EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: **Tanai Kellar-Inniss**

Respondent: **Precision Teachers Ltd**

Heard at: **East London Hearing Centre**

On: **03 July 2025 (In Chambers)**

Before: **Employment Judge B Beyzade**

Representation
Claimant: Per the claimant's written application
Respondent:

JUDGMENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL

The judgment of the tribunal is that:

1.1. Having considered the claimant's application for reconsideration of the Tribunal's Judgment dated 04 March 2025, and sent to parties on 05 March 2025, in terms that "*1.1 No response has been presented to this claim and the Employment Judge has decided to issue the following Judgment on the available material under Rule 22 of The Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024: 1.1.1 the respondent shall pay to the claimant arrears of pay in respect of the claimant's complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages in the amount of £320.00 gross (THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY POUNDS) subject to any required deductions for tax and national insurance provided that the respondent remits any such amount to His Majesty's Revenue and Customs and accounts to the claimant for any such payment.*

1.1.2 the respondent shall pay to the claimant holiday pay in respect of the claimant's complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages (holiday pay) in the amount of £477.00 gross (FOURHUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN POUNDS) subject to any required deductions for tax and national insurance provided that the respondent remits any such amount to His Majesty's

Revenue and Customs and accounts to the claimant for anysuch payment." ("the Original Judgment") the Tribunal, after private deliberation, at the Reconsideration Hearing held in chambers on 03 July 2025, decided that the claimant's application dated 05 March 2025 for reconsideration of the Judgment sent to the parties on 20 February 2025 is refused. There is no reasonable prospect of the Original Judgment being varied or revoked.

1.2. The Tribunal, on reconsideration, has confirmed the Original Judgment sent to the parties on 05 March 2025, without variation, and amplified its reasons, as set forth in the following Reasons for this Reconsideration Judgment, to address the points arising from the claimant's application.

REASONS

Introduction

1. This case called before the Tribunal on 03 July 2025, for an in chambers Reconsideration Hearing, with the Employment Judge sitting alone in chambers (in private). This was appropriate having taken account of the matters contained in the Senior President's Practice Direction on Panel Composition ("the Practice Direction") along with the Presidential Guidance on Panel Composition which came into effect on 29 October 2024. It is noted in this regard that the Practice Direction provides, "6. In respect of any other matter an Employment Tribunal is to consist of a judge. This includes consideration of whether a party's application for reconsideration discloses a reasonable prospect of a judgment being varied or revoked." The Presidential Guidance indicates at paragraph 16 that post-hearing matters in respect of a reconsideration application (including when deciding whether or not such an application discloses a reasonable prospect of a judgment being varied or revoked under Rule 72 of the ET Rules 2013) will always be decided by an Employment Judge sitting alone. In addition, I am satisfied that this decision in respect of panel composition furthers the interests of justice and accords with the Tribunal's overriding objective.

2. The claimant made an application dated 06 March 2025 which has been treated as an application for reconsideration. At the date the application was made, the rules for reconsideration were set out at Rules 68 to 70 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 ("the ET Rules 2024").

3. The Employment Judge considered the claimant's application under Rule 70 of the ET Rules 2024 [the legal test under Rule 70(2) of the ET Rules 2024 is in the same terms as Rule 72(1) of Schedule 1 of the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013]. The Employment Judge decided that there is no reasonable prospect of the Original Judgment being varied or revoked because of the reasons set forth below.

4. The reconsideration application arose out of the Tribunal's Judgment on 04 March 2025 (issued to parties on 05 March 2025) ["the Original Judgment"] that:

"*1.1 No response has been presented to this claim and the Employment Judge has decided to issue the following Judgment on the available material under Rule 22 of The Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024:*

1.1.1 the respondent shall pay to the claimant arrears of pay in respect of the claimant's complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages in the amount of £320.00 gross (THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY POUNDS) subject to any required deductions for tax and national insurance provided that the respondent remits any such amount to His Majesty's Revenue and Customs and accounts to the claimant for any such payment.

1.1.2 the respondent shall pay to the claimant holiday pay in respect of the claimant's complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages (holiday pay) in the amount of £477.00 gross (FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN POUNDS) subject to any required deductions for tax and national insurance provided that the respondent remits any such amount to His Majesty's Revenue and Customs and accounts to the claimant for any such payment.""

5. On 24 June 2025 the Employment Judge directed the Clerk to the Tribunal to issue an apology to parties for the delay and to advise that parties can expect to hear further from the Tribunal by the end of July 2025. Regretfully, on checking the Tribunal's file during today's in chambers hearing, the Employment Judge noted that the Clerk to the Tribunal, had not yet issued the said correspondence to the parties. The Employment Judge apologises that correspondence was not sent to parties prior to today acknowledging receipt of the application and providing an update.

6. 03 July 2025 was the earliest convenient date for the Tribunal to consider the claimant's application, on account of other commitments, including annual leave, the date of receipt of the claimant's application, training, judicial sittings diary, judicial sittings out of region and other judicial commitments.

The Tribunal's Original Judgment

7. The claimant presented their claim of unauthorised deduction of wages and holiday pay to the Tribunal on 25 September 2024. No Response was presented to the claimant's claim.

8. By way of a Notice of Hearing issued to parties dated 15 October 2024, parties were notified that a Final Hearing was listed to take place by video hearing on 05 March 2025 at 12 noon.

9. On 04 March 2025, the case file was referred to the Employment Judge who was advised by the Clerk to the Tribunal that no Response or correspondence had been received from the respondent. The Employment Judge reviewed the case file on 04 March 2025 and noted that no further correspondences or communications had been received by the Tribunal from the respondent and a Response had not been filed. As a result, and for the reasons within the said Judgment, the Employment Judge prepared the Judgment and issued directions to the Clerk to the Tribunal to send the Original Judgment to the parties on 04 March 2025 (please see above).

Claimant's reconsideration application

10. On 06 March 2025, the claimant sent an email sent that day to the Tribunal at 09:26AM, which has been treated as an application to the Tribunal, for reconsideration of the Original Judgment that was issued in writing on 05 March 2025. The claimant's application was not copied to the respondent.

11. The claimant's reconsideration application states as follows:
"*Good morning,*
Is it possible for no interest to be added as it goes against my religion."

Issues for determination by this Tribunal

12. The only live issue for determination by the Tribunal at this Reconsideration Hearing was the claimant's application for reconsideration of the Original Judgment dated 04 March 2025 and issued on 05 March 2025, as per the claimant's application of 06 March 2025.

13. Accordingly, the case file was referred to the Employment Judge thereafter for further directions. The Employment Judge was provided with copies of all correspondences received from parties since 04 March 2025 (in addition to correspondences prior to 04 March 2025 which were accessible within the Tribunal's file including correspondences that were before the Tribunal at the time the Rule 22 Judgment had been prepared and had been forwarded to the Employment Judge thereafter).

14. The Employment Judge also reviewed all correspondences on the Tribunal file between the parties and the Tribunal up to and including today's date, 03 July 2025.

Relevant law: reconsideration

15. The ET Rules 2024 in relation to the reconsideration of judgments are at Rules 68 – 70. Those provisions are as follows:

> *"Principles*
>
> *68.—(1) The Tribunal may, either on its own initiative (which may reflect a request from the Employment Appeal Tribunal) or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so.*
>
> *(2) A judgment under reconsideration may be confirmed, varied or revoked.*
>
> *(3) If the judgment under reconsideration is revoked the Tribunal may take the decision again. In doing so, the Tribunal is not required to come to the same conclusion.*
>
> *Application for reconsideration*
> *69. Except where it is made in the course of a hearing, an application for reconsideration must be made in writing setting out why reconsideration is necessary*

and must be sent to the Tribunal within 14 days of the later of—
(a)the date on which the written record of the judgment sought to be reconsidered was sent to the parties, or

(b)the date that the written reasons were sent, if these were sent separately.
Process for reconsideration

70.—(1) The Tribunal must consider any application made under rule 69 (application for reconsideration).

(2) If the Tribunal considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked (including, unless there are special reasons, where substantially the same application has already been made and refused), the application must be refused and the Tribunal must inform the parties of the refusal.

(3) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (2), the Tribunal must send a notice to the parties specifying the period by which any written representations in respect of the application must be received by the Tribunal, and seeking the views of the parties on whether the application can be determined without a hearing. The notice may also set out the Tribunal's provisional views on the application.

(4) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (2), the judgment must be reconsidered at a hearing unless the Tribunal considers, having regard to any written representations provided under paragraph (3), that a hearing is not necessary in the interests of justice.

(5) If the Tribunal determines the application without a hearing the parties must be given a reasonable opportunity to make further written representations in respect of the application."

16. When considering such an issue regard must also be had to the Tribunal's overriding objective in Rule 3 of the ET Rules 2024 (previously Rule 2 under the ET Rules 2013). The Tribunal's "overriding objective" under Rule 3 is to deal with the case fairly and justly. The precise terms of Rule 3 of the ET Rules 2024, are as follows:

"3.—(1) The overriding objective of these Rules is to enable the Tribunal to deal with cases fairly and justly.

(2) Dealing with a case fairly and justly includes, so far as practicable—

(a)ensuring that the parties are on an equal footing,

(b)dealing with cases in ways which are proportionate to the complexity and importance of the issues,

(c)avoiding unnecessary formality and seeking flexibility in the proceedings,

(d)avoiding delay, so far as compatible with proper consideration of the issues, and

(e)saving expense.

(3) The Tribunal must seek to give effect to the overriding objective when it—

(a)exercises any power under these Rules, or

(b)interprets any rule or practice direction.

(4) The parties and their representatives must—

(a)assist the Tribunal to further the overriding objective, and

(b)co-operate generally with each other and with the Tribunal."

17. A reconsideration application requires to be dealt with as per Rules 68 to 70 of the ET Rules 2024. I have set out its full terms above for ease of reference. As this was an application for reconsideration by the claimant, Rule 71, relating to reconsiderations by the Tribunal on its own initiative, does not fall to be considered further. Further, as always, there is the Tribunal's overriding objective, under Rule 3, to deal with the case fairly and justly.

18. The previous Employment Tribunal Rules 2004 provided a number of grounds on which a judgment could be reviewed (now called a reconsideration). The only ground in the ET Rules 2024 is that the judgment can be reconsidered where it is necessary "*in the interests of justice*" to do so. That means justice to all parties.

19. However, it was confirmed by Her Honour Judge Eady QC (as she then was, now Mrs Justice Eady, the current EAT President) in *Outasight VB Limited v Brown [2014] UKEAT/0253/14/LA*, reported at [2015] ICR D11, that the guidance given by the EAT in respect the previous Rules is still relevant guidance in respect of the ET Rules 2013 (the legal test under Rule 70(2) of the ET Rules 2024 remains unchanged) and, therefore, I have considered the case law arising out of the 2004 Rules.

20. The approach to be taken to applications for reconsideration was also set out more recently in the case of *Liddington v 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust [2016] UKEAT/0002/16/DA* in the judgment of Mrs Justice Simler, then President of the EAT, and now Lady Justice Simler in the Court of Appeal. The Employment Tribunal is required to:

"1. identify the Rules relating to reconsideration and in particular to the provision in the Rules enabling a Judge who considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked refusing the application without a hearing at a preliminary stage;

2. address each ground in turn and consider whether is anything in each of the particular grounds relied on that might lead ET to vary or revoke the decision; and

3. give reasons for concluding that there is nothing in the grounds advanced by the (applicant) that could lead him to vary or revoke his decision."

21. In paragraph 34 and 35 of the Judgment, the learned former EAT President, Mrs Justice Simler (now Lady Simler, a Justice of the Supreme Court), stated as follows:

> "*34. In his Reconsideration Judgment the Judge identified the Rules relating to reconsideration and in particular to the provision in the Rules enabling a Judge who considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked refusing the application without a hearing at a preliminary stage. In this case, the Judge addressed each ground in turn. He considered whether was anything in each of the particular grounds relied on that might lead him to vary or revoke his decision. For the reasons he gave, he concluded that there was nothing in the grounds advanced by the Claimant that could lead him to vary or revoke his decision, and accordingly he refused the application at the preliminary stage. As he made clear, 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 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. Tribunals have a wide discretion whether or not to order reconsideration, and the opportunity for appellate intervention in relation to a refusal to order reconsideration is accordingly limited.*
>
> *35. Where, as here, a matter has been fully ventilated and properly argued, and in the absence of any identifiable administrative error or event occurring after the hearing that requires a reconsideration in the interests of justice, any asserted error of law is to be corrected on appeal and not through the back door by way of a reconsideration application. It seems to me that the Judge was entitled to conclude that reconsideration would not result in a variation or revocation of the decision in this case and that the Judge did not make any error of law in refusing reconsideration accordingly*."

22. There is a public policy principle that there must be finality in litigation and reviews or reconsiderations are a limited exception to that principle. In the case of *Stephenson v Golden Wonder Limited [1977] IRLR 474* it was made clear that a review (now a reconsideration) is not a method by which a disappointed litigant gets a "*second bite of the cherry*". Lord Macdonald, the EAT Judge in Scotland, said that the review provisions were "*not intended to provide parties with the opportunity of a rehearing at which the same evidence can be rehearsed with different emphasis, or further evidence produced which was available before*".

23. The Employment Appeal Tribunal went on to say in the case of *Fforde v Black EAT68/80* that this ground does not mean "*that in every case where a litigant is unsuccessful is automatically entitled to have the Tribunal review it. Every unsuccessful litigant thinks that the interests of justice require a review. This ground of review only applies in even more exceptional cases where something has gone radically wrong with the procedure involving the denial of natural justice or something of that order*."

24. "In the interests of justice" means the interests of justice to all parties. The EAT provided further guidance in *Reading v EMI Leisure Limited EAT262/81* where it was stated "*when you boil down what it said on [the claimant's] behalf it really comes down to this: that she did not do herself justice at the hearing so justice requires that there should be a second hearing so that she may. Now, "justice", means justice to both parties. It is not said, and, as we see it, cannot be said that any conduct of the case by the employers here caused [the claimant] not to do herself justice. It was, we are afraid, her own inexperience in the situation*."

25. I consider that any guidance on the meaning of "the interests of justice" issued under the 2004 Rules (and the earlier Rules) is still relevant to reconsiderations under the ET Rules 2024. I also remind myself that the phrase "in the interests of justice" means the interests of justice to all parties.

26. Further, I have also reminded myself of the guidance to Tribunals in *Newcastle upon Tyne City Council – v- Marsden [2010] ICR 743* and in particular the words of Mr Justice Underhill when commenting on the introduction of the overriding objective (now found in Rule 3 of the ET Rules 2024) and the necessity to review previous decisions and on the subject of a review: "*But it is important not to throw the baby out with the bath-water. As Rimer LJ observed in Jurkowska v Hlmad Ltd. [2008] ICR 841, at para. 19 of his judgment (p. 849), it is "basic" "… that dealing with cases justly requires that they be dealt with in accordance with recognised principles. Those principles may have to be adapted on a case by case basis to meet what are perceived to be the special or exceptional circumstances of a particular case. But they at least provide the structure on the basis of which a just decision can be made*."

27. Further, I have also considered the further guidance on the ET Rules 2013 from Her Honour Judge Eady QC (as she then was, now Mrs Justice Eady, EAT President) in her judgment in Outasight VB Limited –v- Brown [2014] UKEAT/0253/14. I have considered that guidance and in particular have noted what is said about the grounds for a reconsideration under the ET Rules 2013: "*In my judgment, the 2013 Rules removed the unnecessary (arguably redundant) specific grounds that had been expressly listed in the earlier Rules. Any consideration of an application under one of the specified grounds would have taken the interests of justice into account. The specified grounds can be seen as having provided examples of circumstances in which the interests of justice might allow a review. The previous listing of such examples in the old Rules - and their absence from new - does not provide any reason for treating the application in this case differently simply because it fell to be considered under the "interests of justice" provision of the 2013 Rules. Even if it did not meet the requirements laid down in Rule 34(3)(d) of the 2004 Rules, the ET could have considered whether it should be allowed as in the interests of justice under Rule 34(3)(e). There is no reason why it should then have adopted a more restrictive approach than it was bound to apply under the 2013 Rules*".

28. In considering matters in the present case, I also reviewed the EAT judgment in *Wolfe v North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust [2015] ICR 960 ; [2015] UKEAT/0065/14*, and I have noted, from that judgment, at paragraph 75, what the EAT judge, His Honour Judge Serota QC, stated: "*There is now a long line of authority to the effect that where a would be Appellant believes there has been a material omission on the part of an Employment Tribunal to deal with a significant issue or to give adequate reasons in respect of significant findings, the proper course is not to lodge a Notice of*

Appeal, but to go straight back to the Employment Tribunal and ask that the omission be repaired. If reasons are given orally, this should be done as soon as practicable on the completion of delivery of the judgment, and if Written Reasons are later handed down as soon as practicable after the Judgment is received. I would like to make clear that it is the duty of advocates to adopt this course in litigation in the Employment Tribunal."

29. Further, in considering this reconsideration application, I have also taken into account the helpful judicial guidance provided by Her Honour Judge Eady QC, then EAT Judge, and now EAT President, in her judgment in *Scranage v Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council [2018] UKEAT/0032/17*, at paragraph 22, when considering the relevant legal principles, where she stated as follows: - "*The test for reconsideration under the ET Rules is thus straightforwardly whether such reconsideration is in the interests of justice (see Outasight VB Ltd v Brown UKEAT/0253/14 (21 November 2014, unreported). The "interests of justice" allow for a broad discretion, albeit one that must be exercised judicially, which means having regard not only to the interests of the party seeking the review or reconsideration, but also to the interests of the other party to the litigation and to the public interest requirement that there should, so far as possible, be finality of litigation*."

30. At *Outasight VB Ltd v Brown*, at paragraphs 27 to 38, the learned EAT Judge (now Mrs Justice Eady, EAT President) reviewed the legal principles. The EAT President, then Mr Justice Langstaff, in *Dundee City Council v Malcolm [2016] UKEATS/0019-21/15*, at paragraph 20, states that the current Rules effected no change of substance to the previous Rules, and that they do not permit a claimant to have a second bite of the cherry, and the broader interests of justice, in particular an interest in the finality of litigation, remained just as important after the change as it had been before

31. Further, I have also taken into account the Court of Appeal's judgment, in *Ministry of Justice v Burton & Another [2016] EWCA Civ.714*, also reported at [2016] ICR 1128, where Lord Justice Elias, himself a former EAT President, at paragraph 25, refers, without demur, to the principles "recently affirmed by HH Judge Eady in the EAT in *Outasight VB Ltd v Brown UKEAT/0253/14*."

32. Specifically, at paragraph 21 in Burton, Lord Justice Elias had stated that: "*An employment tribunal has a power to review a decision "where it is necessary in the interests of justice": see Rule 70 of the Tribunal Rules. This was one of the grounds on which a review could be permitted in the earlier incarnation of the rules. However, as Underhill J, as he was, pointed out in Newcastle on Tyne City Council v Marsden [2010] ICR 743, para. 17 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…*"

Discussion and decision

33. I have now carefully considered the claimant's written application, and all correspondences up to and including 03 July 2025, including all information within the claimant's reconsideration application, the Tribunal file, the Original Judgment issued to

parties pursuant to my directions dated 04 March 2025, and also my own obligations under Rule 3 of the ET Rules 2024, being the Tribunal's overriding objective to deal with the case fairly and justly.

34. I consider that the claimant has been given a reasonable opportunity, in advance of this Reconsideration Hearing, to make their application for reconsideration of the Original Judgment and to put forth any grounds in respect thereof.

35. On the test of "*in the interests of justice*", under Rule 68 of the ET Rules 2024, which is what gives this Tribunal jurisdiction in this matter, there is now only one ground for "reconsideration", being that reconsideration "*is necessary in the interests of justice*." That phrase is not defined in the ET Rules 2024 (unlike the position upon which a Tribunal could "review" a Judgment under the former 2004 Rules).

36. While there are many similarities between the former 2004 Rules and the ET Rules 2024, there are some differences between the current Rules 68 to 70 of the ET Rules 2024 and the former 2004 Rules 33 to 36. Reconsideration of a Judgment is one of the two possible ways that a party can challenge an Employment Tribunal's Judgment. The other way, of course, is by way of an appeal to the EAT.

37. Rule 68 confers a general power on the Employment Tribunal, and it stands in contrast to the appellate jurisdiction of the EAT. In most cases, a reconsideration will deal with matters more quickly and at less expense than an appeal to the EAT.

38. In the event that the claimant has chosen to pursue both routes, the EAT will decide next steps in that appeal after it, and parties, have given consideration to this my Reconsideration Judgment.

Disposal

Grounds of claimant's application – is it necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the Original Judgment?

39. Having assessed the submissions and representations made by the claimant, I am of the view that this reconsideration application in respect of the grounds of the claimant's application should be refused because it is not necessary in the interests of justice to grant the claimant's application.

40. The Tribunal is of the view that it is not in the interests of justice to allow the claimant's application in respect of any of the grounds set out within the claimant's application, and nor would it be in accordance with the Tribunal's overriding objective to deal with the case fairly and justly to grant the claimant's application on any of the grounds within the claimant's application.

41. In reaching this view, I have again reviewed the documents including all relevant correspondences on the Tribunal file, the relevant statutory provisions and the ET Rules 2024 and case law authorities, any representations made by parties, and I have taken account of all of the relevant circumstances in doing so.

42. I do not believe that the Tribunal have made any error of law, but, if an appeal has been

(or is subsequently) presented to the EAT, I do recognise that that matter is ultimately a matter for the EAT to decide upon, and not for this Tribunal.

43. Now, on reconsideration, the Tribunal do not consider it is necessary in the interests of justice to revoke or vary the Original Judgment and allow the claimant's application. Put simply, the claimant's arguments put within the reconsideration application have not established for me that it would be necessary in the interests of justice for the Original Judgment to be varied or revoked on reconsideration.

44. My view remains essentially the same as it was expressed in the Reasons given at the time in the Tribunal's written Judgment and Reasons ruling on 04 March 2025 and sent to parties on 05 March 2025.

45. As the EAT has made clear, in many other instances, when reviewing any Judgment of an Employment Tribunal, parties should know why they have won or lost, but the Tribunal's decision is not required to be an elaborate formalistic product of refined legal draftsmanship – it must give adequate reasons for its decision, and failure to do so can amount to an error of law giving rise to an appeal to the EAT.

46. The Tribunal gave adequate reasons at the time, when the written Judgment and Reasons were delivered but, in light of the content of the claimant's reconsideration application, I take the opportunity to amplify those earlier reasons here in the Reasons for this Reconsideration Judgment.

47. I am satisfied that the Tribunal did not fail to take into account relevant considerations, and further, that the Tribunal did not have regard to irrelevant considerations.

48. I have included below brief observations in respect of the grounds within the claimant's reconsideration application:

    48.1 The claimant presented complaints of unauthorised deductions from wages and holiday pay. The claimant was awarded the sums sought in their claim and the amounts awarded are set out in the Original Judgment. The claimant did not claim interest in the Claim Form. Accordingly, the Tribunal did not award or consider making an award of interest up to the date of the Judgment (or any other amount other than the amounts claimed by the claimant on the Claim Form). As no interest was awarded up to the date of the Judgment, it is not necessary for interest to be removed from the Original Judgment.

    48.2 The claimant should note that the Employment Tribunals (Interest) Order 1990 SI 1990/479 as amended by SI 2013/1671, made under powers now contained in the Employment Tribunals Act 1996, section 14 ("the 1990 Order") provides that where the whole or any part of a sum of money (other than costs or expenses) that has been required to be paid to a party under an award or other determination of an Employment Tribunal (known as a "relevant decision") remains unpaid, it shall automatically carry interest a stipulated rate from the day immediately following the date when the document recording the award was sent to the parties (such date being known as the "relevant decision day") [please see Article 3 of the 1990 Order]. The Tribunal is required to serve notice on the claimant and the respondent in relation to this matter pursuant to Article

12 of the 1990 Order. The Employment Judge assumes that the claimant is referring to the notice that they received in standard form accompanying the Original Judgment. The claimant should note that the Tribunal has no power to remove any interest that may be payable pursuant to the 1990 Order. If any amounts pursuant to the Original Judgment remain due and owing, the claimant may wish to seek independent legal advice about their enforcement options including in relation to whether or not they are able to not claim interest as part of any enforcement process. The Tribunal is unable to provide any further information or any legal advice about this matter, and in any event any request to remove interest from the same is outwith the Tribunal's powers. The claimant may be able to obtain free advice about this matter from a local Citizens' Advice Bureau or a Law centre.

58. The Original Judgment remains unaltered having taken a step back to consider the claimant's application in light of the full factual matrix, the procedural history and the documents that were before the Tribunal when the Rule 22 Judgment was under consideration, the correspondences on the Tribunal's file, and the claimant's application dated 06 March 2025. The Tribunal did not accept the claimant's position that it is in the interests of justice to reconsider the Original Judgment. In my Judgment, it would not be appropriate or proportionate to revisit or to reconsider the Original Judgment (or to list a reconsideration hearing), in circumstances in which there is no reasonable prospect of the Original Judgment being varied or revoked.

60. The Tribunal's conclusions were reached after having considered all the documents, correspondences and submissions before the Tribunal.

62. Having carefully considered the points made by the claimant in this reconsideration application, the Tribunal does not consider that it is necessary in the interests of justice to revoke or vary the Original Judgment in respect of any of the grounds of the claimant's reconsideration application, and the Tribunal adheres to the Original Judgment, for the reasons given then with the Original Judgment, and as now amplified in these Reasons. As such, the Original Judgment stands, and the Tribunal does not set it aside

Conclusion

63. The claimant's application dated 06 March 2025 for reconsideration of the Original Judgment sent to the parties on 05 March 2025 is refused. There is no reasonable prospect of the Original Judgment being varied or revoked for the reasons set out above.

64. Accordingly, the Tribunal does not vary or revoke the Original Judgment in respect of any of the grounds of the claimant's reconsideration application, as the Tribunal confirms the Original Judgment, that being the appropriate disposal having refused the claimant's reconsideration application.

Further procedure

66. The reconsideration application made by the claimant having been refused, no further consideration shall be given to the same and no further directions shall be issued. As the Original Judgment has not been varied or revoked, the Original Judgment is

confirmed. There are no further or other applications that have been made in the Employment Tribunal that remain extant.

_____

Employment Judge B Beyzade
Dated: 03 July 2025

JUDGMENT & REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON