



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant** Mr G Taylor

**Respondent** EDF Energy Limited

**Heard at:** Exeter

**On:** 14 May 2019

**Before:**  
**Employment Judge Goraj**

**Representation**

**Claimant:** in person

**The Respondent:** Mr C Ludlow of Counsel

## JUDGMENT

**The JUDGMENT of the tribunal is that: -**

1. The Claimant's complaint of disability discrimination was not presented within the relevant statutory time limit as required by section 123 of the Equality Act 2010 and further it is not just and equitable to extend time to allow it to proceed. The Claimant's complaint is therefore dismissed.
2. The Claimant's complaint of unfair dismissal was not presented within the relevant statutory time limit as required by section 111 of the Employment Act 1996 and further it was reasonably practicable for it to have been presented within such time limit/ it was not, in any event, presented within a reasonable period thereafter. The Claimant's complaint is therefore dismissed.

---

Employment Judge Goraj  
Date: 14 May 2019

As reasons for the Judgment were announced orally at the Hearing written reasons shall not be provided unless they are requested by a party within 14 days of the sending of this Judgment to the parties.

**Online publication of judgments and reasons**

The Employment Tribunal (ET) is required to maintain a register of all judgments and written reasons. The register must be accessible to the public. It has recently been moved online. All judgments and reasons since February 2017 are now available at: <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions>

The ET has no power to refuse to place a judgment or reasons on the online register, or to remove a judgment or reasons from the register once they have been placed there. If you consider that these documents should be anonymised in anyway prior to publication, you will need to apply to the ET for an order to that effect under Rule 50 of the ET's Rules of Procedure. Such an application would need to be copied to all other parties for comment and it would be carefully scrutinised by a judge (where appropriate, with panel members) before deciding whether (and to what extent) anonymity should be granted to a party or a witness