



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Mrs Shaukia Mir

Respondent

Iqvia Limited

v

JUDGMENT on CLAIMANT'S APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The claimant's application of the 17 & 30 May 2026 for reconsideration of the decision made on the 12 May 2026 and sent to the parties on the 27 May 2026 is refused

REASONS

1. By email of the 17 May 2026 at 02:12 the claimant applied for reconsideration of the decision made on the 12 May 2026. The claimant opened her application by stating that she was 'writing to provide formal notice of procedural irregularity and a protective application for reconsideration under Rule 70' and she had 'appended the full text of my 12 May 23:42 email at the foot of this letter (in red text) to demonstrate the content and intent of that original transmission.' Attached was a copy of an email sent by the claimant at 23:42 on the 12 May 2026 (the date of the listed remission hearing) and a copy of her doctor's letter of the same date. The claimant referred to the 'oral judgment given in my absence' but was not 'waiting for written reasons to put these serious irregularities on the record'. The written reasons on the remission were not sent to the parties until the 21 May 2026 so there is nothing in the claimant's application of the 17 May 2026 referring to any aspect of the decision made. Reference is made to the further application on the 30 May 2026 below.

Background

2. The Hearing listed for the 12 & 13 May 2026 was to determine the matters remitted by the Court of Appeal by its order of 5 December 2024, following the rejection of the claimant's Appeal to the EAT in its decision of the 22 February

2024. At paragraph 5 of the tribunal's Reasons following the 12 May 2026 Hearing the tribunal recorded:

The Claimant did not attend this Hearing. A postponement request from the claimant in March had been refused and one was received on the 8 May 2026 from Solicitors now instructed by her and that application was also refused. The Tribunal's reasons were sent to the parties in a letter of the 11 May 2026. The Hearing proceeded in the Claimant's absence to determine the remission. As stated, when refusing the postponement request it was in accordance with the overriding objective to proceed with this matter. It started in 2020 and the original decision was made in 2022. A determination needed to be made.

3. In the tribunal's letter of the 13 March 2026 refusing a postponement request the claimant's attention was drawn to the Presidential Guidance on postponements and that no medical evidence had been provided by the claimant in compliance with that.
4. When a further postponement request was made on 8 May 2026 by Grapple Law by then instructed by the claimant this was also refused and reference made again to the Presidential Guidance. The only document that had been produced was a fit note that had expired (for the period 1 – 30 April 2026). It is incorrect to now suggest that any detailed medical evidence had been supplied.
5. The claimant had also made a lengthy strike out application and the letter of the 11 May 2026 made it clear that the decision on that application had been sent to the parties on the 16 February 2026.

The claimant's application of the 17 May 2026

6. *'The 2022/2023/2025 Pattern of Service Manipulation – This Judge and Tribunal have a documented history of prejudicial service irregularities'*

The claimant repeats allegations that were made in her strike out application. As was stated in rejecting that application this tribunal is not involved in the matter in the Family Court.

7. *'The 12 May GP Obstruction Timetable.'*

This tribunal is not involved in the arrangements made between the claimant and her GP's practice and neither was the tribunal informed that the claimant was to have a telephone consultation with the GP on the day of the listed hearing.

8. *'Evidenced Failure of Service on Grapple Law (11 May 2026)*

The tribunal system shows that the letter of 11 May 2026 and the CVP link were sent to Grapple Law as the claimant's representative. This tribunal is not responsible for and is not involved in that organisations IT system. They were not as the claimant suggests 'excluded from correspondence'.

9. *'Non – Service of the 11 May Decision'*

As stated above this was sent to Grapple Law by then instructed by the claimant. The respondent's solicitor also forwarded it directly to the claimant and Grapple Law.

10. *'Hearing Link and Procedural Ambush. The Tribunal's 15:24 email (viewed only via a Respondent chain) delegated the forwarding of the CVP link to the Respondent's solicitor'*

This is incorrect. The tribunal did not 'delegate' the forwarding of the link rather the respondent's solicitor forwarded it to be sure it had been seen by both the claimant and her solicitor.

11. *'Evidence Medical Incapacity (12 May, 23:42 email)*

The claimant states this was successfully uploaded. She ignores the fact that the Hearing was due to commence at 10am on 12 May 2026 and this email was sent at nearly midnight on that day. It was therefore not before the tribunal when the Hearing commenced.

12. More importantly having now seen the GP letter of the 12 May 2026 it is not helpful. The doctor specifically states he is relaying what he was told in a telephone consultation and did not see the claimant. He lists recurrent ear pain, ongoing pain from a previous toe injury and issues relating to a chronic arm pain. He states that the claimant 'describes symptoms that point towards anxiety'. He makes it clear that he does not determine whether the claimant was fit to engage in court proceedings.

Grapple Law correspondence

13. *8 May 2026*

In this email Grapple Law confirmed it acted for the claimant and gave 'formal notice that our client is medically and psychologically unfit to attend or participate in the hearing' and requested a postponement. This application was refused and that confirmed in the tribunal letter to the parties of the 11 May 2026.

14. The letter from Grapple Law repeated the claimant's suggestion that her strike out application had not been determined and in the tribunal's letter of 11 May it was confirmed that was not the case and that judgment had been sent to the parties on the 16 February 2026.

15. Also, on the 8 May 2026 the claimant herself sent the expired fit note to the tribunal stating it was 'for the Tribunal's records and is not copied to the Respondent in light of the active digital interference and security issues detailed in our correspondence'.

16. 12 May 2026

Grapple Law wrote to the respondent's solicitor on 12 May 2026, the day of the hearing, at 4:18 am. This confirmed that their client would not be attending the hearing. It maintained that medical evidence had been produced but referred to the fit note as being such.

Claimant's application and witness statement 29 May 2026

17. By email of 30 May 2026 the claimant sent this further application. It has been treated as part of her application for reconsideration. She referred in her email to a 'confirming email from GP of 26 May' which she had intended to send but 'it has been subsequently removed from my inbox'. This the claimant stated confirmed 'digital interference and unsafe service I am reporting'. This application is 5 ½ pages and sent by the claimant and not Grapple Law. The tribunal has not seen the email from the GP of the 26 May.

'Context: Systematic bias and 'vexatious' threats'

18. The claimant alleges that the respondent's solicitors threatened to use 'vexatious' tactics against her in January 2024. She states that this 'rhetoric' has been used against her since 2001 to justify 'captured solicitors wasting my funds and ignoring valid concerns'. It is not clear what relevance this has to the Hearing on 12 May 2026 in these proceedings which were commenced in 2020.

19. The claimant then refers to a 'malicious prosecution' in 2010 which was overturned on appeal in 2011. Again, it is not clear what relevance this has to the claim before this tribunal.

20. The claimant then refers to the comments of a Family Court judge in August 2024 and again that can have no bearing on these proceedings.

'Massive procedural errors by the tribunal'

21. The claimant asserts that the judgment sent to the parties on 27 May 2026 was issued before 'the GP practice had even provided the DSAR metadata regarding the 12 May 2026 transmission logs'. She states that the GP practice has now admitted they searched for 12 May 2024 and not 2026 and that the

‘Tribunal has therefore relied on an incomplete and corrupted factual record while I was actively seeking disclosure’. It is not clear what the claimant is referring to. The fact remains that the letter she obtained from her GP was sent on the evening of the tribunal Hearing on 12 May 2026. She had not provided it prior to the Hearing. As set out above the letter from the GP is not of assistance to the tribunal. The tribunal has not seen the GP practice letter of the 26 May 2026 referred to by the claimant.

22. The claimant then states that she requested disclosure from the Employment Tribunal in February, April and May 2026 ‘following the disappearance of critical correspondence from my inbox (including a Without Prejudice offer in linked proceedings) and the injection of the 16 February 2026 ‘ghost’ judgment’. Any request the claimant may have made to His Majesty’s Courts and Tribunal Service (HMCTS) is not a judicial matter. As stated above the tribunal sent the judgment on the claimant’s strike out application on the 16 February 2026 so the reference to a ‘ghost judgment’ is not understood. There are no ‘linked proceedings’ to this tribunal claim.

‘The ‘no audit trail’ admission & GP obstruction

23. The claimant refers to her email to the tribunal of 12 May 2026 at 23:42 which attached the GPs letter. She refers to the subsequent letter from the GP of 26 May 2026 which the tribunal has not seen. She says it refers to the GP receiving advice from their Medical Defence Union. That is a matter for the GP and not this tribunal.

‘The 12 May timeline and digital interference’

24. The claimant sets out alleged difficulties in obtaining a letter from the GP. That is a matter between the claimant and her GP. The tribunal explained what the Presidential Guidance required when requesting a postponement on medical grounds in its letter to the parties of the 13 March 2026, 2 months before the 12 May hearing.

‘Service of the 11 May decision: procedural ambush’

25. The tribunal sent the letter refusing the postponement request to Grapple Law, the claimant’s solicitors and the respondent’s solicitors as well as also sending them both the CVP link. It did not ‘delegate’ that to the respondents’ solicitors who make clear in their correspondence they also sent it so there could be no doubt it had been received by both the claimant and her solicitors.
26. The claimant now confirms that Grapple Law is ‘an AI – assisted support tool and not a solicitor of record’ and that the duty of the tribunal was to serve the claimant directly. Grapple Law wrote stating they were acting for the claimant. It is not for the administration to enquire further. If there are issues as to whether Grapple Law forwarded communications to the claimant she must raise them with that entity.

Conclusions

27. The claimant asks that the oral judgment of 12 May 2026 be set aside and that all proceedings are stayed 'pending an independent audit of the service history and the completion of the DSAR metadata request'. It is notable that nowhere in her 5 ½ pages does she comment on the Reasons given by the tribunal that set out its position on the matters remitted to it by the Court of Appeal.
28. The claimant then applies for 'immediate disclosure of full ET server logs and routing data including correspondence in December 2025 with the parties, the metadata of the 'January ex-parte hearing listing' and logs 'explaining the disappearance of correspondence and the 16 February 2026 injection'.
29. None of these are judicial matters. The claimant will need to make her request to HMCTS if she wishes to pursue it.

Employment Tribunal Rules 2024

30. Reconsideration

Principles

- 68.—** (1) The Tribunal may, either on its own initiative (which may reflect a request from the Employment Appeal Tribunal) or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so.
- (2) A judgment under reconsideration may be confirmed, varied or revoked.
- (3) If the judgment under reconsideration is revoked the Tribunal may take the decision again. In doing so, the Tribunal is not required to come to the same conclusion.

Application for reconsideration

- 69.** Except where it is made in the course of a hearing, an application for reconsideration must be made in writing setting out why reconsideration is necessary and must be sent to the Tribunal no later than 14 days of the later of—
- (a) the date on which the written judgment sought to be reconsidered was sent to the parties,
- (b) the date that any written summary reasons were sent, if these were sent separately from the judgment, or
- (c) the date that any written full reasons were sent, if these were sent separately from the judgment.

Process for reconsideration

70.— (1) The Tribunal must consider any application made under rule 69 (application for reconsideration).

(2) If the Tribunal considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked (including, unless there are special reasons, where substantially the same application has already been made and refused), the application must be refused and the Tribunal must inform the parties of the refusal.

(3) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (2), the Tribunal must send a notice to the parties specifying the period by which any written representations in respect of the application must be received by the Tribunal, and seeking the views of the parties on whether the application can be determined without a hearing. The notice may also set out the Tribunal's provisional views on the application.

(4) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (2), the judgment must be reconsidered at a hearing unless the Tribunal considers, having regard to any written representations provided under paragraph (3), that a hearing is not necessary in the interests of justice.

(5) If the Tribunal determines the application without a hearing the parties must be given a reasonable opportunity to make further written representations in respect of the application.

The tribunal's conclusions

31. There are no reasonable prospects of the decision given on the 12 May 2026 being varied or revoked and the application for reconsideration is refused.
32. The claimant had her application for a postponement on medical grounds refused twice. She was directed to the Presidential Guidance as to what would be required and failed to comply with that. She sent a GP letter late on the evening of the Hearing which does not assist the tribunal. The GP had not seen the claimant, made it clear they were recounting what they had been told by the claimant and expressly stated they could not comment on whether she was fit to attend the Hearing.
33. To a large extent the claimant continues to rehearse matters that she included in her application to strike out the respondent which was refused. She then alleges new difficulties regarding communications received from the tribunal. The administration can only send correspondence to the given email address for the claimant and then to those who stated they were instructed by her. If there have been difficulties in the claimant receiving those, they are for her to investigate and resolve.

34. By the time the claimant sent the second part of her application on the 30 May 2026 she had received the tribunal's judgment and reasons on the remitted issues yet makes no comment on the substance of those at all.
35. The claimant has chosen not to engage in the remission from the Court of Appeal. This is her claim which was started in 2020. It is only proportionate and fair to all parties that the issues be determined. That is what the tribunal did on the 12 May 2026. The claimant has not commented at all on the reasons given for the conclusions on the remitted matters. Rather than engage in the hearing on the 12 May 2026 the claimant continues to pursue issues that she raised in the strike out application a number of which involve other courts or parties and have no bearing whatsoever on these proceedings.
36. When considering the overriding objective, the tribunal must have regard not only to the claimant bringing the claim but the respondent who is defending it. The respondent in these proceedings has been incurring costs since 2020 in defending these claims which the claimant seems intent on not finalising. The tribunal is also entitled to take account of other tribunal users. The tribunal has a considerable backlog of cases waiting to be heard. Every time the tribunal deals with this case it means that others are not being dealt with. The remission hearing had been listed for December 2025 but postponed at the claimant's request pending determination of her strike out application and then relisted for the 12 & 13 May 2026. The claimant had not produced appropriate medical evidence that she was unfit to participate in that hearing. A decision has been given which the claimant does not comment on in her application. The decision stands and the application for reconsideration is refused.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Laidler

Date: 12 June 2026

Sent to the parties on: 16 June 2026

For the Tribunal Office.

Public access to Employment Tribunal decisions

All judgments (apart from judgments under Rule 51) and any full written reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions> shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimants and respondents.

Recording and Transcription

Please note that if a Tribunal Hearing has been recorded you may request a transcript of the recording, for which a charge is likely to be payable in most but not all circumstances. If a transcript is produced it will not include

any oral Judgment or reasons given at the Hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a Judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings, and accompanying Guidance, which can be found here:

<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/>