



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr G Kazis

Respondent: Michels Ventures 4 Limited

Heard at: Watford Employment Tribunal

On: 13 October 2025

Before: Employment Judge Arullendran

REPRESENTATION:

Claimant: In person

Respondent: Mr Alex Reid (solicitor)

JUDGMENT having been sent to the parties on **23 October 2025** and written reasons having been requested in accordance with Rule 60(4) of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2024, the following reasons are provided:

REASONS

1. This was a public preliminary hearing to determine whether any of the claimant's claims should be struck out on the grounds they have no reasonable prospect of success and whether a deposit order should be made in respect of any claims which have little reasonable prospect of success.
2. I was provided with a joint bundle of documents consisting of 107 pages. The claimant submitted a further 24 pages of JPEG images of narrative he produced over the weekend and emailed to the respondent and the Tribunal the day before this hearing.
3. The case management orders from the private preliminary hearing which took place on 2 July 2025 in front of Employment Judge McNeill KC, at which the claimant was present, can be seen at pages 44 to 47 of the bundle.

The facts

4. The claimant was employed by the respondent as a kitchen porter from 11 October 2022 until 10 January 2024. After carrying out an investigation and holding a disciplinary hearing, the claimant was summarily dismissed for his conduct by the respondent. The claimant appealed against his dismissal and that appeal was dismissed on 14 February 2024. It is common ground that the reasons for the disciplinary investigation were that a female colleague of the claimant had made an allegation against him arising from a letter written by the claimant to her which was treated as a complaint of sexual harassment. It is also common ground that the claimant gave a copy of that correspondence to the respondent prior to the dismissal.
5. The claimant presented his first claim form to the Employment Tribunal on 20 March 2024, with the claim number 3303290/2024 for unfair dismissal, discrimination on the grounds of marriage or civil partnership, discrimination on the grounds of religion and he also indicated that he was bringing another type of claim because of a physical beating, although this potentially appears to be a criminal matter or a generalised complaint of bullying, as identified by Judge McNeill. The claimant submitted a duplicate claim with the claim number 3303655/2024 and that claim was also submitted on 20 March 2024. The second claim is identical to the first and the claimant indicated at the preliminary hearing on 2 July 2025 that the second claim had been submitted in error (paragraph 3 of the case management order, page 44 of the bundle). The claim of unfair dismissal with the case number 3303290/24 was dismissed by Employment Judge Anstis on 11 February 2025 as the claimant did not have 2 years continuous service to bring that claim (page 86).
6. The claimant stated at the preliminary hearing on 2 July 2025 that he was not suggesting he was badly treated by the respondent because of his status as a single person and that can be seen at paragraph 6 of the orders made by Employment Judge McNeill (page 45).
7. Yesterday (i.e. on Sunday) the claimant sent to the respondent and the Tribunal 24 pages, attached to 2 emails, in support of his opposition to the respondent's application to strike out the claims as having no reasonable prospect of success. The claimant refers in those documents to the Russian Adventist Church being responsible for many of the things which have happened to him dating back several years prior to his employment with the respondent. The claimant also refers to many unrelated matters which the Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to deal with and the vast majority of that information is irrelevant to the claims brought against this respondent in this Tribunal.
8. The claimant has been given several opportunities to clarify his claims both by requests made by the respondent and orders made by the Tribunal, such as the requests made in paragraphs 23 to 29 of the grounds of resistance (page

37 to 38) and the order made by the Tribunal dated 2 December 2024 (page 43 to 44). The claimant failed to clarify his claims as a result of those requests and orders, he also failed to clarify his claims at the previous preliminary hearing on 2 July 2025 and has failed to provide the bullet points of the alleged unfavourable treatment as set out at paragraph 11 of the previous case management orders. At the fourth attempt made at today's hearing to try and understand how the claimant says the dismissal by the respondent related to the claimant's religion, the claimant has failed again to make any connection between the respondent's decision to discipline and dismiss him for the letter he wrote to a colleague and his religion. The claimant's response to this Tribunal was that he has spent approximately 16 years bringing claims and being involved in litigation and suggested that the Russian Adventist Church is implicated in the actions of the respondent, the police, politicians and the Judiciary. Further, the claimant has failed to make any connection between the alleged beatings and his religion, as previously raised by Employment Judge McNeill at paragraph 5 of the previous case management orders (page 45).

9. The respondent stated in submissions today that the claimant did not make the respondent aware of his religion until the matter was discussed at the preliminary hearing on 2 July 2025 which meant that the respondent had no knowledge of it at the time of the dismissal on 10 January 2024. The claimant did not dispute this at today's hearing.
10. The claimant also referred today to a health and safety breach where a livewire was allegedly left exposed at the respondent's workplace and he says that the workers lives were placed at risk for a period of 2 years. That is not the claim which appears in the ET1 form (page 4 to 19). Employment Judge McNeill explained to the claimant at the previous hearing that he would need to make an application to amend in writing if he wished to raise new complaints which do not appear in his ET1 form. The claimant has not made any such application.
11. The claimant also refers to not receiving wages between the date of dismissal and the date of his appeal hearing and that is referred to at box 9.2 of the ET1 in relation to the question about the remedy sought by the claimant.
12. Both sides made oral submissions.
13. The respondent submits that there is no reasonable prospect of the discrimination claim relating to marital status succeeding, particularly given the claimant's concession at the previous case management hearing where he accepted he was not badly treated because of his single status. The respondent also submits that the discrimination claim on the grounds of religion or belief has no reasonable prospect of success given that the respondent was not aware of the claimant's religion at the time of his

employment with them. The respondent refers to the claimant's non-compliance with orders made by the Tribunal to clarify his claims and submits that his conduct is vexatious in sending 24 attachments by email to the respondent the day before the hearing which have no relevance to any of the claims but cover matters relating to the claimant's personal life, the church and the Soviet Union. The respondent further submits that, even taking the claimant's claims at their highest, there is no causal link between the acts complained of and the protected characteristics the claimant seeks to rely on. Several attempts have been made to assist the claimant in clarifying his claims but the claimant has failed to provide the information sought on each occasion. The respondent submits that it would not be in keeping with the overriding objective to allow the claimant to continue with his complaints which focus on the church, the police, politicians and Judges, rather than the respondent, as it would put the respondent to unnecessary expense.

14. The claimant submits that 50 million people died in the Second World War but the respondent has failed to include this evidence in the bundle of documents, that the evidence in the bundle is full of empty words and paragraphs and that no one is looking at the relevant evidence. The claimant submits that there were harmful working conditions at the respondent's workplace in the chemicals used by the respondent but nobody cares about it even though that was the situation for 2 years. The claimant submits that he was discriminated against because the respondent looked at his personal correspondence which affected his right to family and personal life and the police were able to open a case about robbery. The claimant submits that people's lives are in danger and there is a need to examine all of the evidence before making a decision about this case but the County Court and the Employment Tribunal do not care about such matters.

The Law

15. The Rules relating to strike out are contained in Rule 38 of the Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024. Rule 38 states the following:

- (1) *The Tribunal may, on its own initiative or on the application of a party, strike out all or part of a claim, response or reply on any of the following grounds—*
- (a) *that it is scandalous or vexatious or has no reasonable prospect of success;*
 - (b) *that the manner in which the proceedings have been conducted by or on behalf of the claimant or the respondent (as the case may be) has been scandalous, unreasonable or vexatious;*
 - (c) *for non-compliance with any of these Rules or with an order of the Tribunal;*
 - (d) *that it has not been actively pursued;*

- (e) *that the Tribunal considers that it is no longer possible to have a fair hearing in respect of the claim, response or reply (or the part to be struck out).*
- (2) *A claim, response or reply may not be struck out unless the party advancing it has been given a reasonable opportunity to make representations, either in writing or, if requested by the party, at a hearing.*

16. I have referred myself to the case of Mbuisa v Cygnet Healthcare Limited 0119/18 in which the Employment Appeal Tribunal noted that strike out is a Draconian step and should be taken only in exceptional cases where it is instantly demonstrable that the central facts in the claim are untrue or there is no real substance in the factual assertions be made.

17. I also refer to the case of Cox v Adecco Group UK & Ireland 2021 ICR 1307 in which the Employment Appeal Tribunal stated that the claimant's case must be taken at its highest and that litigants in person must seek to explain their claims clearly. The overriding objective also applies to litigants in person who should do all they can to help the Employment Tribunal clarify the claims.

Discussion and Conclusions

18. Applying the relevant law to the facts I find that the claimant's claim that he was discriminated against by the respondent at the time of his dismissal for reasons related to his single status i.e. not being married, has no reasonable prospect of success because neither the claim form nor any of the subsequent details the claimant provided at the preliminary hearing on 2 July 2025 or at today's hearing indicate that the claimant himself draws any connection between the dismissal and his status of being single. In particular, paragraph 6 of the Case Management summary dated 2 July 2025 from the last hearing sets out in terms that the claimant was not suggesting that he was badly treated by the respondent because of that status. Taking the claim at its highest, I find that the claimant is not saying that the respondent would have treated a comparator who was married and subject to the same disciplinary allegations as the claimant, more favourably than the claimant and, in those circumstances, this claim has no reasonable prospect of success and, therefore, it is struck out.

19. There is no freestanding right to claim under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 in the Employment Tribunal. The claimant submitted that the respondent accessed his personal correspondence prior to his dismissal and that this was a breach of his right to personal life. However, that is not a claim on the claim form and in any event that is not a matter the Employment Tribunal has jurisdiction to hear.

20. The claim that the claimant was dismissed for reasons related to breaches of health and safety does not have any reasonable prospect of success. The

reference made by the claimant on his claim form to this complaint refers to a request by the claimant to the Employment Tribunal to insist that the respondent install ventilation in the kitchen area (box 9.2, page 11). The Employment Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to tell a respondent to install ventilation in a building as that is a matter for the Health and Safety Executive. The claimant is not saying that he was dismissed for requesting such ventilation to be installed or that it was because he had raised issues about the lack of ventilation. Taking the claimant's claim at its highest, I find that this claim has no reasonable prospect of success and therefore it is struck out.

21. The claimant's claim that he was discriminated against on the grounds of his religion has no reasonable prospect of success because the respondent did not know which religion the claimant belonged to until after the dismissal had taken place and therefore it could not have been in the mind of the decision-maker at the time the decision was made to dismiss him. Taking the claimant's claim form at its highest, the claimant has not stated anywhere in that document or in the further information provided at the previous case management hearing or any of the documents that have been sent in by the claimant prior to today's hearing, that the decision-maker was materially influenced by the claimant's religion when the decision was made to dismiss him. In those circumstances I find that this claim has no reasonable prospect of success and it is struck out.
22. The claimant cannot make a freestanding complaint of bullying in the Employment Tribunal. The claimant has failed to make any connection between the allegations that he was beaten and his religion and I am also conscious that the claimant has not disputed today that he did not inform the respondent of his religion until after his dismissal. Therefore, I find that the complaint that the claimant was treated unfavourably because of his religion has no reasonable prospect of success and that complaint is struck out.
23. Whilst it has not been identified as a separate claim at the previous case management hearing on 2 July 2025, the claimant has indicated on his claim form at box 9.2 and box 15 that he was claiming for the salary which he said was payable between the date of dismissal and the appeal hearing and this appears to be, at first sight, a remedy issue if any of the discrimination claims had succeeded. The claimant made submissions today on the basis that he was claiming this payment from the respondent, which I took to mean he was saying he was making a claim under section 13 of the Employment Rights Act 1996. As there is no dispute claimant was dismissed on 10 January 2024 and was not working for the respondent after that date, taking the claimant's case at its highest, I find that there is no reasonable prospect of the claimant successfully arguing that there has been an unauthorised deduction from his wages and therefore the claim for wages is struck out.

24. The stay is lifted on the case with the number 330290/24 and all of those claims are struck out as having no reasonable prospect of success for the reasons given above as those claims are an exact duplicate for the above. For the avoidance of doubt, the claim of unfair dismissal with the case number 330290/2024 is struck out as having no reasonable prospect of success as it would be an abuse of process to allow it to continue, as indicated by Employment Judge McNeill at paragraph 3 (page 44) of the previous case management orders given that the claimant did not have 2 years continuous service and an exact duplicate of that claim has already been struck out for exactly the same reasons.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Arullendran

24 November 2025

Reasons sent to the parties on:

25 November 2025

For the Tribunal:

Notes

Judgments (apart from judgments under rule 51) 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.

If a Tribunal hearing has been recorded, you may request a transcript of the recording. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, you will have to pay for it. 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 at www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/