



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mrs C McGill

**Respondent:** Lloyd's Pharmacy Ltd

**Before:** Employment Judge P Cadney

**Representation:**

Claimant: Written Submission

Respondent:

## **Reconsideration Judgment**

The judgment of the tribunal is that-

- i) The claimant's application to revoke or vary the Judgment is dismissed.

### **Reasons**

1. The tribunal heard the claimant's claim over three days on 11<sup>th</sup> / 12<sup>th</sup> / 13<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The tribunal dismissed the claimant's claims of disability discrimination by a judgment dated 13<sup>th</sup> April 2022, with written reasons dated 5<sup>th</sup> May 2022 being given .
2. The claimant has sought re-consideration of those decisions. A large part of the re-consideration application re-iterates points made to the tribunal, particularly in respect of the delay and the failure to keep the claimant informed. As is set out in the written reasons the tribunal shares the claimant's view that this was unacceptable and should not have occurred. However, for the reasons give the decision that did not centrally affect our decision on the specific issues we had to determine.
3. The claimant's only new contention is that the tribunal was misled by one aspect of the evidence of Mr King, who was not able to attend the tribunal. The

claimant contends that his evidence that the respondent did not allow the use of Zoom because it was insufficiently secure is not correct . The claimant contends that she has made enquiries of the respondent and that in fact they do allow the use of zoom. She contends that this is relevant as, if his evidence as to the use of zoom is not correct, it throws into doubt his contention that the voice conversion software required by the claimant could not be used for the same reason.

4. The difficulty for the claimant is that here was documentary evidence before the tribunal (see para 8) as to the fact that the respondent's IT department had not approved the use of the software and the reason for it having done so. This part of the evidence was not, therefore, dependant on the evidence of Mr King.
5. To reiterate, the tribunal is and was extremely sympathetic to the claimant. However there is nothing in the application which sets out any basis for considering that there is a reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked and accordingly the application is refused.

Employment Judge P Cadney  
Date: 16 June 2022

Order sent to the parties: 17 June 2022

FOR THE TRIBUNALS OFFICE