



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr S Sori
Respondent: Currys Group Limited

Heard at: Leicester Hearing Centre, 5a New Walk, Leicester, LE1 6TE
Considered on the papers
On: 29 June 2026
Before: Employment Judge Adkinson sitting alone

JUDGMENT

UPON considering the claimant's application dated 20 June 2026 for reconsideration of the judgment (with full written reasons) dated 2 June 2026

The Tribunal **DISMISSES** the claimant's application for reconsideration because there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked.

REASONS

1. The **Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 Part 12** govern the reconsideration process. **Rule 68** permits reconsideration only where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. **Rule 70** mandates the Tribunal must reject the application at the first stage without a hearing if it considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked.
2. The following principles are in my view relevant to deciding if there is a prospect of success.
 - 2.1. The words "necessary in the interests of justice" mean the Tribunal a broad discretion to determine whether reconsideration of a judgment is appropriate in the circumstances. However, this discretion must be exercised judicially, which means having regard not only to the interests of the party seeking the review or reconsideration, but also to the interests of the other party to the litigation and to the public interest requirement that there should, so far as possible, be finality of litigation: **Outasight VB Ltd v Brown 2015 ICR D11 EAT**. See also **Flint v Eastern Electricity Board [1975] IRLR 277 QBD**; **Newcastle Upon Tyne City**

Council v Marsden [2010] ICR 743 EAT; Ministry of Justice v Burton [2016] ICR 1128 CA.

2.2. Although there is no need for exceptional circumstances (**Williams v Ferrosan Ltd [2004] IRLR 607 EAT**), each decision is unique to its own facts, and the discretion must be exercised in accordance with recognised principles and judiciously: **Sodhexo Ltd v Gibbons [2005] IRLR 836 EAT**.

2.3. Though in reference to the old procedures, the EAT said in **Stevenson v Golden Wonder Ltd [1977] IRLR 474 EAT** that the reconsideration process is

“not intended to provide parties with the opportunity of a rehearing at which the same evidence can be rehearsed with different emphasis, or further evidence adduced which was available before”.

I see no reason why that principle does not apply to the current provisions either.

3. The Tribunal can expect the reasons to be read as a whole. It is not obliged to identify every piece of evidence; and there is no assumption the Tribunal has not considered something or an argument simply because a particular piece of evidence has not been referred to, or specifically dealt with: **DPP Law Ltd v Greenberg [2021] IRLR 1016 CA**. The case relates to appeals and how appellate courts should approach appeals, but there is no reason why the same cannot be expected of parties seeking reconsideration of conclusions reached

4. The Tribunal has considered the application in detail. Most of it amounts to no more than strong disagreement with the Tribunal's findings and conclusions. It seeks to emphasise different matters and different aspects of the evidence in order to derive a different result. The time for doing that was at the final hearing. It is not in the interests of justice to provide the claimant with a second opportunity to do so. It would be disproportionate and unproductive to go through each complaint step by step.

5. The Tribunal comments though on the following specific complaints:

5.1. The decision is not **Meek** compliant. The Tribunal disagrees. The Tribunal is satisfied that, read reasonably as a whole, it explains who won and lost and how the Tribunal reached that conclusion. In any event the claimant's real complaint is not that the reasons do not explain why he lost but, rather, he is unable to accept the conclusion.

5.2. The complaint about the meta-data cross-examination: Ground 9. The claimant did not raise these objections at the time. That was the occasion for doing so. It is too late now. However the claimant misses the key point that the Tribunal did not accept the respondent's submission on the metadata: paragraph 11 of the reasons refers.

5.3. Claimant's mental health and ability to participate: Ground 10. As noted, the Tribunal it delayed the start of day 2 because the

claimant was unwell from failing to take his medication. The claimant did not object to the case resuming at 2pm. The claimant did not apply for an adjournment to accommodate ill-health either before the hearing or at it. Nothing else suggested to the Tribunal reasonable adjustments were required. Paragraph 2.9 of the reasons refers. In any case the claimant did not then and has not since adduced any medical evidence to show that he could not take part in the hearing effectively. The claimant avers that the Tribunal

“should have considered whether further assistance, clearer directions, more time, or an adjournment was required to allow me to participate effectively and give my best evidence.”

If he never raised any matters, no other adjustments appeared necessary and there was no e.g. medical evidence then the claimant's complaint that the Tribunal did not further accommodate him does not persuade me. I note the claimant does not actually suggest what the Tribunal should have done, and I note he does not say he requested but was denied adjustments.

- 5.4. The claimant throughout cites his status as a litigant in person and in Ground 10A cites procedural unfairness and lack of equal footing. Insofar as the claimant criticises the merits of the decision under this heading, the Tribunal repeats the observation above: it is an attempt to reargue the case.

The overriding objective requires the Tribunal to ensure “so far as practicable” that the parties are on an equal footing. The Tribunal must remain neutral. It cannot “descend into the arena”, i.e. take over the conduct of a party's case or act as their advocate. The Tribunal notes the judge assisted the claimant to formulate questions. It explained each stage. The issue about metadata is irrelevant as it found in the claimant's favour on that point. The Tribunal reflected on the cultural background and how people answer questions (paragraph 8.2). Ultimately though Tribunal proceedings are adversarial, not inquisitorial. The Tribunal is satisfied it did what could reasonably be expected of it, as described in **Moustache v Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Trust [2025] EWCA Civ 185**, particularly at [38]. The Tribunal did therefore ensure the parties were on an equal footing so far as possible.

- 5.5. The Tribunal has of its own motion revisited the Presidents' Guidance on Vulnerable Parties and Witnesses as part of this reconsideration. It notes the claimant does not refer to it in an otherwise lengthy application that cites a lot of case law. While probably vulnerable (there is no need to decide), there is nothing in it that points to any reasonable action or adjustment that was not otherwise.

- 5.6. Finally the claimant refers to Ms Meher's evidence. It is the claimant's responsibility to ensure witnesses are available for the hearing. It is his responsibility to ensure if they give evidence from overseas, he obtains permission in good time: he applied on 14 May 2026. There is no reason why he could not have planned with his witnesses to ensure they could attend well before then, so allowing him to make any applications and seek permission in good time.
6. There is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked. Therefore, the application is dismissed.

Approved by the Judge

Employment Judge Adkinson

Date: 29 June 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

08 July 2026

.....
Hrishiraj Pramanik

.....
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Notes

Reasons for the judgment are above. They are full reasons. No further reasons will be given.

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

All judgments (apart from withdrawal judgments) and written reasons for the judgments (if provided) are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the parties in a case.

Appeals

You can appeal to the Employment Appeal Tribunal if you think a legal mistake was made in an Employment Tribunal decision. There is more information here: <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-employment-appeal-tribunal>.

Recordings

If a Tribunal hearing has been recorded, you may request a transcript of the recording upon payment of any fee due. 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. You can access the Direction and the accompanying Guidance here: <https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/>.