K vs CSPL An employment minefield

Sharon Buckley Coal Services Health QMI OHS Conference 2003



Outline of talk

Overview of story
Relevant legislation and case law
Details of the complaint
Relevant issues for each party
Result of the complaint



Overview

Complaint about CSPL and labour hire company (LHC) to ADB Discrimination in employment on the basis of disability (LHC) Aiding and abetting a discriminatory act (CSPL) Took 2 ¹/₂ years to mediate a settlement ADB – ADT; 4 mediation conferences Win-win for CSPL, LHC and K (complainant)



The Story

- K employed from 1985 to 1997 by one mine
- Left industry in 1997; re-entry in 2000
- Pre-employment screening at CSPL
 - Unfit/unsafe by virtue of hearing loss
- LHC did not employ K
- Oct 2000; K lodged complaint with ADB



Applicable Law – Legislation

Coal Industry Act 1946 (C'th), Coal Industry Act 1946 (NSW) and 2001 (NSW)

Occupational Health and Safety Act 2000 (NSW)

Anti Discrimination Act 1977 (NSW)



Coal Industry Acts

1946 Acts

CSPL (then JCB) has power to

 "provide occupational health and rehabilitation services for workers engaged in the coal industry including providing preventive medical services, monitoring workers' health..."

2000 Act

Essentially identical provision



OHS Act 2000 (NSW)

Absolute duty of care owed to employees contained in S8

 "An employer must ensure the health, safety and welfare at work of all the employees of the employer"



Anti Discrimination Act (NSW)

Outlaws discrimination on the basis of disability,

S49

 "It is unlawful for an employer to discriminate... on the grounds of disability ...in determining who should be offered employment"

S52

 Makes it unlawful for a person to aid and abet a discriminatory act by another person



Anti Discrimination Act ctd

Defence against discriminatory act
 \$54

 "Nothing in this Act renders unlawful anything done by a person if it was necessary for the person to do it in order to comply with a requirement of any other Act"





Applicable Law – Case Law

OHS Act – Inherent Requirement

- X vs Commonwealth [1999] HCA 63 2nd
 December 1999
 - Appeal from HREOC and Fed Court
 - Defence forces
 - HIV-AIDS
 - Commonwealth discriminated



Applicable Law – Case Law

OHS Act
 French v Sydney Turf Club
 Bar attendant
 Back injury
 STC lawfully discriminated



Applicable Law – Case Law ctd

AD Act

- Sloey vs State Transit Authority 1998
 NSWEOT 153 of 1996
 - Bus driver
 - Returning to duty following bypass surgery
 - STA unlawfully discriminated





K's hearing loss In 1985 aged 36, had 10.4% binaural loss Over twelve years, hearing fell to 35.2% In 2000, hearing loss was 41.2% K's hearing loss is congenital; therefore likely to continue to deteriorate



К



Employer arrangements During 1985 – 1997, constantly employed by same mine In 2000, sought employment with LHC LHC would place K wherever it had a job LHC sent K to CSPL for a fitness assessment



The Medical

Pre-employment
 Fitness for duty
 Inherent requirements of job

 Includes ability to operate safely

 Different to health surveillance



Issues

K could physically do the job

 Analogous to X
 Reasonable modification
 LHC had no control over duties of K and no ability to enforce mine changes to accommodate K



SSUES ctd

Labour Hire Co Ability to select based on safety Reliance on expert opinion



SSUES ctd

CSPL

- Ability to pass opinion
- Core business of CS Health under threat
- Impact upon CMI



Result

Innovative

- In exchange for dropping his complaint, K was invited to become involved in research into practical hearing tests.
- Useful
 - All parties benefited
 - K fee for consultancy
 - LHC & CSPL no precedent; no legals
 - Industry new procedure for hearing tests



More Information

- Paper is on <u>http://www.coalservices.com.au</u>
 If you want to see transcripts of the quoted cases or other similar ones, look on <u>http://www.austlii.edu.au</u> or <u>http://caselaw.lawlink.nsw.gov.au</u>
- My e-mail address is

buckley@coalservices.com.au

