



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** SP

**Respondent:** (1) RAD Group Ltd  
(2) Mr Andrew Cochrane  
(3) Ms Karen McCarthy-Woods

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 8 October 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 26 September 2025 is refused.

## REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because:

1. There are five grounds set out in the reconsideration application. I will consider them in turn.
2. Ground 1 relates to the Written Reasons provided by Employment Judge Annand, sent to the parties on 6 April 2025. Any application to reconsider the Judgment attached to those Written Reasons is out of time by several months: parties have 14 days from the date on which the Judgment is sent to them to apply for reconsideration – rule 69 of the Employment Tribunal Procedural Rules 2024. It is therefore rejected.
3. In terms of Ground 2, the claimant's representative has cited two paragraphs of the Written Reasons sent to parties on 26 September 2025; paragraphs 127 and 136.1. None of the representations made thereafter have any reasonable prospect of altering the contents of those paragraphs and therefore leading to revocation or variation of the Judgment made.
4. Regarding Ground 3, the claimant's representative submits that I failed to determine causation in relation to Issues 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 relating to the s15 Equality Act 2010 claim, despite clear evidence. The fundamental

issue in this case was whether the respondent had the requisite knowledge of the claimant's disability. That knowledge is a precondition to claims under section 13 and section 15 of the Equality Act 2010 ("EqA") succeeding. The claimant's claim was limited to those two heads of claim. I made a determination on knowledge, specifically that the respondent did not have the requisite knowledge required for either claim to succeed. As such on that issue alone the claimant's claims failed. This ground therefore has no reasonable prospects of success of leading to a revocation or variation of the Judgment.

5. Turning to Ground 4, again the fundamental issue with this claim was that, in the Judgment, my decision was that the respondent did not have the requisite knowledge required for a section 15 EqA claim to succeed. Therefore her points at Ground 4 have no reasonable prospect of leading to a revocation or variation of the Judgment made.
6. In relation to Ground 5, the claimant is correct to say that there is an error at paragraph 11 of the Written Reasons. I have stated at paragraph 11 that "we were able to then use day two and three to hear the evidence of all three witnesses". In fact all three witnesses gave evidence on one day, that being day three of the hearing; Thursday, 8 May 2025. This point however has no reasonable prospect of leading to a variation of revocation of the Judgment.
7. Within Ground 5, the claimant makes reference to late instruction of documents, impartiality concerns, and being instructed to cross examine the respondent's witness in the afternoon of that Thursday. She says that these are procedural irregularities. The claimant's representative states that she was "not adequately prepared due to late provision of the bundle and the unexpected change of the order of proceedings".
8. Case management of this hearing was considered on the first day of the hearing, that being Tuesday, 6 May 2025. In that discussion I made it clear to the claimant's representative that it was only right that she be familiar with the respondent's witness statement and the bundle. I was informed by the claimant's representative that she was familiar with the bundle having discussed it with the respondent's solicitor the Saturday before the hearing commenced: she said it was just the page numbers with which she needed to familiarise herself.
9. All parties were keen to progress this matter at if possible, given that we had a false start due to lack of finalised bundle and exchange of witness statements. This was particularly so given that I had informed the parties that to relist the hearing would have meant to wait until May 2026 for the final hearing.
10. I explained to the parties that my view was at least to start the hearing during the course of the listed three days, and then if we needed to have a part-heard hearing it would be dealt with much sooner than relisting the whole final hearing altogether. Orders were made with the agreement of the parties on day one.
11. It is right that the claimant's representative cross-examined the respondent's witness on the afternoon of day three, that being Friday 8

May 2025. Prior to commencing that process, it was not raised with me that the claimant's representative felt she had not had sufficient time to prepare to cross-examine the witness that afternoon.

12. In summary the matters now raised at Ground 5 of the Reconsideration Application were not raised during the course of the hearing. No concerns were raised with me as to the suggested and enacted procedure during the course of the hearing. All case management orders and the progression of the hearing were dealt with in agreement with both parties.
13. I therefore conclude that there are no reasonable prospects of Ground 5 leading to a variation or revocation of the Judgment.

Date: 14 November 2025

Approved by

Employment Judge Shastri-Hurst

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

17 November 2025

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE