



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Dr Dheeraj Manhas
Respondent: 1. Velocity (UK) Holdings Ltd
2. Sivagami Muthiah
3. Dr Ahmed Elshashai
4. Githin C Jose

RECORD OF A PUBLIC PRELIMINARY HEARING

Heard at: Watford Employment Tribunal (by CVP)
On: 16 December 2025
Before: Employment Judge Alliott

Representation

Claimant: Did not attend
Respondent: Mr Andrew Webster (counsel)

JUDGMENT

The judgment of the tribunal is that:

1. The first respondent has made unauthorised deductions from the claimant's wages and is ordered to pay the claimant the gross sum of £1,308.46 (subject to tax and National Insurance).
2. The claimant's claim of unfair dismissal against the first respondent is struck out as having no reasonable prospects of success.
3. The claimant's claims of disability discrimination against all the respondents are struck out as having no reasonable prospect of success.
4. The claimant's claims for notice pay and/or holiday pay are struck out for failure to comply with orders of the tribunal.

REASONS

The claimant's absence today

1. This public preliminary hearing was originally listed for 2 October 2025 on 20

August 2025. The purpose of the hearing was as follows:-

“At the hearing, an Employment Judge will (1) identify the issues in the case (2) deal with the respondent’s application for strike out or a deposit order (3) make case management orders if necessary.”

2. On 4 September 2025 the claimant applied to attend the hearing by video call.
3. On 1 October 2025 the claimant repeated his request that he be allowed to participate by video call.
4. Unfortunately, the preliminary hearing listed for 2 October could not take place and was postponed.
5. The PPH was relisted on 10 October 2025 for today starting at 10 am.
6. On 10 November 2025 the claimant repeated his request to be able to participate by video call.
7. On 21 November 2025 Employment Judge Dick directed that this hearing be a hybrid one allowing any party to attend by video.
8. Hence, the claimant has known about today’s hearing date from 10 October 2025 and the fact that it was to be held by video link, at his request, from 21 November 2025.
9. The listing team were unaware that this hearing had been converted to a hybrid one until this morning. The CVP link was only sent to the respondent at 09.35 hours today. Due to the fact that there was a direction that the claimant had to obtain permission from the Indian authorities in order to give evidence from India and due to the claimant not making contact with the tribunal, so the listing team did not send the CVP link to the claimant.
10. I began this hearing at 10.05 am. The claimant was not in attendance.
11. I adjourned in order to make enquiries. It was at this point that it emerged that the claimant had not been sent the CVP link which was sent at 10.20 hours. The clerk tried ringing the claimant but the message was that he could not call that number. The claimant was emailed with the link to say the hearing was taking place.
12. I waited until 11.00 hours to allow the claimant an opportunity to join the hearing.
13. Due to the particular facts of this case, I decided to proceed in the absence of the claimant. I will make plain at the end of this document that the claimant can apply to reconsider this judgment if appropriate.

The relevant history of this claim

14. The claimant presented his ET1 claim form on 1 January 2024. He ticked the unfair dismissal, disability discrimination, notice pay, holiday pay, arrears of pay and other payments boxes. In section 8.2 no details of the claim were provided save that the claimant stated:-

“Please see the attached PDF document, where I have disclosed the matter.”

15. In fact, no PDF document was attached to the claim form.
16. On 23 March 2024 the claimant was requested to provide the missing attachment by return. The claimant failed to do so but answered referencing needing to formulate a detailed report.
17. A reply was chased by the tribunal on 9 May 2024.
18. On 28 November 2024 the claimant was ordered to provide an impact statement and medical evidence by 24 December 2024.
19. The claimant failed to comply.
20. On 21 February 2025 Employment Judge Quill indicated that he was proposing to strike out the claim as the claimant had failed to comply with the case management order of 28 November 2024. The claimant was ordered to write to the tribunal and the respondent’s representative by 4 April 2025 stating:-
 - “ 1. His replies to the orders made on 28 November 2024.
 2. A copy of any PDF attachment that he claims was uploaded on 1 January 2024, together with any supporting evidence that it actually was uploaded.
 3. If there was no such attachment, then confirmation that there was no such attachment.
 4. Confirmation that he will attend a preliminary hearing if one is ordered.”
21. The claimant has not complied with orders 2 and 3.
22. On 4 April 2025 the claimant emailed the tribunal as follows:-

“Herewith I declare that I have no physical or mental disability.”
23. In the circumstances, the claimant’s claims of disability discrimination against all four respondents have no reasonable prospects of success and must be struck out.
24. On 9 July 2025 Employment Judge Young indicated that she was considering striking out the claim and the claimant was ordered to provide details of his claims no later than 23 July 2025. The claimant has failed to comply.

The facts

25. The claimant was employed by the respondent on 3 September 2022. He resigned giving three months’ notice. He worked part of the three months’ notice but was placed on gardening leave from 24 August 2023.
26. The effective date of termination of the claimant’s contract of employment was 31 October 2023. Accordingly, the claimant does not have two years qualifying service to present a claim for unfair dismissal. Consequently, the unfair dismissal claim has no reasonable prospect of success.

27. In its ET3 response, the first respondent accepts that the claimant is due the sum of £1,308.46 subject to tax and National Insurance deductions. Accordingly, there will be judgment for that sum.
28. As far as the other money claims for notice pay, holiday pay and “other”, the claimant has failed to provide details of the same despite the strike out warning. Accordingly, I strike out those claims for failure to comply with case management orders.

Amendment

29. I amended the first respondent’s name to Velocity (UK) Holdings Ltd.

Reconsideration

30. The claimant may apply to the tribunal for reconsideration of this judgment. If he wishes to do so, then he needs to present his application for reconsideration within 14 days of the date on which this judgment was sent to him.
31. Any such application for reconsideration must set out the following:-
 31. Why reconsideration of this judgment is necessary in the interests of justice.
 32. Why the claimant was not in attendance today along with any supporting medical or other evidence.
 33. Answers to orders 2 and 3 from the order of Employment Judge Quill made on 21 February 2025 as set out above.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Alliott

Date: 14 January 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

30 January 2026

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Notes

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 claimants and respondents.

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 here:

www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/