



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Meenal Pathak

Respondent: Wipro Limited

Heard at: London Central, by CVP **On:** 3 June 2025

Before: Tribunal Judge Jack, acting as an Employment Judge

Representation

Claimant: Did not attend and was not represented

Respondent: Miss H King, solicitor

JUDGMENT

The judgment of the Tribunal is that:

1. The claim is dismissed under rule 47.

REASONS

1. The hearing today at 10 am was for case management. The claimant did not attend and was not represented.
2. Rule 47 enables the Tribunal to dismiss a claim if a party fails to attend. The Tribunal must first consider any information which is available to it, after any enquiries that may be practicable, about the reasons for the party's absence.
3. The claimant applied for a postponement on 14 May 2025, in a brief application not copied to the respondent.
4. The claimant applied again for a postponement on 30 May 2025. Her application stated that she would be travelling outside India. She said that she had requested to attend the hearing from India and was unsure whether she could attend from another country where she would be travelling for work. She also said "I am no longer in a position to continue this", and that "I am unable to attend the hearing and also do not want to take this any further than it already has impacting my health" (sic). However no medical evidence has been provided by the claimant.
5. On 30 May 2025 the respondent objected to the claimant's application to postpone the hearing.
6. Employment Judge Glennie refused the request to postpone the hearing for

reasons set out in a letter dated 2 June 2025. He was clear that wherever the claimant may be, she could join the hearing by video as she would not be giving evidence and so would not require permission from the relevant country. He also stated that the progress of the claim should not be delayed if that could be avoided. The letter was also clear that the case remained listed on 3 June 2025.

7. The letter was emailed to both parties at 10:05 am on 2 June 2025.
8. The Tribunal clerk today attempted to ring the claimant a few times and left a voicemail for her. The clerk also emailed the claimant.
9. The clerk checked at 10:38 am and confirmed that no response had been received from the claimant by phone or email.
10. The respondent applied for strike out of the claim. The respondent told me (and I accept) that the claimant had not responded to their emails regarding the bundle and case management agenda for today's hearing.
11. Taking account of the overriding objective of dealing with cases fairly and justly, which includes saving unnecessary expense to the respondent, I dismissed the claim in its entirety under rule 47.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Andrew Jack

3 June 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

11 June 2025

.....

.....

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE