



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr J Serrao Da Veiga

Respondent: Titan Risk Management Limited

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 1 June 2023 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 19 May 2023 is refused.

REASONS

1. I have undertaken preliminary consideration of the claimant's application for reconsideration of the judgment dismissing his claims. References in square brackets (e.g. [25]) are references to paragraph numbers from the reasons promulgated with the judgment.

The Law

2. An application for reconsideration is an exception to the general principle that (subject to appeal on a point of law) a decision of an Employment Tribunal is final. The test is whether it is necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the judgment (rule 70).

3. Rule 72(1) of the 2013 Rules of Procedure empowers me to refuse the application based on preliminary consideration if there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked.

4. The importance of finality was confirmed by the Court of Appeal in **Ministry of Justice v Burton and anor [2016] EWCA Civ 714** in July 2016 where Elias LJ said that:

“the discretion to act in the interests of justice is not open-ended; it should be exercised in a principled way, and the earlier case law cannot be ignored. In particular, the courts have emphasised the importance of finality (Flint v Eastern Electricity Board [1975] ICR 395) which militates against the discretion being exercised too readily; and in Lindsay v Ironsides Ray and Vials [1994] ICR 384 Mummery J held that the failure of a party's representative to draw attention to a particular argument will not generally justify granting a review.”

5. Similarly in **Liddington v 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust EAT/0002/16** the EAT chaired by Simler P said in paragraph 34 that:

“a request for reconsideration is not an opportunity for a party to seek to re-litigate matters that have already been litigated, or to reargue matters in a different way or by adopting points previously omitted. There is an underlying public policy principle in all judicial proceedings that there should be finality in litigation, and reconsideration applications are a limited exception to that rule. They are not a means by which to have a second bite at the cherry, nor are they intended to provide parties with the opportunity of a rehearing at which the same evidence and the same arguments can be rehearsed but with different emphasis or additional evidence that was previously available being tendered.”

6. In common with all powers under the 2013 Rules, preliminary consideration under rule 72(1) must be conducted in accordance with the overriding objective which appears in rule 2, namely to deal with cases fairly and justly. This includes dealing with cases in ways which are proportionate to the complexity and importance of the issues, and avoiding delay. Achieving finality in litigation is part of a fair and just adjudication.

The Application

7. The majority of the points raised by the claimant are attempts to re-open issues of fact on which the Tribunal heard evidence from both sides and made a determination. In that sense they represent a “second bite at the cherry” which undermines the principle of finality. Such attempts have a reasonable prospect of resulting in the decision being varied or revoked only if the Tribunal has missed something important, or if there is new evidence available which could not reasonably have been put forward at the hearing. A Tribunal will not reconsider a finding of fact just because the claimant wishes it had gone in his favour.

8. That broad principle disposes of almost all the points made by the claimant. However, there are some points he makes which should be addressed specifically:

8.1 The figure in [1] was inserted following agreement between the parties. The Judge expressly checked that the claimant consented to Judgment being given in the amount which had been proposed. In the circumstances, it is not open to the claimant to re-open the quantification of his wages claim.

8.2 The circumstances which gave rise to the admission of evidence from Jade Hodson as a late witness are fully set out in the Judgment. Whilst it is appreciated that the claimant disagrees with that decision, there are no grounds to reconsider it. The claimant is also wrong to suggest that he was limited to one hour, in total, to question Mr McKenna and Ms Hodson.

8.3 The Tribunal found that the claimant has resigned and had not been dismissed. His claim for wrongful dismissal therefore failed [95]. The Tribunal did not “fail to assess” the wrongful dismissal claim.

Conclusion

9. Having considered all the points made by the claimant I am satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked. The points of significance were considered and addressed at the hearing. The application for reconsideration is refused.

Case No: 2414311/2021

Employment Judge Dunlop
DATE: 26 June 2023

JUDGMENT AND REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
3 July 2023

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE