



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Ms Y Namaji

Respondent: Humraaz Support Services

RECONSIDERATION JUDGMENT

The judgment dismissing all the claimant's claims relating to alleged protected disclosures on time limit grounds and given orally at the hearing of 11 August 2025 is revoked on reconsideration.

REASONS

1. By judgment announced at the hearing of 11 August 2025 the claimant's claims arising from alleged protected disclosures were dismissed on the grounds that they had been presented out of time.
2. Unfortunately, due to an administrative error on the Tribunal's part, Judge Buzzard was not informed that following a prior hearing Judge Barker had already issued a judgment on this very issue.
3. Judge Barker included this as part of her reasons for a decision that the claimant was granted permission to amend her claim to add allegations relating to protected disclosures.
4. Judge Barker did not announce this decision at a hearing. The judgment was provided in writing some time after the hearing. The now complete Tribunal records show that this judgment was sent to the parties on 23 July 2025. It was unfortunately not added to the digital case file when it was sent to the parties and as at 11 August 2025 was not part of the digital case file.
5. At the hearing, neither of the parties present informed the judge that this issue had already been determined by Judge Barker. Accordingly, Judge Buzzard proceeded on the mistaken understanding that the issue was awaiting determination.
6. A Judge cannot ordinarily re-adjudicate an issue that has been determined by another Judge of the same Tribunal. To do so would be in breach of the principle of *res judicata*, which translates to "*already decided*". This means that the decision

reached by Judge Buzzard, whilst unaware of the provision determination, is of no effect and cannot remain unrevoked.

7. Accordingly, Judge Buzzard's decision at the hearing on 11 August 2025, insofar as it purported to determine the issue already determined by Judge Barker relating to whether the claimant's protected disclosure claims were brought in time, is revoked on reconsideration.
8. The claimant had sought written reasons for the decision which has now been revoked. Given that decision has now been revoked on reconsideration there is no longer a judgment for which reasons could, or indeed sensibly should, be provided.
9. The effect of this decision is that the claimant's claims based on the assertion that she had made public interest disclosures are no longer dismissed by Judge Buzzard, and will proceed on the basis of the prior and valid judgment made by Judge Barker and promulgated on 23 July 2025.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Buzzard

22 September 2025

Judgment sent to the parties on:

6 November 2025

.....

For the Tribunal:

Notes

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision. If written reasons are provided they will be placed online.

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 51) and any written reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions> shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimants and respondents.

If a Tribunal hearing has been recorded, you may request a transcript of the recording. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, you will have to pay for it. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral judgment or reasons given at the hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings and accompanying Guidance, which can be found at www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/