



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr L Abdimohamed

Respondent: Avantao Technologies Ltd

Heard at: East London Hearing Centre (in private; [by telephone])

On: 10 November 2025

Before: Employment Judge J Jones

Representation

For the claimant: In person

For the respondent: No attendance and no appearance

JUDGMENT

- 1. The complaint of indirect race discrimination is well-founded and succeeds.***
- 2. The Claimant's remedy will be decided by a Tribunal at a hearing on Friday 16 January at 2pm.***
- 3. The hearing will be conducted by Cloud Video Platform and the Tribunal will send the parties joining instructions in due course.***

REASONS

1. The Claimant brought a complaint of race discrimination on 25 June 2025. The Claimant had notified ACAS of his claim on 4 April 2025. The ACAS Certificate was issued on 16 May 2025.
2. The Claimant complained that on or around 24 March 2025, the Claimant noticed that the Respondent, a company registered in the UK had placed a job advert for a DevOps Engineer on Glassdoor.

3. The Claimant's case is that he holds a First-Class Honours degree in Computer Science and is proficient in Python and was actively seeking employment and considered applying for this role.
4. However, he was prevented from applying for it because the job advert contained the following wording: *"Only candidates who are immigrants from India will be considered."*
5. This wording explicitly excluded the Claimant on grounds of race and nationality. It also excluded anyone who was not an immigrant from India. It did not specify how being an immigrant from India was a qualification for the role.
6. The Claimant has also stated that on 3 April 2025, the Respondent published a statement on social media claiming the advert was part of an internal training exercise mistakenly published by an employee and that no actual recruitment took place.
7. However, the Claimant confirmed to the Tribunal that the advert appeared on Glassdoor as a live job post, where it remained publicly visible and accessible to jobseekers including the Claimant. The advert was still visible on Glassdoor on the date this claim was issued, marked as closed but still accessible, thereby continuing to cause harm.
8. The Respondent has failed to provide a response to this claim. On 24 July 2025, the Respondent submitted a response which was not on the prescribed form. The Tribunal wrote to the Respondent on 3 October 2025 to reject that response and to advise the Respondent how they could submit a response in accordance with the Rules. The Respondent has failed to do so.
9. The Tribunal also informed the Respondent about the application of the time limits in this case and that it would need to apply for an extension for any response to be accepted. There has not been any further correspondence from the Respondent.
10. In the circumstances, under Rule 22 of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2024, having heard the Claimant's evidence today and noted that the relevant facts are not disputed by the Respondent, this Tribunal issues a judgment for the Claimant.
11. In preparation for the remedy hearing on 16 January 2026, the Claimant will provide a Schedule of Loss. This is a document in which he will set out the compensation he seeks from the Respondent. The Claimant must show how any sums are calculated. This document is to be sent to the Tribunal and the Respondent by email by **19 December 2025**.

12. The Respondent can attend the remedy hearing. The Tribunal judge will decide to what extent the Respondent can participate in that hearing. A remedy judgment will be made at that hearing.

Employment Judge J Jones

Date: 03 December 2025

Note

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 51) and any written reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions> shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s).

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 may be payable. 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/>