



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr W Hazell

Respondent: Tata Technologies Europe Ltd

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated **1 July 2025** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **30 June 2025** is refused.

REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because

1. The claimant decided to withdraw his claim in full knowledge of all the circumstances, including that new evidence had come to light during the hearing.
2. The claimant had the benefit of legal advice before deciding to withdraw his claim, and an adjournment was granted to enable him to take that advice before he did so.
3. In addition, the claimant himself would have been aware of the new information in advance of the hearing (as it related to an email on which he was blind copied) and the claimant himself has indicated in his application for reconsideration that he deliberately concealed that information until it was revealed during the hearing. To the extent that this resulted in an initially incomplete and potentially misleading understanding of events, that was at least as much due to the claimant as the witness in question. The claimant could have continued with the hearing in order to put forward the accurate version of events (and to explain why he had withheld that highly relevant information from the Tribunal initially), however he chose not to do so.
4. The claimant's legal representative confirmed at the hearing that the claimant was happy for the claim to be dismissed on withdrawal. The claimant cannot simply change his mind the following day.
5. In relation to the claimant's other correspondence, including the email dated 7 July 2025 the information supplied does not change the fact that the claimant voluntarily withdrew his claim and agreed for it to be dismissed, having taken

legal advice, after it came to light that information that the claimant had provided during the disciplinary process and in his witness statement did not appear to be accurate (as he had been provided with information about a third party's dismissal by the respondent). In any case, Employment Judge Edmonds notes that the information provided relates to separate issues about how information regarding the claimant's Tribunal claim was treated and whistleblowing / redundancy issues, none of which are relevant to whether or not the claimant was fairly dismissed.

6. In summary, information came to light during the hearing which potentially damaged the claimant's case (because of his concealment of that information up to that point). In response to that, the claimant took legal advice and decided to withdraw his claim and to permit it to be dismissed by the Tribunal. The hearing at that point was vacated: had the claimant not withdrawn the claim would have been heard last week and it is anticipated that it would have concluded within the allocated trial window. The claimant appears to have now changed his mind and is seeking to re-open the claim, which would result in a new hearing having to be listed, and nothing in the submissions put forward by the claimant suggests that his decision to withdraw his claim was anything other than a rational decision taken following the benefit of advice. The Tribunal also notes that the claimant does not appear to understand the potential severity of the fact that he appears to have been intending to withhold relevant information from the Tribunal and respondent, which could potentially have amounted to contempt of court had he done so under oath. The claimant's reconsideration request is refused.

Date: **9 July 2025**

Approved by
Employment Judge Edmonds