



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

BETWEEN

Claimant

AND

Respondents

Mr N Mendy

- (1) Motorola Solutions UK Limited
- (2) Motorola Solutions Inc
- (3) Ronan Despres
- (4) Fergus Mayne
- (5) Carole Lawrence
- (6) Uwe Niske

DECISION ON THIRD RECONSIDERATION APPLICATION

1. By email dated 28 October 2021 (with attachments) the Claimant makes a third application for reconsideration of my judgment on his interim relief application originally sent to the parties on 25 June 2020 (as amended following the Claimant's EAT appeal and second reconsideration application and sent to the parties on 12 October 2021).
2. Insofar as the Claimant's application of 28 October 2021 is a complaint about me, it should be addressed to the Regional Employment Judge pursuant to the Employment Tribunal's complaints procedure.
3. Insofar as the Claimant's application of 28 October 2021 is a complaint about the EAT's handling of his appeal, it should be addressed to the EAT.
4. Insofar as it is a third application for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 25 June 2020, the Claimant is a long way outside of the 14-day time limit in Rule 71. There is no good reason for that and the Claimant has had more than enough 'bites of the cherry'. It is contrary to the public interest in the finality of litigation and the over-riding objective of doing justice between the parties, fairly

and within a reasonable time and avoiding expense, for any more time to be spent on the Claimant's attempts to overturn my judgment on his interim relief application. The parties need to focus on the final hearing when the arguments the Claimant makes can be addressed on the merits. I refuse to extend time for this reconsideration application.

5. Insofar as the Claimant's application is in part technically a first application for reconsideration of the reconsidered judgment sent to the parties on 12 October 2021, it is also out of time albeit only by two days, but there is no good reason for the delay and in any event the public interest in the finality of litigation and the over-riding objective firmly indicate that time should not be extended in this case.
6. Further or alternatively, the substance of the application is 'substantially the same' application as he has made in his previous applications and accordingly would fall to be refused in any event under Rule 72(1).

Employment Judge Stout

18 November 2021

DECISION SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

19/11/2021.

OLu.
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE