



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Claire Buckley

Respondents: Dutton Gregory LLP (1)
Andrew Tilley (2)

Heard at: Southampton

On: 15 October 2024

Before: Employment Judge Housego

Representation

Claimant: Written application

Respondent: None

JUDGMENT ON RECONSIDERATION

The judgment of the Tribunal is that the Claimant's application for reconsideration is refused because there is no reasonable prospect of the decision being varied or revoked.

REASONS

1. On 16 and 17 July 2024 I conducted a Tribunal preliminary hearing after which I dismissed the Claimant's claims against the 2nd 4th and 5th Respondents (the 3rd Respondent then becoming the 2nd Respondent).
2. Within the 14 days allowed for an application for reconsideration of a judgment the Claimant's solicitor made such an application.
3. The relevant procedural rules relating to reconsideration of judgments are in Schedule 1 of the Employment Tribunals (Constitution & Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013. Those relevant Rules are as follows:

RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGMENTS

Principles

70. A Tribunal may, either on its own initiative (which may reflect a request from the Employment Appeal Tribunal) or on the application of a party, reconsider any judgment where it is necessary in the interests of justice to do so. On reconsideration, the decision (“the original decision”) may be confirmed, varied or revoked. If it is revoked it may be taken again.

Application

71. Except where it is made in the course of a hearing, an application for reconsideration shall be presented in writing (and copied to all the other parties) within 14 days of the date on which the written record, or other written communication, of the original decision was sent to the parties or within 14 days of the date that the written reasons were sent (if later) and shall set out why reconsideration of the original decision is necessary.

Process

72.—(1) An Employment Judge shall consider any application made under rule 71. If the Judge considers that there is no reasonable prospect of the original decision being varied or revoked (including, unless there are special reasons, where substantially the same application has already been made and refused), the application shall be refused and the Tribunal shall inform the parties of the refusal. Otherwise the Tribunal shall send a notice to the parties setting a time limit for any response to the application by the other parties and seeking the views of the parties on whether the application can be determined without a hearing. The notice may set out the Judge's provisional views on the application.

(2) If the application has not been refused under paragraph (1), the original decision shall be reconsidered at a hearing unless the Employment Judge considers, having regard to any response to the notice provided under paragraph (1), that a hearing is not necessary in the interests of justice. If the reconsideration proceeds without a hearing the parties shall be given a reasonable opportunity to make further written representations.

(3) Where practicable, the consideration under paragraph (1) shall be by the Employment Judge who made the original decision or, as the case may be, chaired the full tribunal which made it; and any reconsideration under paragraph (2) shall be made by the Judge or, as the case may be, the full tribunal which made the original decision. Where that is not practicable, the President, Vice President or a Regional Employment Judge shall appoint another Employment Judge to deal with the application or, in the case of a decision of a full tribunal, shall either direct that the reconsideration be by such members of the original Tribunal as remain available or reconstitute the Tribunal in whole or in part.

Reconsideration by the Tribunal on its own initiative

73. Where the Tribunal proposes to reconsider a decision on its own initiative, it shall inform the parties of the reasons why the decision is being reconsidered and the decision shall be reconsidered in accordance with rule 72(2) (as if an application had been made and not refused).

4. The reconsideration application does no more than to seek to reargue the decision to remove Andrew Witt, Mark Broad and Graham Carr as individual Respondents to the claim.
5. I refuse the application for a reconsideration for this reason. I observe that this does not affect the claims themselves in any way, for the allegations made against the 1st Respondent are that it is liable for the actions of these three individuals as members of the LLP.

Employment Judge Housego
Dated 15 October 2024

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON

28 October 2024

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE