



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr G Roberts

Respondent: Penrhyndeudraeth Town Council

At: Wrexham (in chambers) **On:** 2nd December 2025

By: Employment Judge T. Vincent Ryan

Decision

On application for Reconsideration

Rules 70 – 73 ETs (Constitution & Rules of Procedure) Regs 2013

Rules 68 – 71 The Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024

1. The Claimant has applied for reconsideration of my judgment signed on 6 April and sent to the parties on 11 April 2023 (“the Judgment”).
2. I have read the Claimant’s application for reconsideration dated 11 November 2025.
3. I have re-read the judgment.
4. I consider that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, and I refuse the Claimant’s application for reconsideration. The Claimant’s application rehearses parts of the claim and evidence considered by the Tribunal on 3 – 5 April 2023 and he relies on the Auditor General Wales audit report of 12 October 2025 as “new material”; he says the report shows the Respondent’s non-compliance with laws, regulations and codes of practice and that the Respondent’s witnesses therefore misled the Tribunal.

5. Said non-compliance was initially alleged to have been a “PCP” causing the Claimant substantial disadvantage and triggering the statutory duty to make reasonable adjustments. That claim was withdrawn by the Claimant and dismissed.
6. The judgment specifically excluded adjudication on matters of governance that were outside the Tribunal’s jurisdiction. The Tribunal accepted the Claimant’s continuing sense of grievance, and stressed the difficulty of the word “sufficient” in the context of this matter and the allegations made (para 44.5 of the judgment). Notwithstanding all that, the Tribunal found that the PCP that the Claimant did rely on did not exist, and that in any event “substantial disadvantage” was not found; not only was the statutory duty not triggered but the Respondent did all it reasonably could to remove the perceived disadvantage and see to the Claimant’s return to work. The Claimant did not engage with the Respondent constructively, and the Tribunal could only speculate on how the Respondent would apply itself to proper governance if he had. Out of courtesy the Tribunal even considered matters, in principle, that were raised by the Claimant but were not live claims.
7. In the above context, the Claimant has not raised any new and significant issues, evidence, or other matters that were not properly considered at the final hearing or that would give rise to variation or revocation of the judgment.

Approved by Employment Judge T V Ryan
Dated: 02.12.25

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

15 December 2025

Katie Dickson
FOR THE SECRETARY OF EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS