



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Julian Wilson

Respondent

v G4S Care & Justice Services (UK) Limited

JUDGMENT ON APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGMENT

1. The Claimant's application for reconsideration of the Reserved Judgment sent to the Parties on 3 April 2024 is refused.

REASONS

1. By email dated 16 April 2024, the Claimant make an application for reconsideration of the Reserved Judgment sent to the Parties on 3 April 2024 ("**the Judgment**"). Under rule 70 of the ET Rules 2013, the Tribunal may reconsider a judgment where this is necessary in the interests of justice.
2. The Claimant first refers in his application to the Respondent's having sought an adjournment of the hearing to the second day, on the basis that its representative was ill on the first day. This was sufficient reason to grant an adjournment and in any event no injustice arose from this, in particular as the Tribunal used the first day as a reading day and the evidence and submissions were completed within the time allotted for the hearing.
3. The Claimant next asserts that the Tribunal found that there was no sex discrimination because a man, Matthew Hill, received the same treatment as the women involved. This was not the extent of the Tribunal's reasoning. It compared the Claimant's circumstances to those of his female comparator, Tamika Brown, in particular at paragraphs 55 to 57 of the Reasons, and found that she was treated differently for reasons wholly unrelated to sex.

4. The Claimant asserts that Karl Styles and Michelle Price of the Respondent both admitted to lying about him in the Tribunal, which he refers to as being defamation of character and being against the law. He said that he *“was dismissed on false allegations and the disciplinary process was disproportionate against [him], this is discrimination and against the law”*. These witnesses did not admit to lying, although the Tribunal found at paragraph 53 of its Reasons that they had made errors due to carelessness on their part. The Tribunal considered the relevant evidence and made its conclusion that discrimination did not occur based on that evidence.
5. The Claimant states that one of the reasons that he was dismissed was his ‘door management’ but he points out that there was no policy or guidance on this and training was not provided. The Tribunal made findings on this at paragraphs 44(a) and (b) of its Reasons but this did not mean that sex discrimination had occurred.
6. The Claimant reiterates his case that he was dismissed because he was a man. The Tribunal considered the evidence in support of this claim and, notwithstanding the Respondent’s failures in the disciplinary process, found that the Respondent had proved a non-discriminatory explanation.
7. For these reasons, reconsideration of the Judgment is not necessary in the interests of justice and there is no reasonable prospect of the Judgment being varied or revoked.

Employment Judge de Silva KC

Date:... 13 June 2024.....

Sent to the parties on:
2 July 2024

.....

For the Tribunal:

.....