



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

BETWEEN

Claimant

and

Respondent

Ms E Cross

**Commissioner of Police
of the Metropolis**

BEFORE: Employment Judge Snelson (in chambers)

JUDGMENT

Pursuant to the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013, rules 37(1)((c) and (d)) and 10(2)(l) the Tribunal:

- (1) Determines that all claims are struck out; and
- (2) Directs that the hearing listed for 17-27 September be vacated.

REASONS

1. By her claim form presented on 30 March 2023 the Claimant, a police officer, brought numerous complaints of discrimination, all of which the Respondent disputed in his response form.
2. At a preliminary hearing for case management held on 11 December 2023 (the third such hearing in the case), Employment Judge Emery made an order which defined the issues in the case, gave numerous case management directions and listed a final hearing fall 17-27 September 2024. The order was confirmed in a document sent to the parties on 5 March 2024
3. The Claimant failed to engage with the Respondent's representatives to implement the order of Employment Judge Emery and ignored correspondence after 8 January 2024. In particular, the Respondent's representative drew attention in communications dated 14 May, 24 May, 28 May and 31 May 2024 to the requirement in the order for the Claimant to give disclosure of documents by 26 April 2024. She did not respond to any of these communications. She was and remains in breach of the order for disclosure.
4. In response to a letter from the Respondent's representative dated 4 June 2024, the Tribunal wrote to the Claimant on 25 June 2024 stating that I was considering

striking her case out for non-compliance with the order, and requiring her to respond within seven days. The letter stated in terms that if she did not respond within that period it was likely that the claim would be struck out. It further explained that the effect of striking out was to bring a claim to an end.

5. The Claimant has not responded to the Tribunal's letter of 25 June 2024 or shown any other sign of willingness to engage with the requirements of Judge Emery's order.
6. I am satisfied that it is proper, just and proportionate to strike the case out the under rule 37(1)(c) and (d) of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013. The Claimant is and remains in clear and flagrant breach of the order of Judge Emery. She has provided no explanation for her non-compliance. She has offered no signal to suggest a willingness to comply with the other requirements of the order. She has failed to pursue her claim at all since 8 January 2024. In my judgment, it would be unjust to the Respondent to require him to continue to defend the claims given the Claimant's conduct of them. It would not be fair to leave the feelings and reputations of the individuals whom she has accused of serious wrongdoing in continuing jeopardy when she has demonstrated her unwillingness to fight her case in accordance with the rules. It would also be wrong to expose the public purse to the substantial further cost of funding the defence of her claims any further.

EMPLOYMENT JUDGE SNELSON

Date: 8 July 2024

Judgment and Reasons entered in the Register and copies sent to the parties on 11 July 2024...

.....for the Office of the Tribunals