



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs J Leino

Respondent: Philip O'Halloran
GCA (Surrey) Ltd t/a GCA Chartered Accountants

Heard via Cloud Video Platform (London South) On: 21 March 2024

Before: Employment Judge Davidson

Representation

Claimant: did not attend
Respondent: Mr P O'Halloran, Director and owner

JUDGMENT

The complaint of sex discrimination is struck out under Employment Tribunal Rule 37(1)(d) because it has not been actively pursued and, in the alternative, because they have no reasonable prospect of success.

The claims for notice pay and other payments are struck out under Employment Tribunal Rule 37(1)(d) because they have no reasonable prospect of success.

REASONS

- 1 Today's hearing had originally been listed for 15 January 2024 but was postponed due to the claimant's unforeseen medical emergency.
- 2 The purpose of the hearing was to consider whether the claimant's discrimination claims should be struck out as the particulars of claim disclose no cause of action.
- 3 The claimant has not provided any particulars of her discrimination in correspondence and did not attend today's hearing to give those particulars. 4 I therefore took the decision that the claims should be struck out.
- 5 Although not listed as an issue in the Notice of Hearing, I considered that the claimant's money claims were also not particularised. The respondent

Case No: 2302807/2023

confirmed that the claimant had been paid notice and any holiday pay due to her. She has not identified what money claims she is pursuing.

6 I therefore took the decision that these claims should also be struck out.

Employment Judge Davidson
Date 21 March 2024

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

22 March 2024

P Wing

FOR EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Notes

Written reasons will not be provided unless a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

Public access to employment tribunal decisions: Judgments and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.

CVP hearing

This has been a remote which has been consented to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was Cloud Video Platform (CVP). A face to face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and all issues could be determined in a remote hearing