

PRINCIPAL CLAIM 1: WHISTLEBLOWING

Claimant's Summary: Protected disclosure (whistleblowing), where the Claimant raised concerns about health and safety, transparency and governance failures and was subsequently subjected to adverse treatment culminating in her dismissal, the dismissal being contrary to section 103A of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

This issue is recorded in the Employment Tribunals document titled *Record of a Preliminary Hearing*, in the case of *Ms H Bannerman v The Land Restoration Trust*, Case Numbers **3306483/2024** and **3311035/2024**. The hearing took place on **14 May 2025** before **Employment Judge KJ Palmer**, with the written record dated **19 May 2025**. The relevant section appears under '**List of Issues – Protected Disclosure**' at **paragraph (23)**.

This is the Claimant's summary of what the Tribunal will consider:

1. Whether the Claimant made a disclosure of information during meetings on 2 February 2024 and 8 February 2024, namely:
 - a. that during the water crisis Hill Marshall was nowhere to be seen, that the Claimant had asked them for help, and that [REDACTED] seemed upset with the Claimant; and
 - b. that the Claimant remained concerned that people may be 'dead in their beds' because *no one had been to check on them*
2. If so, whether the disclosure was made to the Claimant's employer or to some other responsible person.
3. If so, whether the disclosure related to matters referred to in section 43B of the Employment Rights Act 1996, including:
 - c. that a criminal offence has been, is being, or is likely to be committed;
 - d. that a person has failed, is failing, or is likely to fail to comply with a legal obligation;
 - e. that the health or safety of any individual has been, is being, or is likely to be endangered;
 - f. that information tending to show any of the above matters has been, or is likely to be, deliberately concealed.
4. Whether the Claimant had a reasonable belief that the information tended to show one or more of the matters referred to above.
5. Whether the Claimant had a reasonable belief that the disclosure was made in the public interest.