



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mrs. S Ravat

Respondent: Tayyibah Girls School

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 16 April 2026 for reconsideration of the decisions at the preliminary hearing on 9 April 2026 is refused.

REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked. The Claimant in her application asked the Tribunal to reconsider the following-:
 - The refusal of her application to strike out the Respondent's response and/or for a deposit order, and/or for alternative directions designed to narrow the case (including her request that the litigation be focused on the Respondent's own admitted 9-day window leading to the dismissal).
 - The refusal of her request for a Scott Schedule and/or an order for further and better particulars in relation to her allegations of race discrimination, harassment and faith-based abuse, in circumstances where the Respondent was permitted to continue to rely on its full ET3 containing extensive allegations against her.
 - The refusal of her application to amend or re-label the existing factual matrix to include Race Discrimination, Disability Discrimination, Harassment and Victimisation.
 - The Tribunal's approach to our client's status as a disabled litigant in person and the extent to which reasonable adjustments were, or were not, made at the hearing, notwithstanding her visible distress, shaking and emotional dysregulation, and the significant inequality of arms she faced as a lone, disabled claimant against a represented Respondent (solicitor and counsel) alongside two of the Respondent's faith leaders.
2. In his application, the claimant claims that the mobile phone notes were contemporaneous and that they verified that the complaints made by him had occurred in the manner that he relied upon at the hearing.
3. In its decision the Tribunal on whether to strike out the Respondent's Grounds of Resistance the Tribunal determined that "*The Tribunal in considering whether to grant the application for a strike out reminded itself of*

the tests and whether it could be said that the Grounds of Resistance were frivolous or vexatious. It noted that it did not have a witness statement or evidence from the respondent concerning the circumstances leading to the dismissal.

4. *The Tribunal noted that the purpose of the preliminary hearing was not to enable the Tribunal to find facts as part of the preliminary hearing. The finding of facts fell to be determined at a full merit hearing in which the evidence could be tested by cross examination.*
5. *The Tribunal accepted that the threshold for striking out the claim was high and that the tribunal hearing this matter would be in a position to decide if there was a lack of transparency in the reason given by the respondent for the claimant's dismissal and whether there was an inference to be drawn from this. The Tribunal decided to refuse the application to strike out the respondent's ET3.*
6. In respect of the Application for a deposit order, the Tribunal carefully considered the Grounds of Resistance in paragraphs 55-68 of the Grounds of Resistance in which the Respondent set out the reasons for the claimant's dismissal. The Tribunal in its decision made the following finding-: "The Tribunal in deciding this application, reminded itself that the test was that the response had little reasonable prospect of success. Having considered the grounds of resistance, the Tribunal found that the grounds of resistance, did raise arguable issues which stood to be evaluated by hearing and testing the evidence before a full merits Tribunal."
7. The Tribunal is satisfied that this was the correct decision.
The Claimant asked the tribunal to review its decision to refuse the claimant's request for a Scott Schedule and/or an order for further and better particulars in relation to her allegations of race discrimination, harassment and faith-based abuse, made its decision by considering the overriding objective and the need to act proportionately. The claimant in the hearing asserted that the respondent gave numerous and contradictory reasons for her dismissal. The Tribunal considered that this is a factor for the Tribunal to consider at the full merits hearing
8. The Tribunal is satisfied that in all the circumstances its refusal to admit the mobile phone notes/records was correct. The Tribunal gave full reasons for the decision to refuse the claimant's application to amend her claim. In the case management order the Tribunal set out that-: "*The Tribunal having heard from both parties, decided to grant a limited amendment to permit the claimant to amend her claim to include Harassment on the grounds of her sex. The Tribunal considered that the facts upon which the claimant now sought to rely were pleaded in her original ET1, the Tribunal considered that this was sufficiently pleaded. The Tribunal also granted an amendment to extend her claim for unlawful deduction of wages, in respect of the increase in wages which she stated had agreed following her successful completion of the NPQH course.*"
9. At the Case Management Hearing Judge Daley set out as follows-: "*The respondent referred me to the test in (Selkent Bus Company Ltd (trading as Stagecoach Selkent) v Moore [1996] IRLR 66). I find that an amendment to permit disability discrimination and race discrimination and Health and safety would amount to a substantial amendment as it introduces new causes of action. In circumstances where the facts were within the knowledge of the claimant. Where the time limit for the new claim has expired and no justification has been set out for the delay.*"
10. The Claimant has set out that the Tribunal accepted unfairly to her as a disabled person. The following adjustments were put in place-: "*At the preliminary hearing the following adjustments were put in place, the claimant, was separated by a screen and was allowed to enter the hearing*

room first, and then depart after the respondent's representative, and those in attendance on behalf of the respondent."

11. The Tribunal was aware that the claimant was a litigant in person and took appropriate steps to safeguard her including pausing the hearing when she became distressed. The claimant was able to fully participate in the hearing.
12. The claimant in her request for a reconsideration has put forward no new grounds to undermine the findings of the Tribunal.
13. Accordingly, the request to reconsider the decision in respect of the preliminary hearing is refused.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Monica Daley

Date 12.08.2026 _____

SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

28 August 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE