



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

**Claimant:** Anthony Mullins

**Respondent:** Alm Bars Limited (in creditors voluntary liquidation)

**Heard at:** Cardiff; by video

**On:** 29 November 2024

**Before:** Employment Judge A Williams

## Appearances

For the Claimant: No attendance

For the Respondent: No attendance

## Preamble

1. I conducted a liability hearing by video on the above date.
2. The Claimant did not attend. The Claimant had not filed a document setting out how much he is claiming and how the amount has been calculated or any supporting documents or evidence with the Tribunal, as required by the notice of hearing and case management order of 20<sup>th</sup> September 2024.
3. The last contact from the Claimant on the Tribunal file was an email on 8<sup>th</sup> August 2024.
4. All practicable enquiries about the reasons for the Claimant's absence were made in accordance with Rule 47 of The Employment Tribunals (Constitution

and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013. The Tribunal e-mailed the Claimant using the e-mail address on the ET1 claim form on the day prior to the hearing but no response was received. The Tribunal was able to contact the Claimant by telephone at 10.30am. The Claimant advised that he was in work and was unable to attend the hearing.

5. I am satisfied that the Notice of Hearing dated 20<sup>th</sup> September 2024 had been sent to the Claimant's correct address as noted on the ET1 form. I also noted that both parties were e-mailed by the Tribunal on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2024 confirming that the liability hearing will go ahead. The email address used for the Claimant is the same one the Claimant had previously used to correspond with the Tribunal on 8<sup>th</sup> August 2024. I am satisfied therefore that the Claimant had adequate notice that the hearing was taking place to make arrangements to attend. The Claimant did not inform the Tribunal that he could not attend the hearing nor did he request an alternative date for the hearing.
6. The Respondent was placed into Creditors Voluntary Liquidation on 20 June 2024. By letter dated 24 October 2024 the joint liquidators confirmed that they would not oppose the claim or provide any representations to the Tribunal.
7. The Claimant, by his ET1 claim form received on 5 August 2024, brought a claim for holiday pay. He also makes reference to a service charge but does not explain that element of his claim any further. He also appears to claim for disability discrimination however Employment Judge Ryan on 20 September 2024 decided that the disability discrimination claim should be rejected.

8. The Claimant did not file any evidence. In the absence of any evidence or explanation from the Claimant as to what he is in fact claiming and why, I could not make any findings as to what he is, or is not, entitled to by way of holiday pay or any claim in relation to service charge. Having considered all the information available to me as to the Claimant's absence, and in light of the absence of any evidence to substantiate the Claimant's claims, I therefore proceeded to dismiss the claim(s), in accordance with Rule 47 of The Employment Tribunals Rules of Procedure 2013.

## **JUDGMENT**

### **Holiday Pay**

1. The claim for holiday pay is not well-founded and is dismissed.

### **Wages**

2. The claim for service charge is not well-founded and is dismissed.

***EJ A Williams***

Employment Judge A Williams

**DATE 29<sup>th</sup> November 2024**

Sent to the parties on:

13 February 2025

For the Tribunal Office:

Katie Dickson