



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: KJL

Respondent: MNO

JUDGMENT

The claimant's application dated 7 July 2026 for reconsideration of the judgment sent to the parties on 23 June 2026 is refused.

REASONS

1. There is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked for the following reasons.
2. Firstly, I apologise for the delay in this Judgment and Reasons being completed and sent to the parties. The claimant's application for reconsideration was referred to me on 20 July 2026, at which point I had a period of "non-working days" until my return to work on 4 September 2026. I have attempted to get this decision to the parties as soon as possible upon my return. I thank them for their patience.
3. References to "Grounds" below reflect the labels used in the claimant's application for reconsideration.

Ground 1 – allegation 16f/28c

4. The claimant has set out her recollection of the evidence of Mr Tueschenboenner ("KT"), however that recollection disagrees with my note.
5. In KT's cross-examination on Day 4, according to my note, I asked the claimant the following questions and I note also his reply:

EJ: Did you say "unfair" as referenced in the List of Issues at 16f?

KT: No – I do not remember what I exactly said as it was about how we sketch where we are and how we look into the future.

...

EJ: [regarding Issue 28c –] Were you influenced by the claimant's tribunal claim or her reasonable adjustments request?

KT: No – if something is urgent we are stepping in for the claimant.

6. Therefore the claimant's basis for this Ground is not well-founded. As such, the claimant has no reasonable prospect of the decision on this allegation being varied or revoked.

Ground 2 – Allegation 8f/11f/16e

7. The claimant has referenced paragraphs 376-378 in her application for reconsideration. Going back to my findings, at paragraph 108 I have accepted that the respondent did have a preference that the claimant attend the office 3-4 days a week before travelling internationally.
8. Therefore, the element of this allegation, that 3-4 days in the office was a prerequisite to travel was considered within my findings of fact. It is further explored at paragraph 112, and the reason for the conduct is explored at paragraphs 113 – 116.
9. In terms of my conclusions, at paragraph 376, I have set out that I found there was a non-discriminatory reason for the respondent's conduct. In relation to the harassment claim, this is reiterated at paragraph 379.
10. As such, the claimant has no reasonable prospect of the decision on this allegation being varied or revoked.

Ground 3 – Allegation 8g/11g/28a

11. Paragraph 389 sets out that there is a distinction between (a) the fact of the request for reasonable adjustments and (b) the need for the claimant to work 4 days a week from home.
12. For the s15 Equality Act claim, the "something arising from disability" is recorded at Issue 11g as "the claimant's request for reasonable adjustments". The claimant's case was not that the "something arising from disability" was her need to work from home 4 days a week, which is a distinct "something".
13. The findings of fact are consistent with my conclusions in light of the pleaded "something arising from disability".
14. Regarding the respondent's justification argument, the question is whether the legitimate aims could have been met by a less discriminatory measure than rejecting the claimant's travel request. The claimant's point has always been that she should have just been allowed to go on the international audit and

her request should have just been granted. My point at paragraph 391 is that she did not make any suggestion, other than letting her go to do the audit, which would address the respondent's aims of:

- 14.1. The effective organisation and safety of the workforce; and,
- 14.2. Appropriate management of the claimant's employment contract.

15. For these reasons, I consider that there is no reasonable prospect of my decision on this allegation being varied or revoked.

Approved by

Employment Judge Shastri-Hurst

Date: 15 September 2026

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON
15 September 2026

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE