

Lee Hanford
Brook House IRC
South Perimeter Road
Gatwick
RH6 0PQ

10th April 2018

Dear Lee,

I am writing to you in reference to a letter I received on the 7th April 2018. This letter stated that as a result of a recent disciplinary investigation my employment with G4S had been terminated. Resulting in my dismissal as an employee of G4S.

I would like to formally appeal this decision for a number of reasons.

The reason for my dismissal is stated as being due a breakdown in the relationship between G4S and myself. I am also alleged to have acted in a way that does not represent the company values. I vehemently deny that this is the case.

On the 11th January 2018 I was suspended from duty due to allegations of inappropriate conduct towards G4S colleagues. I was not provided with any further information at that time.

In my initial investigation meeting I was made aware of the specific allegations against me. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that my local trade union representative Joe Marshall informed me that many of my colleagues were discussing the specifics of these allegations prior to my initial hearing. I made my point of contact Mark Demian aware of this at the time via a telephone conversation. Due to this I immediately had concerns regarding the integrity of the investigation.

During my initial investigation meeting I was informed that my alleged actions had been reported to the police and that a crime reference number had been recorded. Naturally this caused me extreme mental anxiety and stress. To my absolute amazement I was informed during my disciplinary hearing that there was in fact no police involvement in the matter to G4S's knowledge.

On the 16th march 2018 I attended a social event where I had a very brief encounter with a former employee of G4S. This former employee was Christopher Malden. During this encounter Mr Malden made a statement in relation to the investigation into my alleged actions. This statement contained very specific information in relation to the investigation. This encounter was on the exact same date as I received my initial investigation report. I fail to see how a person could know this information unless another party involved in the investigation had acted without integrity and informed them.

When I received the minutes from my initial investigation meeting I requested various amendments be made to them. This was because I felt they were not a true reflection of what I had said during the meeting. To the best of my knowledge these amendments were not made. This left me feeling very disappointed as I felt G4S were duly obliged to provide an accurate account of what I had said during my meeting.

During the course of my investigation many other staff members have been mentioned as being witness to the allegations against me. Upon reading my investigation report it is clear that some of these staff members have not been interviewed during the course of the investigation. It is stated in my dismissal letter that due to a balance of probability the allegations against me are founded. I would argue that unless all parties involved have been interviewed how could the evidence against me form a true balance of probability. Furthermore I would suggest that the evidence against me is unsubstantial as a result.

During my initial disciplinary hearing I raised various concerns. One of these concerns was in relation to staff members not being interviewed. Some of these staff members were then interviewed as a result of the concerns I had raised. I would like to state that I question the neutrality and impartiality of the investigation when the person holding the disciplinary hearing can be actively involved in the investigation. Steve Skitt interviewed two members of staff yet Steve Skitt heard my disciplinary hearing. The manager hearing the investigation should have neutrality from the initial investigation in my opinion. To add to this I did not receive the minutes from these interviews.

My disciplinary hearing took place on Friday March 26th 2018. This hearing was adjourned in order to be reconvened at a later date. On Tuesday 3rd of April 2018 I received a letter to my home address. This letter invited me to a reconvened disciplinary hearing on the 4th March 2018. This letter clearly stated that this had been arranged in line with availability of my Trade Union representative Andy Darken. This was categorically not the case. It is worth noting that my last date of employment with G4S was the 8th April 2018 due to me being on my notice period. Due to the actions of the company I have not been given a fair and proper opportunity to defend myself against the allegations made against me. Nor did I receive a fair notice period prior to my reconvened hearing. Added to this the hearing was dated the 4th March 2018. I was keen to attend my reconvened hearing but was not given fair opportunity to do so. I then received the outcome in writing. Without being given fair opportunity to attend.

I feel it is of vital importance that I draw your attention to an extract from disciplinary outcome letter. "You are a manager regardless if this action was consensual or not, this action would not be inappropriate". This statement alone leads me to question the purpose of the investigation.

I have not been provided with all the alleged evidence against me. Statements and interviews are referenced in my disciplinary outcome letter. I have not been provided with copies of these. As a result of this I have not been given fair opportunity to defend myself. Having fair opportunity to defend ones self should be a pre requisite to any investigation. These statements and interviews are clearly supporting evidence against me. I have to question how I have not been allowed to read them and therefore provide any evidence that I believe would contradict these statements and interviews.

I believe that the bond of integrity was broken during the course of this investigation. As a result of this I would argue that there is an extreme lack of substance in the evidence against me. I also believe that I have been treated without neutrality or fairness throughout the investigation. I have received absolutely minimal support during the course of the investigation and have been suffering from extreme anxiety and stress as a result.

During my initial disciplinary hearing I made Mr Skitt aware of other inappropriate behavior conducted by members of staff on the 17th December 2017. To the best of my knowledge very little has been done as a result of this. This leads to me to feel that I have been treated unfairly. I believe a major equality issue has come to light during the course of my investigation.

Finally I have been a G4S employee for eleven years. I had never been under investigation for my conduct towards my colleagues prior to this investigation. I am of good character and I feel there is substantive evidence to support this within my service record. I feel that members of staff have colluded to make baseless allegations against me. Unfortunately I have not been given fair opportunity to defend myself against these allegations. There is a lack of evidence in this investigation as a result. I do not believe it meets the balance of probability threshold. Finally I would like to once again take this opportunity to protest against the assertion that there has been a breakdown in the relationship between myself and G4S.

I now intend to pursue a new career away from G4S. The purpose of my appeal is to have the reason for my departure amended so as to not read dismissed.

I appreciate this is a very detailed letter I do however hope that you will take time to digest the information contained within it.

Can I please request that any hearing is arranged in line with the availability of my trade union representative Andy Darken.

I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss the matters I have raised further and in more detail with you. Thank you for your time.

Kind Regards

S5091

Signature