



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr A Issa

Respondent: Relief International Syria

Heard at: London South **On:** 22/9/2025
(Croydon via CVP)

Before: Employment Judge Wright

Representation:

Claimant: In person

Respondent: Ms D McIver – General Counsel of Relief International-UK

REQUEST FOR WRITTEN REASONS

Oral judgment having been given on the 22/9/2025 and further to the claimant's request for written reasons, these written reasons are provided.

WRITTEN REASONS

1. The claimant presented a claim on the 11/11/2024, following a period of early conciliation between the 6/11/2024 and 11/11/2024. The dates of his engagement were 9/12/2018 and 4/11/2024.
2. On his own account, the claimant is a Syrian national, he lived and worked in Syria and he was paid in US dollars.
3. The claimant claimed a redundancy payment he said he was due under Syrian law.
4. He worked for Relief International Syria. That is the correct respondent to his claim.
5. The connection to the UK or to England and Wales was that he had come to the UK to study on the 4/10/2024 (when he hoped to continue his engagement with the respondent by working remotely). Furthermore, the respondent has a linked UK based entity, registered as a Private Limited Company by guarantee without share capital use of 'Limited' exemption at Companies House. That entity is Relief International-UK, company number 4476247.
6. This hearing was listed to determine whether or not the Tribunal had jurisdiction to determine the claim on the 9/4/2024. The claimant and Ms McIver provided written submissions and had the opportunity to supplement those submissions orally at the hearing.
7. The question arises as to whether the Tribunal has jurisdiction to hear a claim from a claimant who habitually worked outside Great Britain or whose employer is domiciled or resides outside thereof. The Tribunal can only exercise jurisdiction over those who are defined as being within certain territorial boundaries.
8. The claimant did not work within the territorial boundary of Great Britain, he worked in Syria. He worked for a Syrian entity.
9. The claimant submitted that under Rule 10(2) of the ET Rules 2024 jurisdiction is established if one or more of the following applies:

A claim may be presented in England and Wales if—

(a) the respondent, or one of the respondents, resides or carries on business in England and Wales,

(b) one or more of the acts or omissions complained of took place in England and Wales,

(c) the claim relates to a contract under which the work is or has been performed partly in England and Wales, or

(d) the Tribunal has jurisdiction to determine the claim by virtue of a connection with Great Britain and the connection in question is at least partly a connection with England and Wales.

10. Taking each in turn. The respondent did not reside or carry on business in England and Wales. A separate and distinct entity Relief International-UK resides in the UK. That entity did not however employ or dismiss the claimant.
11. The claimant was in the UK when the respondent terminated his contract with it. That was the extent of the connection.
12. The contract was not performed in England and Wales. The reason the respondent gave for terminating the contract was that the claimant could not work remotely in the UK, he needed to be in the field in Syria.
13. The extent of the connection to England and Wales was that the claimant had come to the UK to study and there was an entity linked to the respondent which was based in England.
14. Self-evidently, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction over Syrian labour law and to payments which the claimant claims under those laws.
15. As such, the claimant's claim is rejected.

22 September 2025

**Approved by
Employment Judge Wright**

Case Number: 6018228/2024

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
3 October 2025

.....
.....
FOR THE SECRETARY OF EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS