



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Denisa Silvana Bordas

Respondent: Grant UK Ltd

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 13 August 2024 (followed by written reasons on 16 September 2024) is refused.

REASONS

Preliminary Procedural Matters

1. The Employment Tribunal was informed in August 2024 that the claimant had appealed the judgment to the Employment Appeal Tribunal. On 20 September 2024 the claimant wrote to the Employment Tribunal saying she was appealing the decision and set out her grounds of appeal. There was a line in the letter which read "The specific issues for Tribunal review included the actions of [MK]. I did not understand this at the time to mean the claimant was requesting a reconsideration. Therefore, no reconsideration was done.
2. On 11 January 2026 the claimant wrote to the Employment Tribunal again requesting a reconsideration and removal of the judgment from the record, setting out her reasons. She asked to know the status of her previous request for re-evaluation.
3. Whilst the 11 January request is out of time, I will give the claimant the benefit of the doubt and treat her correspondence of 20 September 2024 as a request for reconsideration that was in time.

Substantive Reasons

4. By Rule 68 of the Employment Tribunal's Rules of Procedure 2024, the Employment Tribunal may, either on its own initiative or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. On reconsideration, the judgment may be confirmed, varied or

revoked.

5. The judgment will only be reconsidered where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. This allows the Employment Tribunal a broad discretion, which must be exercised judicially. This means having regard not only to the interests of the party seeking the reconsideration but also the interests of the other party to the litigation and to the public interest requirement that there should, so far as possible, be finality of litigation. Reconsiderations are therefore best seen as limited exceptions to the general rule that employment tribunal decisions should not be reopened and relitigated.
6. In Liddington v. 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust EAT/0002/16 Mrs Justice Simler (as she then was), the President of the Employment Appeal Tribunal, held that:

‘... a request for reconsideration is not an opportunity for a party to seek to re-litigate matters that have already been litigated, or to reargue matters in a different way or by adopting points previously omitted. 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. They are not a means by which to have a second bite at the cherry, nor are they intended to provide parties with the opportunity of a rehearing 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.’
7. I have read the claimant’s application, which is an example of that sort of request. The judgment sets out the facts and conclusions relevant to the issues in this case, as supported by the evidence it heard and read. There are no material omissions and there is nothing in the reconsideration application, which would change the outcome of the hearing.
8. In those circumstances, and taking account of the overriding objective of dealing with cases justly and fairly, I conclude that it is not necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the original judgment as there is no reasonable prospect of it being varied or revoked.

Employment Judge Liz Ord

Date 13 January 2026