



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:**                   Lukasz Mejer

**Respondent:**               WINDOWFLOWERS LTD

## RECONSIDERATION JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 5 December 2025, which was referred to me by tribunal administration on 10 December 2025, for reconsideration of the decision to grant an extension of time for service of the ET3 dated and sent to the parties on 1 August 2025 is refused.

## REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked for the reasons set out below.

1. On 19 March 2025 the respondent's representative wrote to the tribunal, stating the representative had been instructed by the respondent that day and requesting an extension of time of 28 days to enter a response pursuant to rule 21(1) of Schedule 1 of the Employment Tribunal procedure rules as the respondent "did not receive a copy of the Claimant's claim form from the Tribunal".
2. Tribunal administration records that the acknowledgment of service letter dated 13 December 2024 was only sent to the claimant at the address stated on the ET1 (which is compliant procedure; the tribunal does not send the acknowledgment of service to the respondent). I have seen a copy of the letter sent by tribunal administration; it was sent only to the claimant.
3. The notice of claim form was sent to the respondent at the following address on Window Flowers Ltd, Grove Road, Burnham, Slough, SL1 8DT on 13 December 2024 informing the respondent that the date for service of the response was 10 January 2025. This is the address provided by the claimant in the ET1. It is noted that the claimant does not provide the premises number or premises name for the respondent. Therefore, it was reasonable for me to conclude that the address was incomplete and that the respondent did not receive the claim form as stated by its representative.
4. Therefore, for these reasons I considered it fair and just and compliant with the overriding objective to instruct tribunal administration to send a copy of the claim for

to the respondent's representative and to grant the respondent 28 days to respond to the claim.

5. At the time of this decision I did not have a copy of the claimant's objection to the extension request before me. For this reason I have granted an extension of time to the claimant to consider the reconsideration request, which is out of time.
6. I have checked the online portal as part of this reconsideration to try and locate the objection document to which the claimant refers. The claimant has made a total of 23 applications to the online portal.
7. As part of my reconsideration of the decision to allow an extension of time, I have considered the following documents from the claimant:
  - 7.1. The objection dated 23 March 2025 and 2 attachments;
  - 7.2. The respondent's response to the objection dated 24 March 2025; and
  - 7.3. The reconsideration request dated 5 December 2025.
8. Addressing the initial objection document (23 March 2025). The contents of this do not change my decision. The tribunal served the claim form using the address provided by the claimant. This address does not contain a premises number or name therefore it is reasonable for me to conclude that the respondent did not receive the claim form. Therefore I accepted, and still accept that it did not.
9. It is the overriding objective of the Employment Tribunal to deal with cases fairly and justly. In these circumstances, I consider it fair and just to allow an extension of time for service of the ET3. For the reasons below. there was (and remains) no prejudice to the claimant in so doing.
10. The points made by the claimant in his reconsideration request do not change my decision. The claimant assertion that the acknowledgement of claim form dated 13 December 2024 was sent to the respondent is factually incorrect. It is clear from the face of this letter that it was sent only to the claimant; tribunal administration records confirm the same. Indeed, the copy of this letter provided by the claimant as an attachment to the reconsideration request evidences that it was only sent to the claimant. It is not clear to me why the claimant is suggesting it was also sent to the respondent. In any event, had it been (which I have found it was not) the address for the respondent before the tribunal at that time was incomplete.
11. There was a good reason for the respondent failing to send a response before 10 January 2025. I have accepted that it did not receive the 13 December 2024 notice of claim letter from the tribunal as the addressed used in this letter (and the address provided by the claimant) was incomplete.
12. There is no prejudice to the claimant of this extension of time. No hearing had been listed by the tribunal when the extension was granted. Indeed, the tribunal subsequently ordered the claimant to provide further information about his complaints. Due to tribunal waiting times, the case management hearing has been listed for 8 January 2026. The respondent did provide an reason for the delay; that it did not receive the claim form and this reason was accepted by the tribunal for the reasons stated above.
13. For these reasons, the claimant's request for reconsideration of the decision to grant an extension of time for service of the ET3 is refused.

Date: 10 December 2025

Approved by

Employment Judge Hutchings

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

23 December 2025

.....  
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE