

****PRESS RELEASE****

****FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE****

4 July 2025

**ALLISON BAILEY WINS FIRST EVER GENDER CRITICAL JUDGMENT IN THE
SUPPLY OF GOODS AND SERVICES**

Allison Bailey has won her discrimination case against Linnaeus Veterinary Limited, trading as Palmerston Veterinary Group, for unlawful discrimination based on her gender critical beliefs.

In the first case of its kind, Miss Bailey, a gender critical feminist, barrister, and lesbian, has demonstrated that the Courts can and will take action where gender critical women are denied goods and services on account of their beliefs.

Miss Bailey was expelled without warning from her vet's practice in 2023. She alleged that her expulsion was due to her gender critical beliefs: she believes sex is binary, biological, immutable, and important — views that would have been entirely uncontroversial at any other time in history. She considers the belief that gender identity can override biological sex to be unevidenced, pseudoscientific, quasi-religious, and dangerous. She believes that gender identity ideology gained ground so quickly in the past decade because it was erroneously linked to LGB rights by self-interested lobby groups, with disastrous consequences for women and girls, children, the vulnerable, and the same-sex attracted, all lawful beliefs protected under equality legislation.

In its judgment, the Court has now agreed with Miss Bailey and found that her expulsion was unlawful and discriminatory.

In 2022, Miss Bailey won a high-profile case against her former barristers' chambers, which had also discriminated against her on the grounds of her gender critical beliefs. In reaching today's judgment, His Honour Judge Holmes found that Miss Bailey's litigation had become known within the vets' practice, and that while some of the staff supported her, others did not. The Defendant's pleaded case — that they had expelled Miss Bailey for being rude and aggressive to staff — was not accepted.

Among the Judge's reasons for reaching his decision was that Miss Bailey had been given no warning; the policy justifying expulsion had not been followed or referred to by the individuals in making their decision to expel; that trans activist material had been distributed throughout the Defendants' practices; that a team

meeting (on the same day on which the Employment Appeal Tribunal handed down its judgment in the Forstater case) had focussed on trans rights activism; that they did not call a material witness in support of the Defendant to give evidence; and that other witnesses' evidence was unreliable. The judge also relied on the fact that, under cross-examination, one key decision maker was a "hair's breadth away" from saying she thought gender critical beliefs were "bigoted".

Miss Bailey said:

"This judgment shows that it is unlawful to deny services to people who believe that sex is binary, biological, immutable and of vital importance.

"For too long, activists in a range of settings have promoted the incorrect view that it is somehow good or kind, or in furtherance of trans people's rights, to unlawfully discriminate in this way."

"I was a client of Palmerston Vets for thirteen years when they expelled me. I never went to the vet to talk about issues around sex and gender. I would not have dreamed of doing so —they raised it with me, and made me the subject of internal gossip as a result. I was given no warning and no indication that I might be expelled."

"As many gender critical women will know, this is all too often the case where anyone expresses a view in support of the rights of women and LGB people, that conflicts with the views of trans rights activists and an authoritarian LGBTQ+ community and lobby."

"As the judgment sets out, and largely unknown to me at the time, the Defendant's business had become imbued with unthinking activist thought and language which has taken root over the past decade. That evidence was crucial in HHJ Holmes reaching the finding that I had been treated unlawfully."

"This was a challenging case to bring against a Defendant who was evasive and unhelpful in matters of disclosure and unnecessarily adversarial in their written communications with my solicitor."

"I want to pay particular tribute to my counsel, Akua Reindorf KC, and my solicitor, Peter Daly. Each is formidable in their own right; together, they were magnificent. Akua's knowledge of equality law was unsurpassed, and her trial advocacy style was calm, effective and brilliant."

“I also want to thank His Honour Judge Holmes for his conduct of the trial, which was fair and accommodating of both parties, and for his careful and reasoned judgment.”

Miss Bailey’s solicitor, Peter Daly of Doyle Clayton, said:

“This is a case which shows that an unquestioning acceptance of gender identity dogma, far from being an anti-discriminatory or a “kind” measure, can in fact lead businesses into unlawful discrimination. The Defendant’s assertion that Miss Bailey was expelled for poor conduct was never justified by her actual behaviour, and once the Judge was able to identify that fact, he concluded that the real reason for her expulsion was unlawful discrimination.”

“While there have been dozens of cases of gender critical women successfully suing their employers for discrimination, this is the first case in which a service user has been able to bring a claim to judgment. This is therefore a very important judgment.”

“The fact that Allison has been successful is a testament to her fortitude, and highlights that it is never lawful to discriminate against people because of their lawfully-held gender critical beliefs. It is essential that businesses and service-providers take good note of this judgment, and review their own practices and attitudes in order to avoid finding themselves as the next unsuccessful Defendant.”

The parties will shortly return to court to determine the amount of damages payable to Miss Bailey, along with her costs.

ENDS