

## MAIN WEBSITE

**RACIAL ABUSE AT THE HOUSE OF LORDS (HOL) MY FORMER EMPLOYER, WAS COVERED UP BY MR ANDREW BANO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CROYDON EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL (ET) AS HE ACCEPTED A BRIBE WHICH WAS AN OFFER OF A PROMOTION TO THE POST OF A SOCIAL SECURITY COMMISSIONER, FROM LORD IRVINE THE THEN LORD CHANCELLOR. THE COVER UP CONCEALED THE ISSUE OF THE NON-PAYMENT OF MY APPROPRIATE BASIC REMUNERATION, OVERTIME AND THE ASSOCIATED BENEFITS OVER A PERIOD OF 10 + YEARS BY HOL. THE NON-PAYMENT OF THE APPROPRIATE REMUNERATION AFFECTED THE APPROPRIATE PAYMENTS OF OCCUPATIONAL AND STATE PENSIONS RESULTING IN SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP. FRAUDULENT DWP ACTIONS OF MY RACIST MANAGER AND HOL WAS SUPPRESSED BY THE COVER UP**

### **INTRODUCTION**

I would quote the following which is directed specifically towards Lord Irvine but equally applicable to Mr Bano the Chairman of the ET.

**“Be you never so high, the law is above you”.**

The above was quoted by Lord Denning during a summing up in the Court of Appeal quoting the great 18<sup>th</sup> century Attorney, Sir Thomas Fuller.

I have set up this **updated** website [www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com](http://www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com) with Appendices 1, 2 and 3 not with any revenge or vengeance but because I have been left with a long lasting sense of grievance and injustice by both HOL and the Judiciary. The website with its Appendices 1, 2 and 3 clearly reveal the corruption and conspiracy at the highest levels of the Judiciary in order to dismiss my Racial Claim against the HOL so as not to taint the HOL with the stigma of Racism. **Racism was the main cause for the Non-payment of my appropriate remuneration, overtime and the associated benefits over 10 + years of my employment at the HOL. This non-payment has directly affected my Occupational and State Pensions as they were calculated on a Fraudulent basis. HOL and the Judiciary are equally liable for these fraudulent actions.** Over the years I have complained to authorities in power, among others, the former and current Prime Ministers, the former Lords Chief Justices and EHRC but to no avail. The facts mentioned below are the same as the evidence submitted during the Court hearings with no hyperbole. I put my case before the readers.

To date no explanation has been given by HOL as to why they have withheld my appropriate remuneration over many years. They are too embarrassed to admit that I was subjected to racial discrimination. HOL turned a blind eye. The main perpetrator was Lorna McWilliam (LM) MBE (KKK is more appropriate) my racist line manager (former Banqueting Manager HOL).

As a result of the original website: [www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com](http://www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com) **I received 12 e-mails (see Appendix 1, para 52, page 11 ; paras 2-35, page 12), of which 2 e-mails (Appendix 3) from a man called James Bano claiming to be Mr Andrew Bano's brother, stating that the information on my website as regards Mr Andrew Bano was false, and I should remove it as**

**Mr Andrew Bano had attempted suicide.** Mr James Bano also threatened to sue me for libel if I did not remove the website. In spite of advising James Bano to sue me for libel, he has not done so. I received these e-mails prior to the Judiciary appointing Mr Bano as Judge, the President of the War Pensions & Armed Forces Compensation Chamber. I complained about the serious misconduct of both Mr Bano and Lord Irvine to Lord Woolf (former Lord Chief Justice), Lord Philip (former Lord Chief Justice), Lord Falconer, (former Lord Chancellor) among others but in spite of that Mr Bano was still appointed a Judge. I have also written recently to both Lord Igor Judge (former Lord Chief Justice) and Lord Neuberger, (currently the President of the Supreme Court) about the Bribery. No one can take action against me because my claims of Judicial Corruption and Bribery are true. The racial abuse that I was subjected to, was perpetrated by LM the racist line manager who was well protected by Mr Bano because he accepted the Bribe i.e. the promotion to the post of Social Security & Child Support Commissioner, from Lord Irvine and HOL. The Bribe was offered by Lord Irvine to Mr Bano who accepted it in order to dismiss my race claim.

### **Background**

This **updated** website is to let the public know that the **below mentioned race incidents (20 in total, 19<sup>th</sup> being the destruction of the evidence of criminality of the opened payslip envelope, by Mr Bano (page 21 Point 19 below)** these 20 race incidents are separate to the 10 ludicrous excuses also mentioned below some of which were in the Internal Grievance Report (IGR) of Mr Geoffrey Embleton the Deputy Establishment Officer, as regards my race complaints.). No investigation was held into my race complaints over 10+ years, until I called my managers, **“You are Racists”**, then an internal grievance investigation took place which was a white wash. At a subsequent meeting I was given an explanation by Mr Embleton, in the presence of Sir Michael Davies the former Clerk of the Parliaments, that **“Racism is everywhere even in Civil Service. Miss McWilliam belongs to a different generation and she cannot be corrected”**. HOL believed racism is everywhere, therefore they allowed LM to abuse me for over 10 years. I complained to the Employment Tribunal (see website [www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com](http://www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com) and the readers will note that LM's actions towards me were racist and racist only, especially the fact that I was forced to work 67 hours p.w. and paid only for 13.9 hours p.w. (**page 9 Point 4 below**). This being a scandal, Lord Irvine bribed Mr Bano the ET Chairman to cover up the race scandal without paying back what I was owed legally. From that time to date, the establishment has prevented the press from publishing the truth. In fact I have written to the 3 successors to Sir Michael Davies namely, Mr Paul Hayter, Sir Michael Pownall and currently Mr David Beamish but to no avail as they want to suppress the truth. **I believe the press was gagged and it still remains so.** HOL breached the Race Relations Act, the Employment Statutes and the Human Rights Act. They never believed that I would pursue the case for this length of time, in order to obtain my appropriate remuneration which has been withheld to date, without an explanation either by the Tribunal or by HOL. Mr Bano after hearing my evidence during my cross-examination stated:

**“I don't think that there is an Equal Opportunity Policy here”.**

**“There was jealousy because Mrs Hunt (CH my comparator) was treated more favourably than the Applicant”.**

It is clear from these 2 examples that I was treated less favourably than the white colleagues, Mr Bano deliberately failed to include the above evidence in his Decision, instead the Decision is riddled with **LIES** as explained below because he accepted the Bribe from Lord Irvine. I tried to integrate well with the white colleagues and the 7 other managers I worked for, but there were no reciprocity. There were no personal complaints about me recorded in my personal file, I was always attired in European dress, fluent in spoken and written English, but I was still not accepted as an equal of the white colleagues who worked at the HOL.

My managers (LM, and Mr Bibbiani the Head of the Refreshment Department who was LM's line manager) treated me less favourably than the white colleagues. **The main racial hatred perpetrator was LM, who behaved as the Leader of the Ku Klux Klan responsible for inciting racial hatred in others against me. I worked in isolation, and was exploited because I am non-white.**

**This is my story:** I was employed in April 1989 at 18 hours p.w., **part time** Clerical Officer until I was suspended from duty in July 1999 when I called the managers **“You are racists, you only want a white face and a white voice to the public in my place” (pages 10 and 11, Point 6 below)** I called them racists, when my post was made untenable as I was given to understand by LM that I am a typist and if anyone asks what my title was, to say that and I quote, “You are a Typist” which signifies a demotion. This was without any prior discussions. (this demotion has been explained in **pages 12 and 13, Point 7 below**). Even this fact was relayed to me by Mr Rupert Ellwood (Assistant Manager, but NOT my manager) who had completed my 1999/2000 Annual Appraisal Report (until then my Appraisal reports were completed by LM as my manager). He shouted at me, to sign my Appraisal Report without allowing me to peruse what he had written. I then called them racists as above and was suspended. I believe during the Internal Grievance Investigation it was apparent to HOL that I was racially discriminated against, the reader can make up his/her own mind after having read the website and the **Appendices 1, 2, and 3.**

**Mr Andrew Bano the Chairman of the Croydon Employment Tribunal perverted the course of justice as he had accepted a Bribe from Lord Irvine.** The Bribe was his promotion to the post of a Social Security & Child Support Commissioner. The readers should be aware that Lord Irvine who was the then Lord Chancellor had a unique triple role which combined the Judicial, Executive and Legislative functions and incorporated various responsibilities inter alia, appointed the President and Chairmen of the Employment Tribunals, recommended the Chief Social Security and Child Support Commissioners and High Court Judges to the Queen for appointments. It was acknowledged by most senior law lords at that time that this triple role of Lord Irvine breached the Convention of Human Rights which guarantees a fair trial by an impartial and an independent Tribunal. This was specially so in my particular case, where a non-white minor employee of HOL had lodged a race claim against the HOL. It is therefore inconceivable that Lord Irvine the Lord Chancellor did not have an intrinsic interest in the outcome of this claim **a)** in order not to tarnish the HOL with the stigma of racism and **b)** to prevent the erosion of the public confidence of the Justice System as HOL in its judiciary capacity was the highest Court of Justice in the UK at that time. Lord Irvine's conflict of interest therefore was evident. As the reader peruses my website including the Appendices 1, 2 and 3 in its entirety, he/she would conclude the same.

**Mr Bano's Decision is riddled with LIES** except for one key evidence that **“It is not in dispute that she had worked throughout very much longer than her contractual hours, at least 60 p.w”**. Mr Bano although accepted that I had worked 60 hours p.w. (I affirm that my hours were 67 p.w.) he deliberately failed to make an order for HOL to pay my rightful remuneration. The public must be informed that I was only paid for 13.9 hrs p.w. while I worked 67 hrs p.w. (see page 8, Point 4 below re composition of the 67 hrs) at the time I was suspended from duty. My Pensions (both Occupational and State) are based on 13.9 hrs p.w. and not based on 67. Mr Bano and Lord Irvine destroyed my life and livelihood by deliberately denying the appropriate remuneration to me, thus placing me in severe financial hardship.

**Mr Bano lied** and dismissed my race claim because he was instructed to do so by Lord Irvine. Mr Bano was promoted to the post of Social Security Commissioner in the middle of my race hearing. I was the complainant but Mr Bano deliberately denied me the opportunity to explain and

clarify my complaints in detail because he frequently reminded among others, “ **I have no time as I am employed elsewhere**” ; “**I have to attend to other matters**”. Ten days allocated to the cross-examination and my re-examination was reduced to just 5 days. Mr Bano documented in his Decision stating “**We find no discrimination**”, he **lied** because he accepted the Bribe. **The 10 ludicrous excuses in the IGR** and in other documents (letters from Mr Embleton and Sir Michael Davies) are as follows:

1. 'Taking each incident contained in Mrs Jayaratne's complaint separately, none of them has enough substance to warrant a grievance for racial discrimination, taken together it could possibly be interpreted so, but in every case, there are other **more probable explanations** ' (IGR of Mr Embleton).
2. 'Racism is everywhere even in Civil Service. Miss McWilliam belongs to a different generation, and therefore cannot be corrected. Racism is everywhere even in civil service.' (by Mr Embleton on 16 September 1999 at the final Grievance Meeting).
3. 'Due to poor management'.
4. 'Due to regrettable thoughtlessness on the part of Miss McWilliam'.
5. 'Unintentional' - (*racist incidents were unintentional*)
6. 'Due to lack of communication on the part of the Management' (IGR)  
(*This confirms my complaint that I worked in isolation as I have reasons to believe that LM instructed the white colleagues NOT to speak to me*)
7. "There is prima facie evidence of some poor management on their part which has led you to feel excluded'. (*stated in the letter of Sir Michael Davies Clerk of Parliaments*)
8. 'The Management considered that Mrs Jayaratne was not worthy of giving training, because she was not good enough in the first place'. (IGR) - (*'Not good enough' was proven to the contrary at the hearing as stated in Point 4, page 9 below*).
9. 'She is not bright and training is not the problem. She will always struggle to keep up".  
(*This false derogatory comment was annotated in my Personal File, by Mr Paul Hayter a man who did not know me at that time. Therefore Mr Hayter was fed this information by LM*).
10. "I believe that there have been some regrettable lapses in the proper management of Mrs Jyaratne, **her performance and career**. (IGR)

**LM'S treatment of non-whites was tantamount to the actions of a Leader of the Ku Klux Klan.** She employed only whites, as waiters/waitresses to serve at Functions in the Banqueting Rooms at the HOL, and at the State Opening of Parliament. Ninety percent of the Kitchen Porters, Cleaners, Kitchen Assistants were non-whites. She acted as if the Human Resources Office did not exist and that she was the person who was carrying out that role as regards employing staff for the Refreshment Department. I cannot understand why, my race complaints explained below were never investigated by HOL. The Respondents were able to state that I never complained of race discrimination, because the notes pertaining to my race complaints over 10 years documented by Anne Mossop the Welfare Officer, were removed from the file during the hearing (for a full account **see page 21, Point 20 below**). Anne Mossop told me that during her absence of maternity leave, Mr Embleton the Deputy Human Resources Officer, may have removed the Welfare file from her office. After removing the file, the notes

relating to my domestic disputes which I related to Anne Mossop during confidential counselling sessions, were typed out on official letter heads. Anne Mossop's hand written notes were destroyed. Mr Bano the Chairman of the Tribunal granted the Respondents' request that HOL did not want Anne Mossop or anyone else to be questioned regarding the Welfare Notes. HOL is too embarrassed to resolve this dispute because the only reason for withholding my rightful remuneration is due **only to Racism and Racism only**. I received a letter dated 22 November 2000 from ACAS (3<sup>rd</sup> such letter from ACAS see **paras 40 to paras 52, page 6 Appendix 1 and paras 3-26, page 7**), stating that the Solicitor representing the Respondents asked ACAS to contact me to establish whether I wished to put forward any proposals for their consideration. I forwarded my proposals soon after detailing the racial harassments. ACAS telephoned me and advised that I should request for £5000 and not to go ahead with the case as it would be very stressful for me (**website Appendix 1, paras 20 to 23, page 7**).

**MR BANO ACTED AS THE COUNSEL FOR HOL BECAUSE HE HAD ACCEPTED THE BRIBE FROM LORD IRVINE. I HAVE DETAILED MR BANO'S COVER UP RESPONSES AFTER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING RACE COMPLAINTS.**

**1A. DENIAL OF A FULL TIME POST IN SPITE OF 7 SUCH POSTS FALLING VACANT WITHIN MY OWN DEPARTMENT, BETWEEN 1989 AND 1999 IN SPITE OF MY WRITTEN REQUEST FOR A FULL TIME POST AND A WRITTEN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO THAT WRITTEN REQUEST FROM ANNE JOHNSON HUMAN RESOURCES OFFICER WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CLERICAL STAFF**

A full time employee (Moira Mitchell), left in September 1989, and I enquired about her post, but I was told that someone else had already been recruited. This was not advertised internally (as LM did not want me to apply and she did not want non-white full time employees. I learnt this later and I have reasons to believe that she had given instructions to everyone not to let me know about such posts). I therefore **wrote to the Human Resources Office** to let me know if such a post falls vacant again to notify me as I would want to apply for it. I received an acknowledgement from Anne Johnson, Human Resources Office, that I would be so advised of it. In spite of 7 full time posts falling vacant in the same department during the 10+ years I worked, they were not advertised internally and everyone had followed LM's instructions not to let me know (I have reasons to believe that such instructions were given by LM). I **became aware of such appointments only when the new white employees started work**. Both the Human Resources Office and my managers had ignored **my written request**. Seven outside, white full time employees were recruited and the interviews were held on Fridays in my absence. I was never allowed to work on Fridays and I had to complete the Friday workload on Thursdays by working very late

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY LIED in his Decision** when he stated:

"Miss McWilliam stated in evidence that there would have been no objection to the Applicant being employed on a full time basis if the Respondents had known that, that was what she wanted. There is no written evidence of any request by the Applicant for full time work".

The above lie is proven by the following: **i)** as stated earlier I requested **in writing** that if a full time post falls vacant to let me know, and this was acknowledged by Human Resources Officer and documented in my Personal File, **ii)** there is also documentary evidence in my Personal File that I had applied for a Full Time, Executive Post in December 1997 in the Judicial Office,

**iii)** during LM's cross-examination by Mr J, he asked her why LM refused a full time post for me, she replied "I have no authority, it is up to the Establishment Office". Mr Bano asked her "Did you ever ask Mrs Jayaratne whether she wanted to do full time?" LM replied "No". Mr Bano asked LM why she employed CH, and LM replied: "**She fitted in**". **I did not fit in because I am non-white.**

## **B. A NEW, FULL TIME POST - DESK TOP PUBLISHING, (DTP) A SPECIALISED DUTY WAS ALLOCATED TO ME WITHOUT ANY PRIOR DISCUSSIONS, TRAINING, AND AMENDING THE CONTRACT**

Prior to the 1991 July summer recess, I was taken by surprise when Head Chef told me that I would be carrying out the 'printing of menus'. I returned after the recess in October 1991, to find that I had been accommodated with the new printing equipment in a mice infested filthy office which I have explained in **Point 2** below. This was the DTP specialised job that was being carried out by a professional, outside printing firm at a cost of £90,000 per year. LM did not inform the allocation of the DTP duty to me. This was done **without (i) any prior discussions, (ii) any specialised DTP training,**

**(iii) a compatible software package to carry out this job effectively, and efficiently to meet the deadlines.** In fact the managers said that I was slow, amidst frequent reminders that "You should be able to complete your workload within the allocated hours. I was given an instruction manual with a totally incompatible software package WordPerfect 5.1. (this has been explained in detail in website **Appendix 1, paras 29 to 54, page 4 and paras 2 to 6, page 5**) and expected me to meet deadlines and work to the same professional standard as the outside Printing Firm. If the managers believed I was slow (**page 8, Point 4 below**) then it was the very reason a) why they should have sent me for the specialised DTP training and b) given me a compatible soft-ware package. In spite of saving/profitting out at my expense by exploiting me (**Mr Bano asked Mr J whether he believed that I was exploited and Mr J responded "Yes" but Mr Bano deliberately failed to include this in his Decision**), they refused to spend £500 for a compatible DTP training course. I carried out the work effectively and efficiently with no training and with incompatible software packages (Word 6 another incompatible software package was installed in 1999 with NO training - **page 11, Point 5 below**) which caused me great stress/anxiety. I received no support from the managers whatsoever except criticisms.

I worked full time hours after the allocation of the DTP duty but I was paid only for 18 hrs p.w. Mr Bano's Decision documented a **LIE** that the Respondents **did not know** that I wanted to do full time and had they known, they would have offered me such a post, as stated in 1 A, above.

**(Note:** As I stated earlier when the DTP duty was allocated to me, I worked full time hours. Subsequently after the resignation of Tracey Cowie in March 1993, I was given a time consuming duty, i.e. Weekly Menu Plan which added more hours forcing me to work 50 hrs p.w. with no extra payments and the contract remained the same. In January 1996 I had to carry out the commissioning work for 3 new Banqueting Rooms which were to be opened in April 1996. Hence, my workload doubled and I worked 67 hrs p.w. - this has been explained in **page 8, Point 4 below**).

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY excluded** the issue of incompatibility of the DTP software package, when he himself accepted at the hearing that the package was incompatible and that I should have been given either Quark Express or Page Maker (**website Appendix 1, paras 44 to 49, page 4**). The exclusion of this evidence was because **Mr Bano accepted the Bribe.**

## **2. MICE INFESTED OFFICE ROOM**

When the DTP duty was allocated to me my colleagues told me that my office was somewhere else as I had to carry out the 'printing work'. I was accommodated in a filthy, mice infested, room which had no ventilation. I was flabbergasted when I saw the printing equipment, guillotine and a new computer as I had no idea how to use it. The room had a foul smell of mice droppings and urine. I was asked to clean my office, while white colleagues had cleaners to clean their offices, thus saving more money at my expense. I asked for a fan during summer months as the small window was high

up and could not be opened without a ladder. My request for a fan was refused as they did with every other request as they did with **my every other request** during 10 + years. I was in this mice infested office from October 1991 until April 1993. I had a telephone in this room for internal calls only, but it was removed two months later by Mr Bibbiani. Therefore to liaise on a daily basis with the 2 chefs and the 4 managers, I had to lock-up my office and visit each one in their work places, which was time consuming and laborious. I also had to visit LM frequently on a daily basis for work instructions especially as regards updating information for functions. I protested to both managers and Anne Mossop for removing the telephone from my office, and it was re-installed after a few weeks. I was relocated at end of April 1993 to the General Office. I told Mr Bano that I developed asthma due to working in the dusty, mice infested room without ventilation. Dead mice in their mouse traps were removed by porters each morning. Mr Bano during the hearing, rebuked HOL: **“When employees work in less than favourable conditions, they could develop psychotic illnesses”**.

However **Mr Bano deliberately failed to include** this evidence as it was in my favour because he had accepted the bribe.

### **3. TRAINING WAS REFUSED OVER 10 YEARS**

As stated in 1 (b) above I was not given the relevant specialised DTP training. Siu Liu the in-house training officer was able to teach me only the basics such as underlining, highlighting, and cut and paste. **She advised me to ask my managers for an advanced training course as she said that my DTP work was of a specialised nature.** As my managers did not send me on a training course and they did not want to spend, I had to enrol myself at the Redbridge Training College at my own expense. Unfortunately for me the advanced course to which I applied was cancelled as there was an insufficient number of students. It should be emphasised that Siu Lieu did not know that such work was a DTP function and I believe that **she did not even know the existence of the terminology DTP.** I was expected to produce professional work, meeting deadlines with incompatible software packages (WordPerfect 5.1, and Word 6 – **page 11, Point 5 below**) and printing equipment without the ESSENTIAL training to carry out the specialised duty DTP. **This is similar to a carpenter without his tools.**

My Annual Appraisal Reports documented year after year that “she would be given training”, “We will arrange training as a matter of urgency” but it never materialised. However, in my Appraisal Reports on separate sheets of papers (which I became aware of only through disclosure of documents at the hearing) there were **false, derogatory and defamatory** annotations i.e. **‘she is Not bright’; ‘Training is not the problem’ ‘she will always be struggling’** and that I also **‘had refused training’**.

Furthermore there were prejudicial and tendentious comments such as **‘the potential development of the case’; ‘Management is in a stronger position’; ‘Management’s position is strengthened’**. These comments lead me to believe that the management had been building up a case against me for ulterior motive i.e. Racism. In the IG R (**referred to in page 4 above**) it was documented that the reason for not giving me training was: **“Management considered Mrs Jayaratne was not worthy of giving training, because she was not good enough in the first place”**. The white colleagues were sent on training courses. It was obvious that I was denied training as I am non-white. Mr Bano asked LM and Mr Bibbiani why I was not given training, they had no answer. To the same question, Mr Embleton’s response was: “She should have emphasised more when asking for training”. Mr Bano’s response (your own words) was that: **“She did not have to be a shriller”**. Please note end of **page 11, Point 6**, re the 3 day

training course that both LM and my comparator CH (recruited in May 1998) attended in May 1999 on the pretext that they were both 'off sick'.

I reiterate that I did not have any training in either WordPerfect 5.1 and Word 6. I had to learn it myself by keeping the instruction manual on my knees (the size of the desk was only sufficient to keep the computer) and reading it while performing the DTP work at the same time, meeting deadlines. Nevertheless, as stated in **1B**, the package was wholly incompatible. It is like putting a square peg in a round hole, hence the excessive time it took me to complete the task.

Mr Bano stated in his Decision: **“We accept the evidence of Siu Lee and we are satisfied that she taught the Applicant how to create documents, amend text and carry out basic word processing functions such as underlining and converting text into italics using the WordPerfect 5.1. word processing system”**.

The above Decision of Mr Bano confirms my earlier statement as regards underlining, highlighting etc. which I knew already. Furthermore creating documents, amending text and carrying out basic word processing functions have no bearing or relevance to the specialised DTP duty! Mr Bano's statement re Siu Lee taught me “basic word processing functions”, is beneath contempt, especially when Siu Lee herself informed me as I stated in **Page 7** that **I needed an Advanced Course**. Mr Bano's statement was a **blatant lie**. Siu Lee was unable to teach me the relevant DTP functions as she did not know, therefore I had to learn myself with an instruction manual relating to the incompatible packages. Mr Bano as stated earlier commented about the incompatibility which he **deliberately failed to include in his Decision**.

Hence Mr Bano **LIED** in his Decision as he accepted the Bribe.

#### **4. THE RECRUITMENT OF CAROLE HUNT (CH), A WHITE EMPLOYEE, MYCOMPARATOR IN MAY 1998 ON THE PRETEXT OF ASSISTING ME WITH MY HEAVY WORKLOAD, BUT IN REALITY TO STOP ME FROM CLAIMING FOR A FULL TIME POST**

i) As explained in 1B above, I worked full time hours after the allocation of the DTP duty in October 1991 and I worked more hours after March 1993 (as a result of the resignation of Tracie Cowie). I repeatedly complained to both LM and Mr Bibbiani to increase my hours but to no avail. Subsequently I complained in June 1995 to Anne Mossop the Welfare Officer who intervened. As a result, I was called into Dr Rodhri Walters' (Human Resources Officer) Office who increased my hours, but only to 22 hrs net p.w. as from October 1995. LM was furious with Dr Walters for increasing my hours and LM added further duties. I was still working 50 + hours p.w. but paid only for 22 p.w. Commissioning work for 3 new Banqueting Rooms (Attlee, Reid and Home) started from January 1996. As a result my work increased to 67 hrs p.w. These rooms were opened for functions as from April 1996.

I carried on working 67 hrs p.w., but still paid only for 22 p.w. At that stage of my employment **I thought I was slow as this was drilled into me by my managers**. LM could see me (her office is next door to mine and she had to liaise with me as I was her secretary - although I was not given either the title or the appropriate salary – clarified this further on **page 14, point 12 b. below**) working 67 hrs p.w. but I was being paid only for 22 p.w. therefore I needed payment for the actual hours I was working. It is absolutely

necessary to point out an annotation regards my so called “slowness” in the 1994/5 Appraisal Report by Dr Rodhri Walters the Human Resources Officer. The annotation was :

**“I am puzzled, at first you thought her slow, but why is she still working long hours without remuneration?”**

I was able to see this only during the disclosure of documents. This annotation was directed towards the managers for their response but their response was not disclosed to me. I have a copy of this Appraisal Report with the annotation. **Equality of Arms therefore was denied.** As a result of her racist actions, she deliberately withheld payment for the extra hours. I should emphatically emphasise that LM never bothered to take into account the fact that I was working for 7 other managers as well. I had a special meeting with both LM and Mr Bibbiani to complain the situation that during a period of 4 months from January 1996 to April 1996 I was working 67 hours p.w. but paid only for 22 p.w. I told them that I needed payment for the 67 hours p.w. and offer me a full time post. **LM’s visceral, virulent racism** was the prime cause for the appropriate non-payment and the offer of a full time post. Due to this direct racist action of hers, and HOL closing their eyes for this blatant racism, I was under great stress and anxiety, **due to no fault of mine.** **Had HOL paid my appropriate full remuneration of £2000 p.m. plus other associated benefits per month, I could have met my financial commitments with ease.** I visited a legal aid lawyer in connection with the re-possession of my home, who after calculating my income told me that my salary for 22 hrs was approx. 90p over the free legal aid entitlement. I complained to Anne Mossop about this state of affairs, including the fact that as HOL refused to pay for the 67 hours I was actually working, it was difficult for me to meet my financial commitments. She advised me to get a letter from my GP that I should not work full time. As a result LM reduced my hours to 13.9 hrs p.w. enabling me to claim legal aid and other benefits.

However HOL did not employ another person to carry out the balance of my work, had I gone home after working 13.9 hours p.w. Therefore I was expected to complete the 67 hrs p.w. workload as usual and LM reminded me frequently to “complete the workload within the allocated hours”.

In fact during my cross-examination, I told the Counsel **“It was illegal to work without pay”**. Mr Bano asked the Counsel, **“What did she say?”** Then Counsel informed Mr Bano what I said. Mr Bano **failed to include** this from his Decision because he was asked to dismiss my race claim.

It was only at the hearing that it became apparent to everyone that I was quick and efficient and in fact in my absence HOL **employed 2, white employees for 90 hrs gross** in total to complete my workload for which, I was paid only for 13.9 hrs p.w. Mr J raised this point of the two employees working 90 hrs p.w. and Mr Bano said: **“Mr J, you proved your point”**, meaning that I alone carried out the 90 hrs p.w. workload, although I was paid only for 13.9 hrs p.w. **It also emerged that my tardiness was actually as a result of incompatible software package and equipment for the DTP duty and the denial of training for that DTP task.** Please refer to the website [www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com](http://www.racialabuse-houseoflords.com) (Appendix 1, paras 44 - 52, page 4)

**Mr Bano Deliberately failed to include the fact that I alone carried out workload of 90 hours p.w. but paid 13.9 hours p.w. in his Decision as he accepted the Bribe.**

LM told me that she wanted to recruit a person to “assist Phyllis with her heavy workload”. Two months later, in May 1998 I overheard a conversation that a new person is to be employed for 30 hours p.w. and would be starting work the following day. This post was not advertised internally. As mentioned earlier, I have reasons to believe that LM had given strict instructions to everyone not to let me know about the new post. I complained to the Human Resources Office but I was informed that it was “nothing to do with your job”. I was ‘**fobbed off**’ which was the phraseology used by a member of the Employment Tribunal.

**Mr Bano Deliberately failed to include this key evidence of “fobbed off” in his written Decision, as he accepted the Bribe.**

#### **5. MARGINALISED ME BY CHANGING THE POSITION OF MY DESK 3 TIMES IN 3 DIFFERENT OFFICES DURING THE 11 YEARS.**

On 3 occasions i.e. May 1989, September 1993, and June 1998, my desk was turned towards the wall with no prior discussions with me. This was done deliberately so that no visitor could see my non-white face on entering our office (see also point 6 below). After CH my comparator joined in May 1998, the seating arrangement was changed for the third time in June 1998. My desk was turned towards the wall, while CH’s desk was turned towards the door so that a white face would be seen and that she would be the first port of call to welcome the visitors and Peers. When I queried LM never responded.

In my evidence I told Mr Bano, that the Works Department Manager checked my office before the Second tranche of the hearing in November and confirmed that my desk could be turned facing the door without any inconvenience. The reason for my asking the Works Manager was due to LM’s lie that there was no other way for my seating arrangement.

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY LIED in his Decision** when he stated that the space required by me to do my work made it convenient that the desk should face the wall, conveniently brushing off not only the Works Department Manager’s confirmation as above, but also the fact that this was the third occasion when the seating was re-arranged. To the reader this may look trivial, but these trivial incidents are clear manifestations of Racism.

#### **6. TRANSFER OF 6 OF MY FRONT OFFICE MAIN DUTIES TO CH, IN ORDER TO SHOW A WHITE FACE AND A WHITE VOICE TO THE PUBLIC**

**From May 1998 when CH joined, up to July 1998 I trained CH while carrying out my duties as before.** LM asked me to train CH so that she could carry out my work in my absence whenever I was off sick. On the face of it this seems reasonable, but as events unfolded as mentioned below, the real purpose was to transfer some of my duties, **especially the front office duties where LM’s motive was to show a ‘White Face’ and hear a ‘White Voice’ to the public.** I perceived by January 1999 that CH was able to do some of my duties, **but certainly not the specialised DTP duty.** In fact whenever I was off sick, CH faxed the DTP work to my home. Subsequently 6 of my duties including two front office duties were transferred to CH in January 1999 which was accepted by Mr Bano. The front office duties were, the escorting of Corporate Clients from the Pass Office, and answering the telephone involving requests for booking of function rooms for both Peers and Corporate Clients. However part of the DTP duty entailed typing the menus for both Peers and Corporate Clients which meant I needed access to the Diaries and Telephones. Therefore the refusal of access was nonsense and absurd, this was ample proof of **LM’s visceral, virulent racism.** The abrupt denial of these duties were relayed to me not by LM but via CH the person who was recruited ‘to assist Phyllis with her heavy workload’ as per LM. **The transfer of the front office duties and the re-arranging of the seating plan was solely in**

**order for the public and the Peers to see a ‘White face’ and hear a ‘White voice’ and marginalising me to the desk bound DTP job.**

In spite of the recruitment of CH, I was still working long hours, reasons being a) Until July 1998 I was training CH as I stated earlier, b) I used to type out one day’s functions (at least 5 events on each day) on one page but as LM wanted one event only on one page from September 1998, for 25 events/ functions (Monday to Friday) they had to be done on 25 pages, which took a considerable time to complete (c) mainly due to DTP and the incompatible package, (d) the work for 7 other managers and (e) the balance of my duties. Hence the pressure was still there, especially as I was not allowed to work on Fridays, yet I had to complete the Friday workload on Thursday evenings and (f) in January 1999, the WordPerfect 5.1 software package was superseded by Word 6 another incompatible software package for the DTP. The in-house IT Officer **Siu Lieu, failed to convert documents from WordPerfect 5.1 to Word 6**, therefore I was forced to do that task and it took considerable time for me to convert these documents to Word 6, as I was denied the appropriate training and it was a case of trial and error in other words by **‘messaging about’** as LM put it.

Mr Bano **DELIBERATELY LIED** in his Decision:

(i) “We are also satisfied that the Respondents’ motive in transferring duties from the Applicant to Carole Hunt’s post was to relieve the pressure on the Applicant .....” *(Pressure from a 13.9 hour p.w. workload I was paid for)*  
*Undoubtedly the prime reason for the transfer of answering the telephone, and the escorting of visitors from the Pass Office, as stated earlier, was for the public to hear a white voice and see a white face.*

(ii) Mr Bano also **DELIBERATELY LIED** when he documented : “Carole Hunt’s training requirements were entirely different from the Applicant’s requirements and we consider that no proper comparison can be made of their treatment in this respect”. It is a downright lie to state that CH’s training requirements were entirely different when my jobs were transferred to her, for her to carry out in 30 hrs p.w. It was agreed by Mr Bano that 6 of my duties were transferred to CH, if that was so, logically her training requirements are not different to mine. She was given training, but I was NOT. It should also be considered that I had already trained her in my aspects of the job and as I stated earlier, she was unable to cope with the DTP function because it is a specialised job.

Mr Bano’s reasons in i) as regards the transfer of 6 of my duties to CH and ii) as regards CH’s training requirements were entirely different, are contradictory, therefore are **DELIBERATE LIES**. Mr Bano also **LIED** when he stated “Respondents proposals were intended to remove from the Applicant the burden of dealing with diary enquiries”. As I stated above, the barring of the telephone was nonsense as I still had to liaise with the Peers and the Corporate Clients in order to update the function diary.

**LM & CH together went on a 3 day training course on the pretext that they were “OFF SICK”**. I was deceived. CH told me discreetly that she had been on a training course, and that she was offered a full time post in September 1999 but that she had refused because it was I who had been asking for a full time post over a long period. She then advised me, **“Don’t let them treat you this way”**.

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY LIED because he accepted the Bribe.**

## **7. AFTER OFFERING CH A FULL TIME POST, I WAS DEMOTED TO THE POST OF A TYPIST - REFLECTED IN MY 1999/2000 APPRAISAL REPORT**

My line manager was LM and it was she who completed my Appraisal Report as the Reporting Officer, and the Countersigning Officer was Mr Bibbiani who was the Head of the Refreshment Department, meaning he was LM's Manager. Up to and including 1993/4 the Appraisal Report was in two parts, Parts A and B. The Applicant was only aware of the contents in Part A. It was only during disclosure of documents that I became aware of Part B and hence the **derogatory (page 7, Point 3 above)** comments about me. From 1994/5 with the appointment of Dr Rodhri Walters as the Establishment Officer the procedure changed and the Applicant was shown the whole Appraisal Report. It was LM as my Reporting Officer who completed my Report up to and including the year 1998/9.

However my 1999 /2000 report was not completed by LM but by Mr Rupert Ellwood (he was recruited in January 1996) who was an Assistant Manager to whom I never reported to. The new job description revealed that I had been demoted to the post of a typist. I had neither seen this job description before nor had anyone discussed about any changes to my job. There were deliberate changes as I had stated in **6 above**, where 6 of my duties including the front office duties were transferred to CH thus confining me to a desk job i.e. the DTP duty. As stated earlier, CH told me that she was offered a full time post, which she declined. I was categorically refused a full time post throughout, in spite of the fact that I was already working 67 hrs p.w. at that time.

The Annual Appraisal Reports have normally been completed by end of May each year. However in 1999 even by early July I was not given the Appraisal Report for me to complete the section i.e. Job Description which I have always done. I constantly asked LM for my Report but she kept on saying that she was busy. CH told me that she had already completed hers and handed it back to LM in May. I remembered what CH said which I stated earlier (**page 11 Point 6 above**) "**Don't let them treat you this way**". It was evidently obvious that LM withheld my report until she was to retire at the end of July 1999. She deliberately demoted me prior to her departure as she had subtly trained the rest of the team how to '**put me in my place**'. It was LM's dirty trick to hand over my Appraisal Report at the last minute before her departure so that I would be unable to complain about her deceitful action. I made many requests to LM, Human Resources Office and then Anne Mossop and I was going back and forth to obtain my Report. Finally Mr Ellwood handed the Report to me pointing his finger to the spot where I should sign. I refused as Mr Ellwood had completed my Report unilaterally when he had no authority to do so without my knowledge. He said that he was my manager, not LM. I told him that I did not know about it, as no one told me and I refused to sign stating that I had to peruse it first to see what Mr Ellwood had written, as it was my Appraisal Report. He shouted at me that it was "not a big deal, just sign and hand it to me". I told him to go back to his desk and I refused to sign. Mr Ellwood went back, but he kept on shouting, that it is not a big deal, and asking me to sign. I told him to stop shouting as I had to complete the work of a Peer. He continued to shout and did not allow me to work. This was the **last straw that broke the camel's back. The pent up feelings and injustices over 10 + years literally boiled over.** In fact I never signed the Appraisal Report.

LM **LIED** to Mr Bano that she was not my line manager, it was Mr Ellwood, but Mr Ellwood denied that he was my manager, and that he was confused. He was also confused when Mr J asked the question "Are Mrs Hunt's hours 24 or 30 p.w. The reason for that question was Mr Ellwood's Witness Statement stated "Carole Hunt has since reduced her hours to 24 per week". Once again Mr Ellwood's response was "**I am confused**".

However Mr Bano's written Decision, "We also regarded Mr Ellwood as an entirely straightforward witness....., we considered his evidence wholly credible"! The perjured evidence of Mr Ellwood, was credible for Mr Bano as **he accepted the Bribe.**

#### **8. UNIFORM CLOTHING**

In spite of Mr B asking LM to claim insurance for my damaged skirt at work, LM purposely delayed and kept me hanging on as she did with all other requests. For 3 years she did not replace my skirt. I do not work on Fridays, and one Friday in June 1998 I had to hand over some work I had completed at home, and I noticed LM measuring CH for uniform clothing (skirts and blouses). LM felt guilty and therefore she gave me uniform clothing as well stating that "**you have been working long hours without remuneration**". It took only a month for CH to receive Uniform Clothing, but I had to work long hours without remuneration for over 10 years to be entitled to the same.

Mr Bano **BLATANTLY LIED** in his Decision that "**.....uniform clothes were provided for Carole Hunt because they had previously been provided for the Applicant**". This was a perversion of the truth. Mr Bano **LIED because he accepted the Bribe.**

#### **9. FRAUD INCLUDING DWP FRAUD COMMITTED BY LM / HOL**

i) After reducing my hours to 13.9 hours p.w. she confirmed in writing to the DWP (formerly DSS) that Mrs Jayaratne was only working 13.9 hrs p.w. when I was actually working 67 hrs p.w. This was **Fraudulent**. For two years until July 1998, I worked 67 hrs p.w. but paid for 13.9 hrs p.w. only. She blatantly lied to the DWP for 2 years.

ii) HOL should have paid the NI Contributions on my behalf as a full time employee but they failed to do so, as I was working 67 hours p.w. for over 2 years (**page 8 Point 4 above**) HOL actions were **Fraudulent**.

iii) By withholding my salary, LM was able to enhance her share of the associated benefits i.e. Staff Gratuities and Bonus. My share of these benefits was based only on 13.9 hours p.w. This is **Fraudulent**.

iv) My Occupational and State Pensions were affected as they were based on the **Fraudulent hours (therefore affecting my final salary)** of 13.9 hours p.w. thus placing me in severe financial hardship.

Mr Bano was promoted to the post of Social Security & Child Support Commissioner, and subsequently Mr Bano was appointed to the Pensions Appeal Tribunal in order to circumvent this Fraud. Had this erupted the ensuing publicity would have had enormous consequences. Mr Bano was following corrupt instructions of Lord Irvine/HOL to cover up the scandal and the fraudulent actions of LM/HOL. In spite of my serious allegations against Mr Bano, (**website. Appendices 1 and 2**) he was appointed to the post of a Judge, The President of the War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber.

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY FAILED to include the above Frauds in his Decision as he accepted the Bribe.**

#### **10. INCIDENTS AT CHRISTMAS INSTIGATED BY LM**

a) My pay at the beginning was £52 net p.w. I stated earlier that I was not allowed to work on Fridays throughout my employment of over 10 years and on such a Friday, Carol Sutton an Assistant Manager at the Refreshment Department had contributed £25 on my behalf for Mr Bibbiani's Christmas present, without my knowledge. On Monday morning when I returned to work, Carol Sutton said that I owed her £25.

I was amazed that they took money out of my meagre pay without asking me first and I told her that she should never do so in the future. That year they asked me to contribute £15 for LM's present as well. There was no money left for my children's presents.

b) Before the Christmas recess, all of us gathered in a room to open presents. LM insisted that I should open the present the managers had given me. I refused as I knew by experience the presents they usually give me are utter rubbish. I told LM that I would like to open my present on Christmas day, but LM insisted that I should open. My present was a 3 pin plug, coloured pencils and balloons. LM entertained the white colleagues at my expense by laughing at what I had been given.

## **11. EXAMPLES OF LM'S RACIST COMMENTS AND ACTIONS**

The following are only a few of her actions which cemented her visceral, virulent racial hatred for non-whites.

a) LM never walked alongside with me across the Royal Courtyard or down the corridors but she made me walk behind her. She never acknowledged me in the vicinity of the Function Rooms because I am non-white. She allowed only white persons to help out at Functions. There were no non-white waiting staff while she was employed at the Refreshment Department, HOL. LM treated the Non-white Peers atrociously, but to their faces she was polite thus maintaining the form. She kept them waiting in spite of having arranged specific appointments to discuss their menu plans for their functions. No one knew where LM had gone, as she did not inform any of us. The non-white Peers had to arrange appointments once again.

b) LM mimicked my accent and made everyone laugh at me. She was disrespectful towards me in order to get more support from the white colleagues.

c) She referred to the Non-white Peers as "that woman" "that man". She would come up to me and say: "Phyllis get that woman to call me Miss McWilliam and not Lorna". We were asked to call her Miss Mac.

d) When non-white Corporate Sector clients visited her to discuss menu plans for their functions, they were made to wait a long time at the Pass Office before they are escorted to LM's office.

f) I was asked to lie to the Non-white Peers that no rooms were available for functions when they were available for booking.

g) LM told us that she will retire early as "I do not want to be here when the hereditary Peers leave, because life Peers have no class".

h) Lady Uddin telephoned several times and LM told me to lie to her that she was not in. CH noticed it once and told me, "Miss Mac hates Lady Uddin".

i) Mr Ellwood asked LM who Diane Abbott was. LM answered "She is a coloured".

j) Mr Jaffa an Asian gentleman who was well spoken and well dressed used to visit LM to discuss about function menus. When the Pass Office telephoned our office there were many unpleasant comments made regarding him and he was forced to wait for a long time at the Pass Office. He must have felt it and then he brought boxes of chocolates to please the managers. LM lied to Mr Bano that Mr Jaffa was interested in her (no one in the office ever noticed/mentioned about him being interested in LM).

k) LM was furious that a black doorkeeper was employed and she said, **“there are some things that cannot be done”**. She was angry that a ‘black face’ was being seen at an entrance.

l) Dr Rodhri Walters the Human Resources Officer increased my hours from 18 p.w. to 22 net p.w. after the Welfare Officer took up my complaint to Dr Walters. LM was furious with both of them and she referred to Dr Walters as “that Welsh Pratt”.

m) During the 10 + years, LM **never** asked me to help out at the Luncheon in the Cholmondeley Room and the Terrace at the State Opening of the Parliaments because LM did not want me to be seen by the public as I am non-white. However, as soon as CH joined in May 1998, LM asked CH to help her out at the Banquet on State Opening of the Parliaments in November 1998.

Mr Bano in his Decision stated: “We are satisfied that the Applicant never expressed any interest in assisting at the Terrace at the State Opening of Parliament. We are also satisfied that the Applicant was genuinely needed during the State Opening of Parliament to deal with telephone enquiries and to produce menus for the following day”. I stated earlier, that all my requests were turned down by LM including the fact that she did not want me to walk alongside with her, and also she did not accept me as her secretary. Therefore I knew there was no point in asking her whether I could assist at the State Opening. As to Mr Bano’s statement that I was needed to deal with telephone enquiries during the State Opening is contradictory to what he stated in **(page 11 Point 6 (ii) above)** i.e. barring the telephone was in order not to “burden me with diary enquiries”.

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY LIED as he accepted the Bribe.**

n) After offering a full time post to CH, it became apparent to me that LM told CH not to speak or make coffee for me. Until then, we had taken turns to make coffee/tea to the managers and their visitors. Mr Bibbiani told me that I should drink tea and not coffee because percolated coffee was expensive. I knew that it was LM who put Mr Bibbiani up to it. Mr Bibbiani being a puppet carried out what LM asked him to do. At this obvious slight I became extremely angry and told Mr Bibbiani in the strongest possible terms that **“I know that I am only supposed to make the expensive coffee for the others (the whites) but I am not supposed to drink it”**. It was obvious to me that LM had concocted a pack of lies to Mr Bibbiani. On purpose I was completely isolated and the working environment became unbearable, thus making my post untenable.

o) LM removed my name label from the telephone which I had been using for over 10 years, and inserted CH’s name. I was given instructions by CH not to answer the telephone and that it was her job from then on. CH had become my ‘BOSS’ after I trained her to do my duties within 3 months **(page 10 Point 6 above)**. LM made several comments to CH: **‘Check her work before you bring it to me’**. CH also stopped me from entering LM’s office to get her signature to the various correspondences I typed for her. I had to hand over such correspondences and messages to CH who was supposed to take it to the KKK Leader. As stated in **(page 14, Point 11a)**, LM never walked alongside down the corridors with me, I had to follow her, but CH walked together with LM, ahead of me. These are only a few of my complaints which proved beyond a reasonable doubt the mentality and the KKK attitude of LM.

Mr Bano accepted her as a credible witness because in his Decision he stated: **“Miss McWilliam was an open and principled witness and she readily admitted that she uttered those remarks...”** **“Miss McWilliam appear to us to have been frank in accepting that she had made some offensive comments and her evidence on this issue appeared to us to be more coherent and credible than that of the Applicant”**.

The contents in this document, reveal distinctly the frauds and the perjured evidence of LM and the others, but for Mr Bano, LM was a credible witness in spite of such fraudulent acts and perjured evidence.

In spite of LM's racist actions as above, HOL held a grand farewell party for 350 guests including Peers, on her retirement on 23 July 1999. This was just after i.e. 12 July when I submitted my 15 page race complaints where I revealed that I was treated less favourably than CH. I should also state that on 16 July I had a meeting with both Mr Embleton and Sir Micahel Davies the Clerk of the Parliaments where I amplified the contents of my race complaint.

**Mr Bano's acceptance of such manifest racism was because he accepted the Bribe in return for dismissing my claim.**

## **12. MRS JAYARATNE ENJOYED A CLOSE PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

LM in her Witness Statement documented that she did everything she could to help me out over the years. This is a blatant lie. **The following will expose LM's lie as well as the palpable untruth of Mr Bano's statement, re 'Close Personal Relationship'.**

- a) In LM's Witness Statement she **LIED** that she did not get to know me until 1996, although I was her secretary and worked closely with me. Not only is this perjury, but also contradicts Mr Bano's assertion about a close relationship between LM and myself.
- b) It is essential to point out that in March 1993, Derek Dunn the Staff Adviser assessed my workload and produced a Staff Report on the Refreshment Department in which he clearly stated that **my work was that of a Personal Secretary** although I was neither acknowledged as such nor paid the commensurate remuneration. I have given evidence that I typed all correspondences of both LM and Mr Bibbiani, and after the relocation to the new office in 1996 (although not far away) I stopped typing correspondences of Mr Bibbiani as he was still in the old office. LM stated in her evidence that I occasionally typed a letter for her. Mr Bano asked: "You must have loads of correspondences to do, who typed them?" LM replied: "I typed them". Mr J reminded LM that she neither had a computer nor a typewriter until January 1999. My Appraisal Reports had denoted that I typed all correspondences of both Mr Bibbiani and LM.

**Mr Bano Deliberately failed to include this key evidence in his Decision as he accepted the Bribe.**

- c) My time sheets were rejected. The reasons are manifold. (i) when we do overtime, we take the time sheets to Mr Bibbiani for his signature and then we place it in the Internal Post tray to the Accountant. On two occasions I was not paid, therefore I enquired from the Accountant who said that he never received them. No one else complained about their time sheets being lost. **It is impossible for my time sheets to get lost even once, let alone twice**, unless someone deliberately removed it. Therefore it was only logical for me to conclude that **LM had removed those time sheets deliberately from the tray**, because she did not want me to get paid. The fact that my time sheets had gone missing were recorded by Anne Johnson in my Personal File. (ii) During my 10 years + service, LM never signed my time sheets, it has always been Mr B. However one morning when I came into work, LM called me to her office and I noticed that she had some blank time sheets with her. She said: "You work from 10.00 am to 3.30 pm therefore you must claim for the extra half hour" and she herself signed my time sheets for that month, which she had never done before. (My official hours at that time were from 10.30 am to 3.30 pm but I always came early to work).

LM then complained to Mr Bibbiani that I had claimed for hours without working, thus LM planted the seed in his head, that I had fraudulently claimed for the extra hours. LM set him up against me. I was afraid that I would cause friction between the 2 managers and had to keep quiet. A few days later Mr Bibbiani called me to his office and warned me, “You must never claim for hours that you had not worked because for insurance purposes, you are not supposed to be in the office until 10.30 am but in your time sheets you have claimed from 10.00 am. This is wrong. Don’t do that again”. (iii) Mr Bibbiani refused to pay me for the extra hours saying to everyone in the office when I submitted my time sheets that “She has notched up some hours”. Mr Bibbiani was not aware of LM’s devious plan to prevent me from getting paid. Mr Bibbiani should have changed the terms of the insurance (**if what he said was true as regards insurance and if it applied to me specifically**) to reflect my long working hours to denote the finishing time. It must be noted by the reader that **I was not given amended contracts** when my duties were significantly changed, on several occasions.

- d) LM exploited me by paying me only for 13.9 hours p.w. when I was actually working 67 hours p.w.
- e) LM deliberately denied me training,
- f) LM deliberately denied me a full time post,
- g) LM’s racist actions over 10 years.
- h) LM denied my share of the associated benefits, i.e. Staff Gratuities and Bonus I was entitled to, she was able to enhance her share of such benefits.
- i) LM brought me to work in taxis while I was off on certified sick leave and on Fridays when I was not at work she was pestering me with telephone queries (my home telephone number was displayed on the Notice Board for all and sundry while the telephone numbers of the other white colleagues were not), and faxing work home,
- j) LM told the Tribunal that she had bought me presents for my birthday. She had never spent her money on buying presents for me, but what she gave me were the manufacturers free samples sent to the HOL Gift Shop so that they could get contracts to supply goods.
- k) LM had requested **i) The HOL chefs to give me left over cream cakes, ii) her friend to give me her used clothes that she found when clearing her wardrobe.**
- l) LM ignored my GP’s medical certificates and **‘diagnosed’** that I was suffering from ‘insomnia’ and brought me a half consumed, date expired herbal drink, which she found when clearing out her cupboard.

I did not need LM’s ‘sympathy’ or ‘compassion’ or ‘leftover food’ or some stranger’s used clothes, but what **I needed and asked** for, was my remuneration and a full time post and training, which I was legally and morally entitled to, but they were deliberately denied because LM behaved as if she was the Leader of the **Ku Klux Klan** who was responsible for inciting Racism in others against me. According to Mr Bano, I enjoyed a Close Personal Relationship with LM, and if she treated me in this manner with such a Close Personal Relationship, what would she have done to me if I did not have that ‘Close Personal Relationship’ with her ?

The above from a) to l) according to Mr Bano were evidence signifying a Close Personal Relationship with LM !!

Mr Bano documented in his Decision: **“We are satisfied that Miss McWilliam did go out of her way to treat the Applicant sympathetically and to support her for compassionate reasons.....”** (LM went out of her way to racially abuse me but Mr Bano LIED and distorted the truth).

**What Mr Bano said was a load of utter rubbish and a pack of LIES !  
Mr Bano **DELIBERATELY LIED** in his Decision as he accepted the Bribe.**

### **13. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING (EOT) COURSE**

Mr Bano documented in his Decision that I never complained of race discrimination prior to the incident in July 1999 (stated in **page 3 above**), this was a **LIE**. The only EOT course was arranged specifically for LM, because of my frequent protests to Anne Mossop the Welfare Officer. I told Anne Mossop that I was still working long hours without remuneration because the management would not acknowledge that I was working long hours in spite of working in the same office as LM. LM received a circular from the Human Resources Office that the line managers must attend the EOT course, she brought this circular to me and muttered that it was ‘stupid...’ and asked me why they sent it to her. I believe she suspected that I had complained about her. She was the only person who did not attend the EOT course. Mr Bano asked LM why she did not attend, she replied: “I don’t know”. Mr Bano asked her: “Do you want to change your answer?” Mr Bano in his Decision stated:

**“...Miss McWilliam could provide no explanation for her failure to attend an Equal Opportunities training course which the Respondents had arranged.**

**Mr Bano failed to arrive at a conclusion as to LM’s non-attendance re the EOT in his Decision as he accepted the Bribe.**

### **14. FORCED TO WORK WHILE I WAS ON CERTIFIED MEDICAL LEAVE**

LM and Mr Bibbiani ignored my doctor’s medical advice. They brought me to work in taxis when I was off sick including on one occasion when I was unable to walk as I was having a temperature due to my swollen knee joints. LM examined my swollen knees. I refused to come to work during later years when I was off sick, but they then faxed the work home to complete and fax it back. I had to pocket out the costs of faxes and telephone calls during peak times. LM blamed me that I had made mistakes during sick periods and even when I was ill they exploited me because I am non-white. White colleagues did not have to work while they were on sick leave. Mr Bano asked Mr Bibbiani why he did not employ a temporary person from an Agency, but he was unable to respond. Mr J pointed out to Mr Bano that although the fact that I was off sick was recorded in my Personal File, **the fact that I worked during sick leave and the fact that I was brought to work in taxis were not recorded.** Mr Bano’s Decision was:

**“We are satisfied that that action was taken by Miss McWilliam at the Applicant’s request \* in order to provide the Applicant with a distraction from her personal problems”.**

**\* Every request I made over 10 + years was denied i.e. training, full time, payment for extra hours etc. I never requested to work without payment while I was sick.**

Mr Bano was ‘satisfied’ with ludicrous responses that LM had given to each and every race complaint I submitted to the Tribunal. **This is because Mr Bano had accepted the Bribe.**

### **15. ‘OFFICE IS SMELLY BECAUSE OF PHYLLIS’ – HUMILIATION**

In the presence of white colleagues and visitors to our office Mr Rupert Ellwood (currently the marketing director at Waitrose) made humiliating comments:

**“The office is smelly (on two occasions) because of Phyllis”** and proceeded to

open the windows saying: “**Let’s get the smell out**”. Twice he said this when CH had eaten sardine sandwiches in the office. Mr Bano heard this complaint during Rupert Ellwood’s cross-examination but Mr Bano soon changed the subject and continued with the hearing.

**Mr Bano Deliberately excluded this issue from his Decision because he accepted the Bribe.**

#### **16. PICKED UP TIMES LAW REPORTS THROWN IN THE WASTE BIN**

Free newspapers were bought for the Refreshment Department managers. Mr Ellwood collected the newspapers from the Printed Papers Office and left them at the General Office, and he brought his Telegraph to our Banqueting Office. I told him that no one read the Times Law Reports section which was thrown in the bin as no one read it except me. Therefore I asked Mr Ellwood to collect the Law Reports before they were thrown in the bin. He did so for a couple of times and then he abruptly stopped the bringing the Law Report and said that it was not his duty to bring it for me. I reminded him that it was not my duty to make tea and coffee for him, LM and their guests and wash their used cups and saucers, but I did so, as I wanted to maintain good work relationships. I have reasons to believe that it was LM who stopped him from bringing the paper to me. Although I reminded the colleagues to leave the Law Report on the desk, it was still thrown in the bin and I was not able to read it, because they were ruined when they also threw empty disposable coffee cups and banana skins into the same bin. My entitlement was the soiled copy when it had ended up in the bin. I firmly believe that LM gave instructions for them to throw the Reports. She always tried her best to deliberately deny me facilities or opportunities to better myself.

#### **17. BEREAVEMENT**

I complained to the Tribunal that the managers/colleagues never did send me flowers, a sympathy card or a representative to the funeral of my eldest son who died under tragic circumstances. I did not receive even a telephone call to ask me how I coped. Instead LM and Mr Bibbiani sent me a note asking me to return to work soon, as the work was piling. I returned to work immediately after the funeral. Mr Bano was so biased that he accepted the Respondents ‘hazy recollection’ of my 14 year old son’s death. **Mr Bano did not accept my (the dead boy’s mother’s) vivid recollection that I was ignored by these managers.**

Mr Bano in his Decision under ‘Condolences’ stated: “**Although the witnesses’s recollection of events which happened 11 years ago was very hazy, we are satisfied from Mr Bibbiani’s evidence that the Respondents did arrange for an appropriate token of condolence to be sent to the Applicant following the death of her son**”.

**Mr Bano’s above Decision stinks because he accepted the Bribe.**

#### **18. INTERNAL GRIEVANCE INVESTIGATION**

I told the managers they were “Racists” (page 2 above) and as a result I was called to the Human Resources Office where I explained my race complaints. On 5 July 1999, I was told by Mr Embleton to think carefully whether I wanted to go ahead with my complaints. On Wednesday the 7 July I was called by Mr Bibbiani to his office in the presence of Mr Embleton who wanted me to “forget the past and return to work”,

I refused to do so, stating that **“I will not tolerate such nonsense for another 10 years, I want the complaints to be investigated”**. I was told by Mr Embleton on 7 July 1999, **“Go home until further notice”** but come back to the Human Resources Office on Monday 12 July to find out whether I still wanted to go ahead with the investigation or if I could forget the past and return to work. I was adamant that this time I wanted all my race complaints to be investigated. I told Mr Embleton that **“You should send the culprits home and not me”**. I handed my 15 page race complaints document on 15 July 1999 to Mr Embleton.

From 7 July 1999, I did not return to the Office. It was only during the disclosure of documents that I came across Mr Embleton’s typed Draft Report dated 23 July 1999 regarding the Internal Investigation as well as the undated hand written notes of the investigation. A major discrepancy between the typed draft report and the handwritten notes was pointed out by Mr J to Mr Bano. This was regarding the transfer of duties. Mr Bano asked Mr Embleton whether his handwritten notes was just an aide memoire or if it was the actual transcript of the notes. Mr Embleton replied: **“It is a bit of both”** to which Mr Bano rebuked: **“It cannot be both Mr Embleton, it must be either one or the other”**. Please refer to **page 4 above**, for the ludicrous excuses given in the Internal Investigation Report and other relevant documents during disclosure regarding my race complaint which confirmed that it was a white wash. Mr Bano documented in his Decision:

**“We are satisfied that Mr Embleton carried out a genuine investigation into the Applicant’s complaints and genuinely and reasonably reached the conclusion that the Applicant had not been the victim of race discrimination”**.

**“We are also satisfied that Mr Embleton did not compel the Applicant to go home on 7 July 1999. ....” “.....in view of the lack of any compulsion on the Applicant to go home, we are satisfied that she did not suffer any detriment in response to her complaint of race discrimination”**.

Mr Bano’s above statements are contradictory to the following statement of Mr Embleton’s in the IGR, **page 4** above.

**‘Taking each incident contained in Mrs Jayaratne’s complaint separately, none of them has enough substance to warrant a grievance for racial discrimination taken together it could possibly be interpreted so, but in every case, there are other more probable explanations’**.

As a face-saving exercise he stated there are ‘other more probable explanations’ which he did not clarify, either in the IGR or at the hearing. Similarly, Sir Michael Davies’s remark **on page 4, ludicrous excuse 10**, where he stated:

**“There is prima facie evidence of some poor management” and “some regrettable lapses in the proper management of Mrs Jayaratne, her performance and career”**.

was for face –saving only. Poor management affected only me.

**The Internal Grievance Investigation was a white wash.**

**Mr Bano DELIBERATELY LIED in his Decision** because he accepted the Bribe.

**19. MR BANO CONFISCATED AND DESTROYED MY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE OF THE OPENED PAYSLIP ENVELOPE BY LM (CRIMINAL OFFENCE) ON THE PRETEXT THAT HE WOULD KEEP IT WITH HIM AS A REMINDER WHEN PREPARING THE DECISION.**

Mr J complained to Mr Bano that my July 1999 pay slip was opened and it was sent to my home address two months later inside a larger envelope. Mr J informed him that the name on the outer envelope was hand written by CH while my address was hand written by LM. As LM had opened my payslip she had to enclose it inside a larger envelope. Instead of writing Essex where I lived, LM wrote 'Exeter'. I made several complaints to the office of not receiving my payslip. I received this incorrectly addressed envelope at the end of August. Mr Bano requested the evidence of the envelope with the handwriting, stating that he would keep it as a reminder when preparing the Decision. After my case was dismissed, I asked the Tribunal Office to return this envelope to me, but Mr John Warren (the Chairman who was at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Interlocutory Hearing) informed me that my file was destroyed. Therefore I did not have this particular evidence when my appeals were heard.

**LM opening my pay slip, is a criminal offence.** It was LM's duty to calculate Staff Gratuities for the Refreshment Department which were paid before the 4 quarterly Recesses. My Staff Gratuities were always meagre as LM based it on 13.9 hours p.w. However as a result of the Internal Investigation, my entitlement prior to the Summer Recess, was calculated by the Human Resources Office. LM opened my July 1999 pay slip in order to find out how much I was paid as Staff Gratuities by the Human Resources Office. Hence LM opening my payslip was a **deliberate and malicious** action, which **therefore is a criminal offence.**

This is the reason why Mr Bano asked for the opened (payslip) envelope and it was destroyed subsequently.

**20. BREACH OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

- a) My payslip was opened as stated in Point 19 above by LM and I believe it was shown to CH.
- b) My notes relating to both work and domestic problems were taken down at every counselling meeting by Anne Mossop the Welfare Officer over 10 years, were apparently missing. According to Anne Mossop's Witness Statement, "These Welfare Files are intended as an aide memoir (sic) rather than as a complete record of my contact with the employee in question. I would not necessarily make a note of each conversation with an employee and might prune the welfare file on occasions and destroy notes which I felt to be no longer relevant". She further states, "The Welfare Files are kept in my office and are not made available to the management of either House. However she told me that **Mr Embleton may have removed my Welfare file from her office** during her absence on maternity leave. She took copious notes during my several confidential conversations regarding my race complaints and I find it hard to believe that she could have pruned them as they are relevant. Furthermore, she stated in her Witness Statement, "I took advice from Geoff (*meaning Mr Embleton*), who told me that it was acceptable for me to show Phyllis (*that is me*) her file". This was prior to my request that I wanted to see my file, she pre-empted it. This was because Anne Mossop told me that Mr Embleton had telephoned Lewis Silkin Solicitors for advice and that it was alright to show it to me. When I looked at the file my notes related to race complaints were missing. Hence HOL were able to state that I had not made any race complaints

before. The Solicitors would not have agreed to show my file if the notes were there, the notes were removed. In addition Mr Embleton is not Anne Mossop's line manager, therefore there was an ulterior motive for her to ask Mr Embleton. After having removed the notes pertaining to race complaints, newly typed out notes on Official Letter Heads regarding my domestic disputes that I had with Mr J were photocopied without my knowledge and forwarded to him by post. HOL caused domestic strife so that I would be isolated thus leaving me to represent myself without anyone's help.

Mr Bano ignored my complaint that my payslip was opened by LM which is a **CRIMINAL OFFENCE**. Mr Bano disregarded my complaints as above and maintained confidentiality to CH's payslips, he comforted LM the main perpetrator during cross-examination, by stating: **"Reveal everything you know about Mrs Jayaratne in order to safeguard your interests"**. While giving her permission to reveal everything in my Welfare File, Mr J was ordered not to ask questions from LM during her cross-examination regarding my Welfare File.

**Mr Bano accepted the Bribe in return for dismissing my race claim against HOL.**

## **CONCLUSION**

The following inter-connected issues clearly emerge from the above evidence, **1) Collusion/ Conspiracy leading to an unfair trial, 2) Racism both institutionalised and the visceral, virulent racism mainly of LM, 3) Non-payment of my appropriate basic remuneration, overtime and the associated benefits during my 10 year + service at the HOL, 4) Fraudulent actions of LM, HOL which were covered up by Mr Bano and Lord Irvine, therefore they are equally liable, 5) Specific criminal offence of LM of deliberately opening my payslip. The unfair trial was solely in order not to tarnish the prestige of the HOL with the stigma of racism especially because HOL was the highest judicial authority at that time.**

Therefore Lord Irvine decided to dismiss my race claim in order, not to erode the public confidence in the HOL in its judicial capacity as at that time. Of course as a consequence the issue of the non-payment of the appropriate remuneration in its totality for over 10 years which was directly due to racism was brushed under the carpet. Consequently this has affected my Occupational and State Pensions, thus causing me severe financial hardship.

**My main point is the non-payment of my appropriate remuneration and its associated benefits as well as the ripple effect it has had on my Occupational and State Pensions.** Over the years significant changes were added to my duty, but the contract remained the same. The DTP duty alone was certainly a substantial alteration to my original contract. Taking into consideration **a) the denial of DTP training b) the incompatible software package/s and equipment c) the cost savings to the extent of £90,000 per year, by allocating the DTP function to me from the outside professional printers, d) non-payment of my appropriate basic remuneration, overtime and its associated benefits over 10 + years placed me under severe stress/anxiety at a considerable personal cost to me.**

This coupled with the continuous racial abuse, humiliation and degrading treatment ending with the deprivation of essential office facilities to carry out my job effectively and confining me to a desk bound post of a typist, and the continuous shouting of Mr Ellwood was the final straw that **"broke the camel's back"** (page 12, Point 7 above) resulting in me calling the managers racists.

The Non-payment of my appropriate remuneration is both illegal and immoral. The reader could clearly observe the Fraudulent actions committed by my former line manager, LM. As LM was employed by HOL, they as an employer/corporate entity were also responsible for such actions. Using legal parlance this is known as **vicarious liability**. Due to the tacit approval of such fraudulent actions of **Mr Bano is also guilty of Fraud, so is Lord Irvine**.

**Mr Bano did not know me until the day of the hearing, therefore he could not have had a grudge against me. Hence his 'so called Decision' including the acceptance of fraudulent DWP actions is due to something else. No words are more appropriate than Mr Bano's own words when he said after reading my Amended Claim, "Something must have happened here"** (Appendix 1, para 28, page 2). **What made Mr Andrew Bano a learned man to accept the fraudulent actions of LM and HOL, racism, non-payment of appropriate remuneration and its associated benefits, breaching not only the Race Relations Act, but the Employment Statutes and the Human Rights Act as well as being an accessory before and after the fact. This therefore comes back to the core point of Lord Irvine and the Bribe.**

The two e-mails (Appendix 3) I received from **Mr James Bano**, purporting to be Mr Andrew Bano's brother, are highly significant. If Mr Andrew Bano **'attempted suicide'** as the e-mails had categorically declared, then quoting Mr Andrew Bano's own words as stated above "something must have happened here". These e-mails are direct evidence confirming the validity of my statements. The readers can judge for themselves. I have repeatedly written to the Judiciary that if my statements are false, to sue me, but to date it has not materialised as my claims are true and Mr James Bano's e-mails are further evidence as to the veracity of the statements.

For your information, all the evidence that I have submitted at the ET hearing I have substantiated that with relevant case laws. I must re-emphasise the necessity of Chairman's Notes in the event of an Appeal which is based on the allegation that the ET's Decision was perverse which was deliberately denied by the Courts. **My case was decided only on LIES. What I want is honesty from the Judiciary which is not too much to expect.**

**I must have my appropriate basic remuneration, overtime and the associated benefits + compensation + interest paid with retrospective effect urgently. Remedial action to be taken also urgently in respect of both my State and Occupational pension rights retrospectively.**

**The injustices of the above, placed me in significant financial hardship.**

**THE PRESS HAS BEEN GAGGED (AS STATED IN PAGE 2 ABOVE) TO STOP THE TRUTH BEING IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN AND TO HOLD THE ESTABLISHMENT INTO ACCOUNT.**