



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Ms D Cesuniene

**Respondent:** Amazon UK Services Limited

## JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 20 July 2026 is refused.

## REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked for the following reasons.
2. Taking each point in the application for reconsideration in turn the position is as follows:

**2.1. The difficulty in identifying comparators:** as set out in the reasons for the strike out, after two years of this litigation the claimant was still unable to properly identify actual comparators, she said she had and was relying on, and did not know the ages of anyone she referred to as a comparator,

**2.2. The Tribunal's characterisation of the "training package":** at the first preliminary hearing of this matter the judge recorded that *"We spent some time discussing precisely what training the Claimant says that she had requested. Other than it was a package of three or four formal training sessions which included picking and stowing and that it was requested from three team leaders the Claimant was unable to say what this training was."*

In providing her further particulars, the claimant said that she was unable to say what the training was but that there was *"...structured training related to working with shelving (racking) systems in the Vendors Returns Department, including roles such as picking, stowing, and other related tasks involving items stored on those shelves. The Claimant has now*

*recalled that these roles formed part of the training in question. At the time the Claimant requested further training, she had already completed approximately four training modules which were held by all employees working in the Vendors Returns Department...".*

Nowhere in my decision did I characterise the training package, I merely set out what the claimant said about it.

**2.3. The Case management order of 24<sup>th</sup> of February incorrectly states that I sought training in order to work in AFE:** it does not do this.

**2.4. The training had already been identified through correspondence:** the training has never been properly identified.

**2.5. I have not changed my evidence:** the claimant's evidence did change – as I set out in my reasons “she has gone from saying she completed 4 training sessions to now saying she did not, with no explanation for the change, other perhaps that the realisation that given that she said in her response to the order for further information that she had received training and could not therefore maintain the allegation that she now pursues, that “the C was never given any formal training” (my emphasis).”

**2.6. The Tribunal's decision did not reflect my earlier, recorded clarification of my age comparators:** yes, it did. After two years and despite saying there were actual comparators, none have been adequately identified.

**2.7. The criticism of delay did not take into account the late and incomplete provision of the hearing bundle, nor the Respondent's own delay:** the issue is not delay *per se* the issue is that after two years of litigation the claim is no further forward because no sufficient details have been provided about this aspect of the case.

**2.8. I was not informed in advance which issues and materials was required to prepare for the hearings:** this is nonsensical. The hearing was listed to deal in part with the respondent's application to strike out part of the claim. The respondent provided a detailed application. There was a bundle of documents. It is not for the Tribunal or the respondent to tell the claimant what she needs to do to prepare to argue the point. All relevant material was before me and the parties in good time for the hearing.

**2.9. As a litigant in person requiring an interpreter, I was limited in my ability to address these points fully at the hearing itself:** with respect, it is the claimant's choice to be a litigant in person. The Tribunal provided an interpreter for the claimant, and I did as much explanation as was necessary for the claimant to understand the application to strike out. Whilst as a judge I can assist parties, I cannot act as their advocate and the fact is that, with the best will in the world, a litigant in person is likely to be at some disadvantage compared to a legally represented respondent but that is not a reason to reconsider a decision.

3. In summary, after two years of litigation, the claim of direct age discrimination amounted to no more than a bare assertion that an unidentified training package was not offered to the claimant but was offered to unidentified colleagues of unknown ages.
4. The claimant has never been able to say why she says if this happened it was related to age, either with any direct evidence or the suggestion of evidence from which adverse inferences could be drawn.
5. Nothing in the application for reconsideration is new, we dealt with the issues fully at the preliminary hearing.
6. The application is refused.

Employment Judge Brewer

Date: 4 August 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

20/08/2026

J. Woolley  
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE