

EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Respondent: Mr I Vaez Agnes Wittman

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 21 April 2017 is refused.

REASONS

1. I have considered the claimant's application for reconsideration of the judgment dismissing the complaints of discrimination and victimisation. That application is contained in a number of emails from 21 April 2017 onwards.

2. Rule 72(1) of the 2013 Rules of Procedure empowers me to refuse the application if I consider that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked. The test is whether it is necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the judgment (rule 70). Preliminary consideration under rule 72(1) must be conducted in accordance with the overriding objective which appears in rule 2, namely to deal with cases fairly and justly. This includes dealing with cases in ways which are proportionate to the complexity and importance of the issues, and avoiding delay. Achieving finality in litigation is part of a fair and just adjudication.

3. My judgment was that it would not be just and equitable for time to be extended for his claim to proceed. Before I reached that conclusion the claimant gave a full explanation of why his claim was submitted beyond the relevant time limits and at the time that it was, including explaining his medical condition in some detail. His medical condition was explored in cross examination and by questions from the Tribunal. There is no reasonable prospect that the medical evidence now suggested by the claimant as supporting that explanation could result in a different conclusion.

4. Accordingly, having considered all the points made by the claimant I am satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked. The application for reconsideration is refused.

Employment Judge Howard

20 October 2017

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

23 October 2017

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE