Case No: 3306417/2020



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant Respondent

MS S MIKUSAUSKAITE V COMPUTER DOCTOR LAB LTD

Heard at: Watford (by CVP) **On**: 7 April 2021

Before: Employment Judge Skehan

Appearances

For the Claimant: In Person
For the Respondent: No attendance.

JUDGMENT

- 1. The claimant's claim for unauthorised deductions from wages contrary to section 13 Employment Rights Act 1996 and breach of contract complaint are well founded and successful.
- 2. The respondent must pay the total sum of £4,392 to the claimant within 28 days from the date of this Judgment. The total sum of £4,392 consists of:
 - £2808 relating to unpaid salary between 23 March 2020 and 27 May 2020; and
 - b. £1584 relating to accrued but un-taken holiday entitlement.
- 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 Employment Tribunal administration had contacted and spoken to the respondent's representative on 6 April 2021 to ensure they were aware of this hearing. There was no attendance on behalf of the respondent at the hearing. I was satisfied that the respondent had been properly informed and reminded of the hearing. The matter proceeded in the absence of the respondent in

Case No: 3306417/2020

accordance with the provisions of Rule 47 of the Employment Tribunal rules and the overriding objective to deal with this matter fairly and justly.

Employment Judge Skehan

Date: 7 April 2021

Sent to the parties on: .22/04/2021.....
THY

For the Tribunal Office

Note

- Written reasons will not be provided unless a written request is presented by either party within <u>14 days</u> 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.