

PRINCIPAL CLAIM 4: DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RELIGION OR BELIEF

Claimant's Summary: Discrimination because of religion or belief, namely the Claimant's philosophical belief in, and adherence to, the principles of social and environmental justice, and the extent to which those principles informed her actions and decision-making, contrary to section 13 of the Equality Act 2010.

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 – Direct Discrimination because of Religion or Belief**' at **paragraph (28)**.

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

1. Whether the Claimant holds a philosophical belief in social and environmental justice that is capable of protection under the Equality Act 2010.
2. Whether the Claimant was treated less favourably than others who do not share that belief, contrary to section 13 of the Equality Act 2010.
3. The specific acts relied upon as acts of less favourable treatment, namely:
 - (i) A failure by Mr [REDACTED] CEO of the Respondent, to challenge numerous false allegations made by Hill Marshall on 2 February 2024 about the Claimant. Those allegations stated that the Claimant had unreasonably enforced recycling rules in the Community Centre, when it was Hill Marshall who had failed to abide by those rules. The Claimant relies upon Mr [REDACTED]'s failure to challenge these allegations as an act of direct discrimination.
 - (ii) [REDACTED] advising the Claimant to go home on 18 January 2024, when she was the only person providing humanitarian assistance in the early stages of what was a civil emergency. The Claimant relies upon this as an act of direct discrimination.
 - (iii) A failure by the Respondent to protect the Claimant despite her vulnerability arising from her belief in social and environmental justice, which she had raised at interview, and which led Hill Marshall to make complaints about her on 12 September 2023, 2 February 2024, and 14 February 2024. The Claimant relies upon the Respondent's failure to protect her in light of those complaints as an act of direct discrimination.
4. Whether a hypothetical comparator would have been treated more favourably in the same or materially similar circumstances.