



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: A S S Morales

Respondent: F W Launderettes Limited

Heard at: London Central (in public; By Video)

On: 18 August 2025

Before: Employment Judge Kara Loraine

REPRESENTATION:

Claimant: S Wong (Solicitor)

Respondent: In person, Mr Charles Otter and Mr Stephen Otter

JUDGMENT

The Respondent did not submit a Response in time the application for an extension of time to submit the Response was refused with oral reasons given to the parties. As a consequence Employment Tribunal Rule 22 applies, and:

1. The complaint of unfair dismissal is well-founded. The claimant was unfairly dismissed. The respondent shall pay the claimant the following sums:
 - a. A basic award of **£4,118.40**.
 - b. A compensatory award of **£500** for loss of statutory rights.
2. The Employment Protection (Recoupment of Benefits) Regulations 1996 apply:
 - a. The total monetary award (i.e. the compensatory award plus basic award) payable to the claimant for unfair dismissal is **£4,618.40**
 - b. The prescribed element is **£0**.
 - c. The period of the prescribed element is from **26 September 2024 to 18 August 2025**.
 - d. The difference between (1) and (2) is **£4,618.40** and this sum must be paid to the Claimant.

3. When the proceedings were begun the respondent was in breach of its duty to provide the claimant with a written statement of the reasons for her dismissal. In accordance with section 93 ERA 1996 the respondent shall therefore pay the claimant **£1,372.80**.
4. When the proceedings were begun the respondent was in breach of its duty to provide the claimant with a written statement of employment particulars. There are no exceptional circumstances that make an award of an amount equal to two weeks' gross pay unjust or inequitable. It is just and equitable to make an award of an amount equal to four weeks' gross pay. In accordance with section 38 Employment Act 2002 the respondent shall therefore pay the claimant **£1,372.80**.
5. The complaint of unauthorised deductions from wages is well-founded. The respondent made an unauthorised deduction from the claimant's wages in the period from **26 August 2025 to 26 September 2025**. The respondent shall pay the claimant **£1,630.20**, which is the gross sum deducted. This figure has been calculated using gross pay to reflect the likelihood that the claimant will have to pay tax on it as earnings
6. The complaint in respect of holiday pay is well-founded. The respondent failed to pay the claimant in accordance with regulation 14(2) and/or 16(1) of the Working Time Regulations 1998. The respondent shall pay the claimant the gross sum of **£3,843.84**. This figure has been calculated using gross pay to reflect the likelihood that the claimant will have to pay tax on it as earnings.
7. The complaint of breach of contract in relation to notice pay is well-founded. The respondent shall pay the claimant **£2,745.60** as damages for breach of contract. This figure has been calculated using gross pay to reflect the likelihood that the claimant will have to pay tax on it as Post Employment Notice Pay.
8. The total sum that the Respondent must pay to the Claimant is therefore **£15,883.64** and the Claimant is responsible for the payment of any tax or National Insurance due.

Approved by:

Employment Judge Kara Loraine

18 August 2025

Case Number: 6003877/25

Judgment sent to the parties on:

28 August 2025

.....

For the Tribunal:

.....