



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Anissa Laurie

Respondent: Greater London Authority

JUDGMENT FOLLOWING RECONSIDERATION (Pursuant to Rules 70 Employment Tribunal Rules 2024)

It is the Judgment of the Tribunal that:

- (1) The Claimant's application for Reconsideration of the Reserved Judgment dated 07 May 2025 and sent to the parties on 15 May 2025 fails. The original Judgment is confirmed.

REASONS

Background

1. The Reserved Judgment with reasons dated 07 May 2025 was sent to the Parties on 15 May 2025. The Claimant made a request for the reconsideration of this Judgment on 29 May 2025, within 14-days of the Judgment being sent to the Parties.
2. The Parties were invited to make written submissions in relation to this application for consideration and the Respondent made submissions dated 31 July 2025.
3. The Parties were informed that the reconsideration would proceed on the basis that the Claimant's written submissions following the hearing on the 28 and 29 April 2025 had not been sent to the Judge and were not considered within the making of the Reserved Judgment. The Parties were informed that this would take place without a hearing and they were invited to make further written submissions.
4. The Claimant made submissions that she wanted a reconsideration hearing, however she was too unwell to attend or to provide further written reasons at within the given time frames. The Respondent did not make further submissions.

5. Having considered the Claimant's further email correspondence, for the reasons given below, I determined that it was in the interests of justice and the overriding objective to conduct the reconsideration on the papers and without a hearing. This reconsideration took place on 16 August 2025.
6. In considering the Claimant's application, I have reviewed the following documents:
 - 6.1. Reserved Judgment of 15 May 2025
 - 6.2. Hearing Notes of 28 and 29 April 2025
 - 6.3. Claimant's Written Submissions (8-pages) dated 30 April 2025
 - 6.4. Claimant's Reconsideration Application dated 29 May 2025
 - 6.5. Respondent's email of 31 July 2025
 - 6.6. Claimant's email of 31 July 2025
 - 6.7. Case Management Orders of EJ Hook dated 03 October 2024
 - 6.8. Case Management Orders of EJ Volkmer dated 16 January 2025
 - 6.9. Claimant's email of 08 August 2025
 - 6.10. Claimant's email of 11 August 2025
7. The Claimant's email of the 11 July 2025 is an application for the postponement of the listing hearing currently listed for 01 October 2025. This email has been located and will be considered as a matter of urgency.

The Law

8. Rules 68 to 71 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 provide as follows:

RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGMENTS

Principles

68. (1) *The Tribunal may, either on its own initiative (which may reflect a request from the Employment Appeal Tribunal) or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so.*

(2) *A judgment under reconsideration may be confirmed, varied or revoked.*

(3) *If the judgment under reconsideration is revoked the Tribunal may take the decision again. In doing so, the Tribunal is not required to come to the same conclusion.*

Application for reconsideration

69. *Except where it is made in the course of a hearing, an application for reconsideration must be made in writing setting out why reconsideration is necessary and must be sent to the Tribunal within 14 days of the later of—*

(a) the date on which the written record of the judgment sought to be reconsidered was sent to the parties, or

(b) the date that the written reasons were sent, if these were sent separately.

Process for reconsideration

70. (1) *The Tribunal must consider any application made under rule 69 (application for reconsideration).*

(2) If the Tribunal considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked (including, unless there are special reasons, where substantially the same application has already been made and refused), the application must be refused and the Tribunal must inform the parties of the refusal.

(3) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (2), the Tribunal must send a notice to the parties specifying the period by which any written representations in respect of the application must be received by the Tribunal, and seeking the views of the parties on whether the application can be determined without a hearing. The notice may also set out the Tribunal's provisional views on the application.

(4) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (2), the judgment must be reconsidered at a hearing unless the Tribunal considers, having regard to any written representations provided under paragraph (3), that a hearing is not necessary in the interests of justice.

(5) If the Tribunal determines the application without a hearing the parties must be given a reasonable opportunity to make further written representations in respect of the application.

Reconsideration by the Tribunal on its own initiative

71. *Where the Tribunal proposes to reconsider a judgment on its own initiative, it must inform the parties of the reasons why the decision is being reconsidered and the judgment must be reconsidered (as if an application had been made and not refused) in accordance with rule 70(3) to (5) (process for reconsideration).*

9. Under Rule 70, a Judgment will only be reconsidered where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. This allows an Employment Tribunal a broad discretion to determine whether reconsideration of a Judgment is appropriate in the circumstances. Whilst the discretion under the rules is wide under the 'interests of justice' test, it is not boundless; it must be exercised judicially and with regard, not just to the interests of the party seeking the review, but also to the interests of the other party and to the public interest requirement that there should, as far as possible, be finality of litigation - Flint v Eastern Electricity Board [1975] ICR 395 at 401, per Phillips J, at 404.
10. By Rule 68 - 71 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024, the Employment Tribunal may, either on its own initiative or on the application of a party, reconsider a Judgment where it is necessary in the interests of

justice to do so. On reconsideration, the Judgment may be confirmed, varied or revoked.

11. An application for reconsideration shall be presented in writing (and copied to all of the other parties) within 14 days of the date upon which the written record was sent to the parties. In this case the Reserved Judgment was sent to the Parties on 15 May 2025 and the application for reconsideration was sent on 29 May 2025. The application is within the time limit.
12. The procedure upon a reconsideration application is for the Employment Judge that heard the case to consider the application and determine if there are reasonable prospects of the Judgment being varied or revoked. Essentially, this is a reviewing function in which the Employment Judge must consider whether there is a reasonable prospect of reconsideration in the interests of justice. There must be some basis for reconsideration. It is insufficient for an applicant to apply simply because he or she disagrees with the decision.
13. If the Employment Judge considers that there is no such reasonable prospect, then the application shall be refused. Otherwise, the original decision shall be reconsidered at a subsequent reconsideration hearing unless, having considered the written representations, the Employment Judge determines that a hearing is not necessary in the interests of justice. The Employment Judge's role therefore upon the considering of the application upon the papers initially is to operate as a filter to determine whether there is a reasonable prospect of the Judgment being varied or revoked were the matter to be the subject of reconsideration hearing
14. The Employment Appeal Tribunal has given guidance as to the nature of a request for reconsideration:
15. Reconsideration is not an opportunity for a party to seek to re-litigate matters that have already been litigated, or to re-argue matters in a different way or adopting points previously omitted.
16. There is an underlying public policy principle in all judicial proceedings that there should be finality in litigation, and reconsideration applications are a limited exception to that rule.
17. It is not a means by which to have a second bite at the cherry, nor is it intended to provide parties with the opportunity of a re-hearing at which the same evidence and the same arguments can be rehearsed but with different emphasis or additional evidence that was previously available being tendered.
18. Tribunals have a wide discretion whether or not to order reconsideration. Where a matter has been fully ventilated and properly argued, and in the absence of any identifiable administrative error or event occurring after the hearing that requires a reconsideration in the interests of justice, any

asserted error of law is to be corrected on appeal and not through the back door by way of a reconsideration application.

Reasons for the decisions in the application of the Rules

Rule 69

19. The Reserved Judgment was sent to the Parties on 15 May 2025 and the Claimant made her written application on 29 May 2025. This application was in time.
20. The application by the Claimant of the 29 May 2025 provides the entire basis of the Claimant's application. Any further applications for matters to be reconsidered would be out of time and require permission for an extension of time.

Rule 70(2)

21. In consideration of Rule 70(2), this requires a review of the papers. In the circumstances of this application, I am satisfied that it was not an appropriate course of action to reject the reconsideration application as there being no reasonable prospect of success, when the Claimant's written submissions had not been considered when the Reserved Judgment was written. Without considering her submissions it is simply not possible to make this determination. I am satisfied that a reconsideration is proportionate and fair and in the interests of justice to both parties.

Rule 70(3)

22. The Tribunal wrote to the Parties on 23 July 2025. The Tribunal apologizes to the Parties for this delay. The correspondence to the Parties had been prepared sooner, but due to an error, it was not sent.
23. The correspondence of the 23 July 2025 informed the Parties a reconsideration has been considered as the Reserved Judgment had been written without sight of the Claimant's written submissions. It sought written representations from the Parties regarding this reconsideration and the Parties views as to whether the reconsideration could take place without a hearing.
24. The Claimant wrote to the Tribunal advising that she was too unwell to make further submissions and asked for a hearing.
25. The Respondent objected to a reconsideration and requested that the reconsideration was rejected as having no reasonable prospect of the Judgment being varied.

26. I am satisfied that in the circumstances it was in the interests of justice to proceed with the reconsideration as the Claimant's written submissions had not been taken into account. This is in favour of the Claimant's position and no further submissions were required from her to support this decision. I am satisfied that this was a proportionate and fair course of action and that was in the interest of justice for both parties.

Rule 70(4)

27. The reconsideration application was not refused under Rule 70(2). It was therefore a requirement of Rule 70(4) that there would be a reconsideration hearing unless it was not necessary in the interests of justice.
28. In making the decision to continue to consider the Claimant's application without a hearing, I have taken into account the following:
- 28.1. The Claimant's application is a clear, detailed and well-structured application. It provides full details of the points to be reconsidered.
 - 28.2. The application is founded, in part, on the failure to read the Claimant's written submissions. I apologize for this failing.
 - 28.3. The Claimant provided full oral submissions at the hearing. These were also clear, detailed and well structured and addressed points that were raised in her cross examination.
 - 28.4. Whilst there was a delay in the first letter being sent to the Parties, the Parties have had the opportunity to make written submissions to the Tribunal. Everything they sent in has been read and taken into consideration.
 - 28.5. It is understood that the Claimant is too unwell to make further submissions. I am satisfied that her original application provides clear, detailed structured submissions as to the basis of her application and that in allowing the consideration application to proceed, there has been no prejudice to her.
29. I am satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to both parties and the overriding objective to consider the application without a hearing. It is also in the interests of the Parties that the decision for the application is made as there should be, in so far as possible, finality in litigation.

Rule 70(5)

30. Both Parties views were sought by correspondence to them from the Tribunal dated 04 August 2025. They were informed that the reconsideration would take place without a hearing and given more time for further written submissions, until 11 August 2025.

31. The time frame given was one week. The Claimant had given full representations in her written reconsideration application. In further correspondence, the Claimant asserted that she was too unwell to make further submissions.
32. The Respondent did not respond further.
33. As stated above, I am satisfied that her original application provides clear, detailed structured submissions as to the basis of her application and that in allowing the reconsideration application to proceed, there has been no prejudice to her.
34. I am satisfied that the points of objection raised by the Respondent can be considered in a balanced manner to ensure that neither Party is prejudiced.
35. I am satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to both parties and the overriding objective to consider the application without a hearing and without further delay. It is also in the interests of the Parties that the decision for the application is made without further delay as there should be, in so far as possible, finality in litigation.

Decision

36. The reasons for the reconsideration application by the Claimant are, in summary, as follows:
 - 36.1. Procedural Mishaps
 - 36.2. New Evidence
 - 36.3. That the email of the 30 April 2025 @ 0837 was wrongly determined to be inadmissible.

Procedural Mishaps

Case Management Orders

37. The hearing of the 28 and 29 April 2024 was the third preliminary hearing in this case. The two previous preliminary hearings on 03 October 2024 and 16 January 2025 had resulted in Case Management Orders. Both sets of Orders required the Claimant to provide medical evidence as to both her alleged disability at the relevant time and for the reasons to support her application to amend, which included a new claim of disability discrimination.
38. As detailed in the Reserved Judgment, the Claimant only provided limited medical evidence and no GP records for the relevant period.
39. Within the Case Management Orders of Employment Judge Volkmer of 16 January 2025, it provided a timetable for the hearing and to allow the Claimant 30-minutes for self-re-examination. This stated that this was for

the purpose of adding clarity to any questions asked of her during cross examination.

40. At the outset of the hearing, the Claimant had confirmed that her disability impact statement was her witness statement and that she understood the purposes of the hearing, i.e. to consider both her application to amend and the issue of disability at the relevant time.
41. I am satisfied that the Claimant understood the purpose of the hearing and had provided a statement and evidence in support of her position.

Oath and Hearing Timetable

42. I have considered the Claimant's position regarding being under Oath or not.
43. Having reviewed the hearing notes, the Respondent's Representative had concluded cross-examination. At this time the Claimant asked for a break and subsequently, the Tribunal were informed that she was too unwell to continue. The hearing was adjourned at 3pm until the following day.
44. The timetable had provided for 30-minutes for the Claimant to give re-examination and that this was for clarity for questions asked under cross-examination only. I am satisfied that but for the Claimant becoming too unwell to continue, this would have taken place.
45. The issue of giving evidence whilst under Oath was raised as part of submissions as to the fundamental fairness or unfairness of the email prepared by the Claimant. The issue of not being aware whether the Claimant was under Oath or not, was not raised at the hearing.
46. The Claimant did not inform the Tribunal that she had called to enquire about whether she was under Oath or not on the morning of the 30 April. I have reconsidered how the proceedings continued and given that the Claimant had produced a statement with assistance and with new evidence, I am satisfied that it was fundamentally unfair to allow this document to be accepted as re-examination. To balance this, the Claimant was permitted to include any points of clarification within her final submissions.

Written Submissions

47. The aim of the hearing was to follow the timetable as provided, however, during the course of the hearing further adjustments were required. This included:
 - 47.1. Breaks for 10-minutes every hour.
 - 47.2. The Claimant had a note taker attend throughout the hearing.

- 47.3. The Claimant was permitted to be supported by her sister whilst giving evidence. With the Tribunal's permission, the Claimant's sister sat with her whilst giving evidence and spoke on her behalf to seek an adjournment if the Claimant became unwell.
- 47.4. Cross-examination of the Claimant was taken slowly. Counsel was sensitive to the Claimant's health and at any time a question needed to be repeated, or a break taken, this took place.
- 47.5. Day 1 of the hearing finished abruptly when the cross-examination finished at 3pm. as the Claimant was unable to continue. The Claimant was informed that the following day would continue as final submissions.
- 47.6. The Claimant was informed that the final submissions would be adapted to require the Respondent to go first. The Claimant was afforded an extended break to review her submissions prior to giving them. The Claimant was informed that she could include any points of clarification for her own evidence within her submissions.
- 47.7. The Claimant was afforded more time for her Oral submissions and she provided clear, detailed and well-structured submissions.
- 47.8. The Parties were offered to provide written submissions. The Respondent confirmed that they would not and the Claimant did not wish to either. I allowed more time for written submissions to be provided if wished. This was until close of business the following day, 01 May 2025 and the Claimant was informed that there was no requirement to submit written submissions, it was her choice and that careful notes of her oral submissions had been made.
48. I have reviewed the written submissions from the Claimant and the documents above to refresh my memory. I am satisfied that the Claimant did include within her oral submissions' references to cross examination questions to provide clarification to her evidence and that the written submissions are materially the same.
49. I am satisfied that the Respondent's questions in cross examination were not to mislead the Tribunal, but to dispute the evidence and to present the Respondent's case. I am satisfied that the Claimant used her time for final submissions to present her case fully and provide clarification of her position too.
50. It has been accepted that the Claimant's written submissions were not considered prior to the Reserved Judgment being written. They have now been considered and the Judgment reviewed. I am satisfied that the written submissions are fundamentally the same as the clear, detailed and well-structured oral submissions and that all points raised within the Claimant's written submissions have now been taken into account.

51. As explained, I had not been informed that submissions had been received. Irrespective of this, I apologize for the failure to consider the written submissions prior to writing the Reserved Judgment.

Order 12

52. The Claimant was afforded the reasonable adjustments she had requested. These are detailed above. At times she was happy to continue without breaks, at other times she needed more breaks, longer breaks. The hearing was adjourned at 3pm on the first day at the Claimant's request.

Conclusion regarding procedural mishaps

53. In conclusion, although the procedure may not have been perfect, it was not unfair. I am satisfied that any imperfections did not prevent the Claimant from having the opportunity to present her case fully and fairly. I am also satisfied that the Claimant utilized this opportunity and all points raised by her have been taken into consideration.

New Evidence

54. The Claimant has provided a letter from her GP dated 23 May 2025, which has been prepared for the purpose of this case. The Claimant states that she was unable to provide this previously as she had been unwell and out of the Country.
55. For new evidence to be included it must not have been available to the Claimant at the time of the preliminary hearing.
56. I note the following:
- 56.1. The Claimant had applied for an extension of time to obtain NHS records in November 2024.
 - 56.2. The Claimant had provided a previous GP letter dated 18 October 2025, which did not provide the details as given in this second letter.
 - 56.3. The Claimant's impact statement of 16 December 2024 confirms that she believes that she has provided all the necessary information.
57. I am satisfied that the Claimant could have provided this evidence at the time of the preliminary hearing and do not accept it as new evidence.

That the email of the 30 April 2025 @ 0837 was wrongly determined to be inadmissible.

58. On the morning of the second day of the hearing, the Claimant provided a detailed 7-page document, which she asked to be included as part of her statement of evidence. The Claimant had previously confirmed that her statement of evidence was her disability impact statement and the Respondent had prepared their case on this basis.
59. I heard submissions from both the Claimant and the Respondent in relation to this document, which had been prepared by the Claimant with assistance from family and friends and found that it was fundamentally unfair to continue with that statement as her evidence. The Claimant accepted the decision. Oral reasons were given during the hearing as follows:

“The Claimant has provided a new document that was sent to the Tribunal and the Respondent at 0837 this morning. The Claimant is asking the Tribunal to accept this document as her explanation for the questions she was asked yesterday and includes additional information to clarify her answers. It is, in effect, a witness statement after the conclusion of her evidence.

The Claimant submits that she was highly triggered yesterday and that the hearing was unfair as she was unable to answer her questions clearly or to the extent that she wanted to. She accepts that the questioning was slow, but she states that it was not slow enough and that there were insufficient breaks that led to her panic attack and the early adjournment of the hearing. She found the day to be traumatic and asks the Tribunal to indulge her with permission for this to be accepted as evidence.

The respondent has objected to this document being accepted as evidence for the following reasons:

- 1. Evidence provides that re-examination may only be related to matters arising out of xx. This is a fundamental principle of evidence. It is also only permitted whilst under Oath. This is simply permitting the Claimant to do re-examination in writing, after the fact of giving evidence and whilst she is not under Oath. The respondent states that this is unfair to allow any litigant to give evidence under Oath, then whilst not under oath, think and discuss and try to improve. That goes to fundamental fairness, it would cut across the fairness of proceedings. This is the reason for wit stats and why warnings are given to witnesses by Judges whilst under oath. This is the obvious reason why that witness statements are not submitted after xx.*
- 2. The respondent accepts that the C may need adjustments, such as additional time, a break or support as in this hearing. In a hearing room, the Claimant would have to apply for permission for sister to support her. The Claimant already has adjustments to assist her. In addition to the breaks and support, the XX was slower and gentler than ordinarily. It is the Claimant's position in this new wit stat that she doesn't have a barrister and should be permitted to submit an additional statement now. It is the respondent's position that all witnesses are alone in the witness box. Even with a team of lawyers, she would not be entitled to do this.*

3. *The rules apply to LinP in the ordinary way. Baroness Hayle in the Supreme Court says the balance of fairness is disturbed if LinP are entitled to greater indulgence.*
4. *There is also a line of authority dating back to the 19th Century. By starting this litigation process, the Claimant accepts that by accepting litigation, the Claimant accepts inconvenience or injustice. The respondent asserts that there has been no injustice to the Claimant and she has had indulgence. The Claimant cannot seek to rely on new evidence having completed her evidence.*

I have reviewed the Claimant's new document and it does introduce new evidence that was not cross examined upon.

Prior to this hearing, the Claimant provided an impact statement. This was a document of some 8-pages and gave the Claimant the opportunity to say whatever she wanted to say in evidence. This document was accepted by the Tribunal as the Claimant's Evidence in Chief and the Claimant was permitted to rely upon it. Additionally, the respondent has relied upon this document in it's preparation for this hearing today and cross examination was founded on this document and the Claimant's disclosure of medical records.

In the preparation for this hearing, the Claimant has been free to disclose any document that she wished to rely upon to support her assertion of her disability. She has also been permitted to prepare her impact statement, which the respondent and Tribunal read in preparation for this hearing.

The Claimant has asked for adjustments from the Tribunal and these have been forthcoming. Any break that was requested by the Claimant was granted, including an early finish. Additionally, I accept that the cross examination was slow and steady and questions were broken down. Where the Claimant struggled to answer a question, it was repeated or simplified. If needed, the Claimant was permitted to take a break before restarting with the question being repeated.

It is a fundamental principle of fairness that an individual giving evidence under Oath gives evidence from agreed documents and answer's to the best of their abilities on the day. I accept that any witness is alone in the witness box, and whilst the Tribunal permitted the Claimant to have her sister sitting next to her throughout and providing support and a voice, where assistance was required, but the Claimant would always be alone when having to provide her answers to the questions directed at her whilst giving evidence.

To accept this document as a new witness statement would take this hearing back to square one as it would be unable to continue as neither the respondent's representative nor his solicitor have been able to review this.

The Tribunal is mindful of the adjustments that have been made for the Claimant, however it would be fundamentally unfair and contrary to the overriding objective to permit the Claimant to introduce a new witness

statement at the point of closing submissions, where evidence has been concluded. I do not accept this document as a witness statement for and on behalf of the Claimant. The witness statement and evidence in chief remains the impact statement as prepared by the Claimant before this hearing which is at pages 246 – 254 of the bundle.

The document as prepared by the Claimant today is not accepted as evidence.

I have considered whether to permit this document as the Claimant's final submissions, with any new evidence being disregarded. Points within it are addressed in the impact statement and the Claimant was cross examined on her proposed amendments to the List of Issues, and her claim, which are highlighted in the List of Issues whether underlined, highlighted in orange or in red within commentary boxes.

The new document is lengthy and expands on the impact statement and gives further evidence. I am satisfied that to make an adjustment to allow this document, even as a closing submission, would cause significant prejudice to the respondent and that this would be an adjustment too far. I do not permit this document to be relied upon.

As with any proceedings, the parties may both submit their closing submissions in writing. These submissions are not there to provide new evidence to the Tribunal but to clarify their arguments as to why the Tribunal should be persuaded to accept their position."

60. I have reconsidered my decision in relation to this email, and I am satisfied that this was the correct decision taking into the submissions and the circumstances as detailed within the decision above.
61. In preparing for closing submissions, the order of submissions was changed to allow the Claimant to hear the Respondent's submissions first. She was also informed that should she wish to include any clarification to any question she had been asked in cross-examination, then she could do so within these submissions. As noted above, I am satisfied that the Claimant did provide clarification in both her oral and written submissions, for example, her use of the word "mysterious" was in reference to questions asked of her by the Respondent's Counsel during cross-examination. This was a term used by Counsel during cross-examination.

Conclusion

62. I am satisfied that I applied the correct law and procedure in this matter. I took account of the following:
 - 62.1. the balance of injustice/hardship in deciding the issue of disability at the relevant time and the amendment application;

- 62.2. that the claimant had a reasonable and fair opportunity to discuss her claim and clarify issues at the hearing on 28 April 2025 and again on 29 April 2025;
 - 62.3. that adjustments were made to assist the Claimant throughout;
 - 62.4. that the Claimant had every opportunity to provide evidence and her statements prior to the hearing and that the Case Management Orders did not contradict one another but required the Claimant to evidence her case; and
 - 62.5. That the Claimant provided a disability impact statement and her evidence and understood the purpose of the hearing being to consider both her application to amend and the issue of disability at the relevant time.
63. The procedure followed during the hearing was adjusted to assist the Claimant. I am satisfied that the Claimant had the opportunity to present her case and to provide clarification for any questions asked of her in cross-examination. Had the Claimant not become unwell, self-re-examination would have followed the cross-examination. However, the Claimant had prepared a new document with assistance that placed the Respondent at a significant disadvantage, which I found amounted to fundamental unfairness. This unfairness, I found, outweighed any disadvantage to the Claimant who was still able to provide the clarification permitted by re-examination, by including this clarification within her closing submissions. I am satisfied that she utilized this opportunity too.
64. The Claimant's written submissions have now been considered and all of the above documents read to ensure a full understanding and recollection of the hearing.
65. I have considered the Claimant's application and all further correspondence. I am satisfied that I have considered the interests of justice, the overriding objective and the principle that there should, in so far as possible, be finality in litigation.
66. In conclusion, and having reviewed the above documents, I am satisfied that the original decision in the Reserved Judgment is confirmed.

Employment Judge Illing
Dated: 18 August 2025