



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

- Claimant:** Dr Ron Black
- Respondents:**
- (1) Imagination Technologies Group Limited
  - (2) Ray Bingham
  - (3) John Kao
  - (4) Peter Kuo
  - (5) IMG Technologies LLC
- Third Party Applicants:**
- (1) The Times Newspaper
  - (2) The Guardian Newspaper
  - (3) UK China Transparency

## JUDGMENT

UK China Transparency application dated 30 April 2026 for reconsideration of the written reasons of the judgment sent to the parties on 29 April 2026 is refused.

## REASONS

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

1. UK China Transparency ('UKCT') were aware of the hearing, having been sent a Notice of Hearing on 29 December 2026, some 2 months before the date of the hearing. They were not told that the hearing had been vacated or postponed. There is no obligation on the Tribunal to repeatedly inform parties of a hearing. It is for the parties to ensure that they are represented or attend a hearing, if they wish to be heard. UKCT chose to engage with other matters on the date of the hearing. The submission that there was an "off chance" that there would be a hearing is misconceived. The failure of UKCT to attend the hearing is not a reason to revoke or vary the judgment. Reconsideration on that basis would not be in the interests of justice.
2. UKCT assert that their written submissions of 6 February 2025 were not taken into account. Their submissions were considered prior to the in person hearing and were taken into account. Paragraph 11 of the Summary Reasons refers. However, as UKCT chose not to attend the hearing they did not expand on them.
3. I accept that the Judgment says that UKCT had not narrowed or refined the documentation they requested and this was incorrect, as the submission of 6

February 2025 contains a list of documents. However, it would not be in the interests of justice to vary or revoke the decision of the Tribunal on that point alone as the reason why the application was dismissed was due to UKCT's failure to address directly the issue of open justice, as set out in *Cape Intermediate Holdings Ltd v Dring* 2020 AC 629,SC, as it applies in this case. Their submissions instead expand wildly to other matters, which were not related or relevant to the issues in this case and do not show how providing these documents would advance open justice.

4. Rather, the principles of open justice as addressed by UKCT in their submissions, indicated that they wish to consider the documentation in order to investigate the actions of the Chinese Communist Party and to use the documents in this case to add to their research on the Chinese Government's actions in the technology industry.
5. The submission of UKCT for reconsideration; that the documents are needed to explain the Tribunal's judgment, is contradicted by the fact that they set out in detail the decision made by the Tribunal in the preceding paragraphs. Showing that there is already a clear understanding of the decision of the Tribunal.
6. In short, UKCT has misunderstood the principle of open justice and sets out its intent to obtain the documents for reasons which go far beyond the explanation of the justice system and the judgment itself. It would not therefore be in the interests of justice to reconsider the judgment.
7. Nothing in the application for reconsideration changes my view, that UKCT have failed to discharge the burden of proof, on the basis that they have not addressed the principle of open justice as is set out in *Dring*. Given that they have not done so, and not set out a case for a requirement to see the documents in order to explain the decision of the Tribunal, there is no need to consider a balancing exercise as I have nothing to balance it against, and no reason to reconsider the judgment.

Approved by

Employment Judge Cowen

Date: 8 May 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON  
11 May 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE