



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Pauline Cherri-Nicole Catesby

Respondent: (1) Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis
(2) Spencer Richards
(3) Du'aine Bowley

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 14 May 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment given on 17 March 2025 and written reasons sent to the parties on 12 May 2025 is refused.

REASONS

1. By Rule 70 of the Employment Tribunal's Rules of Procedure 2013, 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 judgment may be confirmed, varied or revoked.
2. The judgment will only be reconsidered where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. This allows the Employment Tribunal a broad discretion, which must be exercised judicially. This means having regard not only to the interests of the party seeking the reconsideration but also 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. Reconsiderations are therefore best seen as limited exceptions to the general rule that employment tribunal decisions should not be reopened and relitigated.
3. The employment tribunal fully considered the evidence before it and came to its conclusions on all the issues in the case. Written reasons for its judgment have been given. A reconsideration is not an opportunity for the claimant to have a rehearing at which the same evidence is rehearsed with different emphasis. A party's disagreement with the tribunal's judgment is not a good reason to reconsider.

4. The claimant's application centres largely around a restatement of her case, which was before the tribunal at the full merits hearing. For the avoidance of doubt, the panel considered all matters of any significant relevance. There is nothing in her application on the substantive judgment which merits a reconsideration.
5. The claimant further alleges procedural unfairness. She cites me saying I had not read the file at the start of the hearing. However, I and the panel members took time out after dealing with initial matters to read the file, as is normal practice.
6. The claimant also says she was unable to introduced or clarify her case prior to cross examination. However, the normal procedure was followed in that the claimant's witness statement was read by the panel and stood as her evidence in chief. The panel understood her case.
7. There was no unfairness or prejudice. She was given full opportunity to participate and to provide closing submissions
8. There is nothing in the claimant's application which justifies a reconsideration.
9. Taking account of the overriding objective of dealing with cases justly and fairly, I conclude that it is not necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the original judgment as there is no reasonable prospect of it being varied or revoked.

Employment Judge Liz Ord
Date 23 June 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
11 July 2025

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE