



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr R Elliott

Respondent: Reed in Partnership Ltd

JUDGMENT

The claim is struck out.

REASONS

1. By an order dated 20 November 2024 and sent to the parties on 26 November 2024, the claimant was ordered to pay deposits totalling £800 in order to proceed with his complaints of disability discrimination, harassment, victimisation and public interest disclosure detriment by 13 December 2024 as a condition of being permitted to advance those claims.
2. Following an application by the claimant dated 5 December 2024, in which he indicated that he had a solicitor in place to provide an assessment of his claims and that he had been taken seriously ill, Employment Judge Keogh extended the time for the claimant to pay the deposits to 3 January 2025. It was further ordered that if the claimant wished to pay the deposits he must also by 3 January 2025 provide medical evidence about his current medical condition.
3. In an email dated 2 January 2025 the claimant indicated that his solicitors were away until 2 January 2025 and the claimant hoped he would receive the assessment of his claims the following day.
4. The claimant did not pay the deposits by 3 January 2025 and did not provide any formal medical evidence to the Tribunal.
5. On 3 January 2025 the respondent formally applied for the matter to be struck out.

6. In response on 3 January 2025 the claimant emailed the Tribunal seeking a further extension of time to at least 17 January 2025, being the date his solicitors were expected to provide the assessment. The claimant has not provided any evidence from his solicitors as to the ongoing delay, nor have they come on record.
7. There is an important public policy in the finality of litigation. The respondent is entitled to know the position regarding these claims and whether it needs to prepare for the forthcoming hearing on 10 February 2025. A further delay would substantially prejudice preparation for that hearing. The claimant has not provided a good reason why he has not arranged for legal advice to be provided in a timely manner, despite being granted a significant and exceptional extension of time to pay the ordered deposits. It is not in the interests of justice for a further extension of time to be granted.
8. All complaints pursued in this claim were subject to deposit orders which have not been paid by the specified (extended) time. In the circumstances the entire claim must be struck out under rule 40(4) of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024.
9. The hearing fixed for 10 February 2025 will not take place.

Employment Judge Keogh

20 January 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

30 January 2025

.....
.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE