Case No: 6013924/2024

EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs Ravinder Dhillon

Respondent: University of Greenwich

Heard at: Croydon

On: 27 April 2026

Before: Employment Judge Liz Ord

Representation:

Claimant: In person
Respondent: Ms W Miller (counsel)

JUDGMENT

1- By consent, the respondent's husband was disabled at the material time for the purposes of section 6 of the Equality Act 2010 by reason of cancer.

2- The claimant was not disabled at the material time for the purposes of section 6 of the Equality Act 2010 by reason of ADHD.

REASONS

The Law - Meaning of disability

1. The most relevant elements of the definition of disability for the purposes of this claim are set out below.

2. Section 6(1) of the **Equality Act 2010** (EqA) provides that a person (P) has a disability if:

   (a) P has a physical or mental impairment, and

   (b) the impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on P's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

Section 212 EqA - General interpretation:

(1) In this Act-

Substantial means more than minor or trivial.

Schedule 1 Part 1 of the EqA sets out supplementary provisions. It provides:

1. …
2. Long-term effects

(1) The effect of an impairment is long-term if-
(a) It has lasted for at least 12 months,
(b) It is likely to last for at least 12 months, or
(c) It is likely to last for the rest of the life of the person affected.

(2) If an impairment ceases to have a substantial adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities, it is to be treated as continuing to have that effect if that effect is likely to recur.

(3) …
(4) …

3. …
4. …
5. Effect of medical treatment:

(1) An impairment is to be treated as having a substantial adverse effect on the ability of the person concerned to carry out normal day-to-day activities if-

a) measures are being taken to treat or correct it, and
b) but for that, it would be likely to have that effect.

(2) "Measures" includes, in particular, medical treatment and the use of a prothesis or other aid.

(3)

3. The standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

Discussion and conclusion

4. The claimant relied on the impairment of ADHD, which seems to have been diagnosed on 22 September 2023. It was not disputed that the claimant had ADHD at the material time. The issue was whether the ADHD had a substantial and long-term effect on the claimant's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

5. The claimant gave oral evidence in broad terms that the ADHD impacted on her executive functions of concentration, organisation, workload, memory,

needing to go over things, time management, and rejection sensitivity, which were exhausting to manage. However, this vague evidence failed to give any indication of the nature, extent, frequency or duration of the effects and how they impacted on day to day activities.

6. There was little written evidence to support the claimant's general, unparticularised assertions. She produced a heavily redacted letter of 20 December 2023 from a psychiatrist, from which there seemed to be reference to a diagnosis of "Predominantly Inattentive Presentation Type" ADHD in September 2023. There was no indication of any medication having been prescribed or any other formal treatment, and the claimant did not refer to any. There was nothing else discernible of note in the letter.

7. The claimant's disability impact statement of 26 February 2026, despite being eight pages long, largely reflects how she felt about her husband's cancer diagnosis and the way she believed she had been treated by the respondent. There was a brief mention of the respondent's treatment exacerbating "[her] ADHD symptoms including rejection sensitivity, anxiety, increased difficulty managing tasks for fear of reprimands to mention a few." She said she went off sick due to stress.

8. Accordingly, in my judgment, the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate any impact on normal day to day activities from ADHD that is more than minor or trivial, and therefore there is no substantial, adverse effect. Consequently, the test for disability is not met.

Employment Judge Liz Ord

Date 27th April 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
28th April 2026

For the Tribunal Office

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

Judgments and full written 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.