



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Ms Rose Patrick  
**Respondent:** West Thames College  
**Heard at:** London South Employment Tribunal via CVP  
**On:** 08 September 2026  
**Case number:** 6019268/2025  
**Before:** Employment Judge M Da Costa sitting alone

## ATTENDANCE AND REPRESENTATION

**Claimant:** In person, unrepresented  
**Respondent:** Represented by Ms Rezaie, counsel

## JUDGMENT

The judgment of the Tribunal is as follows:

**Complaints of detriment on the ground of a protected disclosure pursuant to section 48(1A) of the Employment Rights Act 1986, unauthorised deductions from wages pursuant to section 23 of that Act, direct discrimination contrary to section 13 of the Equality Act 2010 and breaches of regulations 13 and 17 of the Agency Workers Regulations 2010**

### Refusal of amendment application in relation to whistleblowing:

1. The claimant's application to amend her claim by adding a head of claim for detriment on the ground of a protected disclosure pursuant to section 48(1A) of the Employment Rights Act 1986, is refused.

### Approval of amendment application in relation to direct discrimination:

2. The matters that were identified as amendments in relation to the claimant's existing discrimination claim were the following:

- (a) the requirement to train or assist Zara with induction because the claimant was older;
- (b) Imposing a heavier workload as compared with Zara because of the claimant's age;
- (c) Requiring the claimant to perform task 2.3 rather than leaving it to Zara;
- (d) Requiring the claimant to clear the inherited academic/marketing/planning backlog whilst Zara was protected from it;
- (e) Requiring the claimant to undertake Easter marking / backlog rather than sharing it with Zara;
- (f) Giving Zara more support in the hand-over and speaking to Zara in a gentler manner.

3. The above amendments are allowed.

Strike out of claims for unauthorised deductions from wages and breaches of the Agency Workers Regulations 2010:

4. The claimant's claims for:

- (a) unauthorised deductions from wages pursuant to section 23 of the Employment Rights Act 1996, and
  - (b) breaches of regulations 13 and 17 of the Agency Workers Regulations 2010,
- are struck out.

5. This is because pursuant to rule 38(1)(a) of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024, they have no reasonable prospect of success.

***M Da Costa***

**Employment Judge M Da Costa**  
**19<sup>th</sup> September 2026**

Judgment sent to the parties on:  
1<sup>st</sup> October 2026

For the Tribunal Office

**Note**

Reasons for the judgment were given orally at the hearing. Written reasons will not be provided unless a party asked for them at the hearing or a party makes a written request 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 51) and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at [www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions](http://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions) shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.