



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr B Downes

Respondent: Ready2Go Film, TV and Event Services Limited

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 5 December 2023 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 10 November 2023 is refused.

REASONS

The Application

1. The claimant's application gives the following brief statement as the reasons for requesting a reconsideration:

“My reasons are that I feel the Judge did not consider my case fairly and did not consider my genuine reasons for a late application.”

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.”

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 claimant’s application for reconsideration appears to represent an attempt to get a “second bite at the cherry” which undermines the principle of finality.

8. 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.

Conclusion

9. Having considered the brief application 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.

Employment Judge Buzzard

14 December 2023

Judgment sent to the parties on:

18 December 2023

For the Tribunal:

.....

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

Judgments (apart from judgments under rule 52) and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.