

# Hollie Patterson

Call: 2008  
patterson@12kbw.co.uk

## AREAS OF EXPERTISE

Employment & Discrimination

Hollie's principal areas of practice are employment and discrimination. She has been instructed in various high value, high profile and complex trials, and is in demand not only for her ability to obtain excellent outcomes, but also for her approachable and reassuring manner with clients.

Hollie is also an experienced CEDR accredited mediator. The focus of her mediation practice is employment and workplace disputes.

Hollie acts for both employers and employees. She has worked with a range of clients from national corporations and NHS trusts to small businesses and private individuals. She has specialist experience in claims involving public sector organisations and is well aware of the challenges, both legal and practical, such claims pose.

## Employment & Discrimination

---

Hollie has advised on board-level employment and engagement issues; workforce change; complex disputes in relation to discrimination and whistle-blowing; and managing doctors under the national NHS framework "Maintaining High Professional Standards".

Hollie has a wealth of experience in Employment Tribunal, High Court and County Court litigation at first instance and on appeal. Hollie has also frequently represented clients at disciplinary and appeal hearings before professional regulatory bodies.

## Qualifications

---

CEDR Mediation Skills Training (2017) – Mediation Accreditation

Bar Vocational Course, Manchester (2008) – Very Competent

LLB (Hons) Law, University of Manchester (2007) – 2:1

## Appointments & Memberships

---

Employment Lawyers' Association

The Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn

## Cases

---

**Mr A Leslie v Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust UKEAT/0204/19/JOJ** – This was an exceptional case in which strike-out under *rule 37(1)(a)* part-way through a hearing was deemed appropriate, as the Claimant had refused to continue to participate in proceedings. The burden of proof was on the Claimant so unless he gave evidence his claims



were doomed to failure. The EAT held the claim could legitimately be struck out in those circumstances.

**Dr Glaucia Pereira v Gft Financial Ltd [2023] EAT 124, [2024] ICR D1** – The Employment Appeal Tribunal (EAT) allowed the appellant's appeal against the decision of the Employment Tribunal (ET) who had refused the appellant's application for reconsideration of a refusal to permit amendments to a claim form to add dismissal for pregnancy and asserting a statutory right. It fell to be determined whether the ET had erred in law in its approach to the reconsideration application in failing to engage with issues which straddled both the reconsideration application and the application to amend. The EAT held, among other things, that: (i) the ET wrongly focused on whether the claims raised by amendment by the claimant were in time, since it should have first asked itself whether these were new claims at all or whether they were already part of the claim; (ii) the ET failed to take into account the need for a full hearing about the events and facts regarding the medical evidence submitted by the appellant at the previous preliminary hearing about her illness at the time of presenting the claim and the new medical evidence supplied by the appellant for the reconsideration hearing about her capabilities as a result of her illness; and (iii) the ET erred in reaching its own contrary conclusions on her capabilities without consideration of this medical evidence and as an impermissible exercise of discretion to exclude such relevant matters from the interests of justice consideration. Consequently, the EAT had remitted the judgement to a fresh ET to decide whether a reconsideration hearing was required and whether the original judgment should have been affirmed, varied, or revoked.