



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Miss M Kasapis

**Respondent:** 1. Baaj Capital LLP,  
2. Reem Clothing Limited (in voluntary liquidation)

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 3 November 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 30 October 2025 is refused.

## REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, because

1. There is no factual misunderstanding in the judgment. The Claimant did seek a final settlement in the region of £17,000 (and higher) on numerous occasions.

2. As the Judgment makes clear, it was clear to the Claimant, or should have been, that Reem Clothing Ltd was her actual employer. For the avoidance of doubt:

- (i) The Claimant knew or appreciated that Reem Clothing Ltd [by reason of the judgment in *N Alexander & others-v-Reem Clothing Ltd* (in voluntary liquidation)] was her employer or JD559 Ltd was her employer [the Claimant's information to the Redundancy Payments Service] and that Baaj Capital LLP was not her employer [Claimant's claim not based on technical contractual formalities]
- (ii) In any event, objectively, the Claimant ought reasonably have known or appreciated that Baaj Capital LLP was not her employer and the claim against it was hopeless and doomed to failure.

3. It is noted that the Claimant referred to having legal advice during her exchanges with the Respondent's representative.

4. After this judgment had been drafted but before it has been sent out the Claimant

further e-mailed the Tribunal to state that there has been a material change in her employment circumstances and that her current role is ending. The new information does not cause Employment Judge Alliot to vary or revoke the Costs order as it does not affect the level of savings disclosed by the Claimant.

Date: 19 March 2026

Approved by

Employment Judge Alliot

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

30 March 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE