

Woman sacked in 'ridiculous' row over butterfly tattoo

A WOMAN has lost her job over a row about a butterfly tattoo on her foot.



The tattoo on Jo's foot [INS]

Jo Perkins, who had worked as a consultant for Salisbury FM since the beginning of the year, says she was escorted from the premises and her contract terminated as a result of the tattoo.

She says she is now considering legal action after being fired as the result of a new policy on tattoos introduced earlier this year.

Jo, 38, said: "I have been a procurement consultant for years and I've worked for many high-level companies in my time.

"But I have never heard anything as ridiculous as this."

She said that the four-inch tattoo is only visible when she wears a dress, and claims that she offered to cover it with a plaster.

However, the company said that her contract was ended because she did not comply with their policy on not having tattoos visible at work.

Jo said: "The only way to cover it would be to wear a sock. I'm a businesswoman and I wear smart dresses to work, so that would look stupid.

"I suggested covering it with a sticking plaster, but thought that would look unprofessional and draw attention to it."



Jo said she thought that the decision to sack her was "ridiculous" [INS]

Graham Sievers, a spokesman for Salisbury FM, said: "The policy on tattoos has been communicated by line managers to both staff and contracted staff supplied by agencies - of which this consultant was one.

"We have to apply consistency. We could not say 'yes' to some people and 'no' to others.

"The policy was launched in June and all the line managers made everyone fully aware of it.

"Her tattoo was visible. It is not a ban on tattoos. It is a ban on visible tattoos.

"The company felt it would be unreasonable not to apply it consistently across the board. That I think would be unfair.

"She was not marched off the premises, but asked to leave because she refused to comply with the company policy."

Employment lawyer Nicholas Lakeland, who works for London law firm Silverman Sherliker, said today that it was unlikely that Jo could take any legal action because she was working under contract for an agency. He said: "Because she is not an employee, they can pretty much get away with it because it is not a discrimination type thing.

"I'm afraid she has just got to move on with her life.

"Agency workers, as they are called, have very limited rights. In terms of unfair dismissal, she is not an employee."