

## EMPLOYMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL

### APPEALS OF:

### CASE NO.

EMPLOYEE - Appellant no. 1

MN1685/2011

EMPLOYEE - Appellant no. 2

RP1482/2011  
MN1221/2011

### Against

EMPLOYER - Respondent

### under

### MINIMUM NOTICE AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT ACTS, 1973 TO 2005 REDUNDANCY PAYMENTS ACTS, 1967 TO 2007

I certify that the Tribunal  
(Division of Tribunal)

Chairman: Ms N. O'Carroll-Kelly BL

Members: Mr F. Cunneen  
Ms. E. Brezina

heard these appeals at Naas on 28th November 2012.

### Representation:

Appellants: Ms Susan Webster, Susan Webster & Co., Solicitors, Suva House, Main Street,  
Maynooth, Co. Kildare

Respondent: Mr. Tom McAndrew, 4 Maple Road, Clonskeagh, Dublin 14

At the outset of the hearing appellant no. 2 withdrew his appeal under the Redundancy Payments Acts, 1967 to 2007.

The decision of the Tribunal was as follows:-

### Determination:

The respondent's representative opened its case by stating that the respondent's business is seasonal and during the winter months there is very little work available. The previous year they put their employees on lay off until the spring. They were forced to do the same again in 2010. They did not serve an RP9 initially but they did write to Social Welfare outlining the situation, as they had done in 2009. The respondent was not aware of the RP9 form and sought guidance from their representative in relation to its function. The RP9 forms

were posted out to the appellants in March, 2010 following an unplanned meeting with PH. The RP9 forms were returned to them several days later. The appellants filled out part B of the forms stating their "Notice of Intention to claim a Redundancy Lump Sum Payment...". Unfortunately, incorrect dates were inserted on the forms by the appellants. The respondent's representative called the appellants into the office on the 18<sup>th</sup> March and asked them to sign the amended forms. They were then asked to return to the office on the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> of April to sign the RP50s.

The appellants' representative opened their case to the Tribunal by stating that the appellants were made redundant by the respondent and that they had not been served with an RP9 prior to the lay off. Following lay off they were called into the office and asked to sign documents in order to process their redundancy payments. Those documents were the RP9 and the RP50. The appellants were not aware of the significance of signing part B of the RP9 form and stated that it was never their intention to give notice of their intention to claim redundancy.

AG gave evidence on behalf of the respondent. Her evidence accurately reflected her representative's opening statement. NC and MC gave evidence on behalf of the appellants. Their evidence was littered with inconsistencies. Furthermore, it did not reflect the opening statement made by their representative. What is worth noting is that MC stated that he did sign part B of the RP9 form at his home and did so because he "needed the money". That statement demonstrates his intention and knowledge in relation to the redundancy. The Tribunal is of the view that the two appellants and their colleague PL signed part B of the RP9 form on the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of March and posted the forms back to the respondent. The fact that the wrong dates were inserted on the forms does not render them void. Furthermore, the fact that the forms were not served on the appellants until after their lay off had commenced does not affect their right to claim a redundancy lump sum figure at any stage during the lay off period. The Tribunal is also satisfied that the respondent would not have been in a position within four weeks from the material date to guarantee thirteen weeks work for the appellants.

The Tribunal finds that the appellants, at the material time and with the requisite knowledge and understanding, signed part B of the RP9 and as a result are not entitled to a payment under the Minimum Notice and Terms of Employment Act 1973 to 2005.

Accordingly, the claims under the Minimum Notice and Terms of Employment Acts 1973 to 2005 are dismissed.

Sealed with the Seal of the  
Employment Appeals Tribunal

This \_\_\_\_\_

(Sgd.) \_\_\_\_\_

(CHAIRMAN)