



THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs Chandra Brown

Respondent: (1) The Hamptons Hospital Limited; and
(2) Mr Imran Walji

On: 5 January 2026

Heard at: Norwich (by CVP)

Before: Employment Judge M Warren

Representation
For the Claimant: Mrs D Sherwin, Solicitor
For the Respondents: Mrs M Spencer, Counsel

JUDGMENT ON RECONSIDERATION

I reconsider the Judgment dated 3 March 2025 and revoke it.

REASONS

Background

1. Mrs Brown was Hospital Director for the First Respondent. The Second Respondent is the Chief Executive Officer of the First Respondent. She was employed by the Respondent between 9 January and 12 July 2024. After Early Conciliation as to the First Respondent between 18 July and 13 August 2024 and as to the Second Respondent between 7 August and 13 August 2024, she issued these proceedings on 13 September 2024 claiming unfair dismissal and detriment for having made protected disclosures.
2. The Response having been filed out of time, Judgment was entered for Mrs Brown on 3 March 2025. The Respondents applied for reconsideration of that Default Judgment. Today's hearing was listed to consider that reconsideration application and if successful, to list the case for final hearing and make appropriate case management orders.

Papers before me today

3. I had the following:-
 - 3.1. A Bundle prepared by the Respondents' solicitors;
 - 3.2. A supplemental Bundle prepared by the Claimant's solicitors;
 - 3.3. A Draft List of Issues prepared by the Claimant's solicitors, (a further copy of that List of Issues appeared in the Bundle with proposed amendments annotated in red by the Respondents);
 - 3.4. An Agenda completed by the Claimant;
 - 3.5. A witness statement of Mr Imran Walji;
 - 3.6. A witness statement of Ms Joanne Dunbar;
 - 3.7. A Skeleton Argument for the Respondents; and
 - 3.8. A Skeleton Argument for the Claimant.

The Application for Reconsideration

4. The chronology of events is as follows:
 - 4.1. The claim was issued on 13 September 2024.
 - 4.2. The claim was served on 8 November 2024, the letter of service stated a response was due on 6 December 2024.
 - 4.3. The ET3 Response was received on 7 December 2024, (one day late). The ET3 was submitted by email from the Respondent's Employment Relations Consultants, e-RAS Limited. In the covering letter, they explained that there had been a misunderstanding between themselves, the Respondent and the Solicitors acting for the Respondent's insurers. It had been thought the insurers would have arranged to submit a Response. They did not. The email explained that they therefore attached a "Skeleton ET3" and that it had been unable to submit it via the Portal because the Portal was unavailable. They offered that as the reason why the Response had not been submitted online in accordance with the deadline. They attached a screenshot that shows the Portal was down on 7 December, (not 6 December). The ET3 itself stated at section 6.1:

"In submitting this ET3 we have acted as promptly as we can to ensure compliance in the absence of the confirmation from

DAS.

We would assert that the delay was reasonably practicable and outside the Respondent's control, and as any delay on the Respondent's part is minimum and justifiable given the errors with the online submission system, the genuine belief that DAS have responded and this may in all likelihood be a form of duplication and that there is no prejudice to the Claimant in accepting this ET3, we trust that no default judgment will be entered against the Respondent and that natural justice can apply."

- 4.4. On 31 January 2025, an Employment Judge gave directions for the case to be listed for a Preliminary Hearing.
- 4.5. On 3 February 2025, the Claimant's solicitor applied for a Default Judgment on the grounds that the Response was submitted out of time, not accompanied by an Application for an Extension of Time and that accordingly, the Tribunal must reject the ET3 in accordance with Rule 19 and that the Claimant is entitled to Judgment under Rule 22(2).
- 4.6. On 3 March 2025, I gave Judgment for the Claimant as to liability, remedy to be determined at a Remedy Hearing in due course. I did not give Judgment in respect of the Claimant's victimisation claim as no protected act was apparent in the Grounds of Claim.
- 4.7. On 7 March 2025, solicitors acting for the Respondents wrote to the Tribunal objecting to the Claimant's application for Default Judgment, arguing that the above quoted passage in the ET3 at 6.1 amounted to an application for an extension of time. They argued that the extension of time should be allowed on the basis there would be no material prejudice to the Claimant, that there would be significant prejudice to the Respondent if refused and therefore, the balancing exercise should be undertaken and resolved in favour of the Respondents.
- 4.8. On 14 March 2025, Solicitors for the Respondents applied for reconsideration of the Default Judgment, arguing that it should not have been granted as there was an extension of time application within the ET3 and that in any event, the interests of justice lay in favour of revoking the decision. The background to the misunderstanding over who was going to submit the ET3 is repeated. The interests of justice were said to lie in favour of revoking the Judgment because:
 - 4.8.1. There could be significant regulatory implications for both Respondents;

- 4.8.2. The Second Respondent's Article 6 ECHR rights were engaged and he had not been given the opportunity to independently, submit a Response;
 - 4.8.3. There was no significant prejudice to the Claimant in the Response being one day late, and
 - 4.8.4. significant prejudice to the Respondents as there are serious issues to be tried.
- 4.9. On 20 March 2025, the Claimant's solicitors objected to the reconsideration application, arguing there was no application for an extension of time, the ET3 was late, the Claimant was entitled to Judgment, no reasonable explanation has been given for default, the prejudice to the Respondent was minimal because it can sue its legal advisers or their insurers, but the prejudice to the Claimant is the delay in justice.
- 4.10. On 17 April 2025, the Respondents' solicitors ceased to act, on the basis that there was a conflict of interest, (that they might be sued for negligence by the Respondents). I note that the Respondents' then solicitors, (ARAG Law) did not inform the Tribunal that they were no longer acting until 14 November 2025.
- 4.11. Notice of today's hearing was sent out to the parties on 13 May 2025.
- 4.12. In light of the lack of any correspondence from the Respondents' solicitors, the Claimant's solicitors wrote to the Respondents by email on 8 December 2025, making reference to this Preliminary Hearing, enquiring whether they would be representing themselves and attaching an Agenda and Draft List of Issues.
- 4.13. On 16 December 2025, Ms Dunbar, the First Respondent's Head of Operations, wrote to the Claimant's Solicitors to say that they were in the process of taking advice.
- 4.14. The Respondents engaged a firm of solicitors, Herefords, on 2 January 2026, (three days ago).
- 4.15. On Saturday 3 January 2026, the Respondents' new solicitors emailed the Claimant's solicitors in connection with preparation of the Bundle for today, (Monday).
- 4.16. On Sunday 4 January 2026, the Respondents' Solicitors served witness statements by Ms Dunbar and Mr Walji, as well as the paginated Bundle.

The Law

The Relevant Law

5. Rule 19 of the Employment Tribunals 2024 Rules of Procedure read as follows:

19. Rejection: response form presented late

- (1) The Tribunal must reject a response if it is received later than the time specified in [rule 17\(1\)](#) (response), or after the expiry of any extension of time granted under [rule 21](#) (applications for extension of time for presenting response).
- (2) The Tribunal must not reject a response under [paragraph \(1\)](#) where an application for extension has been made under [rule 21](#), or the response includes or is accompanied by such an application, until that application is determined.
- (3) If it rejects a response under paragraph (1), the Tribunal must send a copy of the response form to the respondent (or in the case of a response provided by two or more respondents, to each respondent) together with a notice of rejection explaining that the response has been presented late. The notice must explain how a respondent can apply for an extension of time and how to apply for a reconsideration of the rejection

6. Rule 21 reads:

21. Applications for extension of time for presenting response

- (1) A respondent may make a written application to the Tribunal for an extension of time for presenting a response.
- (2) The application must—
 - (a) set out the reasons why the extension is sought,
 - (b) except where the time limit has not yet expired, be accompanied by a draft response, or an explanation as to why that is not possible, and
 - (c) specify if the respondent wishes to request a hearing.
- (3) A claimant may within 7 days of receipt of a copy of the application give reasons in writing to the Tribunal explaining why the application is opposed.

- (4) The Tribunal may determine the application without a hearing.
- (5) If the Tribunal refuses to grant an extension of time, any prior rejection of the response must stand. If the Tribunal grants an extension of time, any judgment issued under [rule 22\(2\)](#) (effect of non-presentation or rejection of response, or case not contested) must be set aside and [rule 22\(3\)](#) ceases to have effect.

7. Rule 22 reads:

22. Effect of non-presentation or rejection of response, or case not contested.

- (1) This rule applies where—
 - (a) the Tribunal has not received a response by the time specified in [rule 17\(1\)](#) (response), or by an extension of time granted under [rule 21](#) (applications for extension of time for presenting response),
 - (b) any response received has been rejected and no application for a reconsideration is yet to be determined, or
 - (c) the respondent has stated that no part of the claim is contested.
- (2) The Tribunal must decide whether on the available material (which may include any further information which the parties are required by the Tribunal to provide), a determination can properly be made of the claim, or part of it. To the extent that a determination can be made, the Tribunal must issue a judgment accordingly, otherwise, a hearing must be fixed. Where the Tribunal has directed that a preliminary issue should be determined at a hearing, a judgment may be issued by the Tribunal under this rule after that issue has been determined without a further hearing.
- (3) The Tribunal must provide the respondent with notice of any hearing or decision of the Tribunal but the respondent may only participate in any hearing on that claim to the extent permitted by the Tribunal.

8. The decision whether or not to allow an application for an extension of time is an exercise of judicial discretion and in exercising one's discretion,

one should have regard to the Overriding Objective set out at Regulation 2 to the 2013 Regulations introducing the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure. One should also seek to balance the relative prejudice to the parties.

9. The Overriding Objective is to deal with the case fairly and justly, which includes so far as practicable ensuring the parties are on an equal footing, dealing with the case in ways which are proportionate to its complexity and the importance of the issues, avoiding unnecessary formality, being flexible, avoiding delay and saving expense.
10. Guidance from the appeal courts on how to approach applications for an extension of time date back to 1996 and the case of Kwik Save Stores Ltd v Swain [1996] ICR 49. In the EAT, Mummery J as he then was, identified 3 key questions to consider and weigh in the balance:
 - 10.1. What is the explanation for delay?
 - 10.2. What is the relative balance of prejudice to the parties?
 - 10.3. Is there a defence of apparent merit that ought to be heard?
11. Rule 68 on Reconsideration of Judgments reads:

68. Principals

- (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.
12. At paragraph 33 of Outasight VB Ltd v Brown UKEAT/0253/14, HHJ Eady QC said:

“The interests of justice have thus long allowed for a broad discretion, albeit one that must be exercised judicially, which means having regard not only to the interest of the party seeking the review or reconsideration, but also to 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.”

Respondents' Evidence

13. In her witness statement, Ms Dunbar explained:

- 13.1. The Respondent's insurers were informed of the claim promptly on 14 November 2024.
 - 13.2. She was informed that Solicitors DAS Law were instructed and therefore believed they would file the Response.
 - 13.3. They chased the Solicitors for confirmation and received no response, which is why e-RAS attempted to submit the ET3 as a protective step.
 - 13.4. She was informed the Tribunal Portal was unavailable on 6 and 7 December 2024.
 - 13.5. ARAG Law, (formally DAS Law) withdrew from acting due to a conflict on 17 April 2025, the Respondent was unaware of further developments until she became aware of the Preliminary Hearing on 17 December 2025.
14. Mr Walji in his witness statement gave the following further information:
- 14.1. As a named individual against whom Default Judgment had been entered, he had been denied the opportunity to be heard. He was not notified that the ET3 had been rejected.
 - 14.2. The Respondent had been told by ARAG Law that the application to set aside the Default Judgment would be pursued and one day's delay was unlikely to be prejudicial.
 - 14.3. After ARAG Law withdrew, the Respondents received no further correspondence either from solicitors or from the Tribunal and they were therefore unaware of procedural developments.
 - 14.4. The Default Judgment has proved a barrier to securing Insurance Panel Solicitors, which has resulted in their instructing Herefords Solicitors directly.
 - 14.5. He had been unaware of the Preliminary Hearing until 17 December 2025, when he was copied in on the email from the Claimant's Solicitors.
 - 14.6. Since 17 December 2025, he has engaged constructively and professionally with the Claimant's and the Respondent's solicitors.
 - 14.7. Findings of automatic unfair dismissal and whistle blowing detriment, (particularly where the same arises from Health and Safety concerns) are capable of triggering regulatory scrutiny, governance review and compliance consequence.

Points Opposing the Reconsideration Application

15. Mrs Sherwin makes a number of good points on behalf of the Claimant in opposing the reconsideration application as follows:
 - 15.1. The Respondents' witness statements were sent to the Claimant's solicitors the night before this hearing, 16:16pm on a Sunday.
 - 15.2. The Respondents have not produced any evidence of what instructions were given to their Insurers on 13 November 2024.
 - 15.3. The Respondents have not produced any evidence of what efforts they made to ensure that the solicitors filed the ET3.
 - 15.4. The Respondents have not produced any evidence the Portal was down on 6 December 2024, (the date the ET3 was due).
 - 15.5. The Claimant's solicitors alerted Ms Dunbar and Mr Walji of this pending Preliminary Hearing in the email of 8 December 2025. Ms Dunbar had the matter in hand when she emailed the Claimant's solicitors on 16 December 2025 and yet she did not instruct Herefords it seems, until 2 January 2026. Those Solicitors did not make contact with the Claimant's solicitors until Saturday 3 January 2026, two days before this hearing.
 - 15.6. The quoted words from the ET3 do not amount to an application for extension of time.
 - 15.7. Even now 10 months since the Default Judgment, detailed Grounds of Resistance have not been provided.
 - 15.8. It is in the public interest to have finality in litigation and it would be unjust to give the Respondents a second bight of the cherry.
 - 15.9. She suggests that the Respondents have misled the Tribunal in saying they were unaware of this Hearing until 17 December 2025.
 - 15.10. There is no evidence of what efforts e-RAS made to contact the Tribunal for help on 6 or 7 December of 2025.
 - 15.11. The Respondents' conduct to date is disrespectful of the Tribunal and the Claimant.
 - 15.12. The Respondents can pursue remedy against their professional representatives, the interests of justice lie in the Judgment standing and the matter proceeding to a Remedy Hearing.
 - 15.13. The further delay in this matter is causing prejudice to the Claimant, her reputation is damaged by the dismissal and she is unable to get work.

16. The criticisms of the Respondents and their conduct of the litigation thus far are, as I have said, well made.
17. I do not agree with the Respondents' submissions that a Default Judgment should not have been entered because the Response had not been rejected. I agree that Rule 19 states that a Tribunal must reject a Response if it is late unless there has been an application for an extension of time. The fact of the matter is, the Response was not rejected.
18. Rule 22(1) provides that rule applies if any one of three situations arise, the first of which at (a) is where a response has not been received in time. If a response has not been received in time, the Tribunal must decide, in accordance with sub rule (2) whether a determination can properly be made of the claim, giving judgment accordingly if it can be. In those circumstances, a default judgment must be entered, whether or not the response was rejected.
19. I do not agree with the Respondents' submission the wording in the ET3 at 6.1 amounts to an application for an extension of time. If it was an application for an extension of time, it would have said as such.
20. However, the difficulty for Mrs Brown as I highlighted to Mrs Sherwin at the outset of the case, is that a consequence of the ET3 being one day late is that a Judgment is made not only against a commercial organisation, but also against a named individual, to the effect that it and he has treated a senior employee badly because they have made protected disclosures and that as a consequence, Mrs Brown stands to benefit from an award that is likely to be many thousands of pounds without there being a judicial determination by a hearing of evidence, on whether such disclosures were made and whether she was dismissed and treated badly because of those disclosures. That cannot be in the interests of justice.
21. It was right that the Default Judgment be entered; the Response was late, there was no application to extend time, a determination could be made on the pleadings.
22. However, with the Respondents' reconsideration application of 7 March, the Respondent made its application for an extension of time in respect of the ET3 already filed. The reason the Response is late is apparent from the e-RAS email of 7 December and the contents of the ET3, as further illuminated in the evidence before me today.
23. The balance of prejudice favours the Respondent, I therefore grant the Application for Reconsideration, I reconsider Judgment and revoke it.
24. I note now with the benefit of hindsight, it may have been that this ought to have to have been dealt with under Rule 21(5). That is not how the case was argued before me and I did not spot it at the time. Either way, the

outcome would have been the same.

Victimisation Claim

25. The claim acknowledges her difficulty in relation to the claim for victimisation and withdraws it, by consent, I will issue a Judgment dismissing the claim of victimisation on withdrawal.

The Issues

26. I reviewed the Claimant's Draft List of Issues with the parties. I made the following observations:
- 26.1. At paragraph 9.1 the Claimant ought to set out a bullet point list of the disclosures relied upon; they are in the Particulars of Claim but a bullet point summary ought to appear here in the List of Issues.
- 26.2. None of the proposed changes in red on the copy in the Bundle are necessary, save the query as to whether or not the Claimant has sufficiently mitigated her loss, although that should be moved so that it comes under the heading of Remedy.
- 26.3. Mrs Sherwin agreed to file and serve an Amended List of Issues by 12 January 2026.

Judicial Mediation

27. Both parties agreed they wished to take part in Judicial Mediation, I made arrangements with the Listing Team for this to take place on 7 May 2026. I will issue separate Case Management Orders in that regard.
28. The parties are referred to the "*Judicial Mediation*" section of the Presidential Guidance on 'General Case Management', which can be found at:

www.judiciary.gov.uk/publications/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/

Listing for Final Hearing

29. The Claimant is not calling any witnesses other than herself, the Respondents propose to call four witnesses. The parties agreed that two days should be sufficient for hearing evidence. I allowed half a day for preliminary reading by the Tribunal, half a day for a combination of closing submissions and delivery of an oral Judgment and one day for deliberation. By those means I arrived at and agreed with the parties, a time estimate of four days. The hearing will initially be as to liability only, but the Tribunal will go on to consider remedy if appropriate and if time permits. The parties should prepare accordingly.

30. The parties agreed this case would be suitable for hearing by an Employment Judge sitting alone. There was no reason why we should move from the default position of a hearing in person.
31. In the presence of the parties and on the basis of their dates of availability, I made arrangements with the Listing Team for the case to be listed for a Final Main Hearing in person before an Employment Judge sitting alone, at the Cambridge Employment Tribunal on 24 – 27 November 2026.

Case Management Orders

32. In discussion with the parties and with their agreement, I made the Case Management Orders set out below.

ORDERS

Made under the Employment Tribunal Rules 2024

THE ISSUES

1. On or before **12 January 2026** the Claimant's solicitor is to file with the tribunal a final agreed List of Issue reflecting today's discussions and send a copy of the same to the Respondents' solicitor.

LEAVE TO AMEND

2. The Respondent has leave by no later than **26 January 2026** to file and serve amended Grounds of Resistance in so far as the same may be occasioned by the further clarification of the issues today.

SCHEDULE OF LOSS

3. On or before **26 January 2026** the Claimant shall send to the Respondent a "schedule of loss", i.e. a written statement of what is claimed, including a breakdown of the sums concerned showing how they are calculated.

DISCLOSURE OF DOCUMENTS

4. On or before **14 June 2026** each party shall send to the other a list/copy of the documents in their possession or control relevant to the issues in this case, whether they assist their case or not.
5. If either party requests a copy of any document on the other party's list, that other party shall provide a clear photocopy within 7 days of the request.
6. Documents to be disclosed includes recordings, emails, text messages, social media and other electronic information. A document is in a person's control if you they could reasonably be expected to obtain a copy by asking somebody else for it.

BUNDLE OF DOCUMENTS

7. By **9 July 2026** the parties must agree which documents are going to be used at the final hearing. The respondent must paginate and index the documents, put them into one or more files (“bundle”), and provide the claimant with a ‘hard’ and an electronic copy of the bundle **by the same date**. The bundle should only include documents relevant to any disputed issue in the case and should only include the following documents:
 - 7.1. The Claim Form, the Response Form, any amendments to the grounds of complaint or response, any additional / further information and/or further particulars of the claim or of the response, this written record of a preliminary hearing and any other case management orders that are relevant. These must be put right at the start of the bundle, in chronological order, with all the other documents after them;
 - 7.2. Documents that will be referred to at the final hearing and/or that the Tribunal will be asked to take into account.
8. In preparing the bundle the following rules must be observed:
 - 8.1. Unless there is good reason to do so (e.g. there are different versions of one document in existence and the difference is relevant to the case or authenticity is disputed) only one copy of each document (including documents in email streams) is to be included in the bundle
 - 8.2. The documents in the bundle must follow a logical sequence which should normally be simple chronological order.
9. The Respondent should bring 4 additional copies of the bundle to the final hearing.
10. The Claimant must bring a copy of the bundle to the hearing for their own use.
11. Where an electronic bundle is provided in PDF format:
 - 11.1. The case number(s) should be clearly identifiable.
 - 11.2. Pages in a PDF bundle must be numbered so that they correspond to the automated PDF numbering system.
 - 11.3. Any additional or late submitted documents should be numbered sequentially at the end of the PDF file and not inserted between other pages.
 - 11.4. The parties may choose to send the bundle index or table of contents as a separate PDF file.

- 11.5. Where possible documents should appear the right way up in portrait mode.
- 11.6. Images of text must have been subjected to Optical Character Recognition.

WITNESS STATEMENTS

12. The claimant and the respondent must prepare witness statements for use at the hearing. Everybody who is going to be a witness at the hearing, including the claimant, needs a witness statement.
13. A witness statement is a document containing everything relevant the witness can tell the Tribunal. Witnesses will not be allowed to add to their statements unless the Tribunal agrees.
14. Witness statements should be typed if possible. They must have paragraph numbers and page numbers. They must set out events, usually in the order they happened. They must also include any evidence about financial losses and any other remedy the claimant is asking for. If the witness statement refers to a document in the file it should give the page number.
15. At the hearing, the Tribunal will read the witness statements. Witnesses may be asked questions about their statements by the other side and the Tribunal.
16. The Claimant and the Respondent must send each other copies of all their witness statements by **17 September 2026**
17. The Claimant and the Respondent must both bring copies of all the witness statements to the hearing for their own use.

CONFIRM TO TRIBUNAL READY FOR HEARING

18. **Six weeks before the final hearing** the claimant and the respondent must both write to the Tribunal to confirm that they are ready for the hearing or, if not, to explain why.

HEARINGS

19. This matter has been listed for hearing before an Employment Judge sitting alone, in person, at The Cambridge Employment Tribunal, Cambridge County Court, 197 East Road, Cambridge, CB1 1BA with a time estimate of 4 days on **24 to 27 November 2026** inclusive. This time estimate has been arrived at after discussion with the parties, to include the time needed for considering the oral and written evidence; the party's closing statements; the consideration and delivery of the fully reasoned Judgment of the Tribunal on liability and evidence, consideration and Judgment on remedy, if arising. The parties are expected to ensure that they prepare the case in

such a way that it may be concluded within that time frame. The date of the hearing has been set on the basis of dates of availability provided by the parties and therefore any application for a postponement will only be granted in the most extenuating of circumstances.

About these orders

20. These orders were made and explained to the parties at this preliminary hearing. They must be complied with even if this written record of the hearing arrives after the date given in an order for doing something.
21. If any of these orders is not complied with, the Tribunal may: (a) waive or vary the requirement; (b) strike out the claim or the response; (c) bar or restrict participation in the proceedings; and/or (d) award costs in accordance with the Employment Tribunal Rules.
22. Anyone affected by any of these orders may apply for it to be varied, suspended or set aside.

Writing to the Tribunal

23. Whenever they write to the Tribunal, the Claimant and the Respondent must copy their correspondence to each other.

Useful information

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 52) and any written reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions> shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimants and respondents.

There is more information about the Employment Tribunals on the judiciary website. In particular, you may wish to read the information behind the tiles “Before the hearing”, “At the hearing”, “Rules, Orders, Practice Directions and Guidance”, “Sources of advice and support” and “Further information”. The website is here:

[Employment Tribunals \(England and Wales\) - Courts and Tribunals Judiciary](#)

The Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure are here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/employment-tribunal-procedure-rules>

You can appeal to the Employment Appeal Tribunal if you think a legal mistake was made in an Employment Tribunal decision. There is more information here:

<https://www.gov.uk/appeal-employment-appeal-tribunal>

Please note that if a Tribunal hearing has been recorded you may request a transcript of the recording, for which a charge may be payable. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral judgment or reasons given at the hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings. You can access the Direction and the accompanying Guidance here:

[Practice Directions and Guidance for Employment Tribunals \(England and Wales\) - Courts and Tribunals Judiciary](#)

Approved by:

Employment Judge M Warren

Dated: 15 January 2026

ORDERS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

...21 January 2026.....

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Recording and Transcription

Please note that if a Tribunal Hearing has been recorded you may request a transcript of the recording, for which a charge is likely to be payable in most but not all circumstances. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral Judgment or Reasons given at the Hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a Judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings, and accompanying Guidance, which can be found here:

<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/>