Case Number: 2304422/2023



## **EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS**

Claimant: Mrs S Domingues Ferrao

Respondent: L'Impeccable Services Solutions Ltd (company number

09426642)

Heard at: Croydon/London South On: 17/1/2024

**Before:** Employment Judge Wright

## Representation

Claimant: In person

Respondent: Mr A Abbas - paralegal

**JUDGMENT** having been given to the parties on 17/1/2024 and written reasons having been requested in accordance with Rule 62(3) of the Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013, the following reasons are provided:

## **REASONS**

The Judgment of the Tribunal was that the claimant's claim for unauthorised deductions from wages, notice pay and a redundancy payment is well-founded and succeeds. The claimant is awarded the gross sums of £931.60 (unauthorised deductions), £2,192.00 (notice pay), and £2,877 (redundancy pay). A total of £6,000.60. The claimant is to account to HMRC.

- 1. The notice of hearing was dated 11/9/2023 and informed the parties that the final hearing would take place on 17/1/2024 at 14:00 and would last 2 hours.
- 2. The notice of hearing did not state that the hearing was a private preliminary/case management hearing. In fact, case management Orders were attached to the notice of hearing.
- 3. The Tribunal would not ordinarily list a case management hearing for a claim for notice pay and arrears of pay.

Case Number: 2304422/2023

4. At the commencement of the hearing, the Employment Judge announced that this was a public final hearing.

- 5. Evidence was heard and considered and oral Judgment was given.
- 6. When the parties were asked if they had anything to say following Judgment, the respondent's representative said that understood this was a case management hearing. He had not raised anything during the hearing or whilst Judgment was given.
- 7. The respondent's representative said that it did not receive any of the papers and did not have notice that this would be a final hearing.
- 8. Until the respondent's solicitors came on record on 4/10/2023, the Tribunal had corresponded with the respondent at its registered office address. The Tribunal was satisfied there had been good service and that the respondent was on notice. In fact, the respondent's representative had attended the hearing.
- 9. The claimant had sent copies of her documents to the respondent.
- 10. The respondent had not provided any papers in respect of the hearing.

- <del></del>	
Employment Judge Wright	
Date	9/2/2024
REASONS SENT TO THE PARTIES ON 6/3/2024	
FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE	