



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Gabriel Severi  
**Respondent:** Bridewell Consulting Limited

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 19 January 2026 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 7 January 2026 is refused.

## REASONS

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

1. Reasonable adjustments

- 1.1 In his claim form ET1 the claimant answered section 12 "Do you have a disability?" "No" and did not provide any details of assistance he might need.
- 1.2 The hearing was listed for 16-25 September 2026 on 29 May 2024. The hearing timetable made clear that 1½ days had been allowed for the claimant's evidence and 3 days for the respondent's evidence.
- 1.3 The claimant's completed Agenda for case management is not on the file, but, had he filled in and submitted it, there was an opportunity for him to set out any special requirements for any hearing. He does not appear to have done so.
- 1.4 There have been three case management preliminary hearings and one dispute resolution appointment. None record the claimant as questioning the length of the hearing, the order of participation or any other adjustments required.
- 1.5 The claimant did not indicate any requirements in his pre-hearing checklist.
- 1.6 The claimant did not raise any of the points now raised at the start of the hearing or during it.
- 1.7 Employment Judge Alliott has determined that there was no unfairness in the length of time allowed to the claimant to cross examine the respondent's

witnesses or in going first.

2. Case management orders/key evidence and arguments.

- 2.1 Employment Judge Alliot cannot reconsider orders made by other Employment Judges made during the course of the case.
- 2.2 Employment Judge Alliot rejects the suggestion that he “repeatedly rushed the claimant during cross examination”. Employment Judge Alliot has a duty to manage a case within the time allotted and to concentrate on relevant issues.
- 2.3 If anything, it was the claimant who produced highly relevant late disclosure during the course of the hearing, for example, the two stills from the video of 6 October 2023 and evidence of what could be seen. Late disclosure is always regrettable. However, Employment Judge Alliot has determined that the claimant had the opportunity to assess and deal with such late disclosure as there was. It was noticeable during the hearing that the claimant had a detailed and very good understanding of all the documents and had clearly gone through them carefully in advance. Employment Judge Alliot rejects the suggestion that the claimant was unprepared or unable to put relevant points in cross-examination.

3. Justice

- 3.1 The claimant is seeking to re-argue facts and conclusions that are already subject to findings. There is no duty to deal with every argument. Reasons for any decisions must be proportionate to the significance of the issue. The judgment is 57 pages long and gives the findings of fact and reasons.
- 3.2 If the claimant considers the findings are perverse or wrong in law then he should appeal.

Approved by

Employment Judge Alliot

Date: 28 April 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON  
6 May 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE