



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr Ranjit Singh (also known as Mr Sahota)

Respondent: Bramfitt Technology Labs Limited

JUDGMENT

The Claimant's application dated **17 December 2025** for reconsideration of the judgment given on **17 December 2025** is refused.

REASONS

Rules on reconsideration

The rules of reconsideration applications are set out in The Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024.

1. Rule 69 provides that except where it is made in the course of a hearing, an application for reconsideration must be made in writing setting out why reconsideration is necessary and must be sent to the Tribunal within 14 days of the later of—
 - (a) the date on which the written record of the judgment sought to be reconsidered was sent to the parties, or
 - (b) the date that the written reasons were sent, if these were sent separately.
2. Rule 70(1) provides that the Tribunal must consider any application made under rule 69.
3. Rule 70(2) provides that 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.

4. The Tribunal's discretion on reconsideration is broad, but it must be exercised judicially. The Tribunal must consider the interests of both parties and the public interest in finality. The reconsideration procedure does not provide a vehicle to re-litigate matters already determined, to re-argue the same case with different emphasis, or to introduce evidence that could reasonably have been presented before judgment.

The claimant's application

5. The Claimant's application asserts that the hearing proceeded notwithstanding:
 - (1) an outstanding strike-out application;
 - (2) unresolved accessibility and reasonable-adjustment issues; and
 - (3) late and non-compliant disclosure by the Respondent.
6. He contends that he did not receive a fair hearing and that there was an inequality of arms. He seeks review of the Tribunal's digital audio recording.

Analysis

Timing and compliance with Rule 69

7. The application was made in writing on the day of the oral judgment and complies with Rule 69.

Reasons and case-management decisions

8. The Claimant's concern that insufficient oral reasons were given for case-management and substantive decisions has been addressed by the provision of written reasons for those decisions. The written reasons provide further explanation, including for the refusal of the Claimant's application for postponement.

Strike-out, disclosure and adjustments at the hearing

9. The issues identified at paragraph 5(1)–(3) were considered and addressed at the outset of the hearing. The hearing was adjourned for more than one and a half hours to allow the Tribunal to consider the Claimant’s applications and for both the Tribunal and the Claimant to review the bundle.
10. The Tribunal produced a large-font paper bundle for the Claimant at the start of the hearing. Excluding pleadings, there were approximately 80 documents, almost all of which the Claimant would have had in his possession before issuing the claim. The Tribunal considered the Claimant’s contention that documents were missing and did not accept that this was the case. This is addressed in the written reasons for refusing postponement dated 23 January 2026. The Claimant’s objection is, in substance, a challenge to findings of fact that were properly made by the Tribunal following hearing submissions and a review of the evidence during the adjournment.

Reasonable adjustments

11. The Tribunal made reasonable adjustments, including: Providing a large-font bundle; allowing the Claimant to identify further documents overnight; printing additional documents (including enlarged copies for the Claimant); recalling the Claimant to give evidence-in-chief on additional documents; and postponing re-examination until the following day to allow him time to consider the questions put to him and his re-examination. While the further documents produced were not found to be material to the issues, they were admitted, considered and explored in evidence. In these circumstances, it is not correct to say that reasonable adjustments were not made.

Witness evidence and “chronology”

12. The Tribunal did not direct that the Claimant’s chronology would stand as his witness statement. Any reference to a chronology concerned the Respondent’s witness statement, which also functioned as a chronology. The Claimant’s particulars of complaint, drafted in narrative form, together with the list of issues prepared by Employment Judge Perry on 28 January 2025, were treated as the Claimant’s evidence-in-chief. In addition, the Claimant was permitted to give supplementary evidence and to follow the adjusted process set out above.

Conduct of the hearing

13. It is not accepted that the Claimant was denied sufficient time to answer questions. Care was taken during cross-examination to ensure that he had the relevant document in front of him. During the Claimant's cross-examination of the Respondent's witness, the witness was reminded that it was for the Claimant to ask questions and that the witness should not intervene in that process.

Request to review the digital audio recording

14. The Claimant requests that the Tribunal review the entire digital audio recording. That is neither proportionate nor necessary. The Claimant's dissatisfaction concerns the reasons for the Tribunal's decisions, which have been addressed through the provision of written reasons setting out the basis for the Tribunal's case-management and substantive determinations. Whilst the Tribunal will not have referred to every document and every piece of evidence in those written reasons, the Tribunal carefully considered and weighed the evidence presented by both parties and considered this against the list of issues that were to be determined in the case.

Allegations of bias and recusal

15. The Claimant asserted bias but provided no supporting basis beyond disagreement with the decision to proceed and the observation that he, like the Respondent, was required to comply with directions on disclosure and witness evidence. The request for recusal was refused on that basis.

Conclusion

16. Having considered the grounds advanced, I do not consider that they disclose any basis to revoke or vary the judgment. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked within the meaning of Rule 72(1). The application is therefore refused.

Employment Judge Wright
Date: 17/02/2026