown

Invitation to a grievance meeting

I write to invite you to a meeting on 17 April 2026 at 10:00 to discuss your grievance dated 6 April 2026.

The meeting will be chaired by Marcus Ellery, Site Director. You may be accompanied by a colleague or a trade union representative.

The team leader was asked whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January but could not give a date. The transport planner did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late. The shift rota confirmed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later during the second interview.

The night team disputed that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day. The investigating officer said in interview that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled in an email the following day. The union representative said in interview that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout during the second interview.

Yours sincerely,

Imogen Tate
HR Business Partner

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Grievance meeting: notes

Date: 17 April 2026. Present: Marcus Ellery (chair), Imogen Tate (HR, notes), Rosa Ashdown, Tom Bevan (union representative).

RA: The shift rota noted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting.

TB: The investigating officer confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March but could not give a date.

RA: The warehouse manager later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The yard supervisor disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time.

TB: The investigating officer did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting.

TB: The warehouse manager accepted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled in an email the following day.

ME: The team leader confirmed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and that this was raised again at the meeting.

RA: The warehouse manager disputed that the duty manager left early that night during the second interview.

RA: The investigating officer said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays.

TB: The occupational health adviser agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January although no note of this was made at the time.

TB: The union representative did not recall whether the rota software had been changed in February which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The warehouse manager confirmed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and that this was raised again at the meeting.

IT: The yard supervisor agreed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted.

RA: The HR adviser later wrote that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 according to the rota printout.

RA: The shift rota confirmed that the sickness procedure had not been explained according to the rota printout.

TB: The investigating officer confirmed that the complaint about the comment in the

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

canteen had not been logged.

IT: The investigating officer did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained but could not give a date.

RA: The shift rota accepted that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time.

TB: The transport planner confirmed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The site director agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later during the second interview.

ME: The team leader did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout but could not give a date.

RA: The site director noted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout during the second interview.

IT: The shift rota did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time.

IT: The warehouse manager was asked whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time.

TB: The shift rota noted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout in an email the following day.

ME: The transport planner explained that the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day.

IT: The yard supervisor said in interview that the claimant had raised workload informally in January according to the rota printout.

TB: The occupational health adviser explained that the handover notes were not kept in one place according to the rota printout.

IT: The yard supervisor was asked whether the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date.

IT: The site director did not recall whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The transport planner did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late.

RA: The night team confirmed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January although no note of this was made at the time.

ME: The HR adviser accepted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date.

RA: The night team disputed that the flexible working request was still pending in an

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

email the following day.

TB: The claimant later wrote that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time.

TB: The transport planner was asked whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps according to the rota printout.

ME: The site director agreed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive.

ME: The claimant disputed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date.

TB: The yard supervisor later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive.

TB: The investigating officer later wrote that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and asked for this to be minuted.

RA: Her line manager did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout in an email the following day.

IT: The HR adviser accepted that the handover notes were not kept in one place in an email the following day.

TB: The team leader disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later according to the rota printout.

ME: The shift rota agreed that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive.

RA: The shift rota said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time.

IT: The payroll team did not recall whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January but could not give a date.

RA: The occupational health adviser explained that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice in an email the following day.

TB: The transport planner disputed that the forklift refresher training was overdue but could not give a date.

Meeting closed 11:40.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd
Unit 4, Fenwick Road
Halbridge HB2 7QT

1 May 2026

Ms Rosa Ashdown

Outcome of your grievance

Thank you for attending the grievance meeting on 17 April 2026.

I have partly upheld your grievance.

The team leader noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date. The night team accepted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout which was recorded on the shared drive. The transport planner said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged although no note of this was made at the time. The night team accepted that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted.

The occupational health adviser was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late. The occupational health adviser later wrote that the sickness procedure had not been explained according to the rota printout. The transport planner explained that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval which was recorded on the shared drive. The team leader noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date.

The union representative confirmed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout. The investigating officer accepted that the stock count started forty minutes late but could not give a date. The payroll team noted that the flexible working request was still pending according to the rota printout. The union representative confirmed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days which was recorded on the shared drive.

The occupational health adviser accepted that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually but could not give a date. The investigating officer later wrote that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director agreed that the rota software had been changed in February. The team leader noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays.

The HR adviser explained that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and asked for this to be minuted. The HR adviser was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice according to the rota printout. The union representative said in interview that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The night team disputed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted.

The site director later wrote that the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day. The union representative later wrote that the claimant was

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

told the vacancy had been filled. The occupational health adviser did not recall whether the stock count started forty minutes late in an email the following day. The yard supervisor accepted that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date.

The shift rota disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager accepted that the sickness procedure had not been explained in an email the following day. The night team did not recall whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time. The transport planner was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The HR adviser noted that the flexible working request was still pending although no note of this was made at the time. The occupational health adviser later wrote that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date. The union representative did not recall whether the overtime list had been posted late in March in an email the following day. The union representative later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted.

You may appeal within 7 days of the date of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Ellery
Site Director

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Investigation report: attendance and capability

Investigating officer: Helen Okoro, Operations Manager. Report dated 19 June 2026.

1. The union representative noted that the flexible working request was still pending although no note of this was made at the time. The investigating officer agreed that the sickness procedure had not been explained and asked for this to be minuted. The occupational health adviser explained that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days according to the rota printout. The payroll team accepted that the flexible working request was still pending during the second interview.

2. The yard supervisor said in interview that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and that this was raised again at the meeting. The union representative noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant did not recall whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays. The night team noted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and that this was raised again at the meeting.

3. The union representative noted that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and that this was raised again at the meeting. The warehouse manager was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged during the second interview. The investigating officer was asked whether the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager explained that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays.

4. The claimant later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted. The union representative agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and that this was raised again at the meeting. The occupational health adviser later wrote that the stock count started forty minutes late during the second interview. The HR adviser disputed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January.

5. The transport planner explained that the forklift refresher training was overdue which was recorded on the shared drive. The occupational health adviser did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time. The union representative confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor accepted that the forklift refresher training was overdue and asked for this to be minuted.

6. The warehouse manager disputed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team noted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and asked for this to be minuted. The site director accepted that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted. The HR adviser was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

7. The transport planner noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained. The shift rota explained that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually according to the rota printout. The shift rota did not recall whether the duty manager left early that night according to the rota printout. The claimant accepted that the forklift refresher training was overdue and that this was raised again at the meeting.

8. The warehouse manager did not recall whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice. The yard supervisor later wrote that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date. The HR adviser was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March.

9. The yard supervisor agreed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice. Her line manager said in interview that the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting. The claimant confirmed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time.

10. The site director noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March during the second interview. The payroll team agreed that the rota software had been changed in February but could not give a date. The claimant explained that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days and asked for this to be minuted. Her line manager later wrote that the stock count started forty minutes late in an email the following day.

11. The occupational health adviser accepted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team confirmed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January which was recorded on the shared drive. The investigating officer agreed that the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant accepted that the forklift refresher training was overdue and asked for this to be minuted.

12. Her line manager confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date. The occupational health adviser later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time. The occupational health adviser agreed that the rota software had been changed in February in an email the following day. The investigating officer said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February in an email the following day.

13. The HR adviser agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged according to the rota printout. The night team explained that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The HR adviser disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date. The yard supervisor noted that the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date.

14. Her line manager noted that the duty manager left early that night but could not give

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

a date. Her line manager later wrote that the sickness procedure had not been explained in an email the following day. The investigating officer explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and that this was raised again at the meeting. The yard supervisor said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview.

15. The warehouse manager disputed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days in an email the following day. The union representative explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and that this was raised again at the meeting. The claimant said in interview that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days although no note of this was made at the time. The HR adviser agreed that the duty manager left early that night and that this was raised again at the meeting.

16. The warehouse manager was asked whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023. The site director did not recall whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and asked for this to be minuted. The shift rota confirmed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The claimant noted that the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time.

17. The site director explained that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 but could not give a date. The investigating officer explained that the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time. The transport planner was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March which was recorded on the shared drive. The team leader did not recall whether the rota software had been changed in February in an email the following day.

18. The union representative disputed that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The shift rota agreed that the rota software had been changed in February and that this was raised again at the meeting. The transport planner disputed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota did not recall whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted.

19. The HR adviser later wrote that the overtime list had been posted late in March during the second interview. The team leader confirmed that the duty manager left early that night and that this was raised again at the meeting. The team leader noted that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time. Her line manager noted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time.

20. The investigating officer noted that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days which was recorded on the shared drive. The claimant confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager later wrote that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled during the second interview. The yard supervisor confirmed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

21. The warehouse manager agreed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval during the second interview. The site director did not recall whether the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 in an email the following day. The team leader was asked whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day.

22. The HR adviser noted that the flexible working request was still pending. The HR adviser accepted that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The transport planner agreed that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged according to the rota printout. The transport planner was asked whether the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted.

23. The investigating officer later wrote that the claimant had raised workload informally in January but could not give a date. The shift rota did not recall whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged. The occupational health adviser accepted that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The site director noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice in an email the following day.

24. The night team was asked whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually in an email the following day. The investigating officer accepted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays in an email the following day. The payroll team explained that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps according to the rota printout. The occupational health adviser agreed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and asked for this to be minuted.

25. The payroll team noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The occupational health adviser explained that the forklift refresher training was overdue and asked for this to be minuted. The union representative was asked whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The transport planner disputed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and asked for this to be minuted.

26. The shift rota was asked whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January during the second interview. Her line manager was asked whether the sickness procedure had not been explained but could not give a date. The transport planner accepted that the flexible working request was still pending but could not give a date. The shift rota later wrote that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout during the second interview.

27. The site director agreed that the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time. The investigating officer explained that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive. The union representative noted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

following day. The occupational health adviser was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date.

28. The investigating officer explained that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time. The night team agreed that the rota software had been changed in February during the second interview. The transport planner said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The transport planner accepted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive.

29. Her line manager confirmed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps. The site director later wrote that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps which was recorded on the shared drive. The yard supervisor disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date.

30. The HR adviser confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending. The team leader explained that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and asked for this to be minuted. The union representative accepted that the overtime list had been posted late in March but could not give a date. The night team disputed that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted.

Appendix: interview notes

Q: The shift rota did not recall whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January and asked for this to be minuted.
A: Her line manager confirmed that the rota software had been changed in February but could not give a date.

Q: The yard supervisor confirmed that the duty manager left early that night according to the rota printout.
A: The claimant later wrote that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and asked for this to be minuted.

Q: The investigating officer was asked whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval.
A: The payroll team said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged but could not give a date.

Q: The yard supervisor said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and that this was raised again at the meeting.
A: The transport planner confirmed that the handover notes were not kept in one place.

Q: The occupational health adviser agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January during the second interview.
A: The team leader said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Q: The investigating officer said in interview that the meeting notes were typed up a week later during the second interview.
A: The HR adviser agreed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout.

Q: The yard supervisor confirmed that the overtime list had been posted late in March and asked for this to be minuted.
A: The site director did not recall whether the overtime list had been posted late in March which was recorded on the shared drive.

Q: The investigating officer was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays according to the rota printout.
A: The shift rota noted that the stock count started forty minutes late but could not give a date.

Q: The investigating officer was asked whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and that this was raised again at the meeting.
A: The HR adviser was asked whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps and asked for this to be minuted.

Q: The shift rota accepted that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time.
A: The payroll team said in interview that the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive.

Q: Her line manager explained that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted.
A: The claimant did not recall whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time.

Q: The site director was asked whether the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days in an email the following day.
A: The claimant noted that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive.

Q: The warehouse manager agreed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and asked for this to be minuted.
A: The night team explained that the claimant had raised workload informally in January.

Q: The HR adviser agreed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later during the second interview.
A: The claimant did not recall whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and asked for this to be minuted.

Q: The payroll team confirmed that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day.
A: The occupational health adviser agreed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 during the second interview.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Q: The union representative later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days which was recorded on the shared drive.
A: The HR adviser agreed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays but could not give a date.

Q: The transport planner disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled which was recorded on the shared drive.
A: The yard supervisor was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview.

Q: The warehouse manager noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March in an email the following day.
A: The warehouse manager said in interview that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive.

Q: The claimant explained that the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time.
A: The occupational health adviser confirmed that the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time.

Q: The occupational health adviser did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout and that this was raised again at the meeting.
A: The shift rota accepted that the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time.

Q: The shift rota agreed that the flexible working request was still pending and that this was raised again at the meeting.
A: Her line manager was asked whether the handover notes were not kept in one place although no note of this was made at the time.

Q: The shift rota disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date.
A: The claimant said in interview that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice according to the rota printout.

Q: Her line manager accepted that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted.
A: The transport planner said in interview that the claimant had raised workload informally in January.

Q: The union representative accepted that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time.
A: The investigating officer did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd
Unit 4, Fenwick Road
Halbridge HB2 7QT

3 July 2026

Ms Rosa Ashdown

Invitation to a capability hearing

You are invited to a capability hearing on 24 July 2026 at 14:00.

A possible outcome of the hearing is dismissal on notice.

The shift rota accepted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled but could not give a date. The investigating officer said in interview that the handover notes were not kept in one place. The shift rota was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and that this was raised again at the meeting. The team leader later wrote that the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day.

The site director confirmed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval but could not give a date. The occupational health adviser disputed that the flexible working request was still pending in an email the following day. Her line manager explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted. The yard supervisor later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted.

Yours sincerely,

Imogen Tate
HR Business Partner

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Capability hearing: notes

Date: 24 July 2026. Present: Marcus Ellery (chair), Imogen Tate (HR), Rosa Ashdown, Tom Bevan (union representative).

IT: The occupational health adviser later wrote that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted.

IT: The investigating officer disputed that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout but could not give a date.

IT: The yard supervisor said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February and that this was raised again at the meeting.

ME: The site director disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted.

ME: The team leader disputed that the sickness procedure had not been explained which was recorded on the shared drive.

TB: The night team later wrote that the rota software had been changed in February in an email the following day.

ME: The investigating officer later wrote that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually but could not give a date.

RA: The warehouse manager explained that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and asked for this to be minuted.

IT: Her line manager did not recall whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled although no note of this was made at the time.

ME: The yard supervisor was asked whether the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time.

ME: The warehouse manager later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval.

IT: The transport planner said in interview that the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout.

IT: The team leader said in interview that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive.

RA: The site director explained that the rota software had been changed in February and asked for this to be minuted.

RA: The occupational health adviser disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled which was recorded on the shared drive.

ME: The claimant explained that the meeting notes were typed up a week later according

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

to the rota printout.

RA: The night team later wrote that the handover notes were not kept in one place during the second interview.

RA: The occupational health adviser later wrote that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval in an email the following day.

RA: The warehouse manager confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted.

RA: The claimant disputed that the sickness procedure had not been explained and asked for this to be minuted.

IT: Her line manager was asked whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout which was recorded on the shared drive.

TB: The shift rota disputed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps.

RA: The investigating officer noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time.

RA: The night team disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted.

TB: The night team did not recall whether the meeting notes were typed up a week later during the second interview.

RA: The team leader disputed that the duty manager left early that night and that this was raised again at the meeting.

ME: The HR adviser accepted that the stock count started forty minutes late which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The investigating officer was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview.

IT: The site director was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The site director said in interview that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 which was recorded on the shared drive.

IT: The transport planner did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout although no note of this was made at the time.

TB: The investigating officer did not recall whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually and asked for this to be minuted.

ME: The team leader did not recall whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting.

TB: The team leader later wrote that the agency workers were not briefed on the new

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

layout according to the rota printout.

IT: Her line manager said in interview that the duty manager left early that night.

TB: The team leader agreed that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually during the second interview.

TB: The claimant said in interview that the stock count started forty minutes late during the second interview.

IT: The warehouse manager explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged according to the rota printout.

IT: The claimant accepted that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled.

TB: The occupational health adviser did not recall whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps according to the rota printout.

ME: Her line manager confirmed that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day.

TB: The transport planner said in interview that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and that this was raised again at the meeting.

ME: The team leader did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice.

TB: The team leader later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date.

RA: The investigating officer later wrote that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays but could not give a date.

TB: The union representative was asked whether the duty manager left early that night.

TB: Her line manager said in interview that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time.

RA: The site director confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted.

TB: The transport planner did not recall whether the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled.

RA: The warehouse manager disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later in an email the following day.

TB: The night team explained that the claimant had raised workload informally in January according to the rota printout.

RA: The night team noted that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days according to the rota printout.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd
Unit 4, Fenwick Road
Halbridge HB2 7QT

14 August 2026

Ms Rosa Ashdown

Outcome of capability hearing: dismissal on notice

Following the hearing on 24 July 2026, I have decided to dismiss you on the grounds of capability, with 7 weeks' notice paid in lieu.

Her line manager said in interview that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays which was recorded on the shared drive. The night team did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout according to the rota printout. The yard supervisor disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser accepted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays but could not give a date.

Her line manager was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged during the second interview. The union representative agreed that the flexible working request was still pending and asked for this to be minuted. The payroll team was asked whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps during the second interview. The union representative disputed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays and asked for this to be minuted.

The shift rota disputed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice according to the rota printout. The investigating officer was asked whether the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays which was recorded on the shared drive. The HR adviser later wrote that the forklift refresher training was overdue but could not give a date. The union representative did not recall whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually during the second interview.

The site director later wrote that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date. The shift rota accepted that the stock count started forty minutes late and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota accepted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice during the second interview. The warehouse manager confirmed that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days although no note of this was made at the time.

You have the right to appeal within 7 days.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Ellery
Site Director

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Appeal against dismissal

From Rosa Ashdown, 19 August 2026.

The claimant did not recall whether the forklift refresher training was overdue but could not give a date. Her line manager accepted that the flexible working request was still pending but could not give a date. Her line manager explained that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser explained that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays according to the rota printout.

The HR adviser noted that the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged according to the rota printout. The warehouse manager confirmed that the flexible working request was still pending. The warehouse manager later wrote that the forklift refresher training was overdue but could not give a date. The yard supervisor agreed that the claimant had raised workload informally in January in an email the following day.

The union representative accepted that the forklift refresher training was overdue which was recorded on the shared drive. The transport planner disputed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time. The payroll team did not recall whether the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout. The transport planner said in interview that the flexible working request was still pending which was recorded on the shared drive.

The HR adviser disputed that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date. The claimant accepted that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval according to the rota printout. The transport planner said in interview that the handover notes were not kept in one place. The yard supervisor was asked whether the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date.

The occupational health adviser disputed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and that this was raised again at the meeting. The night team later wrote that the rota software had been changed in February. The payroll team later wrote that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice but could not give a date. The claimant noted that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day.

The payroll team explained that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time. The claimant noted that the sickness procedure had not been explained which was recorded on the shared drive. The shift rota agreed that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 and that this was raised again at the meeting. The shift rota was asked whether the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time.

The occupational health adviser noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays although no note of this was made at the time. The transport planner was asked whether the complaint about the comment in the canteen had not been logged during the second

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

interview. The HR adviser was asked whether the rota software had been changed in February although no note of this was made at the time. The team leader noted that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice in an email the following day.

The claimant explained that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team accepted that the policy had last been reviewed in 2023 according to the rota printout. The claimant confirmed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays. Her line manager agreed that the handover notes were not kept in one place according to the rota printout.

The occupational health adviser accepted that the stock count started forty minutes late and asked for this to be minuted. The team leader was asked whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval and asked for this to be minuted. The warehouse manager explained that the claimant had raised workload informally in January. The yard supervisor later wrote that the forklift refresher training was overdue although no note of this was made at the time.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Corvel Lane Logistics Ltd
Unit 4, Fenwick Road
Halbridge HB2 7QT

9 September 2026

Ms Rosa Ashdown

Outcome of your appeal

The appeal was heard on 2 September 2026 by Karen Whitlow, Regional Director.

Your appeal is not upheld.

The night team explained that the handover notes were not kept in one place but could not give a date. The team leader accepted that the duty manager left early that night which was recorded on the shared drive. Her line manager disputed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and asked for this to be minuted. The claimant did not recall whether two drivers had swapped shifts without approval in an email the following day.

The shift rota disputed that the meeting notes were typed up a week later and asked for this to be minuted. The HR adviser noted that the agency workers were not briefed on the new layout in an email the following day. The HR adviser accepted that the sickness procedure had not been explained in an email the following day. Her line manager did not recall whether the handover notes were not kept in one place.

The team leader confirmed that the duty manager left early that night but could not give a date. The union representative did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice although no note of this was made at the time. The warehouse manager noted that the overtime list had been posted late in March according to the rota printout. The site director agreed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The night team agreed that the handover notes were not kept in one place and that this was raised again at the meeting. The occupational health adviser agreed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps but could not give a date. The HR adviser agreed that the claimant was told the vacancy had been filled. The yard supervisor did not recall whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and asked for this to be minuted.

The team leader confirmed that the temperature log for chiller 3 had gaps although no note of this was made at the time. The yard supervisor noted that the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting. The payroll team later wrote that nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time. The shift rota was asked whether the stock count started forty minutes late according to the rota printout.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

The shift rota explained that the sickness procedure had not been explained although no note of this was made at the time. The union representative disputed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval although no note of this was made at the time. The payroll team was asked whether the flexible working request was still pending but could not give a date. The HR adviser did not recall whether the claimant had raised workload informally in January and that this was raised again at the meeting.

The shift rota later wrote that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview. Her line manager was asked whether the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice and that this was raised again at the meeting. The HR adviser confirmed that the rota software had been changed in February according to the rota printout. The team leader was asked whether nobody had checked the absence triggers manually although no note of this was made at the time.

The payroll team later wrote that the duty manager left early that night although no note of this was made at the time. The night team noted that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays during the second interview. The yard supervisor agreed that two drivers had swapped shifts without approval according to the rota printout. The site director disputed that the forklift refresher training was overdue in an email the following day.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Whitlow
Regional Director

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Payslip: June 2026

Employee	Rosa Ashdown
Employee no.	CL-00417
Basic pay	2,600.00
Night premium	312.00
Tax	-366.40
NI	-148.96
Pension	-145.60
Net pay	2,251.04

Pay date: 28 June 2026.

Payslip: July 2026

Employee	Rosa Ashdown
Employee no.	CL-00417
Basic pay	2,600.00
Night premium	312.00
Tax	-366.40
NI	-148.96
Pension	-145.60
Net pay	2,251.04

Pay date: 28 July 2026.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE

IN THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS
Case No: 6099999/2026

ROSA ASHDOWN Claimant

v

CORVEL LANE LOGISTICS LTD Respondent

SCHEDULE OF LOSS

Basic award (7 years x 1 x GBP 700)	4,900.00
Loss of earnings 14/08/2026 - 03/03/2027	15,880.00
Future loss (26 weeks)	13,520.00
Loss of statutory rights	600.00
Injury to feelings (lower Vento band)	9,000.00
Total	43,900.00

Dated 20 November 2026.

The occupational health adviser explained that the return-to-work meeting had been booked twice which was recorded on the shared drive. The payroll team did not recall whether the sickness procedure had not been explained but could not give a date. The investigating officer later wrote that the CCTV footage was overwritten after 30 days but could not give a date.

The claimant agreed that the loading bay was short-staffed on Tuesdays according to the rota printout. The occupational health adviser said in interview that the claimant had raised workload informally in January according to the rota printout. The site director explained that the sickness procedure had not been explained and asked for this to be minuted.

FICTIONAL SAMPLE