



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**BETWEEN**

**Mr C Duddy**

**Claimant**

AND

**Securitas Security Services (UK) Ltd**

**Respondent**

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application for a reconsideration of the Judgment sent to the parties on 3 August 2019 is refused.

### REASONS

1. I have considered the claimant's email dated 16 August 2019 in which he seeks a reconsideration of the dismissal of his claim of unfair constructive dismissal and also his email dated 1 July 2019 which he resent to the Tribunal on 17 August 2019.
2. Dealing first with the 1 July 2019 email, that was referred to me (without attachments) on the day it was received and I treated it as a request by the claimant for a postponement of the 2 day hearing due to start the following day. I refused that request as I could not see that any of the matters he raised related to the issues in the claim. The hearing therefore proceeded as listed. No further request was made by the claimant for a postponement. He had the opportunity to raise any of the matters referred to in the 1 July 2019 email during the hearing if he believed them to be relevant.
3. Turning to the claimant's email dated 16 August 2019, he refers to the discussions we had on both days of the hearing as to the relevance or otherwise of documents that he wished to add to the bundle. On both days he showed me the documents concerned, I considered them and gave him reasons why it was not appropriate to add them either because they were not relevant or the issues that he said they referred to could be raised with the relevant witnesses during cross examination. He appeared to accept. There is nothing in his application for a reconsideration that suggests the documents were in fact relevant and would have led to any different outcome for his claim.

4. The claimant also comments on the evidence of some of the respondent's witnesses. I considered the evidence of all witnesses assessing it in the usual way for relevance, cogency and credibility. I set out my findings in the written reasons. The claimant has referred to nothing in his application that suggests those findings need to be readdressed. Specifically, with regard to Ms Hall's evidence about when she received the claimant's emails on Sunday 6 May 2019, I considered but rejected the claimant's argument that she did receive them on that day but deliberately failed to reply. I dealt with that in my reasons. Nothing in the claimant's application for a reconsideration suggests that that was a flawed conclusion. In any event, the failure of Ms Hall to reply to these emails was not - on the terms of the claimant's own resignation email of 8 May 2019 - the reason for his resignation.
5. For all these reasons, I conclude that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked.

.....  
Employment Judge Andrews  
4 September 2019