



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr D Gordon

**Respondent:** AJC Easy Cabin

## JUDGMENT

1. The complaint that the claimant was unfairly dismissed is struck out.
2. Since that was the only complaint presented, the entire claim is struck out

## REASONS

1. The claim form named three proposed respondents. The claims against the individuals named in boxes 2.5 and 2.7 were rejected. The Claimant has not sought reconsideration of that decision. On the contrary, his email of 10 November 2025 confirmed that the only claim pursued is against “AJC as a business”.
2. The early conciliation certificate number in box 2.4 is incomplete. However, entirely correctly, the claim against the entity named in Box 2.1 of the claim form was not rejected on that basis.
3. The only respondent to the claim has been identified in the claim form as “AJC Easy Cabin”. Where the claim to proceed, then further information about the employer’s identity might be required. However, it is clear from the claim form and attachments that the Claimant is alleging that he was employed by the Respondent and that he is alleging that he was unfairly dismissed.
4. The end date of employment stated in box 5 of the claim form is 8 May 2025. The resignation letter attached to the claim form states an end date of 7 May 2025. In box 7 of the claim form, the Claimant states that he started work in a new job on 6 May 2025. Where the claim to proceed, some clarification of the end date might be required. However, even if effective date of termination was 8 May, then the normal time limit would expire on 7 August 2025 (the ACAS conciliation period having been during employment, ending on 6 May 2025). The claim was presented on 11 August 2025. Therefore, unless it was not reasonably practicable for the claim form to have been presented

earlier, then the complaint of unfair dismissal seems to be out of time. Where the claim not to be struck out for the reasons stated below, the Claimant would be asked to comment on dates of employment and the reasons for not presenting the claim sooner. However, it is not proportionate to make those enquiries at this stage, because, in any event, I am striking out the claim for the reasons stated below.

5. The claim form implies that the claimant was employed by the respondent for less than two years.
6. Section 108 of the Employment Rights Act 1996 requires a claimant to have not less than two years service to make an unfair dismissal complaint, unless one of the specific exceptions apply.
7. By letter dated 3 November 2025, the Claimant was given until 10 November 2025 to offer any reasons that the claim should not be struck out on that basis. The Claimant's emails of 10 November at 9.19am and 9.47am are noted. The Claimant has not presented any argument that he was employed for at least two years or that one of the exceptions apply. He has not stated any other objection to the complaint being struck out.
8. The complaint of unfair dismissal is struck out because there is no reasonable prospect of the Claimant being able to demonstrate that he meets the requirements of section 108 ERA.
9. The claim form does include the word "harassment". I have considered the claim form and attachments as a whole. The only box ticked in section 8.1 is for unfair dismissal. That is a relevant piece of information, but, in itself, that would not necessarily prevent me from deciding that a complaint other than unfair dismissal had also been presented. However, taking the claim as a whole, my decision is that the Claimant's reference to "harassment" is not an attempt to bring a claim of "harassment" within the definition contained in section 26 the Equality Act 2010 ("EQA"). I note the references to high blood pressure and the need to attend medical appointments (for ECG). However, taken as a whole, it is not alleged that the unwanted conduct was related to a protected characteristic.
10. Thus my decision is that the only complaint included in the claim form was of unfair dismissal. Since that has been struck out, the entire claim is struck out.

**Employment Judge Quill**

Approved :Date: 7 January 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

9 February 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE