



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr. G. Ngugi

Respondent: Amity Security Ltd

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 2 February 2020 for reconsideration of the judgment and the written reasons for it, sent to the parties on 23 November 2019 and 15 January 2020 respectively, is refused.

REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because it is not necessary in the interests of justice to do so.
2. In support of his application for reconsideration, the Claimant has repeated arguments which were considered during the hearing, and in respect of which relevant findings are set out in the Tribunal's reasons.
3. The Claimant disagrees with the Tribunal's findings, but that is not an adequate basis for a reconsideration. Indeed, as set out in the comments received by the Tribunal from the Respondent, dated 17 March 2020, the Tribunal relied on the Claimant's own evidence in reaching its decision, having recalculated and checked the figures with the parties on two occasions. The Claimant expressed no disagreement with the facts and figures, on which the decision was based, during the hearing. The hearing lasted from about midday until just after 3pm, with a break for lunch.
4. Further, the Tribunal treated the additional documents submitted by the Claimant after the hearing by email sent on 26 September 2019 in which he challenged the Tribunal's calculations and findings, as an application for a reconsideration. The reconsideration application was refused. The Claimant was informed of this by letter from the Tribunal dated 15 January 2020. The Claimant has thus had more than an adequate opportunity to put his case.

5. It is well established that the written reasons only need to meet the test of adequacy set out in the case of ***Meek v City of Birmingham District Council*** [1987] IRLR 250 CA, as cited in paragraph 1 of the reasons for the original decision.
6. Further, as set out in rule 2 of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013, in exercising any power given to it, such as the provision of reasons for its decision, the Tribunal shall seek to give effect to the overriding objective of dealing with cases fairly and justly, one aspect of which is dealing with cases in ways which are proportionate to the complexity and importance of the issues.
7. The Tribunal's reasons were set out in appropriate detail and adequately dealt with the issues identified. As stated in paragraph 1 of the reasons for the original decision, the dispute in this case was about the Claimant's entitlement to £15. Further judicial consideration of this claim is not proportionate.
8. In all the circumstances the Tribunal did not consider that it was necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the original decision, and the application was therefore refused.

Employment Judge HYDE

Date: 17 April 2020