



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr G Jones

Respondent: Wortley Shoot Limited (in creditors voluntary liquidation)

Heard at Sheffield (by CVP)

ON: 11 March 2025

BEFORE: Employment Judge Brain

REPRESENTATION:

Claimant: No attendance or representation

Respondent: No attendance or representation

JUDGMENT

UPON the parties having failed to attend or be represented at the hearing, UPON the respondent's insolvency practitioner notifying the Tribunal that there would be none on behalf of the respondent, and UPON the Tribunal (pursuant to Rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024) considering such information as was available to it, and making such enquiries as were practicable about the reason for the claimant's absence the Judgment of the Tribunal is as follows:

Unfair Dismissal

1. The complaint of unfair dismissal is well founded. The claimant was unfairly dismissed. The respondent admits dismissing the claimant and has failed to prove a fair reason for the dismissal.
2. The respondent shall pay the claimant a basic award of £4,846.14. *[It is agreed between the parties that the claimant worked for the respondent between 6 May 2017 and 1 March 2024 (that being six complete years). The respondent says (in paragraph 6 of their grounds of resistance) that the claimant's basic salary was £28,000 per annum. This equates to a gross weekly sum of £538.46. Accordingly, the multiplicand of £538.46 is multiplied by the appropriate multiplier of 9 (considering the claimant's age and length of service)].*
3. There shall be no compensatory award in the claimant's favour, the claimant having failed to satisfy the Tribunal that it is just and equitable to make any such award in his favour.

Notice Pay

4. The complaint of breach of contract in relation to notice pay is not well founded and stands dismissed, the claimant having failed to prove to the Tribunal's satisfaction that his contract of employment was not liable to summary termination.

Holiday Pay

5. The complaint in respect of holiday pay is not well founded, the claimant having failed to prove his case to the satisfaction of the Tribunal.

Unauthorised Deduction of Wages

6. The complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages is not well founded, the claimant having failed to prove to the Tribunal's satisfaction that the respondent made unauthorised deductions from his wages.

Non-Compliance with ACAS Code of Practice on Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures 2015.

Pursuant to section 124A of the Employment Rights Act 1996, there may be no increase in the basic award. In any event, the claimant has failed to prove that the respondent failed to comply with the ACAS Code.

Approved by Employment Judge Brain

Date: 14 March 2025

Note - 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.

Recording and Transcription

Please note that if a Tribunal hearing has been recorded you may request a transcript of the recording, for which a charge may be payable. If a transcript is produced it will not include any oral judgment or reasons given at the hearing. The transcript will not be checked, approved or verified by a judge. There is more information in the joint Presidential Practice Direction on the Recording and Transcription of Hearings, and accompanying Guidance, which can be found here:

<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/employment-rules-and-legislation-practice-directions/>