



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr Yuri Zotov

Respondent: Grant Thornton LLP

Heard at: Watford Employment Tribunal

On: 29 June 2026

Before: Regional Employment Judge Foxwell

Representation:

Claimant: No appearance

Respondent: Mr A Mohamed (Solicitor)

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application for reconsideration of the judgment dismissing his claim for unfair dismissal dated 12 January 2026 (and sent to the parties on 5 February 2026) is dismissed.

REASONS

1. The Claimant began working for the Respondent, Grant Thornton LLP, as a Tax Manager on 14 October 2024. His employment ended on 24 October 2024 after approximately eight days' service. Prior to commencing proceedings, he engaged in Acas Early Conciliation between 3 December 2024 and 14 January 2025.
2. The Claimant presented a claim of unfair dismissal to the Employment Tribunal on 10 March 2025. In his Grounds of Claim he said as follows:

"My contract has been terminated after 8 days of employment without following any internal procedures after I raised the issue with the compliance with Anti Money Laundering.

Furthermore, no onboarding or training has been provided which is in breach of my contract.

No ACAS procedures have been followed i.e. I was not notified about my rights to bring a colleague or friend into the meeting.”

3. On 28 May 2025 the Tribunal acknowledged that the Claimant had presented claims of unfair dismissal and breach of contract and served these on the Respondent. On the same date the Tribunal issued a strike out warning to the Claimant for his complaint of unfair dismissal because he had less than two years' service. It is a requirement under section 108 of the Employment Rights Act 1996 that an employee has two years' service before they can bring a claim of “ordinary” unfair dismissal. The Claimant was given until 11 June 2026 to reply.
4. Subsequently the Claimant wrote to the Tribunal raising concerns about service of documents and the allocation of the claim to Watford Employment Tribunal. He applied for the proceedings to be transferred to London Central Employment Tribunal. I refused this request on 3 September 2025 for the reasons given then and pointed out that the Claimant was yet to respond to the strike out warning. I granted a seven day extension, ending on 10 September 2025, for him to do so.
5. The Claimant provided written representations on 12 September 2025 opposing strike out. The Claimant disputed my power to strike out an aspect of his claim without first hearing evidence but failed to advance any other reason why his unfair dismissal claim should proceed despite him not having two full years' service. I therefore directed that this aspect of his claim be struck out.
6. Unfortunately, due to administrative delay, this judgment was not referred to me for approval until 10 January 2026 and then was not promulgated until 5 February 2026. The judgment, which is in standard terms, explained the basis of my decision in respect of the claim of unfair dismissal and referred expressly to section 108 of the Employment Rights Act 1996. The judgment stated that the Claimant's other claim (that is breach of contract) was unaffected.
7. Immediately upon receipt of the judgment the Claimant replied to the Tribunal in the following terms (sic):

“Dear All,

This is to let you know that I will submit a complaint to the MoJ as a fraud case.

1. *The court have not requested a witness statement from me so had no opportunity to asses my application fully.*
2. *What has the form has no space to provide enough information for a judge to make a conclusion.*
3. *Breach of contract doesn't require the two year service.*

4. *Four I received two weeks ago a letter confirming that part of the claim for section 108 not the same by the breach of contract is going ahead to hearing.*
5. *I had no hearing or no witness statement submitted in order for a judge to make a decision.*
6. *Whoever has written the correspondence is not a legally trained person because they would have known the above points.*

Based on the above, you have 14 days to review your response.

Otherwise will submit an application to a Supreme Court including a complaint to MoJ for a breach of human rights on the basis denying access to a proper legal process and potential complaint to police about the fraud.”

8. I treated this response as a request for reconsideration under rule 69 of the Tribunal Procedure Rules, saying as follows in a letter to the parties dated 10 February 2026:

The Employment Judge’s provisional view is that the application to reconsider the judgment should be granted because the original grounds of claim, although sparse may contain a claim of automatic unfair dismissal under section 103A of the Employment Rights Act 1996 for which no minimum qualifying period of employment is required.

I asked for the parties to provide their views on this by 24 February 2026 and to state whether a hearing was required.

9. Both parties responded on 24 February 2026. The Respondent refuted that the claim contained a complaint of automatic unfair dismissal. It asked for the matter to be dealt with on the papers and for reconsideration to be refused. The Claimant did not address the question of automatic unfair dismissal in his response, stating rather that nothing could happen with his claim until an order for witness evidence had been made by the Tribunal and threatening an appeal if this was refused. He said nothing about whether the matter should be dealt with on the papers or at a hearing.
10. I considered the parties’ representations and decided that a hearing was necessary in order to comply with rule 70(4). A notice of hearing was sent to the parties on 22 April 2026. The hearing was to be in person at the Watford Employment Tribunal today, 29 June 2026.
11. The Claimant emailed the Tribunal and the Respondent on 22 April 2026 confirming his preference for an in-person hearing. He continued to maintain that the tribunal had no standing to make decisions in respect of his claims until it had made orders for a witness statement. Subsequently, on 17 June 2026, I refused

the Respondent's application to convert this hearing to one by video or a hybrid hearing at which they could attend by video.

12. On Thursday, 25 June 2026, the Claimant emailed the Tribunal requesting postponement of today's hearing on the basis that it had not made a direction requiring the Respondent to "share evidence". He also requested that the hearing be in public (which it was) and asked for permission to record it (the hearing has been recorded by the Tribunal in accordance with its usual practice; parties can request a transcript but they can usually expect to have to pay for this).
13. The Claimant's email was referred to me on Friday 26 June and I directed that the Claimant could make his application for a postponement of the hearing at the hearing itself. This would have given him the opportunity to explain why case management orders for exchange of evidence were necessary before the Tribunal could decide whether it had jurisdiction in respect of his claim of unfair dismissal.
14. The Claimant prepared a witness statement for today's hearing dated 16 April 2026 which I have read. It touches on privileged "without prejudice" discussions between the parties which I have disregarded. As I understand the statement, the Claimant says that he was dismissed for refusing to sign off tax-returns without first seeing "a valid AML" (which I have taken to be a valid anti-money laundering check) and that he had refused to deal with a particular client until he had been given evidence that AML and KYC (know your client?) had been complied with. He also made more general points about the quality of induction and training. The statement did not refer to whistleblowing disclosures, rather it was couched in terms of refusals to act, nor did it engage with the question whether disclosures were the sole or principal reason for dismissal.
15. The Claimant did not attend today's hearing. He appears to have taken the view that the Tribunal cannot and should not take any action in respect of his claim until there has been an "exchange of evidence" but has not engaged with the jurisdictional question that lies at the heart of his claim for unfair dismissal despite being given several chances to explain why the two year service requirement does not apply to his case. Furthermore, he is not present to explain why case management orders for exchange of evidence are necessary before the Tribunal can address this question. I have borne in mind that the Tribunal process is an adversarial one and it is not for me to construct a viable unfair dismissal claim for the Claimant when he has not taken the opportunities presented to him to do so. I therefore decline to revoke the judgment of 12 January 2026 dismissing that complaint: it is not necessary in the interests of justice to do so as he has not established that his claim is one of automatic rather than ordinary unfair dismissal.

16. That leaves the complaint of breach of contract which was unaffected by the January 2026 judgment. Mr Mohamed drew my attention to the fact that the Claimant states in his claim form that he was given three months' notice (see box 6.3 of the ET1). I assume that he was paid this in lieu of notice given that his employment ended within a few days of it starting. This begs the question whether there is a viable claim for recovery of damages when damages for breach of a contract of employment are usually limited to notice pay. I have therefore asked for a separate notice to show cause to be issued in respect of this part of the claim as it is in neither parties' interest for it to proceed to another hearing if it is unlikely to succeed.

Approved by:

**Regional Employment Judge
Foxwell**

29 June 2026

Judgment sent to the parties on:

20 July 2026

For the Tribunal:

Notes

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision. If written reasons are provided they will be placed online.

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