



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr S Anderson
Respondent: Southwest Care Ltd (in liquidation)
Heard at: Southampton (by CVP) **On:** 21 May 2021
Before: Employment Judge Dawson
Appearances
For the claimant: Mr Morris, solicitor
For the respondents: No attendance

JUDGMENT ON REMEDY

1. The claimant has permission to amend his claim for loss of earnings to £1151.70.
2. In respect of the claims of breach of contract:
 - a) In respect of the claim in respect of notice the claimant is awarded the sum of £160.
 - b) In respect of unpaid wages due at the date of dismissal the claimant is awarded the sum of £1151.70.
3. In respect of the claim of unauthorised deduction from the claimant's wages, the claimant suffered a deduction of £1151.70, but given that this head of claim is compensated under the claim of breach of contract, no separate award is made.
4. No award is made in respect of the claim of unfair dismissal.
5. In respect of the claim for accrued but unpaid holiday pay the claimant is awarded the sum of £192.
6. In respect of the claim of discrimination, the claimant is awarded the sum of £10,000 in respect of injury to feelings and interest of £800.

Employment Judge Dawson
Date: 21 May 2021

Judgment sent to the Parties: 16 June 2021

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

Notes

Reasons

Reasons for the judgment having been given orally at the hearing, written reasons will not be provided unless a request was made by either party at the hearing or a written request is presented by either party within 14 days of the sending of this written record of the decision.

Public access to employment tribunal decisions

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

CVP

The hearing was conducted by the parties attending by Cloud Video Platform. It was held in public in accordance with the Employment Tribunal Rules. It was conducted in that manner because a face to face hearing was not appropriate in light of the restrictions required by the coronavirus pandemic and the Government Guidance and it was in accordance with the overriding objective to do so.