



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS RECONSIDERATION

Claimant: Mr O Petrov

Respondent: Refcool Refrigeration Limited

Heard at: Reconsideration considered on the papers

On: 5 March 2026

Before: Employment Judge S Shore

DECISION

1. The claimant's application dated 24 June 2025 for reconsideration of my Judgment and Reasons dated 30 May 2025, delivered to the parties on 10 June 2025, is refused as having no reasonable prospects of success.

REASONS

1. I have considered the claimant's application for reconsideration of my Judgment and Reasons sent to the parties on 10 June 2025, following the Hearing on 30 May 2025, at which the claimant did not attend.
2. I must apologise for the length of time it has taken to complete the reconsideration. The claimant's application was loaded onto the Tribunal's digital

case management system on receipt, and a referral was generated for me to deal with it. Unfortunately, I never received the referral, as it was generated by Midlands East Region, which is not my main region. The system only forwards referrals to me from my main region. I only learned of the application today when a routine audit of outstanding referrals by the Regional Employment Judge of Midlands East Region revealed that the claimant's application was outstanding. He notified me today and I have conducted the reconsideration immediately.

3. The application has been considered under Rules 68 to 71 of the Employment Tribunals Procedure Rules 2024, which are the applicable Rules. I may reconsider a judgment only if it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so.
4. I have read the claimant's application in full, together with the extensive attachments and preceding correspondence he relies upon. Nothing in those materials identifies any error of law, procedural irregularity, or factual mistake in my Judgment of 30 May 2025.
5. The claimant's submissions focus heavily on criticisms of the Tribunal administration, difficulties with the digital portal, the conduct of previous case management, and disputes regarding the actions of the respondent. Those issues were not material to my findings made on 30 May 2025, which concerned:
 - 5.1. the claimant's failure to attend both the 29 April and 30 May hearings;
 - 5.2. his failure to comply with repeated and clear case management orders;
 - 5.3. the consequent inability of the Tribunal to conduct a fair and effective hearing; and
 - 5.4. the absence of reasonable prospects of success in any of the pleaded claims.
6. In particular, the Judgment recorded that the claimant had been expressly warned, through the Order of 29 April 2025, that failure to attend the relisted

hearing could result in strike-out. No application for adjournment was made prior to the hearing. No satisfactory explanation for non-attendance was provided at the time.

7. Although the claimant now seeks to revisit the circumstances of his non-attendance, those matters were fully addressed at the hearing on 30 May 2025, and I am not satisfied that any further information provided in the reconsideration request would have affected the Tribunal's findings or outcome.
8. The claimant also invites the Tribunal to revisit the substantive merits of the claims and to reconsider extensive factual assertions and disputes about wages, overtime, mileage, discrimination, and the handling of correspondence. These arguments simply repeat matters advanced earlier and do not disclose anything that would have had a material effect on the original Judgment.
9. The reconsideration process is not an opportunity to re-argue the case. It is confined to whether the original Judgment may have been wrong or unjust due to something the Tribunal overlooked or did not know. The claimant has not identified any such matter.
10. There is no basis for concluding that the Judgment was made in error, that relevant material was overlooked, or that the interests of justice require the Judgment to be revisited.
11. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the application discloses no proper grounds for reconsideration under Rule 68.
12. The claimant also applied for written reasons of the Judgment. Written reasons were provided with the Judgment. I accept that the footnote to the Judgment and Reasons gave information about applying for written reasons which should not have been included in the Judgment and Reasons.

Approved by EJ Shore
Employment Judge Shore
5 March 2026

Sent to the parties on:

...5 March 2026

For the Tribunal Office:

.....