



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Ms J Bramwell
Respondent: Royal Mail Group Ltd

JUDGMENT

The Claimant's application dated 7th, 12th and 25th November 2025 for reconsideration of the judgment is refused.

REASONS

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

1. In her application, the Claimant raised four grounds for requesting reconsideration. These were:
 - 1.1 Procedural unfairness, including repeated breaches of the Tribunal orders by the Respondent without sanctions;
 - 1.2 Late disclosure of evidence, placing the Claimant, as a litigant in person with recognised disabilities at a disadvantage;
 - 1.3 Failure to properly consider material evidence and contradictory witness statements; and
 - 1.4 Inadequate accommodation for the Claimant's recognised disabilities (stress, anxiety, back pain and pending autism assessment) affecting fairness and accessibility.
2. Rule 69 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 require an application for reconsideration to be sent to the Tribunal within 14 days of the

date the decision was sent to the parties.

3. Oral judgment with reasons was given to the parties on 7th November 2025. Immediately after giving that judgment, the Claimant asked for written reasons. This was a lengthy and complex claim and written reasons were not finalised until 7th January 2026. They were sent out to the parties on 19th January 2026.
4. Unfortunately I was not aware that the Claimant's application for reconsideration had been made. I had understood it was simply a request for written reasons, which had been completed on 7th January 2026. I was recently made aware that there was an outstanding request for reconsideration, which had been made through several emails on 7th, 12th and 25th November 2025. These were earlier than the Claimant's receipt of the written reasons. I apologise to the Claimant for this oversight.
5. The Claimant's application to reconsider the decision the judgment was made prior to her having sight of the written reasons. She raised four separate grounds for a reconsideration as set out in paragraph 1 above. Dealing with each of those grounds in turn:

5.1 Procedural unfairness:

This was considered in detail as a preliminary issue at the outset of the hearing when the Claimant made an application to strike out the Respondent's case on the basis of its failure to comply with the Tribunal's orders.

This is recorded at paragraphs 5 – 13 of the written reasons. I concluded that whilst there were breaches, the Claimant confirmed that she was able to proceed with the hearing and was not seeking a postponement of the hearing if her application to strike out the Respondent's case on the basis of its failure to comply with the orders was unsuccessful. Therefore, her application for a strike out was rejected.

5.2 Late disclosure of documents:

This was also considered at the outset of the hearing as a preliminary issue. This is also recorded at paragraphs 5 -13 of the written reasons. I concluded that the Claimant was already in possession of most of the documents and a fair trial was clearly possible. This application was also rejected.

5.3 Contradictory evidence

Paragraphs 46 – 50 deal with the contradictory evidence and why the Claimant's evidence was rejected. In particular at paragraph 46, I

There was a clear dispute in evidence on several issues. Having listened to the witnesses give live evidence, I prefer the evidence of Mr Osagie and Miss Solomon on this point. I do so because I felt that the Claimant's evidence was inconsistent and often in conflict with the documentary evidence.

At paragraphs 47 onwards I explained why I rejected the Claimant's evidence, which included the Claimant's denial of evidence she gave in the hearing before me, that I had carefully noted and read back to her. This issue was considered as part of the hearing.

5.4 Inadequate accommodation of the Claimant's recognised disabilities

The Tribunal noted the Claimant's recognised disabilities (there was no mention of the Claimant's potential autism assessment) and made adjustments, including advising the Claimant to make me aware of any issues she encountered. Adjustments were made including frequent breaks. This was a remote hearing and the Claimant confirmed she was managing her back issue. This issue was considered as part of the hearing.

6. In conclusion, all of the matters raised by the Claimant in her application for reconsideration were considered at the hearing and dealt with at that time.
7. There needs to be finality to litigation. As the Employment Appeal Tribunal ("the EAT") in **Trimble v Supertravel Ltd [1982] ICR 440** decided that if a matter has been ventilated and argued then any error of law falls to be corrected on appeal and not by review.
8. In addition, in **Fforde v Black EAT 68/60** the EAT decided that the interests of justice ground of review does not mean:

"...that in every case where a litigant is unsuccessful he is automatically entitled to have the tribunal review it. Every unsuccessful litigant thinks that the interests of justice require a review. This ground of review only applies in the even more exceptional case where something has gone radically wrong with the procedure involving a denial of natural justice or something of that order".

9. I have concluded that for the reasons set out above, there is no reasonable prospects of the judgment being varied or revoked. Moreover, I have concluded that the Claimant's grounds would not meet the threshold as set

out in **Fforde v Black**.

10. Accordingly I refuse the application for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 70 because there is no reasonable prospect of the Judgment being varied or revoked.

Date: 8th June 2026

Approved by

Employment Judge Lambert

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
11th June 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE