



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimants:** Mr A Kirby & others (see schedule)  
**Respondent:** Vale of Mowbray Limited (in administration)  
**Rule 96 party:** Secretary of State for Business and Trade

## JUDGMENT

### Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013 – Rule 21

1. The claimants' claims that the respondent failed to comply with the requirements of section 188 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 in respect of their dismissals are well founded.
2. The Tribunal orders the respondent, by way of protective award under section 189(3) of the 1992 Act, to pay to each of the claimants a payment equivalent to remuneration for the period of 90 days beginning on 28 September 2022.

### Recoupment

3. The Employment Protection (Recoupment of Jobseeker's Allowance and Income Support) Regulations 1996 apply to these awards. In each case the protected period is the period of 90 days beginning on 28 September 2022.

### Reasons

1. Each of the claimants named in the schedule has made a complaint under section 189 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 on the ground that the respondent failed to comply with a requirement of section 188 in respect of his or her dismissal. The respondent company's administrators have given consent for the claims to continue.
2. The respondent has not presented a response to the claims.
3. I have decided that a determination can properly be made of the claimants' complaints on the available material.
4. On the available material I am satisfied of the following.

**Case No: 2501786/2022 & others (see schedule)**

- a. As at 28 September 2022 the respondent was proposing to dismiss as redundant, within a period of 90 days or less, 20 or more employees who were assigned to carry out their duties at its site at Mowbray House, Leeming Bar.
  - b. The claimants were employees of the respondent who may be affected by the proposed dismissals. They were assigned to carry out their duties at the site referred to above. They were dismissed as redundant on 28 September 2022.
  - c. For the purposes of section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992, the respondent's site at Mowbray House, Leeming Bar was either an establishment in itself or it was part of a larger unit constituting an establishment together with the respondent's site at Plews Way Leeming Bar. In order to determine the claimants' claims it is unnecessary for me to decide which of those possibilities was in fact the case.
  - d. The respondent was required to consult about the dismissals all the persons who were appropriate representatives of any of the employees who may be affected by the proposed dismissals or may be affected by measures taken in connection with those dismissals: section 188 Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992. For the purposes of the consultation, the respondent was required to disclose in writing to the appropriate representatives the information set out at section 188(4) of the Act.
  - e. The claimants were not employees of a description in respect of which an independent trade union was recognised by the respondent.
  - f. There were no employee representatives appointed or elected by the affected employees otherwise than for the purposes of section 188, who had authority from those employees to receive information and to be consulted about the proposed dismissals on their behalf.
  - g. There were no employee representatives elected by the affected employees, for the purposes of section 188, in an election satisfying the requirements of section 188A(1). The respondent did not invite the claimants to elect such representatives. The respondent did not consult with any of the claimants individually about the proposed redundancies.
  - h. Each of the claimants is entitled to make a complaint under section 189 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 on the ground that the respondent failed to comply with a requirement of section 188 in respect of his or her dismissal.
  - i. The respondent failed to comply with the requirements of section 188 in respect of each of the claimants' dismissals.
  - j. The respondent has not shown that there were special circumstances which rendered it not reasonably practicable for the employer to comply with any requirement of section 188.
  - k. Each of the complaints was presented to the tribunal within the period of three months beginning with the date on which the claimant's dismissal took effect (taking into account section 292A).
5. The claimants' complaints under s189 are well founded.
6. Section 189 provides as follows:
- (2) If the tribunal finds the complaint well-founded it shall make a declaration to that effect and may also make a protective award.

**Case No: 2501786/2022 & others (see schedule)**

(3) A protective award is an award in respect of one or more descriptions of employees—  
(a) who have been dismissed as redundant, or whom it is proposed to dismiss as redundant, and

(b) in respect of whose dismissal or proposed dismissal the employer has failed to comply with a requirement of section 188, ordering the employer to pay remuneration for the protected period.

(4) The protected period—

(a) begins with the date on which the first of the dismissals to which the complaint relates takes effect, or the date of the award, whichever is the earlier, and

(b) is of such length as the tribunal determines to be just and equitable in all the circumstances having regard to the seriousness of the employer's default in complying with any requirement of section 188; but shall not exceed 90 days

7. I have determined that it is appropriate to make a protective award under section 189 in respect of each of the claimants.
8. In determining the length of the protected period I have had regard to the seriousness of the employer's default in complying with the requirements of section 188 and borne in mind guidance given in the case of *GMB v Susie Radin Ltd* [2004] EWCA Civ 180, [2004] IRLR 400.
9. I am satisfied on the material available that this is a case where there has been no consultation at all in relation to the claimants' proposed dismissals and there are no mitigating circumstances. Therefore, it is just and equitable that the length of the protected period in the case of each claimant should be the maximum of 90 days.
10. The reference in s189(4) to the date on which 'the first of the dismissals to which the complaint relates' is a reference to the first of the dismissals of which complaint can properly be made under section 189: *E Green & Son (Castings) Ltd v Association of Scientific, Technical & Managerial Staffs* [1984] IRLR 135; approved by *TGWU v Ledbury Preserves* [1986] IRLR 494. A complaint made by an individual under section 189 is a complaint that the respondent failed to comply with its obligations under section 188 in respect of the claimant's own dismissal. That is the only dismissal of which each claimant can properly complain; each claimant can obtain a protective award only for him- or herself: *Independent Insurance Company Ltd v Aspinall* [2011] IRLR 723. It follows that, for the purposes of section 189(4), there is only one dismissal to which each individual's complaint relates: the claimant's own. Therefore, the protected period begins with the date the claimant's own dismissal takes effect.

Employment Judge Loy

Date: 17 April 2024

JUDGMENT SENT TO THE PARTIES ON  
19 April 2024

AND ENTERED IN THE REGISTER  
G Palmer

FOR THE TRIBUNAL OFFICE

**Case No: 2501786/2022 & others (see schedule)**

2501786/2022 and 2501787/2022	Andrew Kirby
2501788/2022	James McQueen
2501789/2022	Gregorio Andrade
2501790/2022	Thomas Harvey
2501791/2022	Trevor Cannell
2501792/2022	Robin Turner
2501793/2022	Daniel Allen
2501794/2022	Mateusz Salawa
2501795/2022	Patrycja Szyszko
2501796/2022	Waldavmar Szyszko
2501797/2022	Aaron Sylvester
2501798/2022	Jason Sartori
2502130/2022	Alla Timofejeva
2502131/2022	Aaron Dixon
2502132/2022	Chloe Allen
2502390/2022	Thomas Read
2502393/2022	James Clapham
2502412/2022	Carol Trotter
2502413/2022	Susan Hindhaugh
2502414/2022	Elliott Harker
2502415/2022	Lorraine Bradley
2502406/2022	Leanne Walker
2502408/2022	Thomas Lane
2502409/2022	Barry Morris
2502209/2022	Stuart Mitton
2502275/2022	John Hawkswell
2501782/2022	Adam Robert Merkin
2501800/2022	Richard Dunn
2501801/2022	Logan James Dunn
2501802/2022	Lee McConnell
2501809/2022	Ruth Dennison
2501814/2022	Alexander Toth
2501830/2022	John Stuart Armstrong
2502128/2022	Gareth James Bellis
2502132/2022	Chloe Allen
2502148/2022	Nigel Train
2502223/2022	Mark Gatenby
2502246/2022	Merlinar Cherubin-John
2502257/2022	Helen Evison
2502288/2022	Graeme Hall
2502318/2022	Martin Gibb
2502341/2022	Ronald Wilbor
2502419/2022	Martyn Vernalls
2502428/2022	John Ward
2501782/2022	Adam Merkin

