



**CILEX Level 6 Single Subject Certificate/CILEX Level 6 Professional Higher
Diploma in Law and Practice/CILEX Level 6 Graduate Fast-Track Diploma**

Unit 19 – The Practice of Employment Law

Case study materials

November 2026

Information for candidates

- You should familiarise yourself with these case study materials before the examination, taking time to consider the themes raised in the materials.
- You should consider the way in which your knowledge and understanding relate to these materials.
- In the examination, you will be presented with a set of questions which will relate to these materials.
- You may discuss these materials with your tutor(s).

Instructions and information to candidates during the examination

- You are allowed to take your own clean/unannotated copy of this document into the examination. Alternatively, you can access the electronic version of this document in the examination.
- You are allowed to take your own unmarked copy of the following designated statute book into the examination – ***Blackstone's Statutes on Employment Law, 33rd edition, Astra Emir, Oxford University Press, 2026.***
- You must comply with the CILEX Exam Regulations – Online Exams at Accredited Centres/CILEX Exam Regulations – Online Exams with Remote Invigilation.

CASE STUDY MATERIALS

ADVANCE INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

You are a trainee lawyer in the employment department of the firm of Kempstons, The Manor House, Bedford, MK42 7AB. Your supervising partner is Ashley Jones. You arrive at work and are given the following documentation to review and consider.

DOCUMENT 1: Email from Michelle Brown to Ashley Jones (advocate) dated 23rd October 2026

DOCUMENT 2: Attendance note dated 12th October 2026 – meeting attended by Ashley Jones (advocate) and Virat Kumar (client)

DOCUMENT 3: Email from Steve Farrier (client) to Ashley Jones (advocate) dated 30th October 2026

DOCUMENT 4: Telephone attendance note dated 27th October 2026 – telephone discussion between Ashley Jones (advocate) and Marcus Evans (client)

Your supervising partner will be requiring your assistance in relation to the above matters.

DOCUMENT 1

EMAIL FROM MICHELLE BROWN TO ASHLEY JONES

From: Michelle Brown
Sent: 23rd October 2026
To: Ashley Jones (advocate)
Subject: Request for Legal Advice

Dear Ashley

I hope this message finds you well. I am seeking your advice regarding my recent resignation from Greencon Ltd, a construction company, where I was employed as a Project Manager from November 2023 until August 2026. I believe I have been treated very badly by the company and would appreciate your guidance on my legal position.

Throughout my employment, I was not made aware of company policies and procedures nor was I advised to familiarise myself with them. I experienced bullying from colleagues early in my employment, which was addressed only after another colleague reported it as management refused to believe it when I reported it to the director.

My workload increased significantly over time, often requiring me to work outside of normal hours. I was frequently assigned tasks outside my job description and had responsibilities shifted away from me without explanation. It was as though they were treating me like this to force me to leave.

On 7th August 2026, I was called into an investigation meeting with management, without any warning, to discuss why I had not followed the risk assessment and structural stability procedure for a project I was working on. They told me this had led to part of the building becoming unstable and being a health and safety risk. It was correct that I had not followed these procedures but that was because I did not know about them. They told me I would be required to attend a disciplinary hearing where I would likely be dismissed. I did not want a dismissal as part of my employment history, therefore I resigned with immediate effect.

Since my resignation, I have suffered significant financial hardship and mental health challenges. I struggled to secure new employment. I started a new job last week but it pays less than my previous role and I am still dealing with the emotional impact of the situation. Given these circumstances, I would be grateful for your advice on my legal position and the steps I should take next.

Please let me know if you require any further information or documentation. Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Kind regards

Michelle Brown

DOCUMENT 2

ATTENDANCE NOTE

By: Ashley Jones (advocate)
Client: Virat Kumar/Apex Textiles Ltd
Date: 12th October 2026
Time Spent: 60 minutes

I attended a meeting with Virat Kumar, the managing director of Apex Textiles Ltd (Apex). Apex had previously outsourced its office cleaning to Cleanio Ltd (Cleanio). However, on 30th September 2026, Apex did not renew its contract with Cleanio as it was decided that it would take back the responsibility of office cleaning and employ its own cleaners as it wanted to cut costs.

Cleanio had previously assigned three employees – Sarah, Jose and David – to clean the Apex offices. Cleanio have told Virat that the employment of these individuals has transferred to Apex when the contract expired on 30th September 2026.

Virat said he understands that although Sarah usually works full time cleaning the Apex offices, she is currently on maternity leave so she was not actively working when Apex took over the office cleaning. Therefore, Apex have refused to accept her. Virat explained that terms have been agreed with Sarah for her not to return to cleaning the Apex offices but they need to formalise this.

Virat is also aware that Jose did not work full time cleaning the Apex offices and his time was split approximately 60% cleaning the Apex offices, with the other 40% of his full-time hours being spent cleaning other premises for Cleanio. Therefore, Apex has refused to accept him.

David did continue to work in his full-time role at the Apex offices when the contract with Cleanio expired. However, on 10th October 2026, Apex informed David that his hourly rate is being reduced from £18 to £14 per hour. This is because it aligns with the current average hourly rate for an office cleaner.

DOCUMENT 3

EMAIL FROM STEVE FARRIER (CLIENT) TO ASHLEY JONES (ADVOCATE)

From: Steve Farrier
Date: 30th October 2026
To: Ashley Jones (advocate)
Subject: Requests made by employees

Hi Ashley

TechStart Ltd (TechStart) is a fast-growing software company and the management team is reviewing the situations of two employees who have recently requested leave or taken unauthorised leave and have raised a grievance or submitted an appeal regarding the decisions made in relation to these situations. The company is facing tight project deadlines and wants to minimise business disruption. Therefore, we need some advice regarding how to manage these requests.

The first employee is Liam. His partner is expecting a baby on 12th January 2027. Liam has worked for TechStart for two years. He submitted a formal request on 1st October 2026 to take two weeks of Statutory Paternity Leave immediately following the birth. At the same time, he also gave us notice that he intends to take a continuous block of 12 weeks of Shared Parental Leave (SPL) starting in April 2027 to allow his partner to return to work early. TechStart's HR Manager has rejected the SPL request outright, stating that the company "cannot support long blocks of parental absence during the peak Q1 development phase" and offered him a staggered part-time schedule instead. Liam has now raised a grievance regarding this rejection.

The second employee is Benedita. She is a software engineer whose five-year-old daughter suddenly fell ill at school last Tuesday morning. Benedita left the office immediately, without permission, to pick her daughter up and stayed at home with her on Wednesday while she recovered. When she returned on Thursday, her manager gave her a formal written warning for 'unauthorised absence'. Benedita immediately submitted an appeal against this disciplinary sanction and at the same time, submitted a formal statutory flexible working request to work permanently from home four days a week. TechStart's HR Manager rejected the request on Friday via an email stating, "We need people in the office for team collaboration. Request denied." Now Benedita has submitted an appeal against this decision too.

Kind regards

Steve Farrier

DOCUMENT 4

TELEPHONE ATTENDANCE NOTE

By: Ashley Jones (advocate)
Client: Marcus Evans
Date: 27th October 2026
Time Spent: 25 minutes

Marcus explained the issues he was having at work and wanted advice. A summary of the background and the relevant incidents is given below.

Eco-Invest Ltd is a financial consultancy firm that manages investment portfolios. In August 2026, the company launched a new corporate growth strategy. To boost morale and align team values, the Board of Directors introduced a mandatory 'Progressive Growth Pledge' for all senior consultants.

The 'Progressive Growth Pledge' requires all senior consultants to sign a declaration committing to 'actively identify, pursue and promote commercial growth opportunities in all lawful sectors to maximise client returns.' The company states the policy applies to all senior consultants equally to ensure maximum profitability and uniform client service.

Marcus is a Senior Investment Consultant who has worked at Eco-Invest Ltd for four years. He is a strict ethical vegan and a dedicated climate activist. Marcus holds a deeply integrated belief system regarding 'Deep Ecology.' He believes that all living beings have inherent value regardless of their utility to human needs and that global financial systems must immediately halt all fossil fuel and intensive farming investments to prevent planetary collapse. He structures his personal life, diet, travel and investments strictly around this philosophy.

In September 2026, during a team meeting to discuss the new strategy the Managing Director, Ambre, presented a lucrative new portfolio opportunity with an international agribusiness conglomerate involved in intensive livestock farming.

Marcus raised an objection, stating his conscience did not allow him to promote the portfolio. Ambre became visibly frustrated and said, "Marcus, your extreme eco-warrior views are getting in the way of your job. We are a finance firm, not a charity. If your head is in the clouds with these radical theories, you clearly lack the corporate mindset needed for leadership here."

The following week, Marcus was removed from leading the firm's flagship tech portfolio, which is a project he had run successfully for two years, and he was reassigned to a back-office analytical role with no client contact.

At the beginning of October 2026, Eco-Invest Ltd then officially implemented the 'Progressive Growth Pledge'.

Marcus refused to sign the pledge. He argued that signing it would force him to promote industries that violate his deepest philosophical convictions. Because of his refusal to sign, Eco-Invest Ltd have initiated formal disciplinary proceedings against him for insubordination and breach of contract.

CASE STUDY MATERIALS

Marcus informed me that he would like to publicly expose Eco-Invest Ltd for what he considers to be their moral and ethical incorrect conduct towards him but suspects that they would try to 'gag' any efforts that would attempt to do that.

End of the case study materials

© 2026 The Chartered Institute of Legal Executives