



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr Michael Iheanacho Ibe

Respondent: John Lewis Plc

JUDGMENT

The claimant is ordered to pay the respondent's costs in the sum of £6,300.00.

REASONS

1. The respondent's cost application was considered on 13 April 2026. The claimant did not attend, was not represented and did not otherwise engage in respect of the cost hearing.
2. At the costs hearing it was concluded that the claimant's conduct of the proceedings has been vexatious, abusive, disruptive, or otherwise unreasonable and the criteria in rule 74(2)(a) of the Employment Tribunal Rules has been met.
3. The claimant was given until 4pm on 11 May 2026 to send to the Tribunal and the respondent any representations he wished to make in respect of the costs order sought by the respondent in the sum of £17,600 and/or as to his ability to pay any such sum.
4. The claimant has not engaged with the Tribunal and made no representations.
5. Taking into account all the matters set out in the reasons for the judgment sent to the parties on 6 June 2024, and also the reasons given in the costs application decision sent to the parties on 14 April 2026, I have concluded that the claimant should make a contribution towards the respondent's cost incurred in conducting these proceedings.
6. I am satisfied that the conduct of the proceedings resulted in more work being required from the respondent than would otherwise have been necessary.
7. Included in the £17,600 is a figure of £5,000 representing a management fee. It is not clear to me whether the claimant's conduct necessarily resulted in the additional costs being incurred by way of the respondent's management fee of £5000. I have therefore concluded that it is not appropriate or proportionate to make any award of costs relating to the management fee. It is not clear to me whether the management fee would

have been less had the claimant's conduct of the proceedings been immaculate.

8. In my view, the claimant's conduct resulted in the final hearing taking longer than it would have done had the claimant not acted unreasonably.
9. The first two days of the hearing were wasted dealing with the claimant's hopeless applications. This was time that was entirely wasted.
10. In my view, the claimant should therefore be required to pay half of the respondent's costs incurred in conducting the final hearing. Looking at the claimant's case as whole, while with hindsight it may be considered hopeless, if conducted appropriately it would have been a claim that a reasonable person might have pursued.
11. The claimant has not engaged in respect of the application for costs therefore I have not been able to take into account the claimant's means.
12. The claimant is ordered to pay the claimant the sum of £6,300.

Approved by:
Employment Judge Gumbiti-Zimuto

22 July 2026
JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

29 July 2026

.....
.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Notes

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 51) and any full 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/