EMPLOYMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL

APPEAL(S) OF: EMPLOYEE

CASE NO. PW84/2010

- First named appellant

EMPLOYEE

PW85/2010

- Second named appellant

against the recommendation of the Rights Commissioner in the case of:

EMPLOYER

- respondent

under

PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT, 1991

I certify that the Tribunal (Division of Tribunal)

Chairman:	Mr J Flanagan BL
Members:	Mr M Carr
	Mr G Whyte

heard this appeal at Dublin on 6th July 2011

Representation

Appellant: Mr Blazej Nowak, Polish Consultancy Enterprise, 107 Amiens Street, Dublin 1

Respondent: Ms Muireann McEnery, Peninsula Business Services (Ireland) Limited, Unit 3 Ground Floor, Block S, East Point Business Park, Dublin 3

This case came before the Tribunal by way of employees appealing against the Decisions of the Rights Commissioner ref: (r-080025-pw-09/GC, r-080019-pw-09/GC)

The decision of the Tribunal was as follows:

Determination

The appellants claimed that they had been paid at the rate of $\notin 9.27$ per hour instead of the applicable JLC Employment Regulation Order rate of $\notin 9.31$ per hour as set forth in SI 142/2008 Employment Regulation Order Catering Joint Labour Committee (for areas other than the areas known, until 1st January 1994, as the County Borough of Dublin and the Borough of DunLaoghaire) 2008. The appellants claimed the total underpayment under this head was $\notin 26$ each. Thefirst named appellant claimed that $\notin 251.92$ had been unlawfully deducted for training. The second named appellant claimed that $\notin 186$ had been unlawfully deducted for training. The

respondentreferred to a clause in the training agreement whereby the employees agreed to remain inemployment for a period of 6 months and permitting a deduction of 20 hours pay should theemployee leave. The appellants and respondent accepted that the appellants had been dismissed. The relevant facts were not in dispute and so no evidence was taken in respect of the appeal underthe Payment of Wages Act, 1991. The respondent accepted that the deduction from the appellants' wages of €26 was unlawful. The Tribunal finds that the appellants did not leave but were dismissedsuch that the deductions of €251.92 and €186 respectively were unlawful. Therefore the Tribunalaffirms the decisions of the Rights Commissioners and awards the first named appellant the sum of €277.92 and the second named appellant the sum of €212.00 under the Payment of Wages Act, 1991.

Sealed with the Seal of the

Employment Appeals Tribunal

This _____

(Sgd.)

(CHAIRMAN)