



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Ms M Husbands

Respondent: London Borough of Islington

Heard at: London Central (hybrid) **On:** 3, 4 5, 6, 7 June 2024

Before: Employment Judge B Smith (sitting with members)
Ms Kilgannon
Mr Pell

Representation

Claimant: In person
Respondent: Mr Harding (Counsel)

JUDGMENT

The unanimous judgment of the Tribunal is as follows:

Race discrimination

1. The complaint of direct race discrimination relating to the training of support workers was not presented within the applicable time limit. It is not just and equitable to extend the time limit. That claim is therefore dismissed.
2. The remaining complaints of direct race discrimination are not well-founded and are dismissed.

Age discrimination

3. The complaint of direct age discrimination was not presented within the applicable time limit. It is not just and equitable to extend the time limit. The claim is therefore dismissed.

Sex discrimination

4. The complaint of direct sex discrimination about allegations of shouting in December 2020 was not presented within the applicable time limit. It is not just and equitable to extend the time limit. That claim is therefore dismissed.

5. The remaining complaint of direct sex discrimination is not well-founded and is dismissed.
6. The complaint of harassment related to sex about allegations of shouting in December 2020 was not presented within the applicable time limit. It is not just and equitable to extend the time limit. That claim is therefore dismissed.
7. The remaining complaint of harassment related to sex is not well-founded and is dismissed.

Disability discrimination

8. The following complaints of direct disability discrimination were not presented within the applicable time limit. It is not just and equitable to extend the time limit. These claims are therefore dismissed:
 - (i) Allegations of shouting in December 2020;
 - (ii) Comments about pain not looking good to management in 2021;
 - (iii) Not interviewing the claimant for job applications dated 30 October 2020 and 12 May 2022; and
 - (iv) Not advocating about a parking ticket received in March 2022.
9. The remaining complaints of direct disability discrimination are not well-founded and are dismissed.
10. The following complaints of harassment related to disability were not presented within the applicable time limit. It is not just and equitable to extend the time limit. These claims are therefore dismissed:
 - (i) Allegations of shouting in December 2020;
 - (ii) Comments about pain not looking good to management in 2021;
 - (iii) Not interviewing the claimant for job applications dated 30 October 2020, and 12 May 2022;
 - (iv) Not advocating about a parking ticket received in March 2022; and
 - (v) Using a mystery shopper in June 2022.
11. The remaining complaints of harassment related to disability are not well-founded and are dismissed.

Protected disclosure detriment

12. The complaint of being subjected to a detriment for making protected disclosures is not well-founded and is dismissed.

Victimisation

13. The complaint of victimisation is not well-founded and is dismissed.

Employment Judge Barry Smith
6 August 2024

JUDGMENT & REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

13 August 2024

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Note

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

Judgments (apart from judgments under rule 52) and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.