



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Lukasz Rembowski
Respondent: Altrad Employment Services Limited
Heard at: Bristol by Cloud Video Platform
On: 17 July 2026
Before: Employment Judge David C. Gardner

Appearances:

For the Claimant: The Claimant did not attend and was not represented
For the Respondent: Richard Bannister (HR Lead)

JUDGMENT

Pursuant to Rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal Rules 2024, the claim is dismissed for non-attendance of the Claimant.

REASONS

1. On 19 July 2025, the Claimant issued a complaint alleging breach of contract by the Respondent employer. The crux of the complaint was that it failed to provide him with private healthcare to which he was entitled to as part of his employment contract.
2. The Claimant has not attended the hearing before me today and I am satisfied that he had sufficient notice of the hearing and after enquiry I am satisfied that there appears to be no good reason for his non-attendance. It appears from the chronology of enquiries as I set out below, that the

Claimant has, since February 2026, disengaged with this case.

3. The following are the relevant dates of enquiry with the Claimant which are taken from Tribunal records or as confirmed to me by Mr Bannister.
4. On 12 January 2026, the Tribunal listed this final hearing to take place on 17 July 2026. The communication of the hearing date was via the HMCTS portal.
5. On 17 February 2026, the Claimant sent various documents to the Tribunal, and so he was clearly aware of the progress with the case and the listed hearing. This was the last communication received from the Claimant by either the Tribunal or the Respondent.
6. On 20 February 2026, Mr Bannister emailed the Claimant. There was no response.
7. On 9 March 2026, Mr Bannister emailed the Claimant. There was no response.
8. On 13 April 2026, the Tribunal emailed both parties to set further directions for preparing documentation for the hearing due to take place on 16 July 2026 and requiring the parties to confirm they were ready for the hearing by 3 July 2026. There was no response from the Claimant.
9. Later on 13 April 2026, Mr Bannister telephone the Claimant and left a message. There was no response.
10. On 19 May 2026, Mr Bannister emailed the Claimant. There was no response.
11. On 2 July 2026, Mr Bannister emailed the Claimant. There was no response.
12. On 6 July 2026, Mr Bannister emailed the Claimant. There was no response.
13. On 16 July 2026, the Tribunal emailed the parties with the CVP link to join the hearing the next day. There was no response from the Claimant.

14. I joined the hearing at 10:00 on 17 July 2026. The Claimant was not in attendance. At my request, as the Claimant had not attended, my clerk telephoned the Claimant (twice) and sent an email to him. There was no response.
15. I returned to the hearing at 10:30. The Claimant was still not in attendance.
16. As a result, I satisfied myself that he would have been aware of the hearing and there did not appear to be any good reason for non-attendance. I then decided that the most appropriate course was not to hear the matter in absence, but to dismiss the claim under r.47. That appeared to me the most appropriate course of action considering what appears to be complete disengagement with these proceedings and to make better use of Tribunal time (and Mr Bannister's time).

Approved by:

**Employment Judge David C. Gardner
17 July 2026**

**JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
6 August 2026**