



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Miss L Wood

Respondent: QIC Trims Ltd

JUDGMENT

The respondent's application for an extension of time for its reconsideration application (and therefore also the reconsideration application itself) is refused.

REASONS

1. At a hearing on 16 October 2025 I decided that the claimant's claim of unfair dismissal should be struck out, but that it was just and equitable to extend the time limit for a claim of pregnancy or maternity discrimination. That hearing was attended by three members of staff of the respondent, one of whom spoke on its behalf. The resulting judgment was sent to the parties on 31 October 2025.
2. On 13 November 2025 the respondent applied for written reasons for my decision, which were provided on 19 November 2025.
3. On 31 January 2026 the respondent wrote applying for reconsideration along with an application to extend time for the reconsideration application. As the claimant points out, an application for reconsideration should have been made by 3 December 2025 so the application is almost two months out of time.
4. The first point for me to consider is whether I should extend time. If time is not extended, then the reconsideration application cannot be considered.
5. The terms of the application to extend time are as follows:

"1. The written reasons were sent to the Respondent on 19th November 2025. The Respondent was not able to apply for reconsideration within the 14 day deadline due to the holiday of the Director responsible for dealing with this claim.

- 2. The Director is also retiring from the business and upon reading the email from the tribunal this month [which would be January], passed it to the new CEO who has recently begun working for the Respondent.*
- 3. This application for reconsideration, and this request for an extension of the deadline is being made as soon as was possible after the new CEO was able to read the correspondence and take advice.*
- 4. There would be significant prejudice to the Respondent in not allowing this application to be made outside of the 14 day time limit ...*
- 5. In not allowing the application for reconsideration out of time, the Respondent will be left with no other recourse, given that the Claimant bringing her claim out of time cannot be reviewed at the final hearing.”.*
6. The claimant makes a number of good points in her response to the application, including in particular that it will seldom if ever be good grounds for reconsideration that a party did not appreciate what would be relevant or necessary for them to prove in respect of the decision in question.
7. The most immediate problem for the respondent is that even on its own case the relevant director did not make any arrangements for matters to be dealt with in their absence and apparently no-one paid any attention to the reasons from their arrival in early December through to some unspecified time in January. The claimant also makes the point that the director in whose name the application is made has been registered as a director for many years at Companies House and remains a director, so it is not at all clear who the “Director” referred to in the application may be.
8. The respondent made an application for written reasons and apparently made no provision for what may or may not happen on receipt of those reasons. On its own case no action at all was taken on the reasons for around a month. No dates have been given of when the relevant director returned to work, when in January the reasons were read or when the CEO read the reasons and took advice, but it seems to me that whatever those dates may be they are unlikely to give much weight to the respondent’s application to extend time for their reconsideration application. The longer the Director’s absence the more difficult it is to understand why they did not make arrangements for matters to be dealt with in their absence, and the longer the reasons were with the CEO the more difficult it is to understand why the application was not made earlier.
9. The respondent refers in general terms to the prejudice to the parties that an extension or refusal of an extension of time would cause. I am not persuaded that that makes a difference in this case. The respondent’s underlying application appears to depend on matters that either were or should have been argued at the hearing in question, and which cannot be revisited now, or

perhaps arguments concerning errors of law, which can be addressed by way of an appeal (see below).

10. The application for an extension of time, and therefore the reconsideration application itself, is refused.
11. Finally, I note the respondent's point that "*they will be left with no other recourse*". They say that advice (presumably legal advice) has been taken. It is not clear why that advice did not identify the possibility of an appeal, if they consider that there are errors of law in the decision.

Approved by Employment Judge Anstis

11 February 2026

Sent to the parties on:

23 February 2026

.....

For the Tribunal:

.....