



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant Mr P Green

Respondent Britvic Soft Drinks Limited

Heard at: Exeter (by CVP)

On: 2 December 2020

Before:
Employment Judge Goraj

Representation

The Claimant: in person

The Respondent: Ms K Barry, Counsel

JUDGMENT AT A PRELIMINARY HEARING

The JUDGMENT of the Tribunal is that: -

1. The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to entertain the claimant's unfair dismissal claim as it was not presented to the Tribunal within the statutory time limit pursuant to section 111 of the Employment Rights Act 1996 and it was reasonably practicable for it to have been presented within such time limit.
2. The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to entertain the claimant's complaint of disability discrimination as it was not presented to the Tribunal within the statutory time limit pursuant to section 123 of the Equality Act 2010 and it is not just and equitable to extend time to allow it to proceed.
3. The final hearing listed on **16,17 & 18 February 2020** is therefore vacated.

Employment Judge Goraj
Date: 2 December 2020
.....

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