Case Numbers: 1402004/2020
1401672/2020
& Others (As per attached schedule)

EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimants: **(1) Mrs K Louden**
(2) Mrs A Finemore & Ors

Respondent: **Shapwick School Ltd (In Voluntary Creditors Liquidation)**

PRELIMINARY HEARING

Heard at: **Bristol** **On: 4 December 2020**

Before: Employment Judge Midgley

Representation
Claimants: (1) Mrs Michaelson, Solicitor (NUT)
(2) Mrs Finemore in person

Respondent: Mr Wyeth, Counsel

JUDGMENT

1. The respondent's application to strike out the claims of the Finemore multiple (ECC MU103522/20/61) is dismissed.

2. The claimants' (Mrs Finemore multiple) application to amend the claim to include the claimants detailed on the Early Conciliation Certificate MU10522/20/61 is granted.

3. The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear the claim of Natalie Carson and it is dismissed.

4. The remaining claims will proceed to a final hearing.

5. A telephone case management hearing to list the final hearing will take place on 9 March 2021 at 2pm.

REASONS

Claims and Parties

1. The claims arise out of the insolvency of Shapwick School Ltd and are brought by its former employees as detailed below.

2. On 1 April 2020 Mrs Louden presented a claim for a protective award pursuant to section 188 TULRCA 1992 and for unpaid notice pay.

3. By a claim form presented on 21 April 2020, Mrs Finemore presented a multiple claim for non-payment of redundancy pay, notice pay and holiday pay, and claims for compensation for unfair dismissal and for a protective award pursuant to section 188 TULRCA 1992. 78 claimants are named in the claim.

4. The respondents presented a response defending all the claims and applied for the claims of some of the claimants in the Finemore multiple to be struck out on jurisdictional grounds.

Procedure, Hearing and Evidence

5. At the time of the preliminary hearing most of the issues for determination had been resolved by consent between the parties. In particular, the respondent accepted that Tracey Horsman and Katherine Sorrill were the married names of former employees of the respondent and could therefore present claims against the respondent.

6. Secondly, Mrs Finemore accepted that any claimant who had less than two years continuous employment would be unable to bring a claim for redundancy pay or unfair dismissal, but would continue to pursue claims for notice pay and for a protective award. The respondent had prepared a schedule detailing the claimants' respective continuity of employment and Mrs Finemore undertook to review the schedule to resolve the question of continuity of employment by consent.

7. Finally, the respondent required (and Mrs Finemore agreed to provide) a schedule detailing whether in respect of each of the claimants in the multiple claim they had made any claim to the Redundancy Payments Service for payment from the National Insolvency Fund relating to of any of the claims brought against the respondent, and if so, the outcome of those claims.

8. In consequence, the only matter for to be determined at the preliminary hearing was whether the Tribunal had jurisdiction to hear the claims of those claimants in the Finemore multiple detailed in the ACAS ECC MU103522/20/61. The respondent accepted that the Tribunal had Jurisdiction to hear the claims of other claimants in the multiple (ECC MU103463/20/10).

9. I was provided a bundle of agreed documents of approximately 100 pages, consisting of the Early Conciliation Certificates, claim forms and responses in the proceedings, together with the schedule of claimants and years of service.

10. I heard submissions from Mr Wyeth and Mrs Finemore in relation to the application. During her submissions Mrs Finemore gave evidence about the circumstances in which she had presented the claims. That evidence was not given by oath or affirmation, but the respondent did not object to it nor did it seek to challenge the account provided. The respondent's argument, as it seemed to me, was limited to a matter of pure law, namely that only one ACAS ECC could be relied upon in respect of any claim.

11. During the argument, I raised with the parties the question of amendment. In particular, I asked Mr Wyeth whether the respondent would resist an application to amend the claim, which it accepted was properly constituted, to include the claimants who were detailed on the ACAS ECC MU103522/20/61. I raised the question in light of the express purpose of the amendment to the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) (Early Conciliation: Exemptions and Rules of Procedure) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 SI 2020/1003, which had been made to ensure that valid claims were not defeated because of minor technical errors in the completion of the ET1 form.

12. Mrs Finemore applied, as an alternative position to her primary argument (that the claims had been properly constituted) to amend the claim to add the claimants in the ACAS ECC MU103522/20/61. Mr Wyeth objected to that application on the grounds that the Trustee in Bankruptcy would be prejudiced by permitting claims which had not been properly constituted to proceed by amendment.

13. Both parties agreed that it would be appropriate for me to reserve my decision and to send a Judgment and written reasons to the parties at the earliest possible juncture.

Factual Background

14. On 25 March 2020, after the respondent school had been closed in accordance with the national legislation passed to meet the Covid-19 pandemic, the staff received an email from Kirks (the insolvency practitioners responsible for the liquidation of the school). The staff were advised that the school would be placed into a creditors' voluntary liquidation with effect from 31 March 2020 and that their employment would be terminated with immediate effect on that date.

15. Mrs Finemore was tasked to act as the representative for approximately 78 members of staff engaged by the respondent school to issue claims for non-payment of redundancy pay, notice pay and annual leave and to claim compensation for unfair dismissal and a protective award pursuant to s.188 TULRCA 1992 due to the school's failure to inform and consult the staff about their redundancies.

16. The normal course where a multiple claim for in excess of 50 claimants is to be presented is for a representative for those claimants to make a call to ACAS to provide details of the claimants to ensure that they are all recorded on the

ACAS ECC. This is because ACAS's online portal only permits the details of approximately 50 claimants to be entered.

17. In the event, because of the Covid-19 pandemic ACAS was not accepting telephone notification of claims. Thus, when Mrs Finemore called to initiate early conciliation for the claimants, she was told that she would be unable to provide ACAS with details of all 78 claimants by telephone, but needed to complete to claims using the online portal to obtain two certificates, which ACAS would then join.

18. She was not told that she should complete the online portal claims for the two groups simultaneously. In consequence, on 3 April 2020 Mrs Finemore presented the claims of the claimants in certificate MU103463/20/10 using the online portal. A certificate in respect of those claimants was issued on 7 April 2020.

19. Subsequently, on 11 April 2020 Mrs Finemore notified ACAS of the claims of the remaining claimants in the multiple using the online portal. The certificate in respect of those claimants was issued on 16 April 2020 (MU10522/20/61). Mrs Finemore's name is not included on that certificate because she did not add her name as she had already obtained a certificate covering her claim on 7 April 2020.

20. Both certificates were sent to Mrs Finemore.

21. On 21 April 2020 Mrs Finemore presented an ET1. She ticked box 2.3 to indicate that she had an ACAS ECC number and included the certificate obtained which included her name (MU103463/20/10). The ET1 was accompanied by particulars of claim and a schedule detailing all the claimants in the multiple.

22. On 25 August 2020 the respondent presented its response in respect of the claims in the Finemore multiple, raising the issues detailed above.

23. Mr Wyeth was not able to assert positively that the Insolvency Practitioner had issued the relevant notice identifying the accepted creditors and the pence in the pound that they could hope to recover.

The Issues

24. Was there a validly constituted claim for the claimants MU 10522/20/61?

25. If not, would it be in the interest of justice to permit the claim to be amended to include those claimants, bearing in mind the balance of prejudice to the parties and any applicable time limits?

The Relevant Law

Early Conciliation and the Presentation of Claims

26. The relevant law relating to early conciliation ("EC") and EC certificates, and the jurisdiction of the Employment Tribunals to hear relevant proceedings, is as

follows.

27. Section 18 of the Employment Tribunals Act 1996 ("the ETA") defines "relevant proceedings" for these purposes. This includes in subsection 18(1)(b) Employment Tribunal proceedings for unfair dismissal under s. 111 of the Employment Rights Act 1996, and s.163 ERA for reference for entitlement to a statutory redundancy payment.

28. Subsection 18A(1) of the ETA provides that:

> "Before a person ("the prospective claimant)" presents an application to institute relevant proceedings relating to any matter, the prospective claimant must provide to ACAS prescribed information, in the prescribed manner, about that matter."

29. Subsection 18A(4) ETA provides:

> "If - (a) during the prescribed period the conciliation officer concludes that a settlement is not possible, or (b) the prescribed period expires without a settlement having been reached, the conciliation officer shall issue a certificate to that effect, in the prescribed manner, to the prospective claimant."

30. Subsection 18A(8) ETA provides:

> "A person who is subject to the requirements in subsection (1) may not present an application to institute relevant proceedings without a certificate under subsection (4).

31. The prescriptive steps which must be taken in order to satisfy the EC requirements and to obtain an EC certificate are set out in the Schedule to the Employment Tribunals (Early Conciliation: Exemptions and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2014 ("the EC Regulations"). The EC Regulations also set out certain limited prescribed exemptions which are set out in Regulation 3(1) (a) to (e). These provide as follows: Reg 3(1)(a) – another person ("B") has complied with that requirement in relation to the same dispute, and A wishes to institute proceedings on the same claim form as B; Reg 3(1)(b) – A institutes those relevant proceedings on the same claim form as proceedings which are not relevant proceedings; and Reg 3(1)(c) – A is able to show that the respondent has contacted ACAS in relation to a dispute, ACAS has not received information from A under section 18A(1) of the Employment Tribunals Act in relation to that dispute, and the proceedings on the claim form relate to that dispute.

32. Rule 10 of the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013 ("ET Rules") states the Tribunal shall reject a claim if it does not contain one of the following:

> (1)(c)
>
> (i) an early conciliation number;

(ii) confirmation that the claimant is not institute any relevant proceedings; or

(iii) confirmation that one of the early conciliation exemptions applies.

33. Rule 12 of the ET Rules provides in so far as is relevant:

(1) the start of the tribunal office shall refer claim to an Employment Judge if they consider that the claim, or part of it, may be –

(c) one which institutes relevant proceedings and is made on a claim form that does not contain either an early conciliation number or confirmation that one of the early conciliation exemptions applies;

(2) The claim, or part of it, shall be rejected if the judge considers that the claim, or part of it, is of a kind described in subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) or (d) of paragraph (1).

(2A) The claim, or part of it, shall be rejected if the considers that the claim, or part of it, is of a kind described in subparagraph (e) or (f) of paragraph (1) unless the Judge considers that the claimant made a minor error in relation to a name or address and it would not be in the interest of justice to reject claim.

34. The Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) (Early Conciliation: Exemptions and Rules of Procedure) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 SI 2020/1003 ("The Regulations") came into force on 16 October 2020. The Regulations introduced a new rule 12(1)(da), which provides that a claim form must be referred to an Employment Judge for consideration where the EC number on the claim form is different from the number on the EC certificate. However, under new rule 12(2ZA), the claim form need not be rejected on this basis if the Judge considers that the claimant made an error in relation to the EC number and it would not be in the interests of justice to reject the claim. In addition, rule 12(2A), which hitherto allowed the Employment Judge to accept a claim form despite 'a minor error' in relation to a name or address, has been amended so that the claim can be accepted where there is 'an error', not only where there is a 'minor' error

35. There can only be one ACAS ECC in respect of each "matter" the purposes of section 18A of the Employment Tribunals Act 1996 ("ETA"). Thus, a subsequent EC notification is of no effect and could not serve to further extend the time limit (see Revenue and Customs Commissioners v Garau [2017] ICR 1121, EAT; applied in Romero v Nottingham City Council EAT 0303/17

Amendment

36. An Employment Tribunal has jurisdiction to determine the case put before it, not some other case (per Gibson LJ at paragraph 42 of Chapman v Simon [1994] IRLR 124). If a case is not before the Tribunal, it needs to be amended to be added.

37. In Cocking v Sandhurst (Stationers) Ltd and anor [1974] ICR 650 NIRC Sir John Donaldson laid down a general procedure for Tribunals to follow when deciding

whether to allow amendments to claim forms involving changing the basis of the claim, or adding or substituting respondents. The key principle was that in exercising their discretion, Tribunals must have regard to all the circumstances, in particular any injustice or hardship which would result from the amendment or a refusal to make it. This test was approved in subsequent cases and restated by the EAT in Selkent Bus Company Ltd v Moore [1996] ICR 836 EAT, which approach was also endorsed by the Court of Appeal in Ali v Office of National Statistics [2005] IRLR 201 CA.

38. In determining whether to grant an application to amend, the Employment Tribunal must always carry out a careful balancing exercise of all the relevant factors, having regard to the interests of justice and to the relative hardship that would be caused to the parties by granting or refusing the amendment Selkent Bus Company Ltd v Moore [1996] ICR 836 EAT. Mummery J explained that the relevant factors would include:

    38.1. The nature of the proposed amendment - applications to amend range, on the one hand, from the correction of clerical and typing errors, the addition of factual details to existing allegations and the addition or substitution of other labels for facts already pleaded to, on the other hand, the making of entirely new factual allegations which change the basis of the existing claim. The tribunal must decide whether the amendment sought is one of the minor matters or a substantial alteration pleading a new cause of action; and

    38.2. The applicability of time limits - if a new claim or cause of action is proposed to be added by way of amendment, it is essential for the Tribunal to consider whether that claim or cause of action is out of time and, if so, whether the time limit should be extended [the word “essential” is considered further below]; and

    38.3. The timing and manner of the application - an application should not be refused solely because there has been a delay in making it as amendments may be made at any stage of the proceedings. Delay in making the application is, however, a discretionary factor. It is relevant to consider why the application was not made earlier and why it is now being made: for example, the discovery of new facts or new information appearing from documents disclosed on discovery.

39. These factors are not exhaustive and there may be additional factors to consider, (for example, the merits of the claim). The more detailed position with regard to each of these elements is as follows, dealing with each of them in turn:

40. The nature of the proposed amendment: A distinction may be drawn between (i) amendments which are merely designed to alter the basis of an existing claim, but without attempting to raise a new distinct head of complaint; (ii) amendments which add or substitute a new cause of action but one which is linked to, or arises out of the same facts as, the original claim (often called “relabelling”); and (iii) amendments which add or substitute a wholly new claim or cause of action which is not connected to the original claim at all.

41. Mummery J in Selkent suggests that this aspect should be considered first (before any time limitation issues are brought into the equation) because it is only necessary to consider the question of time limits where the proposed amendment in effect seeks to adduce a new complaint, as distinct from "relabelling" the existing claim. If it is a purely relabelling exercise than it does not matter whether the amendment is brought within the timeframe for that particular claim or not – see Foxtons Ltd v Ruwiel UKEAT/0056/08. Nevertheless whatever type of amendment is proposed the core test is the same: namely reviewing all the circumstances including the relative balance of injustice in deciding whether or not to allow the amendment (that is the Cocking test as restated in Selkent).

42. The fact that there is a new cause of action does not of itself weigh heavily against amendment. The Court of Appeal stressed in Abercrombie and ors v Aga Rangemaster Ltd 2013 IRLR 953 CA that Tribunals should, when considering applications to amend that arguably raise new causes of action, focus "not on questions of formal classification but on the extent to which the new pleading is likely to involve substantially different areas of enquiry than the old: the greater the difference between the factual and legal issues raised by the new claim and by the old, the less likely it is that it will be permitted".

43. Any mislabelling of the relief sought is not usually fatal to a claim. Where the effect of the proposed amendment is simply to put a different legal label on facts that are already pleaded, permission will normally be granted.

44. The applicability of time limits: This factor only applies where the proposed amendment raises what effectively is a brand-new cause of action (whether or not it arises out of the same facts as the original claim). Where the amendment is simply changing the basis of, or "relabelling", the existing claim, it raises no question of time limitation – (see for example Foxtons Ltd v Ruwiel UKEAT/0056/08 per Elias P at para 13).

45. On the applicability of time limits and the "doctrine of relation back", the doctrine of relation back does not apply to Employment Tribunal proceedings, see Galilee v Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis UKEAT 0207/16/RN. The guidance given by Mummery J in Selkent and his use of the word "essential" should not be taken in an absolutely literal sense and applied in a rigid and inflexible way so as to create an invariable and mandatory rule that all out of time issues must be decided before permission to amend can be considered. The judgments in both Transport and General Workers' Union v Safeway Stores Limited UKEAT 009207 and Abercrombie v AGA Rangemaster Limited [2014] ICR 209 CA emphasised that the discretion to permit amendment was not constrained necessarily by limitation.

46. See also Reuters Ltd v Cole UKEAT/0258/17/BA at para 31 per HHJ Soole:

> "In this respect a potential issue arises from the conflict in EAT authorities as to whether the Tribunal must definitively determine the time point when deciding on the application to amend (Amey Services Ltd & Enterprise Managed Services Ltd v Aldridge and Others UKEATS/0007/16 (12 August 2016)) or whether the applicant need only demonstrate a prima facie case

that the primary time limit (alternatively the just and equitable ground) is satisfied (Galilee v Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis UKEAT 0207/16/RN (22 November 2017)). In the light of the exhaustive analysis of the authorities undertaken by His Honour Judge Hand QC in Galilee, I would follow the latter approach."

47. The timing and manner of the application: This effectively concerns the extent to which the applicant has delayed making the application to amend. Delay may count against the applicant because the Overriding Objective requires, among other matters, that cases are dealt with expeditiously and in a way which saves expense. Undue delay may well be inconsistent with these objectives. The later the application is made, the greater the risk of the balance of hardship being in favour of rejecting the amendment - see Martin v Microgen Wealth Management Systems Ltd EAT 0505/06. However, an application to amend should not be refused solely because there has been a delay in making it, as amendments may properly be made at any stage of the proceedings. This is confirmed in the Presidential Guidance on General Case Management for England and Wales (13 March 2014).

48. The EAT gave guidance on how to take into account the timing and manner of the application in the balancing exercise in Ladbrokes Racing Ltd v Traynor EATS 0067/06: the Tribunal will need to consider: (i) why the application is made at the stage at which it is made, and why it was not made earlier; (ii) whether, if the amendment is allowed, delay will ensue and whether there are likely to be additional costs because of the delay or because of the extent to which the hearing will be lengthened if the new issue is allowed to be raised, particularly if these are unlikely to be recovered by the party that incurs them; and (iii) whether delay may have put the other party in a position where evidence relevant to the new issue is no longer available or is rendered of lesser quality than it would have been earlier.

49. The Merits of the Claim: It may be appropriate to consider whether the claim, as amended, has reasonable prospects of success. In Cooper v Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police and anor EAT 0035/06, one of the reasons the EAT gave for upholding the Tribunal's decision to refuse the application to amend was that it would have required further factual matters to be investigated "if this new and implausible case was to get off the ground". However, Tribunals should proceed with caution because it may not be clear from the pleadings what the merits of the new claim are: the EAT observed in Woodhouse v Hampshire Hospitals NHS Trust EAT 0132/12 that there is no point in allowing an amendment to add an utterly hopeless case, but otherwise it should be assumed that the case is arguable.

Discussion and Conclusions

50. The respondent's argument is that only the first ACAS ECC can be relied upon in respect of the claims, and that in consequence those claimants detailed in the second certificate MU103522/20/61 are not detailed in the valid certificate MU103463/20/10 and so have no valid early conciliation certificate for the purposes of subsection 18A(8) ETA. Their claims, the respondents argue, must therefore be dismissed.

51. Mrs Finemore argues that there is a valid certificate for the second group of claimants, namely certificate MU 103522/20/61.

52. I accept the respondent's argument. Applying Garau and Romero above, there can only be one ACAS ECC in respect of the matter, and that is the first certificate filed, namely MU103463/20/10. There is, in consequence, no validly constituted claim for the claimants detailed in MU103522/20/61 before me.

53. However, there is a validly constituted claim in respect of the claimant's in certificate MU183463/20/10. It is open to the claimants to applied to amend that claim to include the claimant's in the certificate MU103522/20/61. That application was made at the hearing on 4 December, following a dismissal which took place on 31 March 2020.

54. Any claim in respect of those dismissals had to be filed by 30 June 2020. The claims are therefore five months' out of time.

55. However, applying Abercrombie (supra), the focus must be on "the extent to which the new pleading is likely to involve substantially different areas of enquiry than the old: the greater the difference between the factual and legal issues raised by the new claim and by the old, the less likely it is that it will be permitted." Here, the claimants in the accepted multiple and those in MU103522/20/61 bring identical claims (in the sense of the same generic categories of claims) arising from an identical set of facts. There is, as Mr Wyeth accepted, no evidential prejudice to the respondent's ability to defend those claims.

56. The claims are new claims only in the sense that there are new claims; there are no new causes of action or facts relied upon in respect of them.

57. The claims are out of time, but that delay was not occasioned by any knowing or negligent failure on the part of the claimants in question. They notified ACAS of the dispute and obtained the early conciliation certificate and presented a claim to the Tribunal on the understanding that ACAS would join the certificates.

58. The respondent's defence of the claims is that there were exceptional circumstances justifying the failure to inform and consult in relation to the redundancy (which will be a high hurdle for the respondent to clear) give that the School took a unilateral decision to close and to enter into liquidation and it must be shown that there were unforeseen elements which were a significant cause on the decision to take that course. The respondent's case is that the school was not financially viable because of low pupil enrolment, rather than the sudden an unforeseen impact of Covid. There is not obvious defence to the claims for notice pay, redundancy pay or unpaid annual leave.

59. In those circumstances, balancing the prejudice to the parties I conclude that the balance of prejudice clearly favours permitting the amendment. The claimants in the MU103522/20/61 multiple would be denied the right to pursue legitimate claims which appear to be meritorious on the basis of the admitted facts, due to a legal technicality relating to the production of two early conciliation certificates. That decision was outside the claimants' control. True it is that the claimants should have submitted a second claim in respect of the

those named on the certificate, but they relied upon the advice from ACAS that the certificates would be joined. That required specialist employment law knowledge and the claimants are litigants in person.

60. Conversely, there is no real prejudice to the respondent. It is just as able to produce evidence and argument in relation to the claims added by amendment as it is in relation to the accepted claim. The facts and arguments do not change because of the amendment. The Insolvency Practitioner had not, at the time of the hearing, issued the notice of the approved creditors and therefore it cannot be said that there could be any prejudice caused by permitting claims which may add to the number of creditors.

61. In all the circumstances, therefore, refusing the amendment is not in accordance with the Overriding Objective and the interests of justice require that it should be granted.

_____

Employment Judge Midgley

_____

Date: 4 January 2021.

	Case no.	Claimant
1.	1401672/2020	Mrs K Louden
2.	1402004/2020	Mrs A Finemore
3.	1402005/2020	Mr P Anderson
4.	1402006/2020	Mrs T Anderson
5.	1402007/2020	Mrs W Anderson
6.	1402008/2020	Mr B Atwell
7.	1402009/2020	Mrs L Bagg
8.	1402010/2020	Mrs A Baker
9.	1402011/2020	Mrs V Baker
10.	1402012/2020	Mr G Beaver
11.	1402013/2020	Mrs V Billany
12.	1402014/2020	Mr B Bridger
13.	1402015/2020	Miss A Cable
14.	1402016/2020	Mrs N Carson
15.	1402017/2020	Mrs E Carter
16.	1402018/2020	Mrs C Cook
17.	1402019/2020	Mrs J Coombes
18.	1402020/2020	Miss B Davies
19.	1402021/2020	Miss J Davies
20.	1402022/2020	Mr D Derbidge
21.	1402023/2020	Mrs A Digman
22.	1402024/2020	Mrs R Dodden
23.	1402025/2020	Ms S Drinkwater
24.	1402026/2020	Mrs E Evans
25.	1402028/2020	Mrs A Flay
26.	1402029/2020	Mrs R Foster
27.	1402030/2020	Mr T Foster
28.	1402031/2020	Mrs N Fouracre
29.	1402032/2020	Mrs S Frost
30.	1402033/2020	Mrs R Gilmour
31.	1402034/2020	Mrs P Green
32.	1402035/2020	Mr Q Green
33.	1402036/2020	Mrs K Haddleton
34.	1402037/2020	Mr D Hamlin
35.	1402038/2020	Miss V Hann
36.	1402039/2020	Mr D Hannay
37.	1402040/2020	Mrs L Harris
38.	1402041/2020	Mrs L Hedgecock
39.	1402042/2020	Miss N Hill
40.	1402043/2020	Mr G Hilliard
41.	1402044/2020	Mr S Hookins
42.	1402045/2020	Mrs T Horsman
43.	1402046/2020	Miss R Howe
44.	1402047/2020	Mrs J James
45.	1402048/2020	Mr W James
46.	1402049/2020	Mrs C Johnston
47.	1402050/2020	Ms K Kaluzynski
48.	1402051/2020	Mrs L Krynauw

49.	1402052/2020	Mrs T Lawes
50.	1402053/2020	Mrs H Leese
51.	1402054/2020	Mrs S McAuliffe
52.	1402055/2020	Miss S Moseley
53.	1402056/2020	Mrs H Newman
54.	1402057/2020	Mrs E Newsam
55.	1402058/2020	Mr A Omell
56.	1402059/2020	Mr R Petch
57.	1402060/2020	Mrs S Phelps
58.	1402061/2020	Mr L Pickering
59.	1402062/2020	Miss G Reading
60.	1402063/2020	Mrs K Rogers
61.	1402064/2020	Mrs D Sampson
62.	1402065/2020	Miss H Sargent
63.	1402066/2020	Mrs S Saunders
64.	1402067/2020	Mr R Shearman
65.	1402068/2020	Miss J Singleton
66.	1402069/2020	Mrs K Sorrill
67.	1402070/2020	Mrs E Spollen
68.	1402071/2020	Miss R Spurway
69.	1402072/2020	Mrs S Stanislaus-Smith
70.	1402073/2020	Mr D Strange
71.	1402074/2020	Mrs P Taylor
72.	1402075/2020	Miss V Taylor
73.	1402076/2020	Miss C Thomas
74.	1402077/2020	Mrs H Topliss
75.	1402078/2020	Mrs H Tuttle
76.	1402079/2020	Mrs K Whitcombe
77.	1402080/2020	Mr N Williams
78.	1402081/2020	Mrs F Wolfman
79.	1402082/2020	Miss T Woodman
80.	1402083/2020	Mrs C Young