



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr L Ramos

**Respondent:** Nottinghamshire Women's Aid Limited (1)  
Ms A J Bloomer (2)

## JUDGMENT

1. The claimant's application dated 16 March 2022 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 15 March 2022 is refused.
2. The claimant's application dated 16 March 2022 for revocation of the deposit order sent to the parties on 15 March 2022 is refused.
3. The claimant's application to prevent the judgment sent to the parties on 15 March 2022 from being placed upon the online public register of judgments is also refused.

## ALL REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked for the reasons that follow.
2. The claimant made an application for revocation of the deposit order and judgment sent to the parties on 15 March 2022 by emails sent on 16 March 2022 at 07.13am and 07.17am, which appeared to be the same.
3. The application was copied into the respondent and, prior to considering the applications, I gave the respondent the opportunity to comment on them, which they did by email dated 23 March 2022. The claimant sent a further email on 24 March 2020 replying to the points raised by the respondent. I considered all of these communications prior to this reconsideration.
4. The application for revocation was on the grounds that the claimant considered that I had failed to comply with rule 39(3) of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013 (the Rules).

5. Rule 39(3) of the Rules provides:

“The Tribunal’s reasons for making the deposit order shall be provided with the order and the paying party must be notified about the potential consequences of the order.”

6. Reasons for making the deposit order were provided both in the deposit order itself and also in the judgment sent to the parties at the same time on 15 March 2022.

7. The claimant’s assertion that it was illegal to provide a judgment concerning the deposit order has no basis.

8. Therefore, as the judgment is not illegal, and as there was no failure to comply with rule 39(3) of the Rules, there is no reason to vary or revoke the deposit order or the judgment.

9. The claimant’s application that the judgment not be placed on the online public register was made on the grounds that the judgment was illegal and would cause, “huge inconvenience, distress and breach of [his] privacy because it contains confidential information about me which should not be available to the public”.

10. I firstly considered rule 67 of the Rules which provides:

“Subject to rules 50 and 94, and with the exception of judgments for withdrawn claims under rule 52, a copy shall be entered in the Register of any judgment and of any written reasons for a judgment.”

11. Rule 50 of the Rules provides:

“A Tribunal may at any stage of the proceedings, on its own initiative or on application, make an order with a view to preventing or restricting the public disclosure of any aspect of those proceedings so far as it considers necessary in the interests of justice or in order to protect the Convention rights of any person or in the circumstances identified in section 10A of the Employment Tribunals Act.”

12. In balancing the principle of open justice with the arguments the claimant put forward in his applications dated 16 March 2022, I do not consider that it is in the interests of justice to prevent the disclosure of the judgment dated 11 March 2022 on the Register in accordance with rule 67 of the Rules. The principle of open justice far outweighs the concerns expressed by the claimant in his application and I see no reason to prevent its publication.

---

Employment Judge Welch

Date: 24 March 2022