



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Dr Srinivasa Reddy Krishna Thalagavara

**Respondents:** 1. General Medical Council  
2. Professor T Stephenson  
3. Mr N Nickson  
4. Mr V Donnelly  
5. Mr K Done  
6. Ms J Farrell  
7. Ms C Couchman  
8. Mr J Barnard  
9. Ms H Eldridge  
10. Dr N Seivewright

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 13 July 2017 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 29 June 2017 is refused.

## REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked.
2. The claimant seeks reconsideration of the judgment in respect of various allegations which were not struck out and where no deposit order was made. As the respondents' applications did not succeed in relation to these allegations it is not considered necessary to reconsider these issues which will go on to be determined at the final hearing.
3. The claimant seeks reconsideration in respect of allegations m and y which were struck out as having no reasonable prospect of success on the basis that the decision is wrong and amounts to an error of law. I remain satisfied that these matters are within the jurisdiction of the High Court and not the Employment Tribunal.
4. The claimant seeks reconsideration in respect of allegation o which was struck out as having no reasonable prospect of success on the basis that the decision is wrong and amounts to an error of law. The claimant refers to some guidance notes that were not before me although they must have been available at the time of the hearing. I remain of the view that reminding the claimant as to payment of the annual registration fee was not done because the claimant had done a protected act but because he had not paid it.

5. The claimant seeks reconsideration in respect of allegation v which was pleaded by him as “the claimant submitted a formal complaint against Dr Seivewright on 13.10.2015 for preparing a prejudiced psychiatric report dated 02.07.2014. Regrettably the respondents have failed to acknowledge the complaint to this date, let alone act on it” and summarised by the respondents as a failure on the part of the first respondent to acknowledge his complaint in respect of Dr Seivewright. I remain satisfied that the complaint was acknowledged even if the claimant is not satisfied with the way in which the first respondent dealt with it.

Employment Judge Sherratt

20 July 2017

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

21 July 2017

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE