



# Michael Smith

**Year of Call:** 2009

**Email Address:** [michael.smith@3pb.co.uk](mailto:michael.smith@3pb.co.uk)

**Telephone:** 020 7583 8055

## Overview

Michael Smith joined 3PB in January 2025 from another well-known barristers' chambers in London. He is an experienced specialist employment and discrimination barrister.

Michael has experience of acting for both claimants and respondents in many areas including unfair dismissal, constructive dismissal, discrimination, whistleblowing, breach of contract and restrictive covenants. Michael appears regularly in multi-day hearings at the Employment Tribunal and the Employment Appeal Tribunal, and his court work is complemented by a busy advisory practice. He also accepts instructions on a Direct/Public Access basis.

Michael is the co-author of "Employment Agencies, Recruitment Agencies and Agency Workers – A Practical Guide to the Law."

His outside interests include cooking, horseracing and Queens Park Rangers FC.

## Academic qualifications

- BA Hons English Language & Literature, King's College London
- Graduate Diploma in Law, BPP Law School, London
- Bar Vocational Course, BPP Law School, London

## Professional bodies

- Employment Lawyers Association
- Employment Law Bar Association

## Direct Access

Michael Smith is qualified to accept instructions directly from members of the public and professional clients under the Direct Public Access scheme.

# Expertise

## Employment and discrimination

Michael is a specialist employment barrister providing practical and effective advice to a broad spectrum of clients, ranging from employees and individuals through to small and medium sized businesses as well as UK FTSE listed companies, international corporations, local authorities and NHS Trusts.

Michael has extensive experience in discrimination cases (in particular sex, race, disability, religion and belief). He often acts for well-known UK and international companies and is accustomed to appearing in multi-week hearings involving all forms of discrimination, including claims of direct and indirect discrimination, victimisation and harassment.

Michael advises employers and employees on all aspects of the employment relationship, and is regularly instructed in relation to issues arising out of the termination of employment, including breach of contract and restrictive covenants, bonus disputes, unfair dismissal and redundancy. He is especially experienced in county court litigation and is entirely familiar with all issues arising from the Civil Procedure Rules.

Michael has a particular interest in the law relating to employment agencies and recruitment agencies. He is the author of *"Employment Agencies, Recruitment Agencies and Agency Workers – A Practical Guide to the Law"* (published December 2016, LexisNexis) and regularly represents recruitment and employment agencies in tribunal claims.

### Notable Cases:

**British Airways v Pinaud [2019] All E.R. 186:** Michael acted for the Claimant in the Employment Tribunal, Employment Appeal Tribunal and Court of Appeal in successfully establishing that a long-standing cabin crew contract treated part-time workers less favourably, contrary to the Part-Time Workers Regulations 2007.

**OV v HR:** Michael was instructed by a leading recruitment agency in a ten-day claim in which it was alleged that the agency had aided in racial discrimination and unlawful deduction of wages against the Claimant.

**BB v MB:** Michael achieved a six-figure settlement for the Claimant in a claim of unlawful discrimination involving a leading financial institution.

**B v NCRP:** Michael acted for the Respondent in an 8-day tribunal claim with over 20 separate allegations of discriminatory conduct against multiple individuals.

## Articles

Michael Smith reviews the case of *Jones v SoS for Health and Social Care* [2024] EWCA Civ 1568, in which the CoA found that an ET acted perversely in deciding that it was not just and equitable to extend time for a race discrimination claim to be brought outside the primary limitation period and expressed doubts as to whether suspicion would ever be a relevant factor in the assessment of whether it was just and equitable to extend time.

[View Article](#)