



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Ms. J. Ghelani  
**Respondent:** Nikee's Beauty Bar  
**Considered at:** Watford on the papers

## JUDGMENT WITH WRITTEN REASONS

Upon the claim and counter claim having been dismissed in a judgment dated 10<sup>th</sup> of January 2025 and promulgated on 29<sup>th</sup> of January 2025 under Rule 47 of The Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024,

And upon the Respondent's application for a judgment concerning res judicata/issue estoppel and costs under Rule 76 of The Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 relating to alleged actions by the Claimant post dismissal of the claim,

And upon the Claimant's having been notified of the Respondent's application,

1. The Respondent's applications are dismissed. The Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to make findings as to whether the Claimant continued with her claim after its dismissal or to make a costs order; the claim and counter claim having been dismissed.

## WRITTEN REASONS

### Introduction

1. This judgment with short written reasons is provided because the application has been decided on the papers and both parties need to understand why all proceedings have come to an end. In addition, the Claimant may now be a litigant in person since her assistance was from Barnet Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), which may necessarily be time-limited by other demands on their resources.

### Respondent's allegations of continued action by Claimant and Barnet CAB

2. The Respondent alleges that “the Claimant and CAB acted unreasonably by pursuing matters already determined and denying a properly served judgment”. The extent of the Respondent’s description of such actions is “Aug 2025 onwards – CAB continued litigation and later claimed “administrative error.””
3. As all proceedings were dismissed in the judgment promulgated on 29<sup>th</sup> of January 2025, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to consider whether the Claimant continued to pursue matters from August 2025 onwards and certainly no jurisdiction to list a preliminary hearing as suggested by the Respondent or to direct the Claimant to provide her response to these allegations.
4. It is therefore not possible for the Tribunal to determine whether the Claimant pursued matters from August 2025 onwards.
5. Whatever the situation, the Claimant should be aware that any allegations or as the Respondent described it “all overlapping allegations” which match the allegations in the dismissed claim cannot be further litigated in the Employment Tribunal. In other words, even if the Claimant were minded to continue with her claim, there is no claim left and the Employment Tribunal’s file has been closed.

**Respondent’s application for costs**

6. The Respondent’s representative’s costs in the application before me are for assistance to the Respondent in the period 20<sup>th</sup> of June 2024 to 11<sup>th</sup> October 2025.
7. The application thus involves:
  - i. Costs up to and including the date of dismissal of the claim.
  - ii. Costs after the Claimant’s alleged resumption of activity in the claim from August 2025 onwards – 11<sup>th</sup> October 2025.
8. The Respondent’s application for costs in paragraph 7.i is significantly out of time and cannot be considered.
9. With regards to costs in paragraph 7.ii, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction over any application for costs incurred because of alleged pursuance of matters from August 2025 onwards. There is no claim/counterclaim before the Tribunal to which costs could attach.

**Approved by:**  
Employment Judge Coll

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> February 2026.....

Sent to the parties on: 18 February 2026

For the Tribunal Office