



FW: Contact with 20 Minutes

From: "Bloch, Meric" <Meric.Bloch@adeconna.com>
To: sekhon@mail.com" · sekhon@mail.com>
Date: Nov 27, 2012 11:42:52 AM

Dear Ms. Sekhon,

I write to follow up with you regarding my 11 November email. As you will recall, I am one of the Compliance professionals at Adecco, and I have been asked to respond substantively to your allegations that you were treated improperly during your 11 July visit to our Office Angels office in Kingston upon Thames. Please also consider this email as Adecco's reply to your 14 September letter to Mr. De Maeseneire.

I have reviewed your letters, the reply from Mr. Searle, and the relevant emails concerning the matter. I have also made my own inquiries to our UK colleagues to ensure that we understand the facts and could confirm that our regular business practices were followed.

Your allegations of improper treatment by the branch staff cannot be substantiated. I will explain the reasons for Adecco's conclusion.

You visited the Office Angels office on 11 July to meet with the branch staff. During that meeting, you requested some confirmation from the staff that you had visited the office as part of your continued qualification for a Jobseekers Allowance. I am informed that the branch staff declined to provide you with the confirmation because the type of appointment you had with the staff is not the type of qualifying appointment required to receive the confirmation. This is consistent with our company policy and our understanding of the requirements.

To receive the necessary confirmation, an applicant needs to complete a pre-arranged registration appointment. During this appointment, an applicant's information is added to or updated in our database, and the necessary documents are completed. Once these steps are completed, an applicant becomes eligible for placement at an available position for which he or she is qualified. Appearing for an appointment with the branch staff but without completing the registration process is not sufficient because you would not then be eligible for a placement to begin work.

I am informed, however, that you told the branch staff during your visit that you did not wish to complete the registration process. Instead, you asked only that the branch staff review your CV and offer feedback. Your request was accommodated, but there is no doubt that this did not complete the required registration process. And it was the completion of that registration process upon which the confirmation you sought depended. (A compliments slip, even if provided to you, would not have sufficed for the Jobseeker's Allowance.)

The difficulties appear to have begun when the branch staff denied you the confirmation you sought. Although there might have been some initial confusion regarding whether you could receive it, the confirmation was properly denied because you did not complete the registration process.

The police were summoned to the branch office because, according to the staff, you were creating a disturbance and refused to leave the office otherwise. The staff reported that they felt threatened by your behavior. We are aware of no facts to show that the staff incited your reactions or encouraged your conduct in the office.

Neither Adecco nor the local staff had any control over the actions of the police officers once they arrived at the office, and Adecco takes no responsibility for the manner in which they chose to resolve the situation. I am informed that Allan Freeman, the local Adecco manager who intervened in the matter, chose to resolve it with the police as quickly and as discreetly as possible. However, I am also informed that even after you left the branch office you told the police that, once released from their custody, you intended to return to the office to continue your demands.

Your various letters also allege that the branch staff committed racial discrimination by the way you were treated in the office. Adecco denies the allegation completely. Neither my inquiries nor any of your emails or letters detail any facts to show that your race played any role here. You were denied the confirmation letter only because you did not qualify for it, and the police were contacted only because you were creating a disturbance.

Your 14 September letter alleges that Mr. Freeman's actions were "discriminatory and racially motivated." You offer

no facts for your belief, and we are aware of none. To the extent your allegation rests on your presumption that a confirmation letter would have been freely provided to anyone else, our explanation here corrects that misunderstanding.

In conclusion, Adecco considers the actions of its branch staff to be consistent with our company policy and reasonable business practices. We consider this response a complete reply to your letters and emails, and Adecco considers the matter closed.

Sincerely yours,

Meric Bloch

Meric Craig Bloch
Compliance Officer
Adecco Group North America
Tel: (973) 768-3756
Fax: (973) 629-1236
meric.bloch@adeccona.com

From: Bloch, Meric
Sent: Sunday, November 11, 2012 5:49 AM
To: sekhon@mail.com
Subject: Contact with 20 Minutes

Dear Ms. Sekhon,

I am one of the Compliance professionals at Adecco, and I have been asked to contact you regarding the matter. As you will recall, your email to reporter@20minutes.ch was cc'd to Adecco's Chief Executive Officer and has, in turn, been referred to us.

We are aware that you have been dealing with our UK colleagues, and that you have already received some responses, including one from Peter Searle, Adecco's Chief Executive for the UK and Ireland. We are making efforts to learn the relevant facts and ensure that the proper internal inquiries have been made regarding your concerns.

We hope to respond to your latest message as soon as reasonably possible.

Sincerely,

Meric Bloch

Meric Craig Bloch

Compliance Officer

Adecco Group North America

Tel: 973.768.3756

Fax: 973.629.1236

meric.bloch@adeccona.com