

EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant Miss L Eaton and Others (see schedule)

Respondent: The Sheffield Bath Company Limited

INTERIM JUDGMENT REDUNDANCY PAY

Further to the Orders made on 3 January 2020 (sent to the parties on 10 January 2020) and having read the parties' subsequent correspondence it is adjudged that:-

- 1. All 18 claimants were dismissed by reason of redundancy.
- 2. All of the claimants qualified for a statutory redundancy payment but to date have not received one.
- 3. The amount of the redundancy payment which each claimant is entitled to is set out in the schedule below.

Claimant	Age at date of dismissal	Length of service	Gross weekly pay	Statutory redundancy pay
Mrs K Geary	58	14	£456	£9576
Mrs J Rodley	62	11	£303.32	£5004.78
Miss S Sampson	27	12	£206.92	£1448.44
Miss R Miles	37	4	£203.35	£813.40
Mrs A North	44	9	£112.48	£1181.04
Miss A Bartle	26	7	£80.73	£444.01
Ms A O'Connor	57	12	£257.30	£4631.40
Ms G Whiffin	52	2	£163.92	£491.76
Miss J Storey	32	13	£128.65	£1479.47
Miss K Horner	52	14	£327.12	£6378.84

Claimant	Age at date of dismissal	Length of service	Gross weekly pay	Statutory redundancy pay
Mrs K Stratford	37	14	£232.70	£3257.80
Miss A Allott	25	3	£298.80	£896.40
Mrs L Price	37	8	£174.72	£1397.76
Miss C Askew	21	6	£195.51	£294.76
Mrs E Mansell	37	2	£202.31	£404.62
Mrs K Myers	42	4	£225.13	£1013.08
Mrs L Carus	31	6	£266.91	£1601.46
Miss L Eaton	28	3	£540 (capped at £525)	£1575

REASONS

- 1. It is not in dispute that all the claimants were summarily dismissed on 4 September 2019 because the respondent's business had either ceased or was imminently about to cease.
- 2. The respondent does not in principle defend the claims each of the claimants brings for a statutory redundancy payment.
- 3. At the preliminary hearing on 3 January 2020 Orders were made for the claimants to provide some missing information, not least their dates of birth. That information was duly provided. An Order was also made for the respondent to indicate whether, and if so why he disagreed with any of the redundancy calculations which the claimants had put forward.
- 4. It was envisaged that once this information was to hand and without the need for a further hearing I would issue an interim Judgment dealing with the statutory redundancy payments.
- 5. The respondent's managing director, Mr Wilkinson, wrote to the Tribunal on 29 January 2020 raising certain irrelevant issues and indicating that he believed that some of the redundancy calculations were wrong. He set out the amounts which he believed were due to the claimants Sampson, North, Storey, Askew and Myers, although he did not explain how he had reached the figures he had calculated. He also commented that he was not prepared to spend time rectifying a group claim and that "they" need to get the claim correct in the first instance.
- 6. On the basis of the information which the claimants have provided with regard to their age at the date of dismissal, their length of service and their gross weekly pay and by reference to the method of calculation set out in the Employment Rights Act

1996 section 162, I have calculated the statutory redundancy payment which each claimant is entitled as set out in the schedule above.

7. For the record, the claimants have various other complaints, which will be decided at a hearing which will listed in due course.

Employment Judge Little Date 21st February 2020

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

Judgments and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employmenttribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.

Miss L Eaton & 17 Others -v- Sheffield Bath Company

Miss L Eaton
Mrs K Geary
Mrs J Rodley
Miss S Sampson
Miss R Miles
Mrs A North
Miss A Bartle
Mrs A O'Conner
Mrs G Whiffin
Miss J Storey
Miss K Horner
Mrs K Stratford
Mrs A Allott
Mrs L PrIce
Miss C Askew
Mrs E Mansell
Mrs K Myers
Mrs L Carus