# BC EST #D140/96

# **EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS TRIBUNAL**

In the matter of an appeal pursuant to Section 112 of the *Employment Standards Act* S.B.C. 1995, C. 38

- by -

Reginald M. Hayward ("Hayward")

- of a Determination issued by -

The Director Of Employment Standards (the "Director")

**ADJUDICATOR:** Norma Edelman

**FILE NO.:** 96/331

DATE OF DECISION: May 4, 2001

# BC EST #D140/96

## DECISION

### **OVERVIEW**

This is an appeal by Reginald Hayward ("Hayward") under Section 112 of the *Employment Standards Act* (the "*Act*") against a Determination Letter issued by a delegate of the Director of Employment Standards on April 25, 1996. In this appeal Hayward disputes the decision of the Director's delegate that the *Act* does not apply to his complaint against Kevin and Charleen Richardson (the "Richardsons").

#### **ISSUE TO BE DECIDED**

The issue to be decided in this appeal is whether the decision of the Director's delegate to refuse to investigate Hayward's complaint is correct.

# FACTS

The Determination Letter shows the Director's delegate concluded the *Act* did not apply to Haywards's complaint because "...the complaint (he) filed is regarding termination after a week of employment, which is not covered by the *Employment Standards Act...*". Accordingly, the Director's delegate refused to investigate Haywards' complaint.

Hayward's appeal contains the following statements:

He should not be able to affect my money situation the way he has; if I said no! to the job U.I.C. would cut me off, but yet I take the job. An get fired for no reason at all, an still get cut off.

# ANALYSIS

Section 63 of the *Act* clearly states that an employer becomes liable to pay an employee compensation for length of service after the employee works for 3 consecutive months.

Hayward worked for the Richardsons from February 9, 1996 to February 14, 1996 when he was fired. Accordingly, he did not complete 3 consecutive months of employment and therefore he is not entitled to any compensation.

Given the above, I conclude that the Director's delegate was correct in determining that the *Act* did not apply to Hayward's complaint and therefore should not be investigated.

# BC EST #D140/96

# ORDER

Pursuant to Section 115 of the *Act*, I order that the Determination Letter issued on April 25, 1996 be confirmed.

Norma Edelman Registrar Employment Standards Tribunal

NE:jel