



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Anissa Laurie

Respondent: Greater London Authority

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 13 October 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 29 September 2025 is refused.

REASONS

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

1. The Claimant's email of the 13 October 2025 ("Reconsideration Email") as addressed to the East London Employment Tribunal has been referred to me by the Employment Appeal Tribunal by email dated 22 January 2026. It is regrettable that there has been delay in providing a response regarding this request for reconsideration. Unfortunately, the original email was not referred to me at the time and has only recently been sent to me.
2. I can confirm that I have reviewed the Claimant's application and the Judgment on Reconsideration as sent to the Parties on 29 September 2025 ("Reconsideration Judgment"). I have also reviewed the file and the timeline of documentation to clarify the documents taken into consideration when I made my decisions.
3. During the course of this response, I will refer to documents. Documents that are repeatedly referred to are as follows:
 - 3.1. "Written Statement" - Written statement prepared by the Claimant following the hearing on 29 April 2025 as considered on 30 April 2025
 - 3.2. "Written Submissions" - Written submissions received from the Claimant dated 30 April 2025, as received 04 May 2025
 - 3.3. "Reserved Judgment" - Written reserved Judgment dated 07 May 2025 as sent to the parties on 15 May 2025

- 3.4. "Case Management Orders" - Case management orders prepared following the Reserved Judgment, dated 07 May 2025 and as sent to the Parties on 15 May 2025
- 3.5. "Reconsideration Application" - Email from the Claimant requesting reconsideration of the Reserved Judgment dated 29 May 2025
- 3.6. Notice of Listing hearing dated 30 May 2025
- 3.7. "Postponement Request" - Email from the Claimant requesting postponement of the listing hearing dated 11 July 2025 and subsequent emails on 07 and 11 August 2025
- 3.8. "Reconsideration Judgment" - Judgment following reconsideration dated 18 August 2025 as sent to the Parties on 29 September 2025
- 3.9. "Reconsideration Email" - Email from the Claimant requesting further reconsideration dated 13 October 2025.

Paragraphs 1 - 6 (Reconsideration Email)

4. In considering paragraphs 1 - 6 of the Reconsideration Email with regards to the request for "second reconsideration" as detailed by the Claimant, this is the application the Claimant states is outstanding, which is the reconsideration application regarding the decision to progress with the Reconsideration Application without a hearing and without postponing it due to the Claimant's ill health. This was addressed in paragraph 7 of the Reconsideration Judgement which states:

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.

5. In determining that the Claimant's email of the 11 July 2025 requesting a postponement of the Listing Hearing remained outstanding, I addressed this directly with the Listing team. The Listing Hearing was postponed and relisted for 25 March 2026. This Notice of Hearing was sent to the Parties on 30 September 2025.
6. Additionally, the request for a postponement of the Reconsideration Application was considered and is detailed in paragraphs 3 - 7 of the Reconsideration Judgment, which gives my reason for the decision to continue.
7. In preparing for the reconsideration of the Reserved Judgment of the 15 May 2025, I had regard to Rule 68 - 71 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024. As detailed within the Reconsideration Judgment of 29 September 2025 at paragraphs 19 - 35, the Parties were offered the opportunity to provide written submissions. By email of 31 July 2025 the Claimant did state as follows:

Thank you for your letter dated 23 July 2025. I refer you back to my Application for Postponement by Letter dated 11 July 2025. Please note, I

have not yet received a response to this letter. Ordinarily, I would have liked to have the opportunity to respond to the Employment Tribunal as ordered but I am not able to do this due to medical reasons as expressed in my postponement letter sent to the Tribunal on 11 July 2025 and to the Respondent's Counsel.

I reserve my right, if necessary, to provide views as requested by the Employment Tribunal.

8. In writing to the Parties on 23 July 2025, I confirmed that the reason that the Reconsideration Application dated 29 May 2025 was permitted was because the Reserved Judgment had been written without sight of the Claimant's Written Submissions. This is detailed in paragraph 23. Further to the Claimant's email of the 31 July 25, and the Respondent's written submissions, given that the basis of the reconsideration was to ensure that the Claimant's Written Submissions were properly taken into account, I determined that it was proportionate and fair and in the interests of justice to proceed without a hearing. This would ensure that the Claimant's Written Submissions and Reconsideration Application would be fully considered in a timely and proportionate manner. This is detailed in paragraphs 27 - 29 of the Reconsideration Judgment. On 04 August 2025 I wrote to the Parties to confirm that the reconsideration would be conducted without a hearing and the Parties were permitted to submit further written submissions, if they wished to do so. On the 07 and 11 August 2025 the Claimant wrote to the Tribunal to follow up the email of the 11 July, the Postponement Request. I considered this request in relation to the Reconsideration Application and determined that because of the reasons already given, it remained fair and proportionate and in the interests of justice to continue with the Claimant's Reconsideration Application and to do so, without a hearing.
9. The Claimant has raised several sections within this Reconsideration Email. I have reviewed this email and I confirm the following with regards to the information I had available at the time the Reconsideration Judgment was made to enable the decisions to be made at that time. The Parties were provided with the opportunity to provide submissions and the Claimant did so in her Reconsideration Application and by the consideration of her Written Submissions, which had not been taken into account when the Reserved Judgment was written.
10. I address each of the Claimant's applications within her Reconsideration Email in turn:

Court Transcript

11. The request for a Court Transcript was made to REJ Burgher. I make no comment in regard to any decision I did not make.

Procedural Failings

12. At paragraphs 14 - 16 of the Reconsideration Email, the Claimant makes reference to the transcript. Again, I make no comment in regard to any decision I did not make.

13. In considering paragraphs 17 - 18 of Reconsideration Email, the Paragraphs 37 - 41 of the Reconsideration Judgment addressed the reconsideration of the case management orders as prepared by EJ's Hook and Volkmer. In making this decision, I had regard to both sets of case management orders at the time the Reserved Judgment was prepared and in preparing the Reconsideration Judgment. I also had regard to the bundle and my hearing notes and the Claimant's Written Submissions, which was the only reason for the reconsideration progressing.
14. In considering paragraphs 19 - 26 of the Reconsideration Email, paragraphs 42 - 46 of the Reconsideration Judgment considers the Oath and Hearing Timetable. In making this decision, I had regard to the bundle and my hearing notes, the Claimant's Written Submissions and the previous case management orders for both the Reserved Judgment and the Reconsideration Judgment.
15. In considering paragraph 27 - 28 of the Reconsideration Email, paragraphs 47 - 51 of the Reconsideration Judgment addresses Written Submissions. In making this decision, I again had regard to the bundle and my hearing notes, the Claimant's Written Submissions and the previous case management orders for both the Reserved Judgment and the Reconsideration Judgment. As detailed within these paragraphs, I also took into account the Claimant's email of the 11 July 2025, which had not otherwise been progressed. I was aware that the Claimant stated that she was unwell and I made a preliminary decision whether to proceed with the reconsideration at this time. This is detailed in paragraphs 4 - 6 and 27 - 29 of the Reconsideration Judgment. At the time, I was satisfied that the Claimant had had the opportunity to provide Written Submissions following the hearing and her Reconsideration Application, given that the reason for the reconsideration was my failure to consider her Written Submissions, it was fair and proportionate and in the interests of justice to properly consider these Written Submissions and to ensure that the Reserved Judgment took these into account.
16. In considering the second paragraph 28 of the Reconsideration Email, I note that paragraph 46 of the Reconsideration Judgment addresses the Written Statement produced by the Claimant overnight between the hearing days. In making this decision, I reviewed the hearing notes and the Reserved Judgment, alongside the Claimant's Written Submissions. The hearing notes refer to the Claimant calling for external advice to clarify her queries, she also had assistance from her sister and a note taker. The key issue was that the additional document had been prepared following the conclusion of cross examination. This is referred to at paragraph 23 of the Reserved Judgment. The oral reasons for this decision were included in the Reconsideration Judgment at paragraph 59.
17. I have reviewed the Reserved Judgment and there is no paragraph 48.4. I have searched for any reference to "help", and I can find none. Paragraph 59 does refer to the assistance from friends and family. This is a reference to assistance from the Claimant's sister and notetaker. The decision at paragraph 59 - 61 of the Reconsideration Judgment is Meek Compliant.

18. Paragraph 29 of the Reconsideration Email is addressed in paragraphs 19 - 25 of the Reconsideration Judgment. In making this decision, I had regard to the Tribunal file, both the Claimant's and the Respondent's written submissions, the Reconsideration Application, Written Submissions and the hearing notes. As explained above, I was satisfied that in providing a detailed Reconsideration Application, it was fair and proportionate to proceed as the reason for the reconsideration being permitted was because of my failure to read the Written Submissions prior to writing the Reserved Judgment.
19. Regarding paragraph 30 of the Reconsideration Email, the decision in relation to paragraph 56.3 of the Reconsideration Judgment was made with regard to the bundle and my hearing notes, the impact statement, the Reserved Judgment and Written Submissions. I note that the Claimant confirmed in oral evidence that the impact statement was her Evidence in Chief, she had also confirmed that it remained correct. The Claimant confirmed in response to my question, after cross examination by the Respondent's Counsel, that all the medical documents the Claimant wished to rely upon had been disclosed and were in the bundle. This is the information was also taken into consideration when making this decision.
20. Paragraphs 31 of the Reconsideration Email in relation to the hearing itself, were addressed within paragraph 47 of the Reconsideration Judgment. In making this decision I had regard to the previous case management orders, the Reserved Judgment and my hearing notes. The hearing was not as timetabled due to the requirement to take additional breaks and to provide time to allow the Claimant time to prepare as explained within the Reconsideration Judgment. Additionally, the hearing notes for the 29 April 2025 record that following cross examination, the Claimant was given the opportunity to have time to prepare her final submissions. She asked for more time following this break but was subsequently unable to return and the hearing was adjourned and reconvened on the morning of 30 April 2025.
21. The hearing notes of 29 April 2025 do not refer to the Claimant being offered the opportunity for self-re-examination, nor is the Oath referred too. Cross examination was complete and the Claimant was then informed that she would have further time to prepare her final submissions following the Respondent's submissions and that she should include any clarification she wished in relation to the arguments she wished to put forward. The Claimant was provided with this preparation time and gave full and detailed oral submissions with further breaks included. At the time I prepared the Reserved Judgment, I had had regard to these notes and I was satisfied that the Claimant had addressed questions raised by the Respondent's Counsel and that she had repeated his phraseology, for example the word "mysterious" to reflect this. At the time I prepared the Reconsideration Judgment, I also had regard to the Written Submissions, which also reflected rebuttal of points raised in cross examination. These are detailed in the Reserved Judgment at paragraph 25 and the Reconsideration Judgment at paragraph 61 respectively.

22. Paragraph 32 of the Reconsideration Email in relation to the manner of cross examination was also reviewed as part of the Reconsideration Judgment at paragraph 47.4. In making this decision, I had regard to the hearing notes, which included both Parties closing submissions where cross examination and the manner of it, by way of a reasonable adjustment, was specifically addressed.
23. Paragraph 33 of the Reconsideration Email is addressed in the Reconsideration Judgment at paragraphs 54 - 57. In making this decision, I had regard to the bundle, the hearing notes, the Claimant's reconsideration application, where the document is referred to as "New Evidence". The decision was that this New Evidence could have been available at the time of the hearing, and as such it could not be relied upon after the hearing. The details for this decision are in the Reconsideration Judgment at paragraphs 54 - 57.
24. At each stage I have endeavoured to provide reasons for my decisions as set out the above as further information. I have addressed the points raised by the Claimant in relation to Meek compliance and I am satisfied that the decisions made at the time and with the evidence available to me were fair and proportionate and in the interests of justice.
25. In accordance with Rule 70, I consider the Claimant's Reconsideration Email as an application for reconsideration on the Reconsideration Judgment. Having considered the Reconsideration Email and the above, I do not consider that there is a reasonable prospect of the Reconsideration Judgment being varied or revoked and the application by the Claimant in the Reconsideration Email is refused.

**Approved by:
Employment Judge Illing
Dated: 23 January 2026**