



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr D Malic

**Respondents:** (1) JP Morgan Chase Bank N.A London Branch  
(2) Keith Enfield  
(3) Denis Mikhailov  
(4) Pavlos Lazaridis

## JUDGMENT ON APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The claimant's application dated **4 February 2022** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **21 January 2022** is refused.

The judgment is confirmed.

The Claimant is required to pay the deposit set out in the judgment in relation to the remaining discrimination complaint so that the complaint direct discrimination related to the outcome of his grievance appeal, can continue.

## REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because:

On 4 February 2022, the Claimant applied for reconsideration under Rule 70 of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013 of the Judgment and Deposit Order sent to the parties on 21 January 2022. The Tribunal has read all the points and considered the grounds for reconsideration set out by the Claimant and concluded that it is not necessary to reconsider the Order in the interest of justice.

It is this Tribunal's judgment that the application has no reasonable prospects of success. Both parties had opportunity to make full submissions on 11 January. The Tribunal read and considered all papers submitted by both parties. The Tribunal considered the claim, the response and the correspondence received in the period leading up to the hearing. The Tribunal has already provided the claimant with written reasons for the decision. After due consideration of both parties' submissions on 11 January, the Tribunal's judgment was as was set out in the written judgment.

**Case No: 3220743/2020**

In his application for reconsideration, the claimant has provided a narrative of the history of this matter and his dissatisfaction with the judgment. He has not provided any new reasons why the Tribunal should reconsider its decision that his complaints of direct sexual orientation discrimination and harassment against all four respondents are out of time and should be struck out. He has failed to provide any new reasons why the Tribunal should extend time to consider the out of time discrimination complaints relating to the period 2016 – 2018 against all four respondents. The claimant does not provide any new reasons why the complaint of victimisation should not have been struck out.

The Claimant's application for reconsideration repeats/expands points that were made on 11 January or which could have been made at the hearing.

None of the matters raised by the claimant in his application are such that they would give any reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked.

The Claimant's application for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 21 January 2022 is refused for the reasons stated above under Rules 70 and 72 of the Employment Tribunals Rules 2013. The judgment is confirmed.

Employment Judge **Jones**

Date 23 February 2022