



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Respondent

v

Mr G Simons

Warner Leisure Hotels

Heard at: Southampton

On: 16 and 17 November 2020

Before: Employment Judge Rayner

Appearances

For the Claimant: In Person

For the Respondent: Mr O Holloway, Counsel

Judgment

1. The hearing was conducted by the parties attending by video conference (CVP). It was held in public with the Judge sitting in open court in accordance with the Employment Tribunal Rules. It was conducted in that manner because the parties consented and it was in accordance with the overriding objective to do so.
2. The claimant is not an employee within the meaning of section 230 Employment Rights Act 2020.
3. The Employment tribunal therefore has no jurisdiction to hear the claimants claim of unfair dismissal.
4. The claimants claim of unfair dismissal is dismissed.

Employment Judge Rayner

Southampton

Dated 17 November 2020

Sent to the parties on
26th November 2020
By Mr J McCormick

For the Tribunal Office

Notes

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

Note: online publication of judgments and reasons

The ET is required to maintain a register of all judgments and written reasons. The register must be accessible to the public. It has recently been moved online. All judgments and reasons since February 2017 are now available at: <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions>.

The ET has no power to refuse to place a judgment or reasons on the online register, or to remove a judgment or reasons from the register once they have been placed there. If you consider that these documents should be anonymised in any way prior to publication, you will need to apply to the ET for an order to that effect under Rule 50 of the ET's Rules of Procedure. Such an application would need to be copied to all other parties for comment and it would be carefully scrutinised by a judge (where appropriate, with panel members) before deciding whether (and to what extent) anonymity should be granted to a party or a witness