



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr R Ullah

Respondent: Fortnum and Mason PLC

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 22 July 2026 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 13 July 2026 is refused.

REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, for the following reasons:

1. Firstly, I apologise for the delay in this decision reaching the parties. The reconsideration application was referred to me on 12 August 2026, at which point I was on a period of Non-Working Days until my return on 4 September 2026. I have dealt with this matter as soon as was practicable on my return, given other judicial commitments. I do not underestimate the impact of delays on the parties, and am grateful for their patience in waiting for this decision.
2. The points made within the claimant's reconsideration application are set out as numbered Grounds: I will adopt that numbering.

Ground 1

3. In terms of considering the cumulative effect of the respondent's conduct, the Tribunal only upheld, on the facts, one allegation that occurred before the claimant's resignation and therefore only one matter that could have led to the claimant resigning – see paragraph 167. It was that matter (namely Issue 1.1.4/2.2.3) therefore that the Tribunal analysed as to whether it amounted to a fundamental breach. That analysis is set out at paragraphs 170, 171, 248 and 249.

Ground 2

4. The claimant asserts that the Tribunal did not give sufficient weight to certain matters. We have focused on the questions we needed to answer within the List of Issues, and have dealt with those as signposted in our Judgment.
5. The claimant may not agree with what we consider to be relevant, or indeed irrelevant, however it is not the case that we have dismissed anything as irrelevant anything that is relevant. I refer back to the paragraphs cited above regarding our decision on fundamental breach of contract and compassionate leave.

Ground 3

6. The disciplinary hearing and outcome came after the claimant's resignation and as such cannot have impacted his decision to resign. This is set out at paragraph 123.
7. Further, as we set out at paragraph 129, the question for us was not of fairness of the disciplinary decision (a final written warning), as this was not a case in which the respondent had dismissed the claimant and we needed to consider the disciplinary process through the lens of s98 Employment Rights Act 1996.

Ground 4

8. The claimant's grievance was raised on 28 November 2023, after his resignation on 6 November 2023. The grievance outcome therefore could not have been causative of his decision to resign.

Ground 5

9. The claimant is referred to our findings at paragraphs 135-139. This ground amounts to the claimant disagreeing with our findings on this matter.

Ground 6

10. Mr Blackbrough was not pleaded as a comparator and was not included in the List of Issues as a comparator. The fact that Mr Blackbrough was not a comparator was discussed at the outset of the hearing as it affected a disclosure request by the claimant – see paragraphs 10 to 12.
11. No application to include Mr Blackbrough as a comparator was made to us. He did not form part of our considerations when analysing comparators.

Ground 7

12. The Tribunal addressed the claimant's case that the respondent's treatment of him became worse when he started to support Ms Sheikh – see paragraph 20.
13. As was explained to the claimant repeatedly in the final hearing, the relevant causal link for his discrimination claims was whether any treatment had occurred because of his race/religion/belief, not because of his support of Ms Sheikh.

14. The relationship between Ms Sheikh and the claimant was relevant to our Judgment, hence why the findings are set out as they are in paragraph 20.

Ground 8

15. Our findings on the document regarding mobile phone coverage at St Pancras are set out at paragraph 27. We have set out therein how this affected our assessment of Ms Doherty's credibility.

Ground 9

16. This ground amounts to the claimant disagreeing with the Tribunal's assessment of the credibility of a witness. We have dealt with the points that the claimant raises under this paragraph within our Judgment. This is also a repeat (to some extent) of Ground 5.

Material evidence not addressed/why this matters at law/overall submission

17. These grounds repeat those at Grounds 1 and 5 and are therefore dealt with above under those headings.

Approved by

Employment Judge Shastri-Hurst

Date: 21 September 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

1 October 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE