



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr R Kolcz

**Respondent:** Dropp Logistics

**Heard at:** Bristol Employment Tribunal (by video) **On:** 13 February 2026

**Before:** Employment Judge Bradford

## Representation

**Claimant:** Not present or represented

**Respondent:** Mr W Cowley, Litigation Consultant

# JUDGMENT

1. The Claimant's claim is struck out in accordance with Rule 38(1)(c) of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024. The Claimant has failed to comply with the Tribunal's orders.

# REASONS

1. By claim form filed on 2 April 2025 the Claimant, a HGV driver, brought claims for arrears of pay and holiday pay. He stated he was owed £1,000.
2. The Respondent filed a response on 11 June 2025 which stated that there had been some mix-up with day and night rates, but that had been rectified the following week. The Respondent accepted, on reviewing its calculations, that the Claimant was owed the sum of £72.33.
3. The Tribunal wrote to the Claimant on 19 August 2025 asking whether payment of this sum would resolve his claim. If not, he was to say why and set out his calculations of the sum he said was owed, by 26 August 2025. A reminder was sent to the Claimant on 8 September when he did not reply.
4. Thereafter the Respondent made a strike out application as the Claimant had failed to comply with the Tribunal's direction.

5. On 29 October 2025 the Tribunal wrote to the Claimant saying he must respond to the Tribunal's question and the Respondent's application by 5 November. He did not do so. However on 1 December the Claimant contacted the Tribunal saying he had not received the earlier correspondence. He requested his claim was not struck out. He did not however provide any information or calculation in relation to the sum he says is owed.
6. The Claimant was again told to provide that calculation, and revised directions were sent on 5 January 2026. The Claimant did not provide any calculation and on 15 January the Respondent made a further strike out application. On 29 January the Tribunal ordered that if the Claimant did not comply with the Tribunal's case management orders by 3 February 2026, his claim would be struck out. The Claimant emailed the Tribunal on 30 January to say he had complied with the orders. However he did not provide the requested calculation.
7. The Claimant did not attend the hearing today. I was satisfied that he has received the Tribunal's correspondence, sent via the portal, in view of his emails of 1 December 2025 and 30 January 2026. The Claimant was sent a notice of hearing on 8 September 2025 and was sent the joining link the day before the hearing. Calls were made to the Claimant on the morning of the hearing but were unanswered and there was no voicemail.
8. Mr Cowley renewed the Respondent's strike out application in these circumstances. He submitted that Rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules permits the matter to be dealt with in the Claimant's absence. He submitted that the claim should be struck out due to the Claimant's non-compliance with directions. He referenced the history and in particular the Tribunal's correspondence of 29 January 2026, namely that the case would be struck out if the Claimant did not comply with the Tribunal's directions by 3 February.
9. In view of the history, I was satisfied that the Claimant was aware of the hearing and had decided not to attend. I was further satisfied that the Claimant has repeatedly failed to comply with any of the tribunal's case management orders, and noted that he has received a strike out warning. In these circumstances, balancing fairness to the Respondent against the interests of the Claimant, and the need for finality in litigation, I exercised my discretion to strike out the claim. In doing so I had regard to the overriding objective of dealing with cases fairly and justly, and avoiding delay.

Employment Judge Bradford  
Date: 13 February 2026

JUDGMENT & REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON  
7 March 2026

Jade Lobb  
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE