



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Lars Winzer

Respondent: IW Group Services (UK) Limited

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated **9th June 2026** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **28th May 2026** is refused.

REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because :

1. The strike out warning issued on 12th January 2026 was not because the Claimant had not attended at that public preliminary hearing but because the identified claims either were held to have had no reasonable prospect of success, or because the Claimant had not complied with the Order of Employment Judge Jeram made on 4th August 2025.
2. The strike out judgment was issued because the Claimant did not respond to that warning by the due date, 2nd February 2026, and still had not done so by the time the judgment was signed on 28th April 2026.
3. The communications from the Claimant on 12th January 2026 regarding his non-attendance at that hearing cannot be construed as a response to the strike out warning because they do not address either of the potential grounds for strike out. Nor is it now a proper ground for reconsideration of the strike out judgment.
4. There is no reasonable prospect of the expressed opinion as to prospects of success recorded in the Appendix to Employment Judge Smith's Case Management Order of 12th January 2026 being challenged.

5. This application does not address the merits point at all, except in the misconceived argument that an alleged discriminatory dismissal is also automatically unfair under the Employment Rights Act 1996 (ERA), and so does not require 2 years' continuous service. Sections 108 (3) to (5) of the ERA disapplying the minimum 2 year qualifying period does not include any claim under the Equality Act 2010. The Claimant cannot therefore claim statutory unfair dismissal.
6. It is acknowledged and recorded in Employment Judge Smith's Order that the Claimant did potentially seek to assert that his dismissal was discriminatory either because of age, disability or sexual orientation but it was these Equality Act claims that were covered by Employment Judge Jeram's Order that he provide additional information, and with which he did not comply.
7. That additional information should have been provided by 28th August 2025, that is 14 days after the Order was sent out but in fact 20 days after the Claimant was instructed at the hearing as to what he had to do.
8. The application makes no reference as to why the Claimant failed to comply with this Order, and he did not make any attempt to do so until 10th June 2026 after the judgment was issued and by now some 10 months out of time.
9. The claims therefore still have no reasonable prospect of success or the Claimant has, without any attempted explanation, persistently failed to comply with directions. Under rules 38 (1) (a) and (c) of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2024 those are proper grounds for striking out the claim.

Employment Judge **Lancaster**

Date 12th June 2026