



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr P Szulc
Respondent: Charlemagne Capital Ltd

JUDGMENT

The Respondent's application for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 5 June 2019 is refused.

REASONS

1 I have been shown correspondence that appears to be a third application for reconsideration. This correspondence begins on 9 September 2019. The Claimant presented new evidence from Poland that Szymon had forged his signature. He alleges a 'fraudulent investigation' by the Respondent. The case against him 'must have been fabricated' because the Respondent was protecting Szymon's fraud. He wanted a 2 day hearing at which he and his Polish legal team would attempt to show these two-fold frauds, by his former friend and also the Respondent. He said that 'my main goal is to put into jail some solicitors, who I believe participated in ET fraud.'

2 In an email of 9 October 2019 the Claimant repeated his main point. In a further email of the same date to the President, and copied to various other parties, he wrote: 'Even if it is impossible for me to present this evidence to ET in my case, I believe that 2 days hearing will be very beneficial as I hope that ET judge will help us to inform relevant authorities in the UK, if we explain to ET judge that in my case we are dealing in perverting course of justice.'

3 In both emails I have cited are clear statements that suggest the Claimant is seeking to obtain other, or collateral, assistance from the tribunal, namely to expose a conspiracy that may (he believes) involve 'some solicitors' and also to air matters that can be put before other UK authorities.

4 I have also seen more recent correspondence. On 20 October the Claimant was concerned that I might not be able to deal with “the de facto complex criminal case ,, with evidence of serious frauds committed for tens of million of GBP produced by Polish prosecutor.”

5 I need to remind myself that the allegation of forgery was aired at the main hearing, as we acknowledged in paragraph 56 of the Reasons. The subsequent conclusions about the reason for the Claimant’s dismissal also need to be read for the full context to be appreciated.

6 The position, therefore, is that I have an application to reconsider that: (a) gives no explanation as to how the new evidence could change the decision; and (b) seems designed to achieve other and different advantages for the Claimant. I consider that this application has no reasonable prospect of success and must be refused. I would, additionally, comment, that it is impermissible to allow Mr Szulc two days of valuable tribunal time, presumably with a panel of three, to advance his current grievances.

Employment Judge Pearle

Date 06/11/2019

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

06/11/2019

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE