



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

BETWEEN

Claimant
MR P ELEY

AND

Respondent
LINX CHRISTIAN YOUTH TRUST

JUDGMENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL

HELD AT: BRISTOL ON: 2ND JULY 2026

**EMPLOYMENT JUDGE MR P CADNEY
(SITTING ALONE)**

APPEARANCES:-

FOR THE CLAIMANT:- IN PERSON

FOR THE RESPONDENT:- NO ATTENDANCE

JUDGMENT

The judgment of the tribunal is that:-

Respondent's Application

- i) The respondent's application for an extension of time in which to present the ET3 response / Grounds of Resistance is dismissed.

Claimant's Claim

- i) In the absence of a response judgment is entered for the claimant (pursuant to r22 ET Rules of Procedure 2024) in respect of his claims for unfair dismissal and wrongful dismissal (breach of contract in relation to notice pay)

Remedy

- i) Notice Pay- The claimant is awarded - **£1752.24**
- ii) Unfair Dismissal / Basic Award – The claimant is awarded - **£10,067.26**
- iii) Unfair Dismissal / Compensatory Award – The claimant is awarded - **£4234. 58**
- iv) Total - **£16,054.08**

Reasons

Background

1. The following brief chronology outlines the background to today's hearing:
 - i) 5th October 2025 – The claimant submitted his claim for unfair dismissal.
 - ii) 21st November 2025 – The claim was served on the respondent with the ET3 due by 19th December 2025 . No ET3 was received.
 - iii) 23rd February 2026 – A Response not Received letter was sent to the respondent.
 - iv) 12th March 2026 – Solicitors acting for the respondent sought an extension of time I which to present the response, and supplied a draft ET3 and Draft Response.
 - v) 16th April 2026 – The claimant having objected, the case was listed for today's hearing to determine the application.

Extension of Time Application

2. Since the application was made the tribunal has had correspondence from the trustees of the respondent. In summary the existing trustees contend that the limited company through which the respondent's affairs were administered was struck off and dissolved in 2023 due to the failure to file accounts. They understood that an application to restore the company to the register had been made but in fact it had not. In or about March 2026 they discovered that the respondent was essentially insolvent and could not meet its financial obligations, and ceased to operate. The events outlined above have been referred to the Charity Commission and are the subject of a police investigation.
3. In the circumstances it was not clear whether the application was pursued and/or whether the respondent would seek actively to defend the claim. At the commencement of the hearing the respondent had not attend, and when contacted indicated that they were not intending to attend.
4. In those circumstances the application has not been pursued and is dismissed.

Claimant's Claim

5. In those circumstances the claimant is entitled to have judgment entered pursuant to r22 of the ET Rules.

Remedy

6. Notice Pay – The claimant is entitled to notice pay as calculated below. He was able to mitigate his loss and the figures for weekly loss are £376.79 (loss) £230.77 (mitigation) – net loss £146.02 per week:
- i) Notice Pay $\text{£}146.02 \times 12 = \textbf{£1752.24}$.
7. Unfair Dismissal – Basic Award –
- i) Dates of employment - 1st September 2008 – 27th June 2025 (16 complete years)
- ii) Date of birth – 22nd July 1970 (41st birthday 22nd July 2011) = $3 \times 1 + 13 \times 1.5$
- iii) $(3 \times 1) + (13 \times 1.5) = 23.25 \times \text{£}432.99 = \textbf{£10,067.26}$
8. .Unfair Dismissal - Compensatory award - $\text{£}146.02 \times 29 = \textbf{£4234. 58}$.
9. Total **-£16,054.08**

Judgment Approved by
Employment Judge Cadney
Date: 2 July 2026

Sent to the parties on
20 July 2026

Jade Lobb
For the Tribunal Office