



# EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr G Rogers

Respondent: Scott Martin

## JUDGMENT

1. The claim for unlawful deduction of wages is well founded and succeeds. The Respondent is ordered to pay the Claimant the gross sum of **£1,200**.

## REASONS

2. The Claimant was one of three people who presented an ET1 against Scott Martin on **20 October 2024**. A Response was due by **17 December 2024** but none was returned.
3. The Claimant worked as a football coach at a summer football camp run by the Respondent for a period of six weeks commencing on **22 July 2024**. Rebecca worked 5 days a week in return for which it was agreed he would be paid at the rate of £120 a day. It was agreed that he would be paid on the Friday of the following week. Therefore, the relevant pay dates for each of the 6 weeks of work were: **02, 09, 16, 23, 30 August** and **06 September 2024**.
4. Mr Rogers received payment for the first 4 weeks of work. However, he was not paid his wages on **30 August 2024** for working the week commencing **19 August**. Nor was he paid on **06 September 2024** for the last week of work in the week commencing **26 August 2024**.
5. The failure to pay the wages on those occasions amounts to a deduction of wages for which there was no contractual or statutory authority.
6. Under rule 21 of the Tribunal Rules of Procedure 2013, where on the expiry of the time limit in rule 16 no response has been presented and no application for a reconsideration is outstanding, an employment Judge shall decide whether on the available material, a determination can properly be made of the claim or part of it. If there is, the judge shall issue a judgment, otherwise a hearing must be fixed before a judge alone.
7. I was satisfied that I had sufficient information to issue a judgment under rule 21 of the ET Rules and that the total amount due to the Claimant was **£1,200**.

Employment Judge **Sweeney**

---

Date: **12 February 2025**