



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant** Miss B Moulds

**Respondent:** Specsavers Optical Superstores Limited

**Heard at:** Nottingham (via CVP)

**On:** 25 June 2026

**Before:** Employment Judge Smith

## Appearances

**For the Claimant:** In person

**For the Respondent:** Mr S Tibbitts of Counsel

# WRITTEN SUMMARY REASONS

**Made pursuant to the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024**

1. The judgment of the Employment Tribunal dismissing certain of the Claimant's claims upon their withdrawal by her, together with summary reasons, was delivered orally at the preliminary hearing that took place on 25 June 2026 and the written judgment sent to the parties on 21 July 2026. By email dated 4 August 2026 the Claimant requested written reasons. As summary oral reasons were delivered, her right is to written summary reasons under **rule 60(4A)(b)(i) of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024**, and these written summary reasons have been issued pursuant to that request.
2. During the course of the preliminary hearing of 25 June 2026 a discussion had taken place regarding the Claimant's claims for a redundancy payment, notice pay, holiday pay and arrears of pay for the period 5 August to 11 December 2024. Following that discussion the Claimant decided to withdraw those claims and the consequences of withdrawal were explained to her; she confirmed her decision to withdraw them.
3. **Rule 51 of the Employment Tribunal Rules of Procedure 2024** states:

*Where a claim, or part of it, has been withdrawn under rule 50 (end of claim), the Tribunal must issue a judgment dismissing it (which means that the party advancing it may not commence a further claim against the party responding or replying to it raising the same, or substantially the same, complaint) unless—*

*(a) the party advancing the claim has expressed at the time of withdrawal a wish to reserve the right to bring such a further claim and the Tribunal is satisfied that there would be legitimate reason for doing so, or*

*(b) the Tribunal believes that to issue such a judgment would not be in the interests of justice.*

4. In withdrawing those specific claims the Claimant did not express a wish to reserve the right to bring such a further claim, nor did she advance any contention that it would not have been in the interests of justice to dismiss those claims as **rule 51** otherwise makes it mandatory for the Tribunal to do. It did not appear to the Tribunal that there was in fact a reason why it was not in the interests of justice to issue the mandatory judgment.
5. Accordingly, the claims were dismissed upon their withdrawal as **rule 51** required the Tribunal to do.

Employment Judge Smith

Date: 6 August 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE  
PARTIES ON

09/09/2026

AND ENTERED IN THE REGISTER

J. Woolley

FOR SECRETARY OF THE  
TRIBUNALS

**Summary reasons having been given orally at the hearing, written summary reasons will not be provided unless they were asked for at the hearing or are requested in writing within 14 days of the date of this judgment being sent to the parties.**

