Case No: 1304766/2021 and 1300010/2022



## **EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS**

Claimant: Mr T Nagra

Respondent: Supply Chain Coordination Limited (1)

**Unipart Group Limited (2)** 

## **JUDGMENT**

The claimant's application dated **12 December 2023** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **30 November 2024** is refused.

## **REASONS**

- 1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because none of the grounds raise any errors in the judgment.
- 2. The Tribunal did consider the documentary evidence before it. The procedure for disclosure of documentary evidence had already been addressed in previous orders and the Respondent had confirmed full compliance. The Claimant did not present any evidence before the Tribunal to justify a delay to the hearing to secure evidence. He did not show evidence was in existence and had not been disclosed by the Respondent. No such application was in fact made.
- 3. No particulars demonstrate the overriding objective was not applied throughout the hearing. The parties were given a full opportunity to, and did, participate in the hearing. The Claimant was given the opportunity to, and did, cross examine all the Respondent witnesses and make submissions.
- 4. The legal test regarding departure from the contractual terms is covered in the judgment and fully reasoned.
- 5. The Claimant had made a decision to refuse to provide a witness statement when mutual exchange of witness statements had been ordered. He then

Case No: 1304766/2021 and 1300010/2022

confirmed in correspondence his reason is because he would not give evidence at the hearing. On that basis the Respondent proceeded to final hearing. At the final hearing the Claimant was specifically asked by the Judge what his position was, and he again confirmed he would not give evidence and had no intention of giving evidence because he was confident the documentary evidence proved his case without more. The Judge took time to explain the procedure in the light of this stance. It was in the interests of justice to both parties to proceed. The Claimant was able to make any submissions he wished to make at the hearing and did make oral submissions as indicated in the final judgment.

6. None of the grounds identify an arguable error on the part of the Tribunal.

**Employment Judge Mensah** 

Date: 17 January 2024