



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Respondent

Mr Harry Stedman

v

South Stars Entertainment Limited

JUDGMENT

on

APPLICATION for RECONSIDERATION of JUDGMENT

The Claimant's Application dated 1 April 2025 for a reconsideration of the Judgment sent to the parties on 30 March 2025 is refused.

REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked.
2. Dealing with the Claimant's numbered points of Application:-

1. *Continuing Act of discrimination:*

3. The Judgment sets out clearly the reasoning why not only were the claims out of time, but why they were not continuing acts. They were, as set out at paragraph 19, carried out by another company which was an entirely separate legal entity.
4. Notwithstanding that fact, the Tribunal stated at paragraph 22, even if the Tribunal were wrong the Tribunal nevertheless went on to decide whether the alleged disclosures amounted to disclosure.

2. *Post termination victimisation (s.27 EqA 2010):*

5. The Claimant goes on to talk about s.27 of the Equality Act 2010, that is incorrect in Law as this case was not about protected characteristics but was about whistle blowing. The claim under the Equality Act 2010 for the

protected characteristic of disability had been dismissed, at a Preliminary Hearing before Employment Judge Curtis on 21 October 2024.

6. That was equally the case at that time that the claim for unfair dismissal on the grounds of having made protected disclosures was also dismissed.
7. Furthermore, the complaints of detriment on the grounds of having made protected disclosures which relate to detriments prior to termination of the Claimant's employment in April 2022, were also dismissed at the Hearing on 21 October 2024.
8. Given the above, the only complaints before the Tribunal at this Hearing, was the complaint of detriment on the grounds of having made a protected disclosure which related to detriments after the termination of the Claimant's employment in April 2022.
9. It was the sole purpose of the Hearing in March 2025.

3. The Tribunal's uncritical acceptance of the employer's vague dismissal reasoning as proved:

10. On the evidence before the Tribunal, it was the unanimous view the Respondent's evidence was preferred.
11. It is the Claimant's view that we should have considered the legal basis of British Home Stores v Burchell is inherently misplaced. This was not about a claim of unfair dismissal under s.98 of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

4. Procedural failures and the failure to disclose judicial conflict:

12. Employment Judge Postle is uncertain as to what is being suggested here. At the outset of the Hearing the Judge's normal practice is to introduce himself and his Members and explain the Members have an equal say in the outcome of the proceedings.
13. Employment Judge Postle cannot recall whether he has heard previous cases involving the Claimant and if he had, it does not prevent a Judge from hearing subsequent cases.
14. There was certainly no Application at any stage by the Claimant for the Judge / Tribunal to recuse itself.

5. Requests for reasonable adjustments due to connection issues:

15. It was the Claimant's request for a remote Hearing. There were technical issues at the outset. The Tribunal with the assistance of the Tribunal Clerk overcame those, even though it meant a delayed start at 11:30am. The Claimant was therefore not prejudiced in any way.
16. For all the above reasons, the Claimant's Application for a Reconsideration of the Judgment is refused.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Postle

Date: 12 June 2025

Sent to the parties on: 17 June 2025

For the Tribunal Office.

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.

Recording and Transcription

Please note that if a Tribunal Hearing has been recorded you may request a transcript of the recording, for which a charge is likely to be payable in most but not all circumstances. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral Judgment or reasons given at the Hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a Judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings, and accompanying Guidance, which can be found here:

<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/>