# Tribunal considers reasonable adjustments to standard processes and the application of “zero tolerance” policies for neurodivergent employees

**In *Halstead v JD Wetherspoons plc*, the Employment Tribunal has considered whether an employer failed to make reasonable adjustments to their processes and the way in which they applied a “zero tolerance” policy to an employee with autism, and whether that failure amounted to disability-related harassment.**

**What happened in *Halstead*?**

*Facts*

Mr Halstead started his employment with Wetherspoons as a kitchen porter in late 2018 in Berkhamsted. Although he left for a short period, he returned to work for the same branch in May 2019 and later, in 2021, moved to the Wetherspoons in Trowbridge. He had been diagnosed with autism at the age of two and had informed the Berkhamsted branch of this, however this information was not shared with Trowbridge at the time of his transfer.

In August 2023, Mr Halstead and his mother went for a family meal at a Wetherspoons pub along with five visiting family

members. Mr Halstead, assisted by his mother, place the order through the Wetherspoons app and ticked the box to confirm that he accepted the employee discount policy and privacy policy. As a result, Mr Halstead's employee discount of 20% was applied to the entire order, even though the policy said the discount was only permitted to be used for groups of up to four people.

Mr Halstead was investigated and subjected to a disciplinary process in relation to his use of the discount and potential breaches of Wetherspoons' data protection and confidentiality policies (because he permitted his mother to access the app). During the investigation, the impact of Mr Halstead's autism on his day-to-day activities was discussed, including a requirement that someone directs him to read necessary documents (ideally sitting him down to go through any document with him). They explained that delay would highly impact his anxiety and that the process was causing him significant distress. Despite this, Wetherspoons did not make any adjustments to the disciplinary process.

Mr Halstead subsequently went off sick from work, and a long-term sickness meeting was arranged prior to obtaining the outcome of his occupational health referral. The occupational health report set out clear adjustments that should be made. These included giving 1-2-1 explanations of important documents, and confirming the extent to which his mother needed to be involved in his meetings and day-to-day tasks. It also emphasised the need for additional notice and other adjustments to meetings.

Contrary to the occupational health advice, no adjustments were made to the meeting for Mr Halstead's grievance, which he had raised about his treatment. An adjusted meeting was

eventually arranged, following his mother's objections. There had also been no update on the disciplinary process, Mr Halstead had not been having his appraisals, and had not been paid correctly, all of which contributed to his anxiety.

In December 2023, Wetherspoons invited Mr Halstead to a "some other substantial reason" (**SOSR**) hearing to discuss what they asserted was a breakdown in the employment relationship and his apparent failure to attend meetings about his long-term sickness and his grievance. For this hearing, Wetherspoons offered numerous adjustments including the questions being sent in advance, an option for written submissions, an option to change the meeting time and location, confirmation of his mother's eligibility as companion and an open invitation to suggest any other adjustments in advance. This meeting was successful and in January 2024, Wetherspoons ended the SOSR process and instead invited Mr Halstead to an informal meeting to enable his return to work. In March 2024, Mr Halstead returned to work with several practical adjustments to support him.

Mr Halstead had approached ACAS for early conciliation during his grievance process and, whilst he had successfully returned to work, Wetherspoons had declined to offer him any financial compensation for the prior treatment. He therefore brought a claim under the Equality Act 2010 (**EqA**) for a failure to make reasonable adjustments (Section 20 and 21) and disability-related harassment (Section 26). It was accepted that his condition amounted to a disability under Section 6 EqA, and that Wetherspoons had known about it at the relevant time.

*Tribunal's Decision*

The Tribunal upheld Mr Halstead's claim of a failure to make reasonable adjustments, but did not find that Wetherspoons' actions had amounted to harassment. Their key observations were as follows:

- Wetherspoons had failed to adjust its investigation, disciplinary, grievance and long-term sickness processes to accommodate Mr Halstead's needs as an autistic person. In each case they had applied their standard process, including standard notice periods, template letters and options of companion at meetings, and had not permitted the Claimant's mother to attend the majority of the meetings with him. They had also applied their standard categorisation of the breach as gross misconduct and suspended him during investigation, despite there being no apparent risk to the company of him working.

- In the disciplinary letter, Wetherspoons had also referred to Mr Halstead's conduct as "dishonesty" and "abuse", which had caused Mr Halstead undue distress. They remarked that this was notable given that a typical feature of autism was a strong desire to adhere to rules, and that there was no evidence of dishonesty; Mr Halstead had admitted to the breach, had explained the misunderstanding, and had confirmed it would not happen again now that he understood the rule.

- Mr Halstead had therefore been placed at a substantial disadvantage in these procedures compared to someone without his condition. The Tribunal considered that once it had been established that the breach had been caused by his condition, the matter should have been dealt with

informally and not as a disciplinary matter at all.

- From December 2023 onwards, it was clear that the company had taken on board their positive duty to make adjustments. The Tribunal described their approach from this point on as “exemplary”.

- Whilst it had clearly been distressing for Mr Halstead, the Tribunal did not consider that Wetherspoons’ conduct had amounted to harassment. The company had addressed the conduct in a standard manner which was inherently stressful and challenging for those involved, but this did not meet the threshold of intimidation (otherwise employers would never be able to conduct performance management).

Mr Halstead was awarded £25,412, the majority of the award being made for injury to feelings.

**What can employers learn from this case?**

The decision in *Halstead* offers a clear demonstration of the positive impact that making reasonable adjustments can have and, conversely, the negative impact that a failure to make them can have on a neurodivergent employee’s wellbeing and their ability to participate in standard processes.

Given the Tribunal’s commentary regarding the “exemplary” nature of the approach taken by Wetherspoons from December

2023 onwards, the judgment can serve as a helpful guide for employers as to the type of adjustments which can be made to support neurodivergent employees. Examples include:

- Providing longer notice periods for meetings, including investigation meetings. If notice would not usually be given for fact-finding meetings, consider whether this can be adjusted to allow them sufficient time to prepare without compromising the investigation.

- Giving clear explanations of the purpose of meetings, allegations made and the potential consequences (including agendas for meetings, where possible). Ensure that the employee understands the nature of the meeting and (if applicable) the seriousness, including the next steps after the meeting and potential outcomes.

- Allowing flexibility with the options of who can accompany the employee to meetings. This may require the employer to go beyond the standard categories of trade union or colleague companions.

- Minimising delays as much as possible and offering regular updates.

- Carefully wording allegations to ensure that they do not inappropriately presume guilt, dishonesty or cause unnecessary distress.

- Remaining open to any other adjustments suggested by occupational health providers or the employee themselves, and implementing them unless there is a very

good reason not to.

Adjustments should also be considered more widely during employment to ensure that neurodivergent employees are placed on an equal footing with their colleagues. Employers should ensure that, where they know an employee has a condition that affects them at work, this is tracked through their employment journey and information is shared (with their consent) to enable proper support. This will be particularly relevant for employees whose conditions may lead to challenges in asking for support.

In addition, this case highlights for employers the danger of enforcing “zero tolerance” policies. The Tribunal was critical of such policies, suggesting that they can be problematic if applied on a blanket basis because they fail to consider the diverse needs of employees. Whilst the employer may consider a policy breach to be serious enough for suspension and potentially dismissal, they may nevertheless need to consider adjusting the standard applied to employees whose conditions may affect their understanding of the relevant policy or ability to comply with it. This may be surprising to some employers, as the concept of reasonable adjustments is commonly thought of in terms of processes rather than substantive expectations. However, it is clear from this case that applying policies in a one-size-fits-all manner could result in a failure to make necessary adjustments for disabled employees.

Finally, employers should note that it will not always be sufficient to rely on a contractual requirement to abide by

all of their policies. They need to take active steps to ensure their policies are understood: this could include training, written communication and, where necessary, individual explanation.

Halstead v JD Wetherspoons plc

**BDBF is a leading employment law firm based at Bank in the City of London. If you would like to discuss any issues relating to the content of this article, please contact Rose Lim (RoseLim@bdbf.co.uk), Amanda Steadman (AmandaSteadman@bdbf.co.uk) or your usual BDBF contact.**