



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: H Windsor

Respondents: Matthew Law t/a Beauty Spa (1)
Carla Riordan t/a Beauty Spa (2)

Heard at: London South Employment Tribunal by video

On: 21 April 2022

Before: Employment Judge L Burge

Appearances

For the Claimant: P McNamee
For the Respondent 1: In Person
For the Respondent 2: Did not attend

JUDGMENT

It is the Judgment of the Tribunal that the Second Respondent:

1. unfairly dismissed the Claimant;
2. failed to pay the Claimant notice pay;
3. failed to pay the Claimant outstanding holiday pay on termination; and
4. unlawfully deducted the Claimant's wages.

REASONS

1. The Tribunal heard evidence from the Claimant and the First Respondent and based on that evidence finds that the Second Respondent:
 - 1.1. failed to provide a response to the Claimant's claim;

- 1.2. knew about the claim but did not enter a Response; and
- 1.3. also knew about today's hearing but did not attend.
2. The Tribunal also finds that the Second Respondent employed the Claimant as a Beauty Therapist. The Claimant had a contract of employment with the Second Respondent and even after her bankruptcy in November 2019 the Second Respondent continued to run Beauty Spa and the Claimant continued to be employed by her.

EJ L Burge

21 April 2022

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.