



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr J Bassey

Respondent: (1) The Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Excise (2) Ms K Finn (3) Mr J Ritchie (4) Ms G Cooper (5) Mr N Lodge (6) Mr M Rhodes (7) Mr P Atkinson (8) Ms A Khan (9) Ms K Roger (10) Mr S Billington (11) Mr A Winkworth

Heard at: Leeds **On:** 11 March 2019

Before: Employment Judge Keevash

Representation

Claimant: In person
Respondent: Mr P Smith, Counsel

JUDGMENT having been sent to the parties on 13 March 2019 and written reasons having been requested in accordance with Rule 62(3) of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013, the following reasons are provided:

REASONS

1 By an email dated 30 January 2019 the Claimant applied for his costs applications to be determined at this Preliminary Hearing.

2 The Employment Judge noted that by emails dated 3 and 6 June 2018 the Claimant had made applications for Preparation Time and Wasted Costs Orders respectively. Those applications were considered at the Preliminary Hearing on 1 October 2018. The Employment Judge Ordered that the applications be determined by the Tribunal after giving Judgment at the final Hearing (see Order 22 dated 2 October 2018).

3 At paragraph 6 of the Written Reasons dated 13 November 2018 the Employment Judge explained that in accordance with the overriding objective in Rule 2 of Schedule 1 to the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013 it was not appropriate to determine the applications until the Tribunal had given Judgment at the final Hearing. At that stage the Tribunal would be in the best position to assess the Respondents' conduct and Ms Bovill's evidence.

Case No: 1805068/2018 4 The Claimant did not appeal Order 22.

5 During this Preliminary Hearing in support of his application the Claimant referred to his reconsideration application and to his concern that the Tribunal would accept false testimony from the Respondents. Mr Smith objected to the application.

6 The Employment Judge decided that since 1 October 2018 there had been no material change so as to warrant any variation to the approach upon which he had decided at the previous Preliminary Hearing. He had rejected the reconsideration application. Accordingly, he decided to reject this application.

Employment Judge **Keevash**

Date 13 March 2019

