EMPLOYMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL

CLAIM OF: EMPLOYEE – *claimant* CASE NO. UD1570/2010

against

EMPLOYER - respondent

under

UNFAIR DISMISSALS ACTS, 1977 TO 2007

I certify that the Tribunal (Division of Tribunal)

Chairman:	Ms M. Levey BL
Members:	Mr D. Moore
	Mr J. Dorney

heard this claim in Dublin on 28th May 2012

Representation

Claimant: Mr Brian Dolan of Hamilton Turner Solicitors, 66 Dame Street, Dublin 2

Respondent: In person

The determination of the Tribunal is as follows:

Claimant's Case

The claimant gave evidence. He was called into the office and told he was being made redundant. He was not shown the matrix used to select him for redundancy until the day of the hearing.

The claimant has worked as a printer for 30 years. He could run any machine after 4 weeks of on the job training. Towards the end there was often not enough work especially as the respondent left machines with minor problems to rot.

The operations manager chose who was given training. The decision was made in advance on who would be made redundant and then the operations manager ensured they did not receive training to facilitate making them redundant. The claimant did not feel that the matrix accurately reflected his skills.

Respondent's Case

The former company secretary gave evidence. His day to day job was financial controller. The company was under the control of an examiner. Redundancies were required to cut costs in an adverse trading environment. When the period of examination ended the company went into receivership.

The selection matrix was drawn up by the operations manager together with the MD and the HR officer. The operations manager did not fill in the matrix in isolation. He worked with the others. The examiner was consulted and the matrix was submitted to him.

The company did go through a process and did consult with the union. The union advised those made redundant not to complain but to sue.

Determination

The Tribunal carefully considered the evidence adduced. The Tribunal finds that the process used to terminate the claimant's employment was unfair. The consultation process was inadequate and the claimant was not informed that he had a right of appeal. However the claimant's union had the opportunity to engage with the process but chose not to.

The claim under the Unfair Dismissals Acts 1977 to 2007 succeeds and the claimant is awarded the sum of €2895.52.

Sealed with the Seal of the

Employment Appeals Tribunal

This _____

(Sgd.) (CHAIRMAN)