



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr A Christopoulos

Respondent: DBX commodities Limited

JUDGMENT

The respondent's application dated **7 April 2026** for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on **31 March 2026** is refused.

REASONS

There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked, for the reasons set out below.

1. The respondent requests a reconsideration on two main grounds.
2. The first of these is that the respondent is unable to properly understand the reasoning for the decisions in the absence of written reasons and therefore the interests of justice require reconsideration to enable proper scrutiny of my reasoning
3. Full oral judgement was given at the end of the hearing. The parties have been advised of the right to apply for written reasons. The claimant has so applied and written reasons have been provided.
4. Reconsideration is not a substitute for making a request for full written reasons. Those written reasons have been provided and repeat the same information provided to the parties at the end of the hearing by way of oral judgment.
5. The second basis for the application is that there was a failure to properly interpret and apply certain contractual provisions when considering whether commission payments were due. Reliance is placed on a clause in the commission plan which provides that it is not contractual and in which the company reserves the right to make all determinations related to the plan. The respondent is submitting that a proper interpretation of this clause means that commission remain subject to the respondent's discretionary determination even where certain threshold criteria are satisfied.
6. The relevant document was provided to me as part of the hearing. Mr

Claude made no reference to any such clause. He did not make reference to any arguments that there was an overall discretion which had or had not been exercised. He had every opportunity to do so. The commission payment on which the claimant succeeded (Ember) was disputed only on the basis that it was not a new client.

7. The respondent is not seeking to bring in evidence was not available at the time but merely to expand the grounds on which it disputed the payment. There was no reason why this argument could not have been made at the time. It is not appropriate to reconsider a decision in the circumstances the respondent wishes now to propose a different argument which was always available to it.

Approved by
Employment Judge McLaren
Date: 13 April 2026