# EMPLOYMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL

**APPEALS OF:** 3 Employees

CASE NO. PW09/2007 TE02/2007 PW10/2007 TE03/2007 PW11/2007 TE04/2007

against the recommendations of the Rights Commissioner in the case of: Employer

under

### PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT, 1991 TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT (INFORMATION) ACTS 1994 AND 2001

I certify that the Tribunal (Division of Tribunal)

Chairman: Mr Dara Hayes BL

Members: Mr F. Cunneen Mr A. Butler

heard this appeal at Dublin on 14th March 2007

## **Representation:**

Appellants: Mr. Richard Grogan of P C Moore & Company, Solicitors, 17 South Great Georges Street, Dublin 2

Respondent: No appearance. A letter of apology was received from XXXX

This case came to the Tribunal by way of appeals against the Rights Commissioner Recommendations r-044841-te-06/DI, r-044834-pw-06/DI, r-044838-te-06/DI, r-044840-pw-06/DI, r-043027-te-06/DI and r-043029-pw-06/DI.

# Determination

Based on the uncontested evidence of three appellants the Tribunal decided as follows.

# XXXX

The claimant brings claims pursuant to the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 and the Terms of Employment (Information) Acts 1994 and 2001.

In respect of the Payment of Wages Act, he claims that from the week ending 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005 until the week ending 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006 he was paid less than he was due under the terms of the registered employment agreement.

His claim was lodged with the Rights Commissioner on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2006. The Act provides that a claim must be made within six months of the date of the contravention. The six months can be extended by a further six months if exceptional circumstances prevented the presentation of the complaint within the initial six months. The Tribunal is not satisfied that exceptional circumstances such as would allow the extension of time exist in this case.

The Tribunal is satisfied that improper deductions were made in this case and award, in respect of his claim under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 the amount of  $\notin 7,201.09$ .

The Tribunal is also satisfied that the claimant was not furnished with written terms of his employment as required by S.3 of the Act. It is an important statutory requirement that employees be given a written statement of the terms of their employment. In respect of this breach the Tribunal award the claimant compensation in the amount of  $\varepsilon$ , 102.88, which amount being four weeks of his gross basic weekly pay.

Therefore, in respect of the claim under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 the claimant is awarded  $\notin$ 7,201.09 and in respect of the claim under the Terms of Employment (Information) Acts, 1994 and 2001 the claimant is awarded  $\notin$ 2,102.88 being a total amount of  $\notin$ 9,303.97.

# XXXX

The claimant brings claims pursuant to the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 and the Terms of Employment (Information) Acts 1994 and 2001.

In respect of the Payment of Wages Act, he claims that from the week ending 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005 until the week ending 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006 he was paid less than he was due under the terms of the registered employment agreement.

His claim was lodged with the Rights Commissioner on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2006. The Act provides that a claim must be made within six months of the date of the contravention. The six months can be extended by a further six months if exceptional circumstances

prevented the presentation of the complaint within the initial six months. The Tribunal is not satisfied that exceptional circumstances such as would allow the extension of time exist in this case.

The Tribunal is satisfied that improper deductions were made in this case and award, in respect of his claim under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 the amount of  $\in 8,967.98$ .

The Tribunal is also satisfied that the claimant was not furnished with written terms of his employment as required by S.3 of the Act. It is an important statutory requirement that employees be given a written statement of the terms of their employment. In respect of this breach the Tribunal award the claimant compensation in the amount of  $\epsilon$ 2,102.88, which amount being four weeks of his gross basic weekly pay.

Therefore, in respect of the claim under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 the claimant is awarded  $\notin 8,967.98$  and in respect of the claim under the Terms of Employment (Information) Acts, 1994 and 2001 the claimant is awarded  $\notin 2,102.88$  being a total amount of  $\notin 11,070.86$ .

## XXXX

The claimant brings claims pursuant to the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 and the Terms of Employment (Information) Acts 1994 and 2001.

In respect of the Payment of Wages Act, he claims that from the week ending 30<sup>th</sup> November 2005 until the week ending 8<sup>th</sup> March 2006 he was paid less than he was due under the terms of the registered employment agreement.

His claim was lodged with the Rights Commissioner on  $11^{\text{th}}$  May 2006. The Tribunal is satisfied that improper deductions were made in this case and award, in respect of his claim under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 the amount of  $\notin 10,144.95$ .

The Tribunal is also satisfied that the claimant was not furnished with written terms of his employment as required by S.3 of the Act. It is an important statutory requirement that employees be given a written statement of the terms of their employment. In respect of this breach the Tribunal award the claimant compensation in the amount of  $\pounds 2,391.48$ , which amount being four weeks of his gross basic weekly pay.

Therefore, in respect of the claim under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991 the claimant is awarded  $\notin 10,144.95$  and in respect of the claim under the Terms of Employment (Information) Acts, 1994 and 2001 the claimant is awarded  $\notin 2,391.48$  being a total amount of  $\notin 12,536.43$ .

Sealed with the Seal of the

Employment Appeals Tribunal

This \_\_\_\_\_

(Sgd.) \_\_\_\_\_\_ (CHAIRMAN)