



EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNALS

Claimant: Hannah Johnson

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 **£400**.

REASONS

2. The Claimant presented an ET1 against Scott Martin on **20 October 2024**. A Response was returned by the due date, **17 December 2024**. In that response, the Respondent confirmed that the claim was not contested.
3. The Claimant and her sister, Rebecca, worked as football coaches at a summer football camp run by the Respondent for a period of six weeks commencing on **22 July 2024**. Hannah worked 2 days a week in return for which it was agreed she would be paid at the rate of £100 a day. Rebecca worked 3 days a week, in return for which it was agreed she would be paid at the same rate. It was agreed that they 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**. Rebecca has also made a claim for unpaid wages against the Respondent based on identical facts to those in Hannah's claim.
4. Under rule 21 of the Tribunal Rules of Procedure 2013, where on the expiry of the time limit in rule 16 the respondent has stated that no part of the claim is contested, a 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.
5. I was satisfied based on the information provided by Hannah, which was not contested and also that provided by her sister Rebecca in an identical claim, 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 £400.

Case Nos: 2501966/2024

Employment Judge **Sweeney**

Date: 19 December 2024