



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: S Yesufu

Respondent: 1- Peabody Housing Trust
2- Zurich Insurance PLC

JUDGMENT

The claim is struck out.

REASONS

1. By a letter dated **5 February 2025** the Tribunal wrote to the claimant in the following terms:

“In your claim form you have entered Peabody Housing Trust as your employer and your dates of employment as 7/9/1996 to 28/11/2014. Was Peabody Housing Trust your employer? If not, who was your employer? Are the dates of employment correct? If not, what are the correct dates of employment?” Please reply by 12th February”
2. In a response dated 5 March 2025 the respondent stated as follows:
 - 2.2. At the time of filing this defence, the Claimant is unknown to the First Respondent; the First Respondent has never employed the Claimant.
 - 2.3 The Claimant's ET1 suggests that the First Respondent is her landlord – it includes "also Islington Council, until they transferred their stock to Peabody". The Claimant may be a tenant of the First Respondent, however, the address details identified on the Claimant's ET1 form do not correlate with the First Respondent's records.
 - 2.4 Accordingly, the First Respondent submits for the following reasons that the First Respondent should be dismissed from these proceedings by the Employment Tribunal as the Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to consider any of the Claimant's claims against the First Respondent:
 - 2.4.1 the Claimant will not be able to show that she, at any time, held the status of an employee of the First Respondent. The Claimant's claims of unfair dismissal and a redundancy payment therefore cannot succeed and the Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to consider those claims;
 - 2.4.2 the Claimant will not be able to show that she, at any time, held the status of an employee or worker of the First Respondent, the

Claimant's claims of arrears of pay, other payments or whistleblowing (dismissal/detrimental treatment) therefore cannot succeed and the Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to consider those claims;

2.4.3 the Claimant will not be able to show that her discrimination complaints relate to a complaint within s120(1) of the Equality Act 2010, those claims therefore cannot succeed and the Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to consider those claims; and

2.4.4 the Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to consider claims of "POCA s330 ECCTA RIDDOR SLAPs DPA FOMI Frauds Concealment Serious gross misconduct"

3. The claimant has failed to respond to the tribunal's letter of the 5 February 2025.
4. The claim has no reasonable prospect of success and is struck out.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Gumbiti-Zimuto

1 July 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

22/07/2025

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE