



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant

Respondent

v

Miss H Soole

NLB Group South West Limited

Judgment

Heard at: Southampton

On: 15 April 2020

Before: Employment Judge Rayner

Appearances

For the Claimant: Miss H Soole in person

For the Respondent: Not attending

1. The hearing was conducted by the parties attending by telephone. It was held in public, in that the hearing was recorded, and in that the hearing was accessible at the Bristol CJC to the public. It was conducted in that manner because it was in accordance with the overriding objective to deal with the matter of remedy by an in-person hearing, and the parties consented to the hearing being by telephone.
2. The documents that I was referred to were provided by the claimant in advance by email, and were her time sheets setting out the hours worked and the places of work, as submitted to her manager and email exchanges from her former employer stating that she would be paid.
3. I heard evidence under oath from the claimant.

JUDGMENT

4. The respondent has made an unlawful deduction for the claimant's wages of £1110.81 gross in respect of unpaid wages, and of £263.50 gross in respect of unpaid holiday pay.
5. The respondent will therefore pay the claimant the sum of **£1374.31** in total forthwith.

Employment Judge Rayner

Dated: 15 April 2020

.....

Note: online publication of judgments and reasons

The ET is required to maintain a register of all judgments and written reasons. The register must be accessible to the public. It has recently been moved online. All judgments and reasons since February 2017 are now available at:
<https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions>.

The ET has no power to refuse to place a judgment or reasons on the online register, or to remove a judgment or reasons from the register once they have been placed there. If you consider that these documents should be anonymised in any way prior to publication, you will need to apply to the ET for an order to that effect under Rule 50 of the ET's Rules of Procedure. Such an application would need to be copied to all other parties for comment and it would be carefully scrutinised by a judge (where appropriate, with panel members) before deciding whether (and to what extent) anonymity should be granted to a party or a witness