

## **EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS**

Claimant:

Mr J Bassey

Respondents:

(1) The Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
(2) Katie Finn
(3) John Ritchie
(4) Gemma Cooper
(5) Nigel Lodge
(6) Michael Rhodes
(7) Peter Atkinson
(8) Ayesha Khan
(9) Kirsty Roger
10) Steve Billington
(11) Andrew Winkworth
(12) Toni Bovill

And

Claimant: Mr J Bassey

**Respondents:** 

Mr P Smith, counsel Mr O Wilton, solicitor

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2020 is refused.

## REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because:

Once again, the Claimant has demonstrated that he appears to be totally incapable of understanding the nature of the Rule 38 (2) Hearing.

He, despite having lost the case in every respect, applied for a preparation time order against the successful Respondents: such an application was on the face of it entirely spurious.

He was ordered to provide information about the legal and factual basis upon which he made this application. He did not do so.

The provision of that necessary information was then made subject to an Unless Order. He again failed to comply.

The application for a preparation time order was therefore automatically dismissed. The hearing under rule 38 (2) is concerned only with whether or not that order should be set aside on the grounds that it is in the interests of justice to do so: that 11.6C Judgment – Reconsideration refused – claimant - rule 72 is, should the Claimant be given relief from the sanction of automatic dismissal of his most recent application for a preparation time order?

The reconsideration application of 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020, and indeed the subsequent email of 11<sup>th</sup> March 2020, are completely irrelevant to this specific issue.

The Claimant has still not sought to explain why he did not comply with the tribunal orders, nor why having still persistently refused so to comply it would be in the interests of justice to set aside that order.

Employment Judge Lancaster Date 19<sup>th</sup> March 2020