



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** gloria [ruiz flores]

**Respondent:** Hovat Limited

## RECONSIDERATION JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 16 December 2025 for reconsideration of the strike out judgment and order refusing anonymity and restricted disclosure, both sent to the parties on 12 December 2025, is refused.

## REASONS

1. Employment Judge Ord apologises for the delay in producing this judgment, which was caused by her not receiving the application until 6 March 2026.
2. By Rule 68 of the Employment Tribunal's Rules of Procedure 2024, the Employment Tribunal may, either on its own initiative or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. On reconsideration, the judgment may be confirmed, varied or revoked.
3. There is no provision in the Procedure Rules for reconsideration of an order. On this basis, the application for reconsideration of the order refusing anonymity and restricted disclosure, is refused.
4. The judgment will only be reconsidered where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. This allows the Employment Tribunal a broad discretion, which must be exercised judicially. This means having regard not only to the interests of the party seeking the reconsideration but also the interests of the other party to the litigation and to the public interest requirement that there should, so far as possible, be finality of litigation. Reconsiderations are therefore best seen as limited exceptions to the general rule that employment tribunal decisions should not be reopened and relitigated.
5. If there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked, the application must be refused.
6. The tribunal properly considered the evidence before it at the hearing and came

to the conclusion, based on the evidence, that the claimant had conducted the proceedings in an unreasonable and vexatious manner. Using its discretion it concluded that strike out was a proportionate response to the claimant's behaviour. The reasons for this are adequately set out in the judgment.

7. There were no procedural irregularities in the proceedings, as suggested by the claimant. The respondent's representative was properly appointed and conducted matters in a professional manner.
8. There was no bias or predetermination. The hearing was conducted with an open mind and the claimant's applications were dealt with. The claimant was given full opportunity to participate. There was no unfairness or breach of natural justice, as suggested.
9. A party's disagreement with the tribunal's judgment is not a good reason to reconsider.
10. There is nothing in the claimant's application which justifies a reconsideration.
11. Taking account of the overriding objective of dealing with cases justly and fairly, I conclude that it is not necessary in the interests of justice to reconsider the original judgment as there is no reasonable prospect of it being varied or revoked.

---

Employment Judge Liz Ord

Date 12 March 2026