



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Mr L McKenzie
Respondent: Mazaar UK Limited
Heard at: East Londond Hearing Centre (via CVP)
On: 26 June 2025
Before: Employment Judge Davidson

Representation

Claimant: in person
Respondent: Mr D Cools-Lartigue, Director

JUDGMENT

Unfair dismissal

1. The complaint of unfair dismissal is dismissed as the tribunal does not have jurisdiction to hear it because the claimant does not have sufficient service.

Wages

2. The complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages is well-founded. The respondent made an unauthorised deduction from the claimant's wages in the period **1- 14 August 2024**. The respondent shall pay the claimant **£1816.39 net**. The respondent is responsible for paying any tax or National Insurance.
3. The respondent shall also pay the claimant **£19.99** as reimbursement for expenses and **£190.00** as lay off statutory guarantee pay.

Notice Pay

4. The complaint of breach of contract in relation to notice pay is well-founded.
5. The respondent shall pay the claimant **£3617.16 net** as damages for breach of contract. The respondent is responsible for paying any tax or National Insurance.

Holiday Pay

6. The complaint in respect of holiday pay is well-founded. The respondent made an unauthorised deduction from the claimant's wages by failing to pay the claimant for holidays accrued but not taken on the date the claimant's employment ended.
7. The respondent shall pay the claimant **£1067.10 net**. The respondent is responsible for paying any tax or National Insurance.

Employment Judge Davidson
Dated: 26 June 2025

Notes

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.

Public access to employment tribunal decisions: 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.

CVP hearing

This has been a remote which has been consented to by the parties. The form of remote hearing was Cloud Video Platform (CVP). A face to face hearing was not held because it was not practicable and all issues could be determined in a remote hearing.