



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr G Idenekpoma

Respondent: Camden & Islington NHS Trust

JUDGMENT

The claimant's applications dated 13 December 2024, 14 December 2024, 15 December 2024, 16 December 2024, 17 December 2024, 21 December 2024, 25 December 2024, 26 December 2024 and 4 January 2025 for reconsideration of the Judgment sent to the parties on 12 December 2024 are refused.

REASONS

1. Some of the correspondence sent by the claimant was sent outside the time limit for an application for reconsideration. I have nonetheless looked at all of the claimant's correspondence with a view to understanding the claimant's application(s).
2. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because the claimant essentially seeks to reargue matters on which the Tribunal heard detailed submissions at the hearing and made findings based on the evidence in front of it. It is not in the interests of justice for those matters to be relitigated.
3. Although the claimant makes some reference to producing further documents, I cannot discern in the claimant's application a suggestion that there is new evidence which should not have been reasonably known about or foreseen at the hearing.
4. In his series of emails, the claimant seems to be taking issue with the Tribunal's findings of fact. Insofar as the arguments are understood, it appears that the claimant is seeking to reargue the claims based on the evidence which was in front of the Tribunal or which could have been in front of the Tribunal and persuade the Tribunal that different conclusions should have been reached. So

far as can be discerned, the claimant criticises the Tribunal's findings of fact in particular in respect of but not limited to the following matters:

- As to the ambit of his duties when working in MHCAS;
 - As to what tasks were appropriate for him to be allocated on Laffan Ward;
 - As to whether the claimant consented to a Break in Learning and what the circumstances of and reasons for the Break in Learning were;
 - Whether Ms Bih was aware of the claimant's protected disclosure;
 - Whether various detriments were caused by the claimant's protected disclosure.
5. It would not be in the interests of justice to relitigate these matters, which were decided on the basis of the evidence and submissions the Tribunal heard. The claimant's challenge seems to be in large part premised on an assertion that the respondent's witnesses were untruthful but that was not what the Tribunal found.
 6. The claimant seems to be alleging that a document which was before the Tribunal at the hearing was forged (email of 4 January 2025). He has attached some jpegs of the document which he says is the correct document although he has not highlighted the alleged differences between that document and the document in the bundle. He states that he has now 'been able to access my other phone drive and been able to get some new documents'. He does not suggest that he was not able to access his 'other phone drive' before the full merits hearing or, if that was the case, explain why that was. I am not satisfied that this evidence was not available to the claimant at the hearing and it is not apparent that it would have made any material difference to the Tribunal's findings.
 7. The claimant suggests that other documents which were in front of the Tribunal were forged. We did not have evidence from which we could reach any such conclusion.
 8. The claimant suggests in his application that he received the bundle and witness statements late and did not have time to familiarise himself with them, but there was no application by the claimant at the hearing for a postponement, extra time or for the respondent to be prevented from relying on documents or statements. In those circumstances, it did not appear that there was any procedural mishap.

Employment Judge JOFFE

Date: 21 January 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

24 January 2025

.....