



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs T Laguda

Respondent: GTC Infrastructure Limited

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated **4 June 2026** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **4 June 2026** is refused.

REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked.
2. The claimant's pregnancy and maternity discrimination complaint was based on allegations that, following disclosure of a miscarriage in January 2025, the respondent failed to provide support, risk assessments, adjustments or welfare assistance, and that this occurred shortly before the withdrawal of a permanent role and the non-extension of her contract. A non-Black colleague who received bereavement support was relied upon as a comparator.
3. The complaint was struck out on 4 June 2026 on the basis that it had no reasonable prospect of success. The claimant now seeks reconsideration, arguing that the miscarriage-related treatment formed part of a wider and continuing pattern of discriminatory conduct, that there are disputed factual issues concerning support offered by the respondent, and that the matter should not have been summarily determined without evidence. Alternatively, she seeks confirmation that the miscarriage-related matters may be relied upon as background evidence in support of the surviving discrimination, harassment and victimisation claims.
4. In her response to the Tribunal's Rule 28 Notice and Order, the claimant clarified that, amongst other claims, she pursued a complaint of pregnancy and maternity discrimination under section 18 Equality Act 2010.
5. Under the heading "Relevant Background", the Claimant asserted that:
 1. *In August 2024, the IT Director offered her a permanent role in recognition of her performance and business need.*
 2. *In January 2025, that offer was withdrawn.*

3. *In May 2025, during discussions concerning whether she could remain within the business in any capacity, the IT Director stated that her continued presence would cause "strain or discomfort" within the team. The claimant stated that she had a recording of this conversation and would provide it if required. She further asserted that when the matter was subsequently raised with HR, the comment was not denied.*
6. The claimant contended that the reference to her presence causing "strain or discomfort" should be viewed in the context of racial dynamics within the team, particularly as no performance concerns had been raised and she had previously been offered a permanent role because of her performance.
7. The claimant also complained that she had not been informed that there was no availability for her to remain within the organisation.
8. In support of her discrimination claims, the claimant relied upon a number of alleged inconsistencies. None of those matters made any reference to pregnancy or maternity. The claimant also identified a comparator described as a returning Lead Business Analyst who was not Black.
9. In relation to pregnancy and maternity discrimination, the claimant relied upon pregnancy (including miscarriage) as the relevant protected characteristic and alleged:
 1. *In January 2025, she informed her manager that she had suffered a miscarriage.*
 2. *No support, risk assessment or workplace adjustment was offered, and the matter was not revisited.*
 3. *By contrast, a non-Black colleague was granted compassionate leave and support following bereavement.*
10. The claimant alleged that the unfavourable treatment comprised the failure to provide support following her pregnancy loss and the subsequent adverse employment outcomes, namely the withdrawal of the permanent role and the non-extension of her contract.
11. On the basis of the information provided by the claimant as at 23 February 2026, I concluded that the pregnancy and maternity discrimination complaint had no reasonable prospect of success and should be struck out. I refer to paragraph 3 of the Judgment sent to the parties on 4 June 2026.
12. By a document dated 4 June 2026, the Claimant applied for reconsideration of the Judgment striking out the pregnancy and maternity discrimination complaint. The substance of the Claimant's application is as follows:
 1. *The pregnancy and maternity complaint was considered too narrowly and in isolation from the wider pleaded allegations of discriminatory treatment, lack of support, harassment, victimisation and race discrimination.*
 2. *The miscarriage-related treatment formed part of an alleged continuing course of discriminatory conduct running from February*

2024 to May 2025, culminating in the non-extension of her contract and termination of employment.

- 3. Following disclosure of the miscarriage, the Respondent allegedly failed to provide pastoral support, risk assessments, adjustments, welfare checks or follow-up assistance.*
- 4. The pregnancy/maternity claim should not have been struck out without permitting the Claimant to adduce evidence, including grievance documents, appeal documents, counselling referral evidence and comparator evidence.*
- 5. The Respondent's grievance and appeal responses were said to contain inconsistent explanations regarding whether support had been offered.*
- 6. The Claimant argued that disputed facts and competing explanations made the matter unsuitable for strike out.*
- 7. The miscarriage-related treatment was said to be relevant both to the pregnancy and maternity complaint and to the alleged continuing act relied upon throughout the proceedings.*
- 8. The Claimant submitted that, as a litigant in person, her ET1 and subsequent clarifications should be interpreted with appropriate latitude.*
- 9. If further particulars were required, she sought permission to provide additional information concerning the miscarriage disclosure, the support not provided, the comparators relied upon and the connection with the alleged continuing course of conduct.*
- 10. Alternatively, if the pregnancy and maternity discrimination complaint were not reinstated, the Claimant requested confirmation that the miscarriage-related events could nevertheless be relied upon as background and contextual evidence in support of the remaining race discrimination, harassment and victimisation claims.*
- 11. The Claimant sought reconsideration of the Judgment and, if necessary, a hearing to determine the application.*

Conclusion on the application

- 13. While the claimant makes an assertion that there was discrimination following the mention of her miscarriage other than a suggested temporal proximity there is nothing in the apparent narrative that points to the pregnancy/maternity discrimination being the cause of any alleged less favourable treatment. The claimant in fact appears to present a positive case of alternative reasons for less favourable treatment.*
- 14. The claimant contends that the reference to her presence causing "strain or discomfort" must be viewed in the context of racial dynamics within the team, particularly as no objective performance concerns have been raised and she had previously been offered a permanent role in recognition of her performance. The claimant refers to a comparator "the returning lead BA (non-Black)"; a non-Black colleague was granted compassionate leave and support for bereavement.*
- 15. Section 18 (2) Equality Act 2010 provides that: "A person (A) discriminates against a woman if, in or after the protected period in relation to a pregnancy of hers, A treats her unfavourably — (a)because of the pregnancy, or (b)because of illness suffered by her in that protected period*

as a result of the pregnancy.” The claimant has provided a non-pregnancy related basis for the alleged less favourable treatment. The claim of pregnancy/maternity discrimination has no reasonable prospect of success.

16. To the extent that the claimant’s evidence relating to her pregnancy is relevant to the issues that remain before the tribunal the matters can be relied on in evidence during the final hearing of the remaining claims.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Gumbiti-Zimuto

Date: 13 July 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

4 August 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE