

# Manufacturer fined after employee's fingers severed

- South Kirby firm fined £24,395 after employee suffered partial severing of two fingers
- Worker was cleaning printing machine when fingers were drawn into unguarded rollers
- HSE investigation found company failed to prevent access to dangerous machinery parts

A wooden cable drum manufacturer based in South Kirkby has been fined £24,395 after an employee's fingers were severed in a printing machine.

A 57-year-old woman was working for Askern UK Limited at its site in South Kirkby, Pontefract on 8 March 2024 when she was able to raise the guard and easily override an interlock to run the rollers of a machine which prints logos. The employee was cleaning the rollers with a paper towel when her fingers were drawn into the nip point, leaving two of her fingers partially severed.

An investigation by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) found that Askern UK Limited failed to prevent access to dangerous parts of machinery, namely the moving rollers of the printing machine. The investigation also found that the company had failed to adequately maintain the machine or provide employees with suitable training for the printer.



Image from site

HSE guidance states employers must take effective measures to prevent access to dangerous parts of machinery. This includes ensuring protection devices, such as interlocks, are not easily bypassed or disabled. Further guidance on the [Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations 1998 \(PUWER\)](#) is available.

Askern UK Limited, of 28 Lidgate Crescent, Langthwaite Business Park, South Kirkby, Pontefract, WF9 3NR, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 2(1) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974. The company was fined £24,395, ordered to pay £5000 in costs and a victim surcharge of £2,000 in costs at Leeds Magistrates' Court on 4 February 2026.

**HSE inspector Shauna Halstead said:** "This case demonstrated multiple failures

by the company in respect of the printing machine.

“An employee was tasked with cleaning the printer without provision of suitable information, instruction or training, particularly in relation to the safety devices intended to protect them.

“A suitable interlock and employee training would have prevented this incident”

This HSE prosecution was brought by HSE enforcement lawyer Samantha Crockett, paralegal officer Benjamin Stobbart, and HSE legal team.

## **Notes to Editors**

1. [The Health and Safety Executive](#) (HSE) is Britain’s national regulator for workplace health and safety. We are dedicated to protecting people and places, and helping everyone lead safer and healthier lives.
2. More information about the [legislation](#) referred to in this case is available.
3. Further details on the latest [HSE news releases](#) are available.
4. Relevant guidance can be found here [Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations 1998 \(PUWER\) – HSE](#)
5. HSE does not pass sentences, set guidelines or collect any fines imposed. Relevant sentencing guidelines must be followed unless the court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so. The sentencing guidelines for health and safety offences can be found [here](#).