



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs Monica Larbi

Respondent: Mihomecare Ltd

Heard at: Watford Employment Tribunal

On: 22 April 2025

Before: Judge Bartlett

RECONSIDERATION JUDGMENT

Background

1. On 18 March 2025 the claimant applied for reconsideration of the judgement of 21 November 2024 which was sent to the parties on 5 March 2025. This application was sent to me on 8 April 2025.

Decision

2. The application sets out 29 numbered paragraphs all of which make various criticisms of the judgement. These include but are not limited to the following:
 - 2.1. "There was bias in the judges and proceeds during the hearing";
 - 2.2. Complaints about the time accorded to various stages of the proceedings during the hearing;
 - 2.3. Many complaints about the assessment of the evidence and findings of facts made by the tribunal;
 - 2.4. "not all the decision for the claim was made leaving some case or claim undealt with in the decision" and a claim that the Tribunal did not consider the harassment claim.
 - 2.5. The judgement did not explain how the award of £10.59 came to be made

3. I have considered the claimant's application under Rules 69 and 70 of the Employment Tribunal Rules of Procedure 2024.
4. I find that the reconsideration application is largely a disagreement with the findings and decision of the Tribunal. I find that there is no merit to those assertions and there is no reasonable prospect of the judgement being varied or revoked. I have specifically dealt with two aspects of the reconsideration request below where they diverge from being a mere disagreement with the Tribunal's findings.
5. In relation to the claim that not all parts of the claim were dealt with and specifically that the harassment claim was not dealt with, I find this argument is not sustainable. Paragraph 118 sets out that the harassment claim fails and why. The claimant has not identified any other parts of the claim that were not dealt with.
6. In relation to the claim that there is no explanation as to how the £10.59 amount awarded to the claimant was calculated, this is clearly a misconceived assertion. Paragraphs 79 to 87 set out step by step how this amount was calculated.
7. I find that there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked and refuse the application under rule 70.

Employment Judge **Bartlett**

Date 25 April 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
2 May 2025

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Note

Written reasons will not be provided unless a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

Judgments 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.