EMPLOYMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL

APPEAL OF:	CASE NO
Employee	RP15/2008 MN9/2008
against	
Employer	
under	

REDUNDANCY PAYMENTS ACTS, 1967 TO 2003 MINIMUM NOTICE AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT ACTS, 1973 TO 2001

I certify that the Tribunal (Division Of Tribunal)

Chairman: Mr. P. Quinn BL

Members: Mr. M. Forde

Dr. A. Clune

heard this appeal at Limerick, on 3rd September 2008

Representation:

Appellant:

In person

Respondent:

XXXX

The determination of the Tribunal was as follows:

It was commoncase that the Appellant is a Lithuanian national whose employment with the Respondent commenced on the 20^{th} August 2002 and ended on the 24^{th} December 2007, by reason of redundancy, by which time he was in receipt of a gross weekly wage of ϵ 490 and to date has received from the Respondent, a redundancy payment in the amount of ϵ 2,761.20. It was also commoncase that the Respondent's business, at the place where the Appellant was employed, ceased on the 24 th December 2007.

As the amount of such payment aforesaid does not equate to the statutory redundancy payment to which the Appellant is entitled, the Tribunal unanimously determines that the Appellant's appeal under the Redundancy Payments Act 1967 to 2003 succeeds, although the Respondent is entitled to a set-off, in respect of the monies aforesaid, aspaid to date by way of a redundancy payment to the Appellant, however the award of this Tribunal determining the Appellant's entitlement to redundancy, is

subject to hishaving been in insurable employment under the Social Welfare Acts during the relevant period. The appellant's date of birth as provided on his T1A form is the 18thJanuary 1968.

It was also commoncase that, by letter dated the 17th December 2007, the Appellant was notified in writing by the Respondent, of its intention to cease doing business in the place where the Appellant was employed, namely Roxboro Shopping Centre.

The Appellant in his direct evidence testified that by reason of same he was not afforded his notice entitlement.

The Respondent in its direct evidence testified that in Autumn 2007, the Appellant was verbally notified by the Respondent, that business in the Roxboro Shopping Centre was to cease on the 24th December 2007 and that from Autumn 2007 onwards, a closing down sale was in operation at the premises, with the sale of stock on a "two for the price of one" basis and no new stock being purchased in the interim.

The Appellant in the course of his cross-examination by the Respondent and on further questioning by the Tribunal, admitted that he had been verbally notified, some months prior to the 24th December 2007, that business of the Respondent in the Roxboro Shopping Centre was to cease on the 24th December 2007, but that he hadn't believed same, until he received the letter of the 17th December 2007 aforesaid from Mr. C, as in other years, there had been previous disposals of stock, on a similar basis. The Respondent accepted that whilst there may have been various promotional offers over the years, it denied that it had ever previously conducted a closing down sale.

In all of the circumstances, the Tribunal unanimously determines that the notice afforded to the Appellant in Autumn 2007, possessed such degree of certainty, as to date and time on which his employment would terminate and which in fact transpired, as to amount to an appropriate and lawful period of notice on the facts of this case.

In such circumstances, it is irrelevant whether the Appellant believed such would in fact transpire or not and in the absence of any further controverting evidence being adduced by the Appellant, as to the means by which he was entitled to receive notice of termination of his employment from the Respondent, the Tribunal unanimously determines that the claim of the Appellant pursuant to the Minimum Notice And Terms Of Employment Acts, 1973 to 2001, must fail.

Sealed with the Seal of the
Employment Appeals Tribunal
This
(Sgd.)
(CHAIRMAN)