

Dignity at Work - Condensed Complaint Dossier

Daniel Mark Jackson - Infosys / BT/EE Home Billing

Period covered: 22 August - 31 October 2025

Submitted: 13 November 2025

1. Purpose & Overview

This report summarises a sustained pattern of behaviour, support failures, and procedural breaches that collectively resulted in doctor-certified work-related stress.

Across 35 documented incidents (P1-P6) — evidenced by screenshots, call recordings, and timelines — I experienced:

- Repeated refusal of reasonable requests for escalation and guidance
- Incorrect complaint-handling instructions, including pressure to close complaints prematurely
- A complaint closed without the customer's consent (P6-13)
- Mishandling of vulnerable and elderly customers, including an 85-year-old bereaved widow
- Public shaming and demeaning comments (including a "moron" remark in a private Teams message sent by an SME and visible on Noel's screen)
- Long and repeated delays in TL/SME support
- Three ignored wellbeing warnings
- Structural removal of training and 1-to-1 support
- Contradictory workplace pressures, including blocking escalations while publicly criticising low complaint numbers

Collectively, these represent breaches of:

- Infosys Ireland Dignity at Work Policy
 - Ofcom General Conditions GC C4 (Complaints) and GC C5 (Vulnerability)
 - Internal EE/BT complaint-handling rules
-

2. Role & Operational Context

I work in BT/EE Home Billing, handling broadband, landline and TV billing queries.

My responsibilities require adherence to:

- Ofcom GC C4 - fair complaint handling, escalation, ADR
- Ofcom GC C5 - safeguarding vulnerable customers
- Internal EE/BT rules around escalation and complaint progression

Performance constraints:

- ACW \leq 40 seconds
- Hold time \leq 60 seconds

Agents depend on timely TL/SME support to:

- escalate complaints when customers request it
- resolve mis-selling or vulnerability cases
- deliver fair, legally compliant outcomes

When support is delayed, refused, or incorrect, agents face an impossible conflict between compliance and fairness vs internal metrics and managerial instruction.

This systemic conflict became a sustained source of stress.

3. Chronology - Six-Phase Pattern (P1-P6)

Phase 1 - Early Warning Signs (22-23 Aug)

(P1-1 to P1-3)

- Contradictory guidance; unclear escalation pathways.
 - Early indicators that TL support was inconsistent.
-

Phase 2 - Early September Deterioration (02-08 Sep)

(P2-1A, P2-1B, P2-2 to P2-9)

Includes:

- P2-1A — Early September support gaps
- P2-1B — “All offline is gone Everyone” (12 Sept)
- P2-2 — Escalation friction
- P2-3 — Partial engagement then silence
- P2-4 — First wellbeing alert ignored
- P2-5 — 1-to-1 cancelled
- P2-6 — Second wellbeing alert
- P2-7 — Escalation request ignored
- P2-8 — Multi-hour escalation obstruction
- P2-9 — “Thumbs-up” dismissal

Themes:

- Public pressure begins
 - Escalations delayed or refused
 - Wellbeing concerns acknowledged then ignored
 - Non-cooperation becomes repetitive
-

Phase 3 - Vulnerability Ignored (12-13 Sep)

(P3-1, P3-2)

- P3-1 — Vulnerable bedbound customer left waiting
- P3-2 — Misinformation compounded by delays

Clear GC C5 concerns appear.

Phase 4 - Late September Pressure Surge (20-29 Sep)

(P4-1 to P4-4)

- P4-1 — 55-minute escalation resistance
 - P4-2 — 29-minute delay
 - P4-3 — Inappropriate tone re: 96-year-old customer
 - P4-4 — Removal of training & increasing pressure
-

Phase 5 - “Noel Pattern” Emerges (02-13 Oct)

(P5-1 to P5-6 + P5-2B)

- P5-1 — Escalation delay
 - P5-2 — Incorrect advice
 - P5-2B — Incorrect guidance re: O2 cancellation
 - P5-3 — Escalation refused despite request
 - P5-4 — Multi-page callback mishandling
 - P5-5 — Noel logs off after misunderstanding
 - P5-6 — Key facts repeatedly ignored
-

Phase 6 - Mid-Late October Collapse (15-31 Oct)

(P6-1 to P6-14)

Includes:

- P6-1 — Complaint pressure list (15 Oct)
- P6-2 — Third wellbeing alert ignored
- P6-3 — Promised support meeting never held
- P6-4 — “This is a Joke lads”
- P6-5 — Incorrect rule: “all complaints must be closed on the call”
- P6-6 — Fairness concern brushed aside
- P6-7 — 30-minute wait
- P6-8 — Contradictory guidance + dismissive emoji
- P6-9 — “Complete joke lads”
- P6-10 — Incorrect complaint advice
- P6-11 — Support delay
- P6-12 — Escalation bottleneck
- P6-13 — Flagship vulnerable widow case
- P6-14 — Additional delay case (31 Oct)

Shows steady deterioration → systemic failure → collapse in safe working environment.

4. Key Flagship Case Studies (Short Form)

Flagship Case 1 - P6-13: 85-Year-Old Bereaved Widow (31 Oct)

- Elderly, vulnerable widow sold unaffordable package in store
- Repeatedly treated rudely; refused access to a manager
- Noel instructed closure despite explicit request to escalate
- Incorrectly stated ADR could not be offered
- Withheld key vulnerability details from ECR
- Overlooked earlier complaint lodged the day after purchase
- Left customer on hold ~15 minutes
- Complaint closed without consent
- Goodwill offered only on condition of closure
- Screen recording revealed TL receiving a private message from an SME:

“that moron daniel mark...”

Implications:

- GC C4: incorrect closure, ADR denial
 - GC C5: failure to safeguard a vulnerable customer
 - Dignity at Work: demeaning language, hostility, managerial failure
 - Direct contributor to work-related stress
-

Flagship Case 2 - P4-1: 55-Minute Escalation Resistance (20 Sep)

- Serious mis-sell case
- TL non-responsive for 27 minutes
- Second TL argued 55 minutes against escalation
- Customer waiting throughout

Implications:

- Unreasonable refusal
 - Obstruction
 - High compliance risk
-

Flagship Case 3 - Ignored Wellbeing Warnings

(P2-4, P2-6, P6-2, P6-3)

- 5 Sep — “I’m struggling”
- 6 Sep — Repeated to Ops
- 16 Oct — Third alert; meeting promised and never arranged

Implications:

- Duty of care breach
 - Foreseeable harm
-

Flagship Case 4 - Public Shaming

(P2-1B, P6-1, P6-4, P6-9)

- “All offline is gone Everyone”
- Complaint lists posted publicly
- “This is a Joke lads”
- “Complete joke lads”

Implications:

- Public humiliation
 - Pressure used instead of support
-

Flagship Case 5 - Vulnerable Bedbound Customer

(P3-1)

- Left waiting
 - No adapted safeguarding measures
-

5. Thematic Findings

Across phases, 11 recurring themes:

- 1. Refusal of reasonable requests**
- 2. Unnecessary work interference**
- 3. Isolation and non-co-operation**
- 4. Public shaming**
- 5. Demeaning behaviour (“moron”), emojis, sarcasm**
- 6. Failure to safeguard vulnerable customers**
- 7. Incorrect complaint handling (GC C4)**
- 8. Contradictory or incorrect instructions**
9. Ignored wellbeing warnings
10. Removal of training / support
11. Contradictory pressures
 - escalation discouraged internally
 - complaint numbers demanded publicly

These show repetition, escalation, foreseeability — core criteria for a dignity-at-work finding.

6. Support Delays - Summary

Documented:

- 12 delays >10 minutes
- 5 delays >25 minutes
- 2 delays ~45-55 minutes
- Occurred mainly with customers on hold
- Included vulnerable and elderly customers
- Often paired with escalation refusals
- Made it impossible to meet ACW/hold targets while remaining compliant

This was a major contributor to cumulative stress.

7. Compliance & Policy Summary

Ofcom GC C4 – Complaints

- Escalations refused despite requests
- Complaint closed without consent (P6-13)
- ADR incorrectly denied
- Incomplete or misleading customer information

Ofcom GC C5 – Vulnerability

- Vulnerabilities missed or dismissed
- Customers disadvantaged by process
- No adapted handling

Infosys Dignity at Work

- Bullying via refusal of reasonable requests
 - Non-cooperation and isolation
 - Public humiliation
 - Demeaning remarks (“moron”)
 - Cyberbullying (Teams)
 - Ignored wellbeing warnings
 - Failure of managerial responsibility
-

8. Conclusion

The evidence shows a sustained, escalating pattern of:

- inappropriate behaviour
- procedural obstruction
- unfair complaint handling
- disregard for customer vulnerability
- managerial hostility
- neglected wellbeing indicators

The harm was cumulative, foreseeable and avoidable.

This environment directly resulted in doctor-certified work-related stress and exposed vulnerable customers to unfair outcomes.