EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant		**Respondent**
Mr I Ali	**v**	**Royal Mail Group Ltd**

Heard at: Cambridge **On:** 7 March 2018

Before: Employment Judge G P Sigsworth

Appearances
For the Claimant: Mr P Berry, Trade Union Representative.
For the Respondent: Mr D Summers, Un-registered Counsel.

RESERVED JUDGMENT

1. The Judgment of the Tribunal is that the Claimant was not unfairly dismissed.

RESERVED REASONS

1. The Claimant brings a single claim to the Tribunal of unfair dismissal. Dismissal is admitted by the Respondent and the reason given for it relates to conduct, potentially a fair reason. Although the Claimant was summarily dismissed, there is no claim for wrongful dismissal or breach of contract, for notice pay or pay in lieu of notice.

2. The Tribunal heard oral evidence from the Claimant. Called for the Respondent were two witnesses. Mr Anthony McShane, night shift manager, who dismissed the Claimant; and Ms Clare Tebbutt, independent case work manager, who conducted the appeal against dismissal. There was an agreed bundle of documents of some 220 pages, to which the Tribunal was referred as was necessary and appropriate. At the end of the evidence, the parties' representatives made oral submissions. There was insufficient time for the Tribunal to reach a determination and deliver a judgment, so the decision on liability was reserved.

Findings of Fact

3. The Employment Tribunal made the following relevant findings of fact:

3.1 The Claimant was employed by the Respondent as an OPG at Peterborough Mail Centre on 28 July 2003 until his summary dismissal for alleged gross misconduct on 31 March 2017. The Respondent has agreed standards with the relevant trade unions for the conduct of its employees, and the Claimant was expected to meet these. All employees are subject to the conduct code. The Respondent also has a code of business standards which states that: "High standards of personal behaviour at work are expected of everyone." "We should all demonstrate honesty and integrity." To enable the Respondent to provide an efficient and reliable service, it is necessary for its employees to regularly attend for work. The Respondent has in place an attendance procedure agreed with the CWU, which agreement includes the establishment of minimum national standards of attendance which are designed to encourage a high standard of attendance so that a reliable staffing base can be maintained. The attendance policy states (inter alia) that: "Regular contact between the manager and the employee who is absent is vital and they should seek to agree an appropriate time and date for reviewing together all but very short absences."

3.2 In or about November 2016, the Claimant's wife booked a surprise holiday for the Claimant to Morocco, and the flights she booked were from 31 December 2016 to 6 January 2017. On 8 December 2016, when the Claimant discovered the booking, he asked the book room at work (which deals with annual leave requests) for a day's annual leave for 31 December 2016. The request was refused, because the Claimant had exhausted his annual leave allowance. He asked his line manager, Mr Murti Munir, for the leave, but was refused because it was New Year's Eve. Mr Munir told the Claimant to ask for unpaid special leave through the book room, but when the Claimant made that request it was also refused. This was because the Claimant had historically been granted excessive amounts of special leave (albeit often for religious observances) and also because New Year's Eve was a very busy time for the Royal Mail and operationally acceptable/manageable levels had already been exhausted. It was not viable for the Claimant to have time off on 31 December.

3.3 The Claimant then attended a meeting with Mr Alasdair Redmond, production control manager, to renew his request. As Mr Redmond later told the disciplinary investigation the reason for this was that the Claimant had exhausted his annual leave, and annual leave was full for that particular day. Mr Redmond told the Claimant that if he could provide cover, it would have to be from someone who was not working that day and who had an equivalent range of skills, and that was the only way Mr Redmond would allow him time off.

Mr Redmond then had no further communication or conversation with the Claimant on that subject. At the meeting was also present the weekend shift manager, Mr Phil Rozier. The Claimant worked weekends, Friday to Sunday. The Claimant told the subsequent disciplinary investigation that he asked Mr M Farid to cover for him, and Mr Farid agreed to this. However, Mr Farid only worked 8am to 1.30pm and could not cover the first two hours of the Claimant's shift which started at 6am. It is the Claimant's case, and was throughout the disciplinary process, that following this meeting Mr Rozier did in fact give him his special leave verbally, although no form was filled in and no paperwork produced. The Claimant said that that was not unusual, as forms were often filled in retrospectively. Special leave was sometimes allowed informally, according to the Claimant. It was the Claimant's case that the following day, after the meeting with Mr Redmond, Mr Rozier granted him the leave verbally and informally. However, that was denied by Mr Rozier in the disciplinary investigation. Mr Rozier told the investigation that he refused the leave and did not know that the Claimant was going on holiday. He had texted the Claimant that he would speak to him in person the next day (rather than discuss the matter by text), and told the Claimant to fill out a special leave form or get cover for that day. Mr Rozier told the investigation that he never received a special leave form and never heard from the Claimant again on the matter. It appeared that the Claimant approached a number of other managers about the special leave, for example Mr Paul Blacktop, but they were aware that the Claimant's special leave privileges had been removed because of the excessive amount of special leave that had been granted to him in the past. Those managers refused him special leave. The Claimant's case is that he told all the managers he approached the purpose of his special leave, in other words his holiday, because they always asked. Later, he put his holiday on Facebook, and people in the union and in the bookroom were his Facebook friends so would have read about it. The Claimant's case to the investigation was that leave had been granted to him informally by Mr Rozier in the past, and was again on this occasion. However, Mr Rozier denied that, and said that he had tightened up his procedures since the earlier dates on which he had granted the Claimant special leave.

3.4 On 30 December 2016, the Claimant reported in sick, and he remained absent from work on 31 December, and indeed did not return to work until 23 January 2017. On 27 January 2017 he attended a welcome back meeting with Mr Rozier. On the welcome back meeting sheet, signed by the Claimant, is the absence start date of 30 December and the absence end date of 23 January. Sickness is given as the reason for the absence. The special leave box is not ticked, and there is no reference to special leave on 31 December anywhere in the meeting notes. In the employee absence declaration form, again signed by the Claimant, the first

date of absence is given as 30 December, the last date as 23 January, and the reason for absence given is illness bug. Again, there is no reference in that form, signed by the Claimant, of special leave on 31 December. The Claimant obtained sick notes from his GP from 6 January 2017 onwards, the first being back dated from 12 January. Employees are entitled to self-certificate the first seven days of sickness absence, so that the period from 30 December was covered by the Claimant's self-certification.

3.5 On 30 January 2017, the Claimant was suspended from duty, pending further investigation into an alleged serious breach of trust – in other words, falsely claiming to be sick in order to go on holiday. There then followed a fact-finding meeting with Mr Karl Brace, at which the Claimant was represented, on 3 February 2017. The Claimant set out his version of events. The Claimant said that he had arranged for Mr Farid to cover his duty and that he was under the impression that Mr Rozier had granted him special leave. The Claimant says he therefore told Mr Farid that he had been granted special leave and would not need him to cover. The Claimant confirmed that he had put his request for special leave in writing. The Claimant said that his flight to Marrakesh was due to depart from Gatwick airport at 15:40 hours and his duty time was 06:00 to 14:00 hours. The Claimant said he planned to work through his break to get to the airport on time and that he did not really need the day off.

3.6 Mr Brace conducted further interviews and another fact finding meeting with the Claimant. Mr Brace interviewed Mr Rozier, and he said that as far as he was aware the special leave had not been granted to the Claimant, and the Claimant needed to follow the procedure and fill out a special leave form and get cover for his duties. Mr Farid told Mr Brace that the Claimant had told him on 24 December 2016 that he would not need to work for him as it was all sorted. Mr Munir and Mr Blacktop were also interviewed and spoke of refusing the request for leave from the Claimant. At a further fact finding interview, the Claimant told Mr Brace that on 30 December he woke up and took ill, and as he had been granted special leave on 31 December he went on holiday and the following Friday 6 January 2017 he again reported sick for duty. He confirmed that he had never completed the special leave request form for 31 December, either at the time or retrospectively.

3.7 Following the fact finding investigations, Mr Brace believed that the potential misconduct may require a penalty that was above his level of authority and the matter was passed to Mr McShane. Mr McShane reviewed the papers from the initial investigation and was satisfied that there was a case to answer. He wrote to the Claimant inviting him to attend a formal conduct meeting, and the allegation against the Claimant was:

> "Behaving in such a manner as to bring your integrity into question in that you attempted to gain time off for 31 December 2016 which was not authorised, you then went absent claiming illness between 30 December 2016 and 23 January 2017. During which period you were not contactable in line with the attendance procedure and also during which time you travelled abroad for a pre-booked holiday."

The letter enclosed all the relevant paperwork. The Claimant was notified that he could be accompanied by a work colleague or trade union representative. The Claimant was warned that if the allegation was upheld one outcome could be his dismissal without notice.

3.8 The formal conduct meeting took place on 9 March 2017 at Peterborough Mail Centre. The Claimant was represented by his trade union. Essentially, the Claimant put his case as he put it in the investigation and as he puts it at this hearing. Following that meeting, Mr McShane had further interviews with Mr Rozier and Mr Redmond, but the notes of these interviews were not sent to the Claimant. Mr McShane told the Tribunal and he was satisfied that any comments on them made by the Claimant would not have changed his decision. Further, the Claimant would have been provided with the further interview notes at the appeal stage.

3.9 On 28 March 2017, Mr McShane wrote to the Claimant inviting him to a meeting to give the disciplinary decision on 31 March 2017. At that meeting, the Claimant was told that he was being summarily dismissed with immediate effect, the allegation notified having been made out to Mr McShane's satisfaction. A letter confirming that was given to the Claimant. In his detailed decision report, also given to the Claimant, Mr McShane set out the reasons for his decision. Essentially, Mr McShane preferred the evidence from the other managers about the refusal of the special leave. He did not believe that, having been refused special leave by a senior manager (Mr Redmond, at the meeting at which Mr Rozier was present), Mr Rozier would then on the following day have given the Claimant 'the thumbs up' to allow him the time off. Mr McShane noted that it was in fact not Mr Rozier who had granted special leave to the Claimant on previous occasions in an informal way, but rather another manager as this was recorded on the Claimant's absence record. Mr McShane did not believe that the Claimant would have been able to finish work at even 1.30pm (by working through his break) and still have reached Gatwick to catch a flight at 3.40pm. There was no doubt in Mr McShane's mind that the Claimant needed the day off if he was going to get to his flight to go on holiday. The welcome back meeting notes were silent on the second reason for absence relied on by the Claimant, namely his special leave. The Claimant would have had an opportunity to fill in the special leave request form (retrospectively) at that stage, but he failed to do so. Mr McShane believed that the Claimant did not display honesty and integrity in his actions in obtaining the time off

on 31 December 2016. He considered the appropriate penalty to be dismissal. Mr McShane did consider the Claimant's conduct record which was clean and his length of service of nearly 15 years. However, the Claimant had previously on numerous occasions been granted special leave and annual leave at short notice, and was well aware of the procedure to follow. Having been refused special leave on 31 December, Mr McShane believed that the Claimant commenced sick leave on 30 December knowing full well that he had not been authorised time off the following day. He believed that the Claimant was dishonest in his actions. Mr McShane considered whether a lesser penalty could be awarded but felt that the actions shown by the Claimant were a serious breach of the conduct code, serious enough to warrant dismissal, even for a first offence.

3.10 The Claimant appealed the decision to dismiss him, by letter to Mr McShane on 31 March 2017. He set out his grounds of appeal and then emailed to the appeal manager, Ms Tebbutt, on 5 May 2017. Ms Tebbutt had had no previous dealings with the Claimant. There were no specific challenges to the procedural aspects of the appeal or the disciplinary hearing, either then, or at this Tribunal hearing. I assume, therefore, that the procedural aspects were all in order. At the appeal hearing on 4 May 2017, the Claimant was again represented by his trade union representative. The appeal took place by way of a re-hearing of the Claimant's case.

3.11 Ms Tebbutt identified the main points of the Claimant's appeal. First, that he had been granted special leave for his absence on 31 December 2016. Second, that he made no secret about going on holiday and had informed his managers and colleagues. Third, managers did not record or complete relevant paperwork. Fourth, he believed that the text from Mr Rozier indicated that he had granted special leave. Fifth, the holiday was booked outside his own contracted time. Following her initial interview with the Claimant, Ms Tebbutt interviewed Mr Rozier and Mr Redmond, and then sent further evidence from them to the Claimant. She then considered her decision. For the first two main points of appeal referred to above, Ms Tebbutt found there was no dispute that the Claimant had requested special leave on at least four occasions from four different managers, and that all managers were consistent in their response to decline the request, because of operational needs and the Claimant's own excessive use of special leave in the past. Mr Redmond said that although he did not know what the Claimant wanted the leave day off for, he said it would not have mattered because he would have been refused whatever reason the Claimant had given. Mr Rozier also said that he did not know the reason for the Claimant's request.

3.12 The alleged lackadaisical recording and completing of paperwork for special leave by management. Mr Rozier had told Ms Tebbutt that once informed of the correct process for granting special leave, this was followed by him. The text message referred to by the Claimant, asking the Claimant to come and see Mr Rozier the following day. That, in Ms Tebbutt's view, did not mean that the special leave had been granted. Mr Rozier explained to Ms Tebbutt that he wanted to talk to the Claimant personally and not start a text conversation, particularly as this was now Friday evening and he was at home. He had told the Claimant the following day that he could not have the special leave. Ms Tebbutt did not believe that Mr Rozier's response by text message meant that he had authorised time off, time off that had just been refused to the Claimant by Mr Redmond. Even if the Claimant was asked to fill in the request form, that did not mean that he had been granted the leave, and anyway he failed to fill in that form. Ms Tebbutt was quite satisfied that the Claimant would not have been able to get to his flight at Gatwick on time if he had worked his shift. As Mr McShane had decided earlier, Ms Tebbutt thought it highly unlikely that Mr Rozier would have gone against the decision made by his senior manager and grant the Claimant the time off. If the time off had been granted by Mr Rozier, Ms Tebbutt would have expected the Claimant to have completed the necessary paperwork and clarify that the leave was authorised either with or without pay. The fact that the Claimant failed to do this led her to believe that he was well aware that he had not been granted either special or annual leave. Ms Tebbutt also found it hard to believe that, if the Claimant had been aware (as was his case) he had been granted special leave on 10 December 2016, he would have waited until 24 December to inform Mr Farid that his assistance was not required. Ms Tebbutt also noted the failure at the welcome back meeting of the Claimant to indicate his absence on 31 December was due to special leave and not sickness. She would have expected him to have made it clear in the meeting that his absence between 30 December 2016 and 23 January 2017 was not continuous sickness absence, given that he said he genuinely believed he had been granted special leave on 31 December. This further highlighted for Ms Tebbutt the fact that the Claimant had been dishonest in his assertion that he had been granted special leave on 31 December. Yet further, Ms Tebbutt believed that steps would have been taken to ensure that the Claimant's duty was assigned to someone else to cover if special leave had been granted. However, the signing in sheet for 31 December shows that the Claimant was scheduled to work that day. Taking all this into account, Ms Tebbutt was satisfied that no manager had authorised the Claimant's special leave as alleged by him. She believed, therefore, that the Claimant had tried to deceive his managers as to the reason for his absence on 31 December.

3.13 Ms Tebbutt did consider whether it was possible that the Claimant may have held a genuine perception that he had been granted special leave by Mr Rozier. However, she felt that Mr Rozier was clear when he told the Claimant on 10 December that his request had been refused and if he wanted to request again he should submit the relevant forms. The fact that the Claimant was asked to submit the forms did not mean that he had been granted special leave, rather that he could re-apply via the formal channels. Although the Claimant had said to Ms Tebbutt that he would not be stupid enough to report sick and then go on holiday as this would jeopardise his job, Ms Tebbutt noted that only when the management became aware the Claimant had been on holiday was it that an investigation into what had happened started. The Claimant had been assigned normal duty for both 30 and 31 December 2016. If he had been granted special leave the duty sheets would have reflected this. The Claimant failed to report in fit to resume work on 31 December, albeit that he had been granted a days' special leave, on his case. Even if Mr Farid had cancelled a half day's leave to cover for the Claimant, it would only have been from 8.00 to 13.30, leaving a gap between 6.00 and 8.00 when the Claimant's shift would not have been covered. The Claimant was not able to provide an explanation to Ms Tebbutt in that regard.

3.14 Taking all this into account, Ms Tebbutt believed that the Claimant did intend to deceive management in order for him to be able to go on holiday on 31 December 2016. The Claimant raised some procedural points about the attendance procedure assuming all absence to be genuine. However, the sick pay conditions state that the business must be satisfied that an employee's absence is necessary and due to genuine illness. Here, there was sufficient evidence to challenge the genuineness of the Claimant's absence. Further, the Claimant was dealt with not under the attendance policy but rather under the conduct policy. Ms Tebbutt took into account all points of mitigation, such as clean record and 14 plus years' service, and did not believe these factors outweighed the breach of conduct displayed by the Claimant. She considered whether a lesser penalty would be appropriate, but this was a case of dishonesty, and given the loss of trust and faith, and questions as to the Claimant's integrity, she believed that a lesser penalty would not suffice. She believed that the Claimant proved that he was happy to deceive his management team and was quite capable of manipulating a situation for his own benefit. His actions had broken the bond of trust with Royal Mail, and Ms Tebbutt believed that dismissal was a reasonable and appropriate sanction in the circumstances. Accordingly, Ms Tebbutt wrote to the Claimant on 26 May 2017 informing him of her decision, and sending him a copy of her deliberations and conclusions.

The Law

4. The law relating to unfair dismissal is well established.

By s.94(1) of the Employment Rights Act 1996, an employee has the right not to be unfairly dismissed by his employer.

By s.95(1)(a), for the purposes of the unfair dismissal provisions an employee is dismissed by his employer if the contract under which he is employed is terminated by the employer (whether with or without notice).

By s.98(1) and (2), it is for the employer to show the reason (or, if more than one, the principal reason) for the dismissal, and in the context of this case that it related to the conduct of the employee. Conduct is the reason relied upon by the Respondent. In Abernethy v Mott, Hay and Anderson [1974] IRLR 213, CA, it was held that the reason for a dismissal is a set of facts known to the employer or beliefs held by him that cause him to dismiss the employee.

By s.98(4), where the employer has shown the reason for dismissal, the determination of the question whether the dismissal is fair or unfair having regard to that reason:

(a) depends on whether in the circumstances (including the size and administrative resources of the employer's undertaking) the employer acted reasonably or unreasonably in treating it as a sufficient reason for dismissing the employee; and

(b) shall be determined in accordance with equity and the substantial merits of the case.

The law to be applied to the reasonable band of responses test is well known. The Tribunal's task is to assess whether the dismissal falls within the band of reasonable responses of an employer. If the dismissal falls within the band, the dismissal is fair. If the dismissal falls outside the band, it is unfair. I refer generally to the well-known case law in this area: namely, Iceland Frozen Foods Limited v Jones [1982] IRLR 439, EAT; and Foley v Post Office; HSBC Bank Plc v Madden [2000] IRLR 827, CA.

The band of reasonable responses test applies equally to the procedural aspects of the dismissal, such as the investigation, as it does to the substantive decision to dismiss – see Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd v Hitt [2003] IRLR 23, CA. In so far as the investigation is concerned, and the formation of the reasonable belief of the employer about the behaviour, conduct or actions of the employee concerned, then I have in mind, of course, the well-known case of British Homes Stores Ltd v Burchell [1978] ICR 303, EAT. Did the Respondent have a reasonable belief in the Claimant's conduct formed on reasonable grounds after such investigation as was reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances?

In Taylor v OCS Group Ltd [2006] ICR 1602, CA, it was held that if an early stage of a disciplinary process is defective and unfair in some way, then it does not matter whether or not an internal appeal is technically a re-hearing or a review, only whether the disciplinary process as a whole is fair. After identifying a defect the Tribunal would want to examine any subsequent proceeding with particular care. Their purpose in so doing would be to determine whether, due to the fairness or unfairness of the procedure adopted, the thoroughness or lack of it in the process and the open-mindedness (or not) of the decision maker, the overall process was fair, notwithstanding any deficiencies at an earlier stage.

In Britto-Babapulle v Ealing Hospital NHS Trust [2013] IRLR 854, EAT, it was held that a finding of gross misconduct does not necessarily make a dismissal fair. Even in cases of gross misconduct, regard must be had to possible mitigating circumstances, such as, in this case, the Claimant's length of unblemished service and that dismissal would lead to her deportation and destroy her opportunity of building a career in the United Kingdom.

In Strouthos v London Underground [2004] IRLR 636, CA, it was held that length of service and a clean disciplinary record are factors which can properly be considered in deciding whether the reaction of an employer to an employee's conduct is an appropriate one.

Conclusions

5. Having regard to my findings of relevant fact, applying the appropriate law, and taking into account the submissions of the parties, I have reached the following conclusions.

5.1 The reason for dismissal - conduct is made out here. It is not suggested by the Claimant that his dismissal was for anything else, although it is said by the Claimant that the Respondent could have followed the sickness absence procedure. However, the Respondent chose not to do so as they were not satisfied that the Claimant's absence from 30 December 2016 was due to genuine illness. The Respondent had conduct in mind as the reason for the Claimant's dismissal, and they followed their conduct policy rather than the attendance policy.

5.2 I conclude that the Burchell test has been satisfied. Mr McShane and Ms Tebbutt were entitled to accept the evidence of the managers, particularly Mr Rozier and Mr Redmond, as to the refusal of the special leave request of the Claimant, particularly as the documentary evidence supported their account. The Claimant did not make a special leave request formally in writing, although (on his own account) he was refused it verbally by several managers. He did not make a formal application retrospectively either, and indeed signed off on what he must have known was misleading and incorrect return to work documentation. The

documentation (the welcome back meeting notes and the employee absence declaration) glosses over and fails to mention the alleged one day's special leave on 31 December 2016 – making it look as if there was a continuous sickness absence from 30 December 2016 to 23 January 2017. That situation is supported by the Claimant's own self certification and the GP fit notes. Further, Mr Farid's involvement in respect of cover for the Claimant was not satisfactorily explained by the Claimant. First, Mr Farid could not cover the first two hours of the Claimant's shift. Second, why would the Claimant not tell Mr Farid until 24 December 2016 that he did not need him for cover if he knew on 10 December (on his case) that special leave had been agreed? Another document inconsistent with the Claimant's case is provided by the signing in sheet for 31 December 2016 – showing that the Claimant was booked in to work. He would not have been, if he had been granted special leave.

5.3 Taking all this evidence into account, I conclude that the Respondent had a reasonable belief in the misconduct alleged – which was 'behaving in such a manner as to bring your integrity into question'. That conduct was the taking time off that was not authorised on 31 December, and by claiming illness between 30 December 2016 and 23 January 2017 during which time the Claimant was not contactable in line with the attendance procedure, and during which time the Claimant went abroad for a pre-booked holiday. The Respondent's reasonable belief was supported by the comprehensive investigation undertaken by Mr Brace, and by the enquiries of Mr McShane and Ms Tebbutt. They clearly obtained sufficient evidence in support of the finding of misconduct. Although there was conflict between the Claimant's account and the Respondent's managers' accounts, there was no reason in the minds of Mr McShane and Ms Tebbutt why the managers would lie, and their oral testimony is supported by the documentary evidence.

5.4 There is no real challenge to the procedural aspects of the dismissal. The Respondent followed their disciplinary procedure. After the thorough investigation there were appropriate hearings, both disciplinary and appeal, and the Claimant given every opportunity to put his case. He was represented appropriately and warned of the possibility of dismissal if misconduct was found. Ms Tebbutt's appeal was far from a 'rubber stamp'. She treated it as a re-hearing and looked carefully at all grounds of appeal and the decisions of Mr McShane. She conducted her own investigations and shared these with the Claimant for his comments, which she took into account when reaching her decision.

5.5 Sanction. Mr McShane and Ms Tebbutt both took into account the Claimant's mitigation – his clean disciplinary record and long employment with the Respondent. However, their view was that the

Claimant had acted dishonestly with regard to his absence from work on 31 December 2016. This led them to believe that the Respondent had lost faith and trust in the Claimant and they had to question his integrity. For Mr McShane, the Claimant had also sought to discredit the managers by blaming them for incomplete paperwork, but he was well aware of the procedure to follow, having been granted special leave on many previous occasions. The Respondent's business standards code states that employees are expected to have honesty and integrity. The Respondent took the view that the Claimant had not shown this, and could not be trusted to do so in the future. Therefore, the Respondent's disciplinary managers came to the conclusion that dismissal was an appropriate sanction for the misconduct that they found. I conclude that they were entitled to take this view, and that the sanction of dismissal (in this case summary dismissal) was within the band of reasonable responses.

5.6 It follows, therefore, that the Claimant was not unfairly dismissed by the Respondent.

_____
Employment Judge G P Sigsworth

Date: 3 May 2018

Sent to the parties on: .....

.....
For the Tribunal Office