

Employment Round-Up

Legal Update
August 2013



Our monthly review of key cases and new law affecting employers

The importance of “subject to contract”

Decision: The High Court has decided that a letter from an employer’s solicitors to an employee’s solicitors setting out a settlement offer and a subsequent letter from the employee’s solicitors accepting that offer amounted to a binding settlement agreement. Since the words “subject to contract” had not been used in the correspondence, there was no scope to make the offer subject to other terms such as confidentiality. A reference to entering into a “suitably worded settlement agreement” in the letter was not sufficient as it did not envisage that there were further terms to be agreed.

Impact: Any correspondence around settlement should have “subject to contract” clearly marked on it. It is also sensible to state that there will be no binding agreement until such time as all parties have signed a binding agreement prepared by the employer.

Newbury v Sun Microsystems

Holiday and sickness

Decision: The Employment Appeal Tribunal has confirmed that the additional 1.6 weeks’ statutory holiday given under the Working Time Regulations, which is in excess of the 20 days’ holiday provided under the Working Time Directive, does not have to be carried over into the following holiday leave year where an employee is prevented from taking their holiday due to sickness absence.

Impact: This is a helpful decision for employers as it clarifies a point that had previously been unclear and limits to some extent the costs of long term absence for employers. The approach is also in line with that set out in the Government’s current consultation paper looking at amendments to the Working Time Regulations. The response to that paper has not yet been issued.

Sood Enterprises Limited v Healy

Large costs award against unrepresented claimant

Decision: The Employment Appeal Tribunal has upheld a decision to make a costs award of £87,000 against an unemployed, unwell, unrepresented claimant. This was on the basis that the claims brought by the claimant were misconceived. The EAT were of the view that the claimant was likely to find work in the future and the County Court could take her means into account when it decided on the timescale for making the payment.

Impact: Whilst costs awards are relatively unusual, this case is a useful reminder that Tribunals can make significant costs orders if claimants bring claims which are very weak. Costs orders, of this size, may well be a real deterrent to individuals.

Vaughan v London Borough of Lewisham and others

Subject access requests – new code published

The Information Commissioners Office (ICO) has published a code of practice to assist employers in handling data subject access requests. It gives some good practical guidance on how to deal with such requests, including circumstances in which personal data is exempt from disclosure. The code also includes a useful “ten simple steps” checklist which is worth a read. The ICO also intends to carry out a “subject access request sweep” of websites later in the year, in a project to look at the information organisations are providing to anyone who may want to make a subject access request. A report will be published in 2014.

Please speak to your usual contact in the Employment Group if you have any questions on any of the issues in this update.

Christopher Fisher

Partner, London

Tel: +44 20 3130 3724

Laura Pharez

Associate, London

Tel: +44 20 3130 3405

Mayer Brown is a global legal services organisation advising many of the world's largest companies, including a significant portion of the Fortune 100, FTSE 100, DAX and Hang Seng Index companies and more than half of the world's largest banks. Our legal services include banking and finance; corporate and securities; litigation and dispute resolution; antitrust and competition; US Supreme Court and appellate matters; employment and benefits; environmental; financial services regulatory & enforcement; government and global trade; intellectual property; real estate; tax; restructuring, bankruptcy and insolvency; and wealth management.

OFFICE LOCATIONS AMERICAS: Charlotte, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Palo Alto, Washington DC
ASIA: Bangkok, Beijing, Guangzhou, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Singapore
EUROPE: Brussels, Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, London, Paris
TAUIL & CHEQUER ADVOGADOS in association with Mayer Brown LLP: São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro

Please visit our website for comprehensive contact information for all Mayer Brown offices. www.mayerbrown.com

Mayer Brown is a global legal services provider comprising legal practices that are separate entities (the "Mayer Brown Practices"). The Mayer Brown Practices are: Mayer Brown LLP and Mayer Brown Europe-Brussels LLP, both limited liability partnerships established in Illinois USA; Mayer Brown International LLP, a limited liability partnership incorporated in England and Wales (authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and registered in England and Wales number OC 303359); Mayer Brown, a SELAS established in France; Mayer Brown JSM, a Hong Kong partnership and its associated entities in Asia; and Tauil & Chequer Advogados, a Brazilian law partnership with which Mayer Brown is associated. "Mayer Brown" and the Mayer Brown logo are the trademarks of the Mayer Brown Practices in their respective jurisdictions.

© 2013. The Mayer Brown Practices. All rights reserved.