



LITTLETON

PROTECTED CONVERSATIONS

Autumn 2018

Littleton Chambers, 3 King's Bench Walk North, London EC4Y 7HR
Telephone: 020 7797 8600 | Facsimile: 020 7797 8699 | DX: 1047 Chancery Lane
www.littletonchambers.co.uk | clerks@littletonchambers.co.uk

LITTLETON



The Question(s)

**Using real-life examples,
what is the root cause of the
trouble with protected
conversations?**

**Why do they go wrong and
how can you put them right?**

The Essential Issues...

(1) What is a protected conversation?

(2) When can it go wrong?

(3) What can you do when it does?



1. What is a Protected Conversation?



Reason for Existence

- Concern felt by the government that an employer was unable to have a frank discussion as regards performance without facing a potential claim for constructive dismissal
- Cannot rely on “without prejudice” rule as often no dispute thus the privilege does not attach
BNP-v-Mezzotero [2004] IRLR 508



The Statutory Response

- s111A of the Employment Rights Act 1996
- Supported by Statutory Code of Practice



S111A ERA

(1) Evidence of pre-termination negotiations is inadmissible in any proceedings on a complaint under section 111. This is subject to subsections (3) to (5).

(2) In subsection (1) “ pre-termination negotiations ” means any offer made or discussions held, before the termination of the employment in question, with a view to it being terminated on terms agreed between the employer and the employee.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply where, according to the complainant's case, the circumstances are such that a provision (whenever made) contained in, or made under, this or any other Act requires the complainant to be regarded for the purposes of this Part as unfairly dismissed.

(4) In relation to anything said or done which in the tribunal's opinion was improper, or was connected with improper behaviour, subsection (1) applies only to the extent that the tribunal considers just.

Remember “Without Prejudice”

- s111A ERA is a “bolt-on” to the Common law



- Always need to consider additionally if WP privilege applies



Conditions

- Must be “*pre-termination negotiations*” as defined
- Only covered if “*with a view to [employment] being terminated*”
- Need not actually reach agreement nor need a specific sum be offered –NB “*discussions*”. Can also come from the employee. No need for existence of a dispute
- Must not involve “improper behaviour”

Limitations

- Only applies to “ordinary” unfair dismissal claims i.e not automatically unfair, breach of contract or discrimination/detriment claims
- If “mixed” claim then Employment Tribunal can consider as regards other claims but not the fairness of the dismissal



Procedural Requirements

- In fact there are none
- Suggested steps in the Code (e.g. that allow 10 days to consider offer and failure may be undue pressure –see later-)
- Yet none are requirements



Improper Behaviour

- s111A(4) imports a 2 stage test
- Is the behaviour improper?
- To what extent is it just to protect confidentiality?
- Examples found in Code



Problem (1)

What is Improper Behaviour?

- (1) Harassment, bullying and intimidation including offensive language/threatening behaviour
- (2) Criminal Behaviour
- (3) Victimisation and discrimination
- (4) Placing undue pressure on a party (e.g. stating that a failure of discussion will lead to dismissal, reducing settlement sum on a daily basis or employee stating that will undermine public reputation if not agreed).

Problem 1 (Cont).

What is not Improper Behaviour?

- (1) Setting out in a neutral manner the reasons for the offer
- (2) Informing that a refusal shall lead to disciplinary proceedings which may lead to dismissal
- (3) Not using template letters or refusing a reference
- (4) Not paying a lawyer's fee for advice



Problem 1 (Cont)

What about the Middle?

- Extremes are easy and Code provides only examples in any event
- What about the uncertain middle ground?



Problem 2 “Just to protect”

- Matter for Employment Tribunal and consequences vary
- May lead to complete loss of privilege
- Or may be partial



Problem 2 – How do you Predict?

- Reality is that you cannot
- Therefore exercise caution



Jurisprudential Guidance

- 2 decisions as regards Protected Conversations
- ***Faithorn Farrell Timms-v-Bailey*** [2016] IRLR 839
- HHJ Eady QC
- Agrees Employment Tribunal may be required to admit evidence for some purposes but not others

Scope

“

Section 111A renders inadmissible evidence of any offer made or discussions held with a view to terminating the employment on agreed terms and that must extend to the fact of the discussions, not simply to their content...Further, the application of s.111A is not limited to the evidence of the negotiations from those who were directly involved...the focus has to be on the subject matter of the evidence in question. If it is properly to be characterised as evidence of an offer or discussions held for the required purpose then (unless rendered admissible by any of the exemptions) it is inadmissible in any claim of unfair dismissal.

”

Waiver?

“

Section 111A confidentiality cannot be waived. The section cannot be read so as to permit agreement to the admission of evidence otherwise rendered inadmissible by the provision. Parliament apparently chose not to allow for an exception where the parties so agree (although it has provided for other exceptions). It could have imported the without prejudice rule into s.111A; instead it chose to create an express provision relating to the admissibility of evidence in quite specific circumstances.

”

Basra-v-BJSS Ltd [2018] ICR 793

“

40. *Ground 1 therefore succeeds on the facts of this case because the parties were expressly relying upon two different dates of termination. Had that not been the case, and had the only issue been whether or not an undisputed termination on 3 March 2016 amounted to a resignation by the Claimant, a dismissal by the Respondent or an agreed termination, then the Tribunal would have been correct to exclude all evidence of negotiations prior to that date.*

”

LITTLETON

2-3 Case Study



Reminder of the Question

What is the root cause of the trouble with protected conversations? Why do they go wrong and how can you put them right?



L v Teaching Trust

- Claimant is a Associate Headteacher of Academy Trust
- Falls out with Trust Head
- Concerns expressed as to her competence to be discussed in a meeting

L (cont)

- Claimant goes absent from work with stress
- R seeks to have a protected conversation and seeks answer within 24 hours indicating termination is likely
- R brings discrimination and constructive dismissal claims

How to correct?

- Not easy
- But remember the human element and the more reasonable an employer's approach the more likely that the purpose of the discussion shall bear fruit. Touchstone is reasonableness
- Also renders a claim less likely



The Evidential Question

- Remember that the S111A privilege is “flimsy” and susceptible to challenge in a way WP privilege is not
- Good idea that record discussions so that if the veil is pierced you can evidence what was in fact said



Are Protected Conversations a Good Idea?

- They can be
- But use with caution



LITTLETON

QUESTIONS



Nicholas Siddall

Call: 1997

+44 (0) 20 7797 8600

nsiddall@littletonchambers.co.uk



Six Pump Court

LITTLETON

If after this session you have any questions
please do not hesitate to contact:

Nick Siddall

nsiddall@littletonchambers.co.uk

Littleton Chambers
3 King's Bench Walk North
Temple
London
EC4Y 7HR

T +44 (0) 20 7797 8600
F +44 (0) 20 7797 8699
DX 1047 Chancery Lane
www.littletonchambers.com
clerks@littletonchambers.co.uk