



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs Carole Richardson

Respondent: Pristine Cleaning Laundry and Maintenance Ltd

JUDGMENT

The respondent's application dated 23 June 2026 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 11 June 2026 is refused.

REASONS

1. This is the preliminary consideration of the respondent's application for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 11 June 2026. That judgment issued as rule 22 judgment in the Claimant's favour as the respondent failed to present a response.
2. The respondent's application was made by means of a letter attached to an email dated 23 June 2026.
3. Such an application falls to be considered under Rules 68 to 70. Rule 69 provides that an application for reconsideration must be made within 14 days of the date on which the written record (or, if later, the written reasons) were sent to the parties. Here, the claimant's application was received within the relevant time limit.
4. By rule 68, the Tribunal may reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so and, if it decides to do so, may vary, revoke or confirm the original decision. There is single threshold for making an application. That is that reconsideration is necessary in the interests of justice. There must therefore be something about the nature of how the decision was reached, either substantively or procedurally, from which the interests of justice would be offended if the original decision was allowed to stand.
5. By rule 70 I am to give an initial consideration to the prospects of the application determining whether it is necessary to seek the views of the respondent and whether the matter can be dealt with on paper or at a further hearing before the

same tribunal. Where the application can be said to carry no reasonable prospects of being varied or revoked, the rules dictate that I shall refuse the application without being required to consider the matter further.

6. Rule 70 gives the Tribunal a broad discretion to determine whether reconsideration of a decision is appropriate. Guidance for Tribunals on how to approach applications for reconsideration was given by Simler P in the case of **Liddington v 2Gether NHS Foundation Trust UKEAT/0002/16/DA**. Paragraphs 34 and 35 provide as follows:

“34. [...] a request for reconsideration is not an opportunity for a party to seek to re-litigate matters that have already been litigated, or to reargue matters in a different way or adopting points previously omitted. There is an underlying public policy principle in all judicial proceedings that there should be finality in litigation, and reconsideration applications are a limited exception to that rule. They are not a means by which to have a second bite at the cherry, nor are they intended to provide parties with the opportunity of a rehearing at which the same evidence and the same arguments can be rehearsed but with different emphasis or additional evidence that was previously available being tendered. Tribunals have a wide discretion whether or not to order reconsideration.

35. Where [...] a matter has been fully ventilated and properly argued, and in the absence of any identifiable administrative error or event occurring after the hearing that requires a reconsideration in the interests of justice, any asserted error of law is to be corrected on appeal and not through the back door by way of a reconsideration application.”

7. The respondent contends that the claimant was employed by Paula Beard in her sole trader business and was never employed by Pristine Cleaning Laundry and Maintenance Ltd. This application does not raise any new information which the respondent could not have raised in its defence had it chosen to submit a response to this claim.
8. I am therefore not satisfied that reconsideration is necessary in the interests of justice as the respondent had ample opportunity to raise these matters prior to judgment being issued. The claim was validly served, and the respondent has no one to blame but itself for the fact that it chose not to submit a response to this claim.
9. In the circumstances the application for reconsideration is rejected on the basis there is no reasonable prospect of the judgment being varied or revoked. Accordingly, the application for reconsideration is therefore refused.

Date: 3 July 2026

Approved by

Employment Judge McTigue

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

20/07/2026

J. Woolley
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE