



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Miss A Shaheen

Respondent: LPS Solicitors LTD

JUDGMENT

The judgment of the Tribunal is that the Claimant's application dated 1st June 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment made in relation to the hearing held between 7th – 11th April 2025, is refused because there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked.

REASONS

1. Schedule 1 of The Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013 contains the Employment Tribunal Rules of Procedure 2013 ("the Rules").
2. Under Rule 70 of the Rules, the Employment Tribunal may, either on its own initiative or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. On reconsideration, the decision may be confirmed, varied or revoked.
3. Rule 71 provides that an application for reconsideration under Rule 70 must be made in writing (and copied to all other parties) within 14 days of the date on which the decision (or, if later, the written reasons) were sent to the parties.
4. The process by which the Tribunal considers an application for reconsideration is set out in Rule 72. Rule 72(1) provides that where an Employment Judge considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, the application shall be refused, and the Tribunal shall inform the parties of the refusal.

5. Guidance for Tribunals on how to approach applications for reconsideration was given by Simler P in the case of Liddington v 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust UKEAT/0002/16/DA. Paragraphs 34 and 35 provide as follows:

“34. [...] a request for reconsideration is not an opportunity for a party to seek to relitigate 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.

Where [...] 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.”

6. The application for reconsideration appears to be made on the following Grounds, namely the claimant believes evidence presented in the hearing should have been interpreted differently.
7. The claimant is a disappointed litigant and is seeking to have a further attempt to re-argue her position having had a full opportunity at the previous hearing. It is not the purpose of reconsideration to allow a party to the opportunity to rehearse the arguments that have already been made and explored. It is a fundamental requirement of litigation there is certainty and finality.
8. If there was an error of law, this is a matter for appeal and not reconsideration. The claimant has not argued or identified an error of law.
9. This application does not raise any new information or grounds which she could not have raised at the hearing which would make reconsideration necessary in the interests of justice.
10. In the circumstances the application for reconsideration is rejected on the basis there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked. Accordingly, the application for reconsideration is therefore refused.

Case No: 1802932/2024

Employment Judge **Singh**

_____7th July 2025_____