

APPEARANCE, DISABILITY AND THE LAW

People with disfigurements often face prejudice, exclusion and discrimination in employment and across other life contexts. Law's response to this evidence is flawed both by its own limited and illogical scope and its failure to understand the perspectives of those people who may need to use it. Drawing on interviews with people with lived experience of disfigurement and employers, the book sketches out different approaches to the complex social problem of discrimination against people with visible differences. It also asks whether, in our changing social context, law should widen its protection beyond disfigurement. Would a protected characteristic of appearance offer viable legal rights to the many millions of us who do not have a disfigurement but who are prone to a few spots, whose ears stick out more than we would like, or who are carrying an extra stone in weight?

HANNAH SAUNDERS leads the policy and education work of an international alliance of not-for-profit organisations working to secure greater recognition of the rights of people with visible differences. She is also a Visiting Fellow at Queen Mary University of London.

CAMBRIDGE BIOETHICS AND LAW

This series of books – formerly called Cambridge Law, Medicine and Ethics – was founded by Cambridge University Press with Alexander McCall Smith as its first editor in 2003. It focuses on the law's complex and troubled relationship with medicine across both the developed and the developing world. In the past twenty years, we have seen in many countries increasing resort to the courts by dissatisfied patients and a growing use of the courts to attempt to resolve intractable ethical dilemmas. At the same time, legislatures across the world have struggled to address the questions posed by both the successes and the failures of modern medicine, while international organisations such as the WHO and UNESCO now regularly address issues of medical law. It follows that we would expect ethical and policy questions to be integral to the analysis of the legal issues discussed in this series. The series responds to the high profile of medical law in universities, in legal and medical practice, as well as in public and political affairs. We seek to reflect the evidence that many major health-related policy and bioethics debates in the UK, Europe and the international community over the past two decades have involved a strong medical law dimension. With that in mind, we seek to address how legal analysis might have a trans-jurisdictional and international relevance. Organ retention, embryonic stem cell research, physician-assisted suicide and the allocation of resources to fund health care are but a few examples among many. The emphasis of this series is thus on matters of public concern and/or practical significance. We look for books that could make a difference to the development of medical law and enhance the role of medico-legal debate in policy circles. That is not to say that we lack interest in the important theoretical dimensions of the subject, but we aim to ensure that theoretical debate is grounded in the realities of how the law does and should interact with medicine and health care.

Series Editors

Professor Graeme Laurie, *University of Edinburgh*
Professor Richard Ashcroft, *City, University of London*

APPEARANCE, DISABILITY AND THE LAW

HANNAH SAUNDERS
Queen Mary University of London



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
978-1-009-60504-5 — Appearance, Disability and the Law
Hannah Saunders
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment,
a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of
education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781009605045

DOI: 10.1017/9781009605076

© Hannah Saunders 2025

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions
of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take
place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

When citing this work, please include a reference to the DOI 10.1017/9781009605076

First published 2025

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

A Cataloging-in-Publication data record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

ISBN 978-1-009-60504-5 Hardback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence
or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this
publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will
remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	ix
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 About This Book	2
1.2 Key Claims	5
1.3 Scope and Limitations	6
1.4 Terminology	8
2 Law’s Response to Disfigurement Inequality	10
2.1 Justifying a Legal Response	10
2.2 Law’s Response	15
2.2.1 Equality Act 2010	15
2.2.2 Disability in the CRPD	19
2.2.3 Disability in the Decisions of the ECtHR	23
2.2.4 Disability in EU Law	24
2.3 Summary	26
3 Law’s Limited Ambitions	27
3.1 Constructing an Evaluative Framework	34
3.2 Methodological Implications of the Framework	38
3.3 Summary	39
4 The Lived Experience of Visible Difference	41
4.1 Psychological Impact	41
4.2 Meeting Others	44
4.2.1 At Work	46
4.3 All in Your Head?	49
4.3.1 Seeing You, Knowing You	52

vi	CONTENTS	
	4.3.2 Factors Affecting the Social Consequences of Disfigurement	54
	4.3.3 Real Life and the Law	55
	4.4 Summary	61
5	Disfigurement Equality at Work: Employer Perspectives	63
	5.1 Recruitment	64
	5.2 Support and Adjustments	68
	5.3 HR Practice and the Law	73
	5.4 Summary	75
6	Defining Disfigurement	77
	6.1 Disfigurement: An Appearance Disability	77
	6.2 The Relationship between Disfigurement and Disability	81
	6.3 The Relationship between Disfigurement and Appearance	83
	6.4 The Relationship between Disability and Appearance	91
	6.5 Can Other Protected Characteristics Fill the Gaps?	95
	6.6 Summary	100
7	Severity and Complexity	101
	7.1 Determining Severity	101
	7.1.1 The Bodily Location of Disfigurement	103
	7.1.2 Progressive Conditions	105
	7.2 Why Have a Severity Threshold?	107
	7.3 The Legal Dichotomy of Complex Conditions	109
	7.4 Mitigating the Act's Limitations: Perceptive Discrimination	111
	7.5 Summary	114
8	Law and Social Change: Are We Expecting Too Much?	115
	8.1 How Contentious Is the Law?	116
	8.2 What Aspect of Social Change Is Targeted?	118
	8.3 Does the Law Have 'Bottom Up' Ownership?	120
	8.4 Has the Law Been Publicised?	121
	8.5 What Compliance Mechanisms Does the Law Use?	122
	8.6 Summary	125
9	Alternative Approaches in Law and Policy	127
	9.1 Changing Attitudes, Perceived Social Norms and Behaviours	127
	9.1.1 Regulatory Interventions Focused on Contact and Visibility	128
	9.1.2 Reform Focused on Education	133
	9.1.3 Reform of Advertising	134

CONTENTS vii

9.1.4	Reforms Designed to Motivate Employers	137
9.1.5	Law Reform of AI in HR Processes	141
9.1.6	Reform at Wider Institutional Level	142
9.2	Creating an Effective Remedial Mechanism	144
9.2.1	Reforms to Improve Claim Success Rates	145
9.2.2	Reforms to Increase Enforcement	152
9.3	Summary	155
10	Beyond Disfigurement	157
10.1	Is a Protected Characteristic of Appearance Justified in Principle?	157
10.2	Is a Protected Characteristic of Appearance Viable in Practice?	167
10.2.1	The Problem of Pretty	170
10.3	Would a Protected Characteristic of Appearance Be Enforced?	174
10.4	Summary	176
11	Conclusion	178
<i>Appendix 1 Model of Good Practice</i>		184
<i>Appendix 2 Empirical Study Information</i>		193
<i>References</i>		196
<i>Index</i>		217

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am in the debt of many people for their help in writing this book. First, I thank the participants who volunteered their time to be interviewed and to attend focus groups at different stages of the research, and the charities who have supported this process. It would not have been possible without them.

I am very grateful to the late Professor Aaron Baker, who passed away shortly after my PhD viva and whose guidance, commitment and good humour during that journey was second to none. My special thanks also go to Professor Kate Malleson of Queen Mary University of London, for her unwavering energy, enthusiasm and excellent guidance. I am also grateful to many others who have generously given their thoughts on earlier drafts and ideas, including Di, Lizzie, Roger, Phyllida and the Labour Law discussion group.

Finally, thank you to my family for their belief in this project.

TABLE OF CASES

UK Case Law

- A Kinlay v Bronte Film and Television Limited* [2021] ET/2200251/2020 (18 July 2021, unreported, ET).
- Bickerstaff v Butcher* (2015) IT92/14 (3 February 2015, unreported, NIIT).
- Blyth v Historic Scotland* [2001] ET/S/4000514/00 (14 February 2001, unreported, ET).
- Britlief v Birmingham City Council* [2020] ICR 653 (EAT).
- Campbell v Falkirk Council* [2008] S/136261/07 (9 April 2008, unreported, ETS).
- Cosgrove v Northern Ireland Ambulance Service* [2007] IRLR 397 (NICA).
- Cromwell Garage Ltd v Doran* [2011] UKEAT/2011/036 (8 April 2011, unreported, EAT).
- Dhillon v Leeds Teaching Hospital NHS Trust* [2019] ET/1800222/19 (18 December 2019, unreported, ET).
- Ellen Mart v Assessment Services Inc* [2019] UKEATS 0032/18/SS (16 May 2019, unreported, EAT).
- English v Thomas Sanderson Ltd* (2009) ICR 543 (CA).
- EOC v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry* [2007] ICR 1234 (QBD).
- Finn v British Bung Manufacturing Company Ltd* [2022] ET/1803764/2021 (11 May 2022, unreported, ET).
- G v Head Teacher and Governors of St Gregory's Catholic Science College* [2011] EWHC 1452 (Admin).
- Goodwin v Patent Office* [1999] IRLR 4 (EAT).
- Griffiths v Lancashire County Council* [2009] (17 April 2009, unreported, ET).
- Hand v The Police Authority for Northern Ireland* [2002] NIIT 1691/01 (2 August 2002, unreported, NIIT).
- Hartley v Foreign and Commonwealth Office Services* [2016] ICR D17 (EAT).
- Hussain v Sky In-Home Services Ltd* [2017] ET/2300908/16 (10 January 2017, unreported, ET).
- Hutchison 3G Ltd v Edwards* [2014] UKEAT/0467/13/DM (4 August 2017, unreported, EAT).
- Insitu Cleaning v Heads* [1995] IRLR 4 (EAT).
- J v DLA Piper LLP* [2010] ICR 1052 (EAT).
- Johansson v Fountain Street Community Development Association* [2005] NIIT 311_03 (4 July 2005, unreported, NIIT).

- Leighton v VR Music Limited and Others* [2020] 2301546/2018 (17 April 2020, unreported, ET).
London Underground v Edwards (No2) [1988] IRLR 364 (CA).
M O'Reilly v (1) BBC & (2) Bristol Magazines Ltd [2011] ET2200423/2010 (10 January 2011, unreported, ET).
McNicol v Balfour Beatty [2002] IRLR 711 (CA).
Paterson v The Commissioner of the Police of the Metropolis [2007] IRLR 763 (EAT).
Pepper v Hart [1992] 3 WLR 1032 (HL).
Primmer v Mayflower Kebabs Ltd [2007] (unreported, ET).
R (on the application of UNISON) (Appellant) v Lord Chancellor (Respondent) [2017] UKSC 51 (SC).
Riam Dean v Abercrombie and Fitch [2009] (August 2009, unreported, ET).
Rugamer v Sony Music Entertainment UK Limited [2001] IRLR 644 (EAT).
Smith v HM Prison Service [2004] ET/2406059/03 (10 August 2004, unreported, ET).
Smith v Rees [2013] EqLR 74 (ET).
Taylor v Ladbrokes Betting and Gaming Limited [2017] IRLR 312 (EAT).
The Chief Constable of Norfolk v Coffey [2018] IRLR 193 (EAT).
The Chief Constable of Norfolk v Coffey [2019] IRLR 805 (CA).
Vatcher v Kelly Services (UK) Ltd [1999] UKEAT 595/99/0510 (5 October 1999, unreported, EAT).
Walker v Sita Information Networking Computing Limited [2013] UKEAT/009/12 (8 February 2013, unreported, EAT).
West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive v Singh [1988] IRLR 186.
Whyte v First Capital East Limited [2005] UKEAT/0686/04/DM (22 March 2005, unreported EAT).

ECHR Case Law

- I.B. v Greece* App no 552/10 (ECtHR, 3 October 2013).
Kiyutin v Russia (2011) ECHR 439, para 64.

EU Case Law

- C-188/15 *Bouagnaoui v Micropole SA* [2016] 7 WLUK 275.
 Case C-395/15 *Daouidi v Bootes Plus SL* [2017] 2 CMLR 21.
 Case C-354/13 *FOA v Kommunernes Landsforening (Kaltoft)* [2015] 2 CMLR 19.
 C-335/11 and C-337/11 *HK Danmark, acting on behalf of Ring v Dansk almennyttigt Boligselskab and HK Danmark, acting on behalf of Lond Skouboe Werge v Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening, acting on behalf of Pro Display A/S (Ring and Skouboe Werge)* [2013] 3 CMLR 21.
 Case-C-270/16 *Ruiz Conejero v Ferroservicios Auxiliares and Ministerio Fiscal* [2018] 2 CMLR 27.

TABLE OF CASES xi

US Case Law

Gerdorn v Continental Airlines, Inc., 692 F.2d 602 (9th Cir. 1982).
Superior Min. Co. v Industrial Commission (1923) 309 Ill. 339, 141 N.E. 165.
Wilson v Southwest Airlines Co., 517 F. Supp. 292 (N.D. Tex. 1981).

TABLE OF LEGISLATION

British Primary Legislation

Deregulation Act 2015
s1

Disability Discrimination Act 1995
sched 1 s3 (repealed save for Northern Ireland)

Employment Tribunals Act 1996
s18A

Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013
s66

Equality Act 2010
s6
s13
s15
s19
s20
s26
s149
s212
sched 1
s3
s5
s5A
s6
s8
sched 9
sched 19

Human Rights Act
s2(1)

Online Safety Act 2023
s15
s16

TABLE OF LEGISLATION

xiii

Worker Protection (Amendment of Equality Act 2010) Act 2023
S1

British Secondary Legislation

Equality Act 2010 (Disability) Regulations 2010 SI 2010/2128
Reg 3
Reg 5
Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011 SI 2260/2011
Reg 2
Reg 3

International Legislation

Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 UN (10 December 1948) General Assembly Resolution 217A (III)).
UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (12 December 2006) A/RES/61/106
Preamble
Art 1
Art 3
Art 3 (7)
Art 3 (8)
Art 8
Art 27
Optional Protocol

France

Code du Travail
Art 1132-1
Art 1133-1
Art 1121-1
Law No 223-451 (9 June 2023)
Art 5

Norway

Marketing Control Act 2009 (as amended by Inst. 146L, 2020–2021)
s2

District of Columbia Code
 § 2-1401.01
 Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, No 453 of 1976, Michigan
 art 1 § 372202(1)
 Harford County, Maryland, Code
 chap 95 § 95-3
 chap 95 § 95-5
 Howard County, Maryland, Code
 title 12 subtitle 2 §12.200 (ii)
 title 12 subtitle 2 §12.201 (xv)
 Madison, Wisconsin, Code of Ordinances
 chap 39 §39.03 (1)
 chap 39 §39.03 (2)
 New York City Administrative Code
 title 8 chap 1 §8-107 (1)
 Prince George's County, Maryland, Code
 subtitle 1 div 12 Subdiv 1 §2-185
 subtitle 1 div 12 Subdiv 1 § 2-186 (21)
 Regulations to Implement the Equal Employment Provisions of the Americans with
 Disabilities Act
 29 CFR 1630.2(h)
 Santa Cruz Municipal Code
 chap 9.83 §9.83.010
 chap 9.83 §9.83.020 (12)
 chap 9.83 §9.83.030
 San Francisco, California, Administrative Code
 chap 12A §12A.1
 Urbana, Illinois, Municipal Code
 chap 12 art 3 div 1 § 12-37
 chap 12 art 3 div 1 §12-39

¹ References in this section are believed to be correct as of 5 February 2024.

ABBREVIATIONS

Act	Equality Act 2010
art	Article
CA	Court of Appeal
chap	Chapter
CRPD	UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
div	Division
EAT	Employment Appeal Tribunal
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EDI	Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
EHRC	Equality and Human Rights Commission
ET	Employment Tribunal
EU	European Union
HC	High Court
HL	House of Lords
HR	human resources
Ill	Illinois
NHS	National Health Service
s	Section
SC	Supreme Court
subdiv	Subdivision
UN	United Nations
US	United States