



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

## Claimant

**Ms I Cetin**

**v**

## Respondent

- 1. Mr D E**
- 2. Mr B C**
- 3. A Limited**

**Heard at:** Watford

**Before:** Employment Judge French

## RECONSIDERATION JUDGMENT

The claimant's application for a reconsideration of the Reasons Judgment sent to the parties on 29 April 2025, is refused.

## REASONS

1. The application was made on 29 May 2025. Written reasons were sent to the parties on 29 April 2025. Rule 69 of the Employment Tribunal Rules or Procedure state that any application for re-consideration must be made within 14 days of receipt of the Judgment or written reasons if sent separately and therefore the application should have been made by 13 May 2025.
2. The claimant makes an application for an extension of time to the application on the basis that new evidence has become available since the time limit expired and therefore an extension is in the interests of justice.
3. The new evidence relied on is Judge Stout's EAT decision on 15 May 2025 accepting the claimant's appeal against the anonymity orders made in this case and evidence of an email sent by the one of the respondents to the tribunal concerning the police report.
4. I am not persuaded that either give rise to an extension being necessary in the interests of justice, however I have considered the claimant's application in full in any event.

5. I have considered the claimants application dated 29 May 2025 and the further information sent on 24 June 2025. I apologise for the delay in dealing with the claimant's original application, which was not referred to me by the administration team until 10 July 2025, together with her updated information sent in June 2025.
6. I consider that the claimant's application largely seeks to challenge my findings and conclusions and is an attempt to re-litigate the case. At the hearing on 18 March 2025, I carefully considered the evidence presented by the claimant and heard her submissions. I gave full reasons having regard to the evidence before me.
7. As to the new evidence, the decision of Judge Stout is to allow the appeal to proceed to a preliminary hearing. Firstly, that relates to the anonymity orders made in this case and are not related to the matter that was before me namely whether the claim should be dismissed pursuant to rule 28. Part of the claimant's complaint was that the respondents reported her to the police for an alleged breach of previous anonymity orders. Those previous orders are not part of the appeal before the EAT in relation to Judge Stout's decision (and indeed I understand were previously challenged by way of appeal which was unsuccessful in the EAT), and I maintain my conclusion that the respondents were simply seeking to enforce previous orders of the tribunal.
8. To the extent that I looked at the decision of anonymity as set out in paragraphs 41 to 47 the fact that the appeal has been allowed to proceed to a preliminary hearing does not in my view change that reasoning or give rise to re-consideration.
9. As to the correspondence between the tribunal and one of the respondents, the claimant's argument appears to be that it is the actions of the tribunal and members of the judiciary that has allowed continued victimisation and harassment. The claim is against the respondents, not the tribunal and I see no basis for re-consideration on those grounds because on the claimant's account the new evidence would not seek to support that it is the actions of the respondent.
10. In respect of the further enforcement action outlined in the additional information of 24 June 2025 I consider that my reasoning given in relation to the previous enforcement action would equally apply.
11. Rule 70 of the Employment Tribunal procedure Rules 2024 states:
  - (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.*

12. Under rule 70, and having regard to the matters above, I have concluded that there is no reasonable prospect of the Judgment being either varied or revoked. Accordingly, this application by the claimant for a reconsideration, is refused.

Approved by:

Employment Judge French

11 July 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES  
ON 23 July 2025

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE