

of any disturbed remains, the retention of some displaced memorial masonry and the retention of any displaced earth within the churchyard. The second part of the petition was for the replacement of the floor in the east end of the nave of church with a broad wooden raised platform and for the consequential removal of a small number of pews. There were no parties opponent, but objections were received, largely from those with views about more radical future plans being formulated by the petitioners. The chancellor only commented on the petition before him, which he found to be of limited scope, largely reversible and necessary. A faculty was granted for both parts of the petition. [WA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000256

Re Great Malvern Priory

Worcester Consistory Court: Mynors Ch, October 2009

Chairs – choice

The incumbent and PCC sought to replace the chairs in the nave of the priory. There was no objection to the disposal of the existing chairs, which had come to the end of their useful life, nor to the principle of replacement. However, there was considerable discussion between the petitioners, DAC, amenity societies and the chancellor on the design of the new chairs. The petitioners preferred a chair with a back upholstered in crimson-coloured fabric, whilst others preferred a chair with a plain wooden back for aesthetic reasons. The petition was amended several times. A compromise was sought and found and a faculty granted for the introduction of chairs upholstered in a more acceptable colour. [WA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000268

Re Grimsby and Cleethorpes Cemeteries

Lincoln Consistory Court: Bishop Ch, October 2009

Testing of memorials – diocesan guidelines

The chancellor refused a petition by the local authority for permission to carry out the physical testing of memorials in the consecrated parts of the cemeteries. Despite purporting to do so, the proposed regime failed to comply with diocesan guidelines for such testing. The chancellor invited the petitioner to discuss any future proposals with the registrar before submitting any future petition. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X1000027X

Re Holy Trinity, Eccleshall

Lichfield Consistory Court: Coates Ch, November 2009

Re-ordering – nave altar – raised dais

The petitioners sought a faculty to introduce a raised dais at the east end of the nave, with disabled access to the raised area. The plan required the removal of some pews. A faculty had been granted several years earlier to permit the introduction of a nave altar, which would be re-sited on the proposed dais. Applying the *Bishopsgate* questions the chancellor found that the petitioners had discharged the burden of proof as to the necessity of a new dais. Following a ‘fact gathering’ visit to the church, he found that the size of the proposed dais was excessive and would have a detrimental effect on the character of the building. The petition was refused. [WA]

An appeal is pending in this matter.

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000281

Grainger plc and others v Nicholson

Employment Appeal Tribunal: Burton J, November 2009

Discrimination – philosophical belief – climate change

The judge, sitting alone, upheld the decision of the Employment Tribunal that a philosophical belief (in this case in the real danger of climate change) not based on religious belief was capable of protection under the Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003, SI 2003/1660. He held that in establishing a claim based on such a belief the believer should provide evidence as to the genuineness of his or her beliefs and be subject to cross-examination. [WA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000293

Greater Manchester Police Authority v Power

Employment Appeal Tribunal: HHJ Clark, November 2009

Discrimination – religious or philosophical belief – spiritualism

Mr Power, a spiritualist, was dismissed from his employment with Greater Manchester Police Authority as a trainer of special constables on the grounds, amongst other things, of ‘his current work in the psychic field’. He complained that the authority had discriminated against him on the grounds of his religious or philosophical belief. The Authority appealed against the decision of the