10-26 UC Labour Market – Friedman V SSWP & Anor [2026] UKUT 362 (AAC) – When a claimant commitment is the 'most up-to-date' version

Contents	Paragraphs
Introduction	1
Background	2-4
The UT Judgement	5
Impact upon decision making	6-7
Mandatory reconsiderations	8
Appeals	9

INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this memo is to inform Decision Makers (DMs) about the judgement in Friedman v SSWP & Anor[1] made by the Upper Tribunal (UT) on 16.7.26.

1 Friedman v SSWP & Anor [2026] UKUT 362 (AAC)

BACKGROUND

2. YF and her partner made a joint claim to Universal Credit (UC) on 8.7.24.

3. A change of circumstances for YF occurred on 25.8.24 which required her to accept revised claimant commitments.

4. YF failed to accept the revised claimant commitments within the time specified by the SSWP and as a result her UC award was terminated on 3.9.24.

THE UT JUDGEMENT

5. The UT allowed the appeal, deciding that:

> **a.** *"Where a new claimant commitment is offered for acceptance which is not materially different from a previously-accepted claimant commitment, and the previous claimant commitment still accurately captures all of the claimant's ongoing responsibilities, the previous claimant commitment will still be the "most up-to-date version" within the meaning of that phrase in s.14(5) of the 2012 Act. As such, failure to accept the new claimant commitment will not be a breach of the basic condition in s.4(1)(e) of the Act."* [1]

1 Para 50

IMPACT UPON DECISION MAKING

6. Where a revised claimant commitment has been

> **6.1.** provided for a claimant to accept **and**
>
> **6.2.** the work-related requirements remain the same as in the previous claimant commitment

the revised claimant commitment is not materially different and a failure to accept does not end UC entitlement.

7. The department's current position is that where a revised claimant commitment has been

> **7.1.** provided for a claimant to accept **and**
>
> **7.2.** a new requirement has been added **or**
>
> **7.3.** a pre-existing requirement has clearly been amended **or**
>
> **7.4.** a pre-existing requirement has been removed

the claimant must accept the new claimant commitment to retain entitlement to UC.

Example

Arlo is subject to all work-related requirements, and his expected hours of work are normally 35 hours per week. This is recorded on his claimant commitment. Arlo informed his work coach that he is a relevant carer for his mother and provides care for her for 4 hours per week. It has been agreed with

Arlo's work coach that his expected hours of work will be reduced to 31 hours per week. His claimant commitment is updated to reflect the change. This is a material change to his claimant commitment, and he is required to accept the new claimant commitment to retain entitlement to UC.

MANDATORY RECONSIDERATIONS

8. Where a claimant requests a mandatory reconsideration of a decision to

> **8.1.** end an award of UC for failing to accept a revised claimant commitment **and**
>
> **8.2.** the revised claimant commitment was not materially different to the previous claimant commitment

the DM should revise the decision.

APPEALS

9. Any current appeals at the First-Tier Tribunal (FTT) where a UC award was ended for failing to accept a revised claimant commitment that was not materially different to the previous claimant commitment should be lapsed.

ANNOTATIONS

Please annotate this Memo at the side of the following ADM paragraphs; J1031.

CONTACTS

If you have any queries about this memo, please write to Decision Making and Appeals (DMA) Leeds, 3E zone E, Quarry House, Leeds. Existing arrangements for such referrals should be followed, as set out in – Memo 7/19 Requesting case guidance from DMA Leeds for all benefits.

DMA Leeds: October 2026

The content of the examples in this document (including use of imagery) is for illustrative purposes only.