



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mrs S Daramy

**Respondents:**  
**3200398/2021** London Borough of Tower Hamlets

**3203309/2021** Ms C Brown  
Mr S Last  
Ms A Debiyi  
Ms M Groves  
Ms M Bouman

**3204987/2021** East London NHS Foundation Trust

## RECONSIDERATION JUDGMENT

The Claimant's application dated 9 May 2022 for a reconsideration of the Judgment sent to the parties on 25 April 2022 is refused.

### REASONS

1 Case number 3204987/2021 was struck out in its entirety and all claims against Ms Groves and Ms Bouman in case number 3203309/2021 were struck out in an oral Judgment with reasons given at the Preliminary Hearing on 28 January 2022. Separate case management orders were made in the remaining claims at the same hearing. There were therefore two documents to be sent to the parties: (1) the Judgment and Reasons and (2) the Orders. The file copy of the Judgment and Reasons shows that it was sent to the parties on 17 March 2022. It is clear from subsequent correspondence that due to an administrative error, two copies of the Orders were sent. This was corrected when the Judgment and Reasons were sent by letter dated 25 April 2022.

2 In correspondence before 25 April 2022, the Claimant had indicated an intention to apply for a reconsideration of my Judgment. The amended application now before me was made by the Claimant in an attachment to her email dated 9 May 2022.

3 Having carefully considered the grounds of the reconsideration application, I am satisfied that it is a repetition of arguments which the Claimant made at the hearing in

an attempt to re-litigate points which were considered and rejected for the reasons given. Disagreement with the findings and decision of the Tribunal is not a valid ground for reconsideration.

4 In reaching my decision on 28 January 2022, I carefully considered and tried to distill the relevant information from the Claimant's written submissions to the Tribunal including those sent in October and on 30 November 2021 – these were the Claimant's lists of issues in the three claims which I allowed her to rely upon as her further information and clarification of the claims. The Claimant does not identify in her reconsideration application the specific reason for an extension of time said to have been overlooked and paragraph 69 deals with her submissions on time. I can confirm that I took into account the entirety of those documents in reaching my Judgment and, in any event, time limits were only one part of my reasons for concluding that strike out was appropriate.

5 Considerable time and effort was spent trying to clarify the claims and identify the issues before considering strike out, with full allowance made for the Claimant's position as a litigant in person with some ill health.

6 As was made clear at the Preliminary Hearing, the file in the fourth claim (Case number 3207944/2021 which included disability discrimination for the first time) was not before me that day. It was only presented on 31 December 2021 and the date for a Response had not yet passed. The claim was subsequently consolidated with the remaining claims by the Regional Employment Judge upon review of the claim and Response at the rule 26 stage, as confirmed by letter dated 14 April 2022.

7 None of the matters raised by the Claimant are such that they would give any reasonable prospect of original decision being varied or revoked and it is not necessary to reconsider the judgment in the interests of justice. Accordingly, the application for a reconsideration is refused under rules 70 and 72.

**Employment Judge Russell  
Dated: 8 August 2022**