EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: **Mr D Hughes**

Respondent: **Science Recruitment Group Limited**

DECISION ON RECONSIDERATION APPLICATION

The claimant's application dated 5 October 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment on costs sent to the parties on 30 September 2025 is refused.

REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because:

1. Rule 69 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 ("ET Rules") requires that an application for reconsideration is made within 14 days of the written record of judgment being sent to the parties. The claimant's application for a reconsideration was received within 5 days, so is made in time.

2. The initial process for reconsideration is set out in rule 70 of the ET Rules:

   "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."

   Paragraph 6 of the Practice Direction of the Senior President of Tribunals on Panel composition in the Employment Tribunals and Employment Appeal Tribunal dated 29 October 2024 provides

   "6. In respect of any other matter an Employment Tribunal is to consist of a judge. This includes consideration of whether a party's application for reconsideration discloses a reasonable prospect of a judgment being varied or revoked.

   This initial application for reconsideration has therefore been considered by Employment Judge Flood alone.

3. The application for reconsideration was set out in 20 numbered paragraphs. Much of the application dealt with points raised by the claimant about the judgment on liability in the above claim, rather than the judgment on costs itself. The claimant continues to set out his disagreement with the findings of fact and conclusions of the Tribunal which led to his claim being dismissed at a hearing on 24 January 2025. Much of the latest application contained criticisms of and in some cases personal and racially motivated attacks on one of the witnesses for the respondent at final hearing. The claimant has already applied for the judgment on liability to be reconsidered and this was refused by a decision sent to the parties on 28 January 2025. Therefore no further applications for reconsideration of that judgment will be considered.

4. In relation to the costs judgment, the claimant contends that the amount awarded against him is too much and would pay his rent for 2 years. He gives details of his average wage as being £12 per hour. He asks for the award to be reduced to nil.

5. The claimant attended the hearing on costs and was able to give evidence and make submissions as to whether a costs order should be made against him. A request for reconsideration should not be used to re-open or relitigate issues that were determined at the full hearing. The claimant has not raised any new matters that have only come to light after the hearing but is just challenging again findings of fact which he disagreed with. He already had the opportunity to adduce evidence on means and make submissions on the level of the award which were fully considered and taken into account in the judgment on costs itself.

6. There is nothing in the application which indicates that it is in the interests of justice to reconsider the decision. The claimant's application does not identify any new matters but largely makes points already raised (or which clearly could have been raised) at the hearing itself.

7. The discretion to refuse the application for reconsideration is therefore exercised as there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked.

Employment Judge Flood
Approved on 12 December 2025