



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

BETWEEN

Claimant

AND

Respondent

Mr A Bansal-McNulty

(1) Queens Park Rangers Football
and Athletic Club Limited

(2) John Yems

(3) Crawley Town Football and Social Club Limited

PRESS SUMMARY

This document is intended to assist the media and public to understand the Tribunal's judgment. It does not form any part of the reasons for the Tribunal's decision. The Judgment issued by the Tribunal is the only authoritative record of the reasons for it.

The Claimant was an Academy player at QPR from age 14 until his final contract expired at the end of the 2021/22 season. He never played in the QPR first team. He went on various loans the final one being to Crawley Town during the 2021/22 season.

During this loan he alleged that he had suffered discriminatory conduct from a Mr John Yems, the Crawley Town manager. There was a dispute as to when and what he communicated to QPR regarding this discriminatory conduct.

Allegations against Mr Yems were reported in the Daily Mail on 22 April 2022. He was immediately suspended and ultimately his employment was terminated. Several players made complaints to the PFA/FA, and a FA Disciplinary Commission was convened. This resulted in Mr Yems being found culpable of various discriminatory acts pertaining to various players, to include the Claimant, and suspended from any involvement in English professional football for 3 years. Mr Yems disputes most of the allegations.

The Claimant is half Indian. He brought claims of direct race/religious discrimination and harassment against QPR, Crawley Town and Mr Yems. He also brought claims of victimisation against Crawley Town (these were withdrawn during the hearing) and QPR.

There was a 30-day hearing. The Tribunal reserved its judgment.

We found that some, but not all, of the claims of harassment on the grounds of race against Mr Yems were upheld. We found that Crawley Town was vicariously liable for his conduct which was in the course of his employment.

The claims against QPR failed.

The Claimant is seeking circa £12 million compensation as he claims that he suffered psychiatric, and career ending, injury because of the treatment which he had suffered. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on the implications of the liability judgment given the likelihood of a remedy hearing.