



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Respondent

MR B. LACEY

V

**SVM CONSULTING ENGINEERS
LIMITED**

Heard at: Watford

On: 24 and 25 March 2021

Before: Employment Judge Skehan

Appearances

For the Claimants: Ms Nicholls, Counsel

For the Respondent: Mr Krivinskas, lay representative.

JUDGMENT

1. The claimant's claim for unauthorised deductions from wages contrary to section 13 Employment Rights Act 1996 and his breach of contract complaint are well founded and successful.
2. The respondent must pay the total sum of **£17,871.84** to the claimant within 28 days from the date of this Judgment. The total sum of £17,871.84 consists of the agreed sums of:
 - a. £9807.72 relating to unpaid salary between 18 February 2019 and 29 March 2019;
 - b. £7083.35 relating to damages for wrongful dismissal relating to the claimant's one month' notice period; and
 - c. £980.77 relating to accrued but un-taken holiday entitlement.
3. The above sums are awarded gross and the claimant is responsible for any income tax or employee national insurance contributions which may become due.
4. The claimant's claims for failure to provide initial employment particulars contrary to section 1 of the Employment Rights Act 1996 and an itemised pay

statement contrary to section 8 of the Employment Rights Act 1996 were withdrawn by the claimant and are dismissed.

Employment Judge **Skehan**

Date: 25 March 2021

Sent to the parties on: 21 April 2021.....

.....GDJ.....
For the Tribunal Office

Note

1. Written reasons will not be provided unless a written request is presented by either party within **14 days** of the sending of this written record of the decision.
2. Judgments and reasons for the judgments are published, in full, online at www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions shortly after a copy has been sent to the claimant(s) and respondent(s) in a case.
3. This was a remote hearing which had not been objected to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was video. A face to face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and no-one requested the same and all issues could be determined in a remote hearing. The documents that I was referred to are in a bundle of 184 pages, together with the additional documents supplied during the hearing the contents of which I have noted. The order made is described above.