Employer not liable for employee’s physical attack on customer

[et_pb_section admin_label=”Section” global_module=”136″ fullwidth=”on” specialty=”off” transparent_background=”off” background_color=”#ffffff” allow_player_pause=”off” inner_shadow=”off” parallax=”off” parallax_method=”off” padding_mobile=”off” make_fullwidth=”off” use_custom_width=”off” width_unit=”on” make_equal=”off” use_custom_gutter=”off”][et_pb_fullwidth_code global_parent=”136″ admin_label=”Post Header”][Page_Header_Start] Employment Law News [Page_Header_End][/et_pb_fullwidth_code][/et_pb_section][et_pb_section admin_label=”section”][et_pb_row admin_label=”row”][et_pb_column type=”3_4″][et_pb_text admin_label=”Text” background_layout=”light” text_orientation=”left” use_border_color=”off” border_color=”#ffffff” border_style=”solid”]

Employer not liable for employee’s physical attack on customer

[post_details]

[Social-Share]

[post_tags]

In *Mohamud v WM Morrison*, the Court of Appeal found that an employer was not vicariously liable for its employee’s

physical assault on a customer because there was not a sufficiently close connection between the employee’s actions and his employment.

Mr Mohamud, a Somali, visited Morrison’s supermarket where he was both verbally abused and physically assaulted by K, a Morrison’s employee. Following this, Mr Mohamud brought a claim against Morrisons. The Court of Appeal found Morrisons not liable because there was not a sufficiently close connection between the wrongdoing and K’s employment. The fact that K’s employment provided the opportunity and setting for the incident was not sufficient enough to prove liability on the part of Morrisons.

[/et_pb_text][/et_pb_column][et_pb_column type=”1_4″][et_pb_sidebar admin_label=”Sidebar” orientation=”right” area=”sidebar-1″ background_layout=”light” remove_border=”off”]
[/et_pb_sidebar][/et_pb_column][/et_pb_row][/et_pb_section]