



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

AND

Respondent

Mr TA Raneti

Housekeep Limited

Before: Regional Employment Judge Wade

JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 37

1. The judgment of the Tribunal is that the claim is struck out under the Tribunal rules Rule 37 (a) and (b) because it has no reasonable prospect of success and because the manner in which the proceedings have been conducted by the claimant has been scandalous and unreasonable.

REASONS

1. The claim was filed on 9 September 2019. It soon became embroiled in disputes about case management which meant it did not progress, and then further delays due to the pandemic although it has been listed for a final hearing in February 2021.

2. The respondent applied for the claim to be struck out. On 20 August the claimant wrote to the tribunal saying "I request (again for the nth time) that my claim is judged in my absence". The respondent also consented. I replied on 3 September and made the position clear:

"[the EJ] notes that the claimant has asked for the application to strike out be decided on paper. She is prepared for the tribunal to cancel the preliminary hearing and decide the point on paper, which if the respondent is successful, would result in the claims being brought to an end or, if not successful, a final hearing in February 2021."

I wrote to the parties on 14 October confirming that the application would indeed be decided on paper. I regret that due to pressure of work I have delayed in reaching a conclusion.

3. Having considered the pleadings and the extensive correspondence I have decided to strike out the claim for the reasons set out below.

4. **The claim has no reasonable prospect of success.**

4.1 The claimant was employed by the respondent for 12 days from 1 to 12 July 2019. The period of employment was too short to enable him to pursue his claim for “ordinary” unfair dismissal for which a period of two years’ service is required. The claimant does mention whistleblowing (which would not require two years’ service) but as far as I can tell this relates to the reason for bringing the claim rather than the reason for the dismissal.

4.2 The claimant also argued religion or belief discrimination describing “Principal Retaliation (unfair dismissal) and victimisation type discrimination claims on honesty vs dishonesty belief criteria, accompanied by a secondary Hostile work environment claim”. In his ten-page Particulars of Claim the claimant shows an understanding that his must define the relevant religion of belief. He says

“I am a big believer in a state of right and honest, in other words faithful to this value system, which is in sync with my Christian Orthodox religion....in short, my belief in law and regulation, or in short being civilized, I acted accordingly and defended my rights....”

I conclude that the claimant has little prospect of showing that this set of beliefs amounted to a religious or philosophical belief.

4.3 The respondent says he was dismissed “due to his capability, conduct because the respondent believed he posed a danger to the public and for other substantial reasons”. I have never, in many years as a judge, experienced language as persistently intemperate and threatening as the claimant’s and I conclude that it is highly likely that the respondent’s reasons for fairly immediately dismissing the claimant on a belief tht he “posed a danger to the public will be found to be the reason why he was dismissed. In other words, on a balance of probabilities, there is no reasonable prospect that the claimant’s allegations will succeed. The language was so threatening that the tribunal planned to list the hearing not at its premises at Victory House but at a nearby building, Field House, where a higher level of security protection is available for judges. A few examples:

- a. The claimant calls the respondents “a remorseless clique of sociopaths who....don’t have to be responsible for their evil”
- b. ACAS are “a shitty corrupt institution”.
- c. Judges Wade and Tayler are corrupt criminals being bribed by the respondent and the judiciary as a whole is a “psychosis of organised crime”, fraud and bribery. Strike out law is “invented by UK criminals illegally occupying the government, parliament and judiciary.”

5. **The claimant’s conduct in these proceedings has been unreasonable and indeed scandalous.** The below, from an email dated 20 August 2020 is but one example of language used repeatedly towards me (a woman but the claimant assumes I am a man) and EJ Tayler:

"In **conclusion** the hearing called by "judge" Wade is unjustified, his order void of right because "judge" Wade is a defendant in this dossier, and is inculpated for the committal of the felonies of **fraud, bribery and misconduct in public office**, for which he has never been acquitted, nor can be acquitted. The hearing is proven unjustified and a silly attempt at falsifying the reality of the dossier, because he adversarial procedures in regard to the supposed purpose of this hearing have already been consumed in writing through my response to the 21st March 2020 Housekeep **fraud** in writing, and I will simply direct "judge" Wade to go read it, proving in the process he has refused with malice aforethought to read the dossier, or has read it and ignored me which is just as bad, and proves "judge" Wade favoring the other defendant, Housekeep, because Housekeep bought "judge" Wade interest to commit **misconduct in public office** and partake its **frauds**, through **bribery**

As further demonstration of "judge" Wade misconduct in public office, I will request the cancelation of any hearings because they are unjustified as demonstrated throughout this argument, which I've done before and have the right for the trial to be judged in my absence, based on my written claim and evidence which cannot be possibly contradicted, which is why Housekeep and its bribed "judges" are scurrying in all directions attempting all sort of artifices to cover-up their intent and acts to deny me justice, which also can't possibly work at least for the cover-up, as I have been denied justice so far, for which the "judges" must pay also. "judge" Wade will ignore my request because he cannot possibly contradict it legally, proving partial in favor of the criminal Housekeep representation caught flagrantly and repeatedly committing **fraud.**"

In a 14-page email dated 22 March the claimant says "Pseudo legal artifices against me are pointless – I will sue the "judges" for every abuse and when my cup fills again, I will sue UK in ECHR, not to mention this whole judicial abuse." This language is not only offensive but it shows disregard for the legal process which the claimant chose to initiate.

6. Judges must of course be broad shouldered and seek to enable a final hearing to take place where possible but this behaviour has rendered this impossible. Despite a number of efforts by EJ Tayler, clarity as to the claimant's case was never achieved and the language was intimidating to the judges, staff and respondent representatives. I have considered whether language or health have been an impediment to the claimant, who was born in Romania, but his English is good, he has clearly researched the law and he has not mentioned any mental health condition which may affect the way he presents himself.

7. In all the circumstances, therefore I have decided to strike the claim out.

Case Number: 2203386/2019

Regional Employment Judge Wade

_26 January 2021__

Date

REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

27th Jan 2021..

.....
For the Tribunal Office