



# THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr R Roe

**Respondent:** Grosvenor Casinos Limited Newcastle

**UPON considering the file** and on my own initiative the Judgment (“the Judgment”) issued under Rule 21 of the 2013 Rules dated 24 November 2017 and sent to the parties on 27 November 2017 is reconsidered pursuant to Rule 70 of the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013 (“the 2013 Rules”)

## **JUDGMENT ON RECONSIDERATION**

1 The Judgment is revoked. The Judgment was issued on the basis that the respondent had failed to submit a response to the claim within the time allowed namely by 23 November 2017. In fact the respondent did file a response to this claim on 23 November 2017 at 16:55. Due to an administrative error, the response was filed on an incorrect file and was not before me when I issued the Judgment. That administrative error has now been discovered and the file has been referred to me for reconsideration. In the circumstances it is clear that the Judgment should not have been issued and the interests of justice require that it be reconsidered. I do not need to seek the views of the parties in light of this administrative error.

2 The response from the respondent filed on 23 November 2017 is now accepted and is to be served forthwith on the claimant.

3 The Remedy Hearing set for 13 December 2017 is cancelled.

4 It is ordered that the Tribunal now relist the claim of unfair dismissal for hearing before an Employment Judge sitting alone at North Shields and issue to the parties a revised letter setting out the standard directions for the preparation of the claim for hearing. The estimated length of hearing is one day.

5 The parties are to deal with the following matters by **4pm on 8 December 2017**:

5.1 The respondent states in the response that the correct name of the company which employed the claimant was Grosvenor Casinos Limited. Does the claimant agree to the name of the respondent being amended accordingly?

5.2 At section 6.1 of the response the respondent I indicates that it does not defend the claim. That is clearly an error when read in conjunction with Attachment to the

Response Form. The respondent is to confirm that it wishes to amend section 6.1 to indicate it does wish to defend the claim.

5.3 Do the parties consider the matter can be dealt with in one day or should a second day be added to the hearing?

5.4 it is noted that there is reference in the pleadings to cctv evidence. If either party wishes the Tribunal to view that evidence, it is the responsibility of that party to bring to the hearing a device on which such evidence can be viewed easily by both parties and the Employment Judge simultaneously.

---

**EMPLOYMENT JUDGE A M BUCHANAN**

**JUDGMENT SIGNED BY EMPLOYMENT  
JUDGE ON 1 December 2017**