



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr A Chaudhry

Respondents:

1. Marshall 247 Services Ltd (in liquidation)
2. Marshall 247 Security Ltd
3. F&A Management Ltd
4. Linkmi Ltd

JUDGMENT

The Claimant's application for the Judgment of 7 November 2022 to be reconsidered is refused.

REASONS

1. At a Hearing on 7 November 2022 at which the Claimant alone attended, the Tribunal reached a decision on the claim. The Judgment was sent to the parties on that date. The claims against all but the First Respondent were dismissed. Some of the claims against the First Respondent succeeded. The Claimant withdrew the remaining aspects of his claim against the First Respondent at the Hearing and these were dismissed on withdrawal.
2. On 10 November 2022 the Claimant applied for Written Reasons for the Judgment and these were issued to the parties on 13 December 2022. On 18 December 2022 the Claimant applied for the Judgment to be reconsidered. The Tribunal has considered that application under Rule 72 of its Rules of Procedure.
3. The basis of the Claimant's application is that the Tribunal's Judgment and Reasons are "generalised, narrow and insufficient" and "don't meet the requirements of insolvency service and simply leaving me on the respondent's own plan". He believes that the Tribunal "ignored in addressing and ordering and meeting the requirements of the insolvency service when the Employment Tribunal was aware the Respondent's voluntary liquidation". In summary, the Claimant's concern appears to be that the Tribunal's Judgment and Reasons do not give the information required by the

Insolvency Service before it can make payments to the Claimant from the National Insurance Fund.

4. The Claimant has attached to his application two letters sent to him by the Insolvency Service. The first letter, dated 3 December 2022, asks for details of two matters that were covered by the Judgment, namely the claim for unauthorised deductions and the basic award for unfair dismissal. These details appear in the Reasons sent to the parties on 13 December 2022. The letter also mentions holiday pay, but the Claimant withdrew his claim for holiday pay at the Hearing. The second letter, dated 15 December 2022, states that the Service cannot pay the Claimant redundancy pay, holiday pay and notice pay because it has been unable to certify the Claimant's employment details with the Respondent's Insolvency Practitioner. The Claimant did not include a claim for a redundancy payment in his Tribunal claim. He withdrew claims for holiday pay and notice pay at the Hearing.
5. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Judgment correctly records the findings it made at the Hearing. There is no reason to believe that it is necessary in the interests of justice to amend the Judgment. Further, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Reasons it has issued correctly record the reasons for those findings in a way that complies with Rule 62 of the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure.
6. As the Tribunal does not consider there is any reasonable prospect of its original Judgment being varied, the Claimant's application for reconsideration is refused.

Employment Judge Cox
Date: 9 January 2023