



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant  
**Miss S Bi**

v

Respondents  
**Matrix Academy Trust**

## JUDGMENT

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the judgment with written reasons (relating to my refusal of the claimant's application that I recuse myself) dated and sent to the parties on 5 March 2026 being varied or revoked and the claimant's application dated 9 March 2026 for reconsideration of my recusal is therefore refused.

## REASONS

1. As I indicated at the conclusion of the recusal hearing I will be playing no further part in the claim because I will no longer be sitting as a salaried judge in the Employment Tribunal. I made plain at the recusal hearing and repeated in the reasons for the recusal decision why the recusal hearing would address recusal only (see (22) and (44-48)) and why I would not be addressing
  - a. the reconsideration application in relation to the decision to strike out and
  - b. the respondent's costs application.

I have thus addressed how those remaining applications will need to be addressed at (7) below.

2. Notwithstanding what I say at (1) it appears on the basis the claimant seeks a reconsideration that she believes that I have addressed those points and/or is seeking a reconsideration of the recusal. Given the matters raised in paragraph 2 of the application to amend the reconsideration application I have therefore treated that as an application to reconsider the recusal decision.
3. For the reasons given above any application that I reconsider the decision to recuse myself is redundant and unnecessary. That aside I address it for the reasons below.
4. Much of the reconsideration application is a challenge to the original decision and is in any event not relevant to the recusal application. As to the other points raised in the reconsideration application they are appeal points on the basis that either they were raised or insofar as they were not raised at the recusal application, they should have been and the application does not address why they were not.
5. As to the entirely new matters that relate to the conduct of the recusal hearing, I do not propose to engage with them other than to say they are not accepted.



6. Nor does a reconsideration appear to be an appropriate way to challenge that decision. As the claimant disagrees with the recusal decision, the appropriate mechanism is to appeal, not to reconsider it. In the alternative, the argument becomes circular.

**Directions**

7. The file shall be passed to Regional Employment Judge Jones to consider if a judge should be appointed to hear the remaining applications (see (1) (a) & (b) above); and if so, whom and what directions are required.

approved by me

**Employment Judge Perry**

**Dated: 16 March 2026**