



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Mr J Mangrola

**Respondent:** The Home Office

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated **28 August 2023** and **22 September 2023** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **13 September 2023** is refused.

## REASONS

1. I have been shown an order dated 19 August 2025 from the Employment Appeal Tribunal made by Caspar Glyn KC, Deputy Judge of the High Court in chambers.
2. I have also been provided with the employment tribunal file in case of Mr J Mangrola -v- The Home Office (Case No. 3300775/2021). The file does not contain the applications for reconsideration dated 28 August 2023 or 22 September 2023.
3. I have however been able to obtain copies of both these documents which were forwarded to me for the first time by EJ Annand on 24 January 2025. The documents appear to have been put before her in a different case involving the claimant and The Home Office. The failure to match the documents containing the reconsideration application and the file has resulted in the application for reconsideration not being considered until now.
4. In the document dated 28 August 2023 the claimant refers to "*new evidence which I believe is relevant credible and will significantly influence the judgment*". The claimant also states that the evidence could not have been

obtained before. Having considered the content of the document I am not satisfied that the evidence could not have been provided at the final hearing. The document on its face illustrates that all the evidence was available and with due diligence could have been presented to the Tribunal. The only evidence that was not available before the hearing was the updated version of the Home Office Policy.

5. The updated version of the Home Office policy relied does not lead me to conclude that the decision of the Tribunal might have been wrong. The claimant in any event does not explain how the varied policy should have been considered so that it might lead to a different conclusion on any of the relevant points or explain how the prior version of the policy that was in existence was different. Without illustrating the difference it seem to me not possible for the claimant to assert that there was evidence which could not have been available at the hearing.
6. Having considered all the information provided by the claimant I do not consider that there is any reasonable prospect that the decision made by the Tribunal, i.e. that the claimant was not discriminated against on the grounds of his race or subjected to detriment because of protected disclosure, will be varied or revoked. This is because the original decision was made after considering all the evidence that was placed before us and forming a view on the reliability of that evidence. The new evidence produced by the claimant does not lead me to consider that the original decision was wrong or may be wrong.
7. The new evidence does not impact on the Tribunal's conclusion that there was no protected disclosure or that the claimant was not subjected to any less favourable treatment or detriment because of his race.
8. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, the application for reconsideration is refused.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Gumbiti-Zimuto

Date: 3 September 2025

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON  
8 SEPTEMBER 2025

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE