

RM



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr I Ndu  
**Respondent:** Coventry University London Campus  
**Before:** Employment Judge O'Brien

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application to be found in his correspondence dated 27 January and 4 February 2019 for reconsideration of the judgment on reconsideration sent to the parties on 10 January 2019 is refused.

### REASONS

1 By emails dated 27 January and 4 February 2019, the Claimant submitted correspondence in respect of a judgment dated 10 January 2019 on reconsideration of a judgment sent to the parties on 2 May 2018.

2 Neither correspondence included an explicit application for further reconsideration. However, both seek to criticise management of the hearing, the findings of the Tribunal on reconsideration and the Tribunal's refusal of the claimant's oral application for costs. I have decided on some reflection and in the circumstances to treat the correspondence as together constituting an application for reconsideration of the judgment on reconsideration.

3 Unfortunately, the applications make no attempt to explain clearly why reconsideration would be necessary in the interests of justice, but mainly comprise disagreement with the Tribunal's findings and attempts to reargue the case. The Claimant has no reasonable prospect of persuading the Tribunal that it would be in the interests of justice to vary or revoke its judgment on those grounds.

4 The application does additionally suggest that the Tribunal was biased against the claimant and failed to make allowances for his health and status as a litigant-in-person. This is a gross misrepresentation of the way in which the claimant was treated. Instead, he was treated fairly and with courtesy, but repeatedly refused to follow reasonable directions, wasting much of the generous time given for the reconsideration hearing. Again, I find that the Claimant has no reasonable prospect of persuading the Tribunal that it would be in the interests of justice to vary or revoke its judgment on that ground.

5 The application also asserts that the behaviour of the respondent and its witnesses formed proper grounds for the claimant's application for costs. However, the Tribunal was entirely satisfied, for the reasons given in the judgment on reconsideration, that no order should be made in the claimant's favour and disagreed with the claimant's description of the respondent's behaviour. The present application adds nothing to the claimant's application for costs but instead merely repeats the allegations rejected by the Tribunal. Once again, I find that the Claimant has no reasonable prospect of persuading the Tribunal that it would be in the interests of justice to vary or revoke its judgment on that ground.

6 The application is therefore refused on the grounds that there are no reasonable prospects of the judgment being varied or revoked.

Employment Judge O'Brien

17 April 2019