



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr G. Oliver

Respondent: Hunsdon Skip Hire Ltd

Heard at: Cambridge Employment Tribunal

On: 14 April 2026

Before: Employment Judge Hutchings (sitting alone)

Appearances

For the claimant: did not attend

For the respondent: Mr J. Keeble, director

JUDGMENT

The claim is dismissed pursuant to rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024.

REASONS

1. The claimant did not attend the hearing. Mindful of Rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal Rules of Procedure 2024 I asked the Tribunal clerk to telephone the claimant on the telephone phone number stated on his ET1. The call was answered by a friend of the claimant's who told the Tribunal that the claimant is on holiday.
2. Having complied with the requirement under rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 (stated in full below) to make practicable enquiries (by telephone), I started the hearing and considered any relevant information before me in order to determine whether to dismiss the claim or proceed with the hearing in the absence of that claimant.

"47. If a party fails to attend or to be represented at a hearing, the Tribunal may dismiss the claim or proceed with the hearing in the absence of that party. Before doing so, it must consider any information which is available to it, after any enquiries that may be practicable, about the reasons for the party's absence"

3. Mr Keeble told the Tribunal the he understood that the claimant had written to the Tribunal requesting this hearing be postponed. There was not a copy of the claimant's letter on the Tribunal's paper file. Therefore, I checked the Tribunal's electronic system. On 13 April 2026 Tribunal administration wrote to the claimant as follows:

"I refer to your letter of 19 March 2026.

Regional Employment Judge Foxwell has considered your request to postpone the hearing and has refused it.

The Judge's reasons for refusing the request are

"The application is not copied and there's no explanation."

The case remains listed for hearing on 14 April 2026.

4. I find that the claimant did not give a reason for his postponement request when he wrote to the Tribunal on 19 March 2026. He was aware of the date of this hearing on 25 November 2025 when Tribunal administration wrote to both parties to informing them that Regional Employment Judge ("REJ") Foxwell had postponed the 25 November 2025 hearing to 14 April 2026 due to "judiciary unavailable". The claimant did not at this time contact the Tribunal to request a postponement due to a holiday. Either the claimant has delayed in making his request or booked a holiday after he became aware of this date. Either way, he did not explain in his 19 March 2026 letter to the Tribunal why he was requesting a postponement nor copy the respondent to this request as required by Rule 90. The claimant was aware of this requirement; it is referred to (emphasized in bold text) at 20 of the case management order of Employment Judge K J Palmer dated 16 October 2025 and sent to parties on 4 November 2025.
5. I consider it fair in all the circumstances before me at this hearing, and taking account of REJ Foxwell's decision to refuse the postponement application, to dismiss this claim following the claimant's non attendance.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Hutchings

14 April 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

..18 May 2026.....

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE