Why context matters in harassment claims

[et_pb_section bb_built="1" _builder_version="3.0.100" background image="http://davidk423.sg-host.com/wp-content/uplo ads/2017/09/bdbf final-stages-1-4-1.jpg" custom padding="|||" saved tabs="all" next_background_color="#ffffff" global_module="2165"][et_pb_row global parent="2165" custom_padding="|||" _builder_version="3.0.100"][et_pb_column type="2 3"][et pb post title global parent="2165" meta="off" featured image="off" text_color="light" _builder_version="3.0.99" custom_margin="||0px|" custom_padding="||0px|" /][et_pb_text global_parent="2165" _builder_version="3.0.100" background layout="dark" text font="|||||" custom margin="0px|||" custom padding="0px|||"] [post details] [Social-Share] [/et_pb_text][/et_pb_column][et_pb_column type="1_3"][et_pb_post_title global_parent="2165" title="off" meta="off" _builder_version="3.0.99" /][/et pb column][/et pb row][/et pb section][et pb section bb_built="1" admin label="section" prev_background_color="#000000"][et_pb_row admin_label="row" background position="top left" background repeat="repeat" background_size="initial"][et_pb_column type="3_4"][et_pb_text use border color="off" _builder_version="3.2.2" text orientation="justified"]

The EAT has made clear that context is key to the determination of whether conduct amounts to harassment.

Not only does conduct have to be unwanted and humiliating in order to qualify as harassment, but it also has to be related to a protected characteristic. Determining whether that is so cannot be done in the abstract. The EAT in this case held that the Employment Tribunal had been entitled to consider conversations had before the allegedly harassing remark and to

reach the conclusion that it had not been related to religion.

The facts of the case illustrate the importance of context. Mr Bakkali was a Muslim and had discussed with a colleague, Mr Cotter, a journalist's report portraying IS fighters in a positive light. Later that month, Mr Cotter asked Mr Bakkali if he was "still supporting" IS. The Tribunal was satisfied on the facts that the reason Mr Cotter made this remark was the discussion they had previously, not because Mr Bakkali was a Muslim.

The EAT stated that the test for harassment (that the conduct be 'related to' the protected characteristic) is broader than the 'because of' test in direct discrimination, which warrants a close look at context in order to understand the motivation behind it.

Bakkali v Greater Manchester Buses (South) Ltd (t/a Stage Coach Manchester) UKEAT/1076/17

[/et_pb_text][/et_pb_column][et_pb_column
type="1_4"][et_pb_sidebar orientation="right" area="sidebar-1"
background_layout="light" remove_border="off" show_border="on"
/][/et pb column][/et pb row][/et pb section]