



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Ms B Lock

Respondent: The Chiltern Brewery Company Limited

JUDGMENT

1. The claimant's application dated 22 March 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 8 March 2025 is refused.

REASONS

1. The Tribunal has considered the application for reconsideration contained in the Claimant's emails to the Tribunal on 22 and 23 March 2025 and the Respondent's response to the application dated 11 April 2025.
2. These were first brought to my attention on 23 May 2025 and therefore apologise for the delay in responding to the application. The delay in administration of the application is due to the backlog of workload in the Tribunal.
3. The Claimant's references to rule 37 (2) ET Rules 2013 – now 38 ET Rules 2024 was not the basis of the decision made on 18 February 2025. The decision was made under rule 47 ET Rules 2024 that the Claimant had failed to attend. As set out in the Judgment sent to the parties, the information which was available, including the history of the case seen on the Tribunal file, was taken into account.
4. Furthermore, enquiries were made by emailing the Claimant. No contact telephone number was listed by the Claimant on her ET1, nor recorded by the Tribunal in their computer system. It was therefore accurate to say that the Tribunal could not contact the Claimant by telephone. The Claimant had provided an email address and that was used to contact her to ask if

- she was attending, or to explain why she was not. No reply was received.
5. The Respondent's counsel responded to questions about whether the Respondent's solicitor had any contact with the Claimant and the responses were noted in the Judgment. The Tribunal had no reason to doubt that Counsel was acting in accordance with instructions and in accordance with his Code of Conduct, not to mislead the Tribunal. In short, the Tribunal believed what Mr Jones said about contact between the solicitor and the Claimant.
 6. The application for reconsideration by the Claimant is long, repetitive and rambling. It asserts that the Tribunal made false assertions, but does not set out any evidence or basis on which that allegation is made.
 7. Whilst it is understandable that as a litigant in person, the Claimant is not familiar with the fact that any decision of the Tribunal which brings the claim or part of it to a close is a Judgment; this is the correct format for the Tribunal's decision.
 8. Whilst it is recognised that the Claimant had previously asked for the hearing to be conducted by telephone and this had been noted in the case management order of EJ Young on 3 September 2024, it is also noted that the postponement notice indicated that the relisting would proceed by video.
 9. However, the Tribunal noted that the Claimant was sent this notice on 13 November 2024 and made no attempt between then and 18 February 2025 to contact the Tribunal to ask for a telephone number to be provided so that she could join. Had she made that request, a telephone number would have been provided.
 10. The Tribunal has considered this application in line with rules 70(2) having taken into account the written submissions of both parties.
 11. The decision of the Tribunal is that it is not necessary in the interests of justice to alter the Judgment which was sent to the parties on 8 March 2025.

Approved by

Employment Judge Cowen

Date: 23 May 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
27 May 2025

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE