

## CASE FILE: EMPLOYMENT DISPUTE DOSSIER

Reference: LCMS-RAG-SAMPLE-2026-001

Organization: Al-Silah Legal Services

Prepared Date: February 24, 2026

### SECTION 1: PARTIES

#### Claimant:

Name: Yasser Ibrahim Al-Harhi

National ID: 1-2345-6789-01

Address: Al-Naseem District, Riyadh

Phone: +966-5X-XXX-XXXX

Email: yasser.harhi@example.test

Position Held: Senior Sales Executive

#### Respondent:

Name: Al-Madina Industrial Supplies LLC

Commercial Registration: CR-1010119911

Head Office: King Abdullah Road, Riyadh

HR Contact: Huda Al-Qahtani, HR Director

Legal Contact: Rashid Al-Tamimi, External Counsel

### SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This file concerns a labor dispute arising from alleged delayed salary payments, disputed commission calculations, and termination without lawful cause or adequate procedural notice. The claimant states that his base salary was delayed repeatedly between October 2025 and January 2026, and variable commission payments for three major contracts were withheld. The respondent states that the claimant failed to meet internal sales compliance

procedures and that certain commissions were contingent upon client collections that did not clear.

The claimant seeks unpaid wages, unpaid commissions, end-of-service benefits, payment in lieu of notice, compensation for arbitrary dismissal, and reimbursement of business expenses allegedly advanced personally for customer meetings and logistics.

The respondent rejects most financial claims, admits minor payroll delay for one cycle due to banking integration issues, and argues termination was due to poor performance and policy breaches documented in internal warnings.

### SECTION 3: EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP BACKGROUND

#### 3.1 Contract Formation

The claimant signed an employment contract dated March 1, 2023. The contract indicates:

- Monthly base salary: SAR 16,500
- Housing allowance: included in base salary
- Transport allowance: SAR 1,200 monthly
- Commission structure: tiered, payable monthly after invoiced client payments are confirmed
- Probation period: 90 days (completed)
- Notice period after probation: 60 days
- Governing law: Saudi Labor Law and implementing regulations

#### 3.2 Job Duties

Primary duties included lead generation, customer relationship management, bid support, and quarterly revenue targets. The contract and attached job description identify mandatory CRM logging, anti-corruption declarations, and pre-approval for discounts above 8%.

### 3.3 Performance Context

The claimant contends he exceeded annual revenue targets in 2024 and received an internal appreciation letter dated December 22, 2024. The respondent does not deny strong 2024 performance but argues significant deterioration in Q4 2025 due to unapproved pricing concessions and delayed submission of signed delivery confirmations.

## SECTION 4: DETAILED FACTUAL TIMELINE

March 1, 2023:

Employment commences. Claimant receives onboarding and policy handbook.

June 15, 2023:

First major account win attributed to claimant (Eastern Pumps Co.).

January 5, 2024:

HR updates compensation policy; commission calculation template revised.

March 30, 2024:

Claimant receives annual performance rating "Exceeds Expectations."

December 22, 2024:

Internal appreciation memo issued to claimant for securing strategic account renewals.

July 10, 2025:

Internal audit team issues advisory reminder on sales discount approvals.

September 18, 2025:

Claimant submits expense reimbursement request for client meetings in Jeddah and Dammam totaling SAR 8,740.

October 31, 2025:

Salary payment for October not received by claimant on expected date.

November 4, 2025:

Claimant emails payroll and HR, requesting urgent salary processing.

November 7, 2025:

Partial salary credited; transport allowance missing.

November 30, 2025:

Second delayed payroll cycle alleged by claimant.

December 8, 2025:

Claimant receives first formal warning for incomplete CRM documentation.

December 19, 2025:

Claimant disputes warning and requests meeting with regional sales director.

December 28, 2025:

Company finance team circulates memo citing temporary banking integration instability.

January 2, 2026:

Second warning letter issued citing non-compliance with discount approval workflow.

January 15, 2026:

Claimant submits demand memo for unpaid commission and delayed salary components.

January 22, 2026:

Respondent HR invites claimant to disciplinary meeting on January 27, 2026.

January 27, 2026:

Meeting held; claimant asserts he was not provided complete evidence file in advance.

February 1, 2026:

Termination notice issued, effective immediately, citing repeated policy violations and loss of trust.

February 3, 2026:

Claimant files complaint through labor dispute channel requesting urgent relief.

February 10, 2026:

Respondent files preliminary defense statement denying arbitrary dismissal.

## SECTION 5: KEY DOCUMENTS IDENTIFIED

Document A:

Employment Contract dated March 1, 2023.

Contains salary, commission mechanism, and notice terms.

Document B:

Job Description and Sales Governance Manual, version 4.2.

Document C:

Performance Appraisal 2024 showing above-target results.

Document D:

Warning Letter #1 dated December 8, 2025.

Document E:

Warning Letter #2 dated January 2, 2026.

Document F:

Payroll Bank Transfer Logs (October 2025 to January 2026).

Document G:

Commission Calculation Sheets for Q3 and Q4 2025.

Document H:

Termination Notice dated February 1, 2026.

Document I:

Email correspondence between claimant, HR, finance, and line manager.

Document J:

Expense reimbursement forms and receipts for client-related travel.

## SECTION 6: CLAIMANT STATEMENT (LONG FORM)

I, Yasser Ibrahim Al-Harthi, was employed in good standing and consistently contributed to revenue growth. I repeatedly informed management that delayed salary payments were causing personal hardship. My landlord issued payment reminders in November and December 2025 due to payroll delays. I also advanced business expenses from personal funds for approved meetings because procurement approvals were slow. Despite my contributions, I was treated unfairly.

Regarding warnings, I dispute their basis. CRM entries were delayed because the system was frequently unavailable and because support staff responsible for uploading signed delivery receipts had backlog issues. I requested technical logs to prove outages, but no complete logs were provided to me before the disciplinary meeting. I also requested that commissions be calculated based on signed contracts, not delayed customer settlement cycles outside my control.

The termination was abrupt and damaged my professional reputation. I was escorted from premises and denied access to retrieve personal files until two days later. I was not given a meaningful opportunity to defend myself with complete evidence. The notice period in my contract is 60 days, yet my employment ended immediately. I request full rights under labor law, payment in lieu of notice, and compensation for arbitrary dismissal.

## SECTION 7: RESPONDENT STATEMENT (LONG FORM)

Al-Madina Industrial Supplies LLC denies arbitrary dismissal. The claimant received multiple coaching sessions, documented policy reminders, and formal warnings. Sales governance in our regulated procurement pipeline is strict, and unauthorized discount practices expose the company to compliance and audit risks. The claimant repeatedly failed to record complete client interaction notes in CRM and bypassed approval workflows.

The company acknowledges minor payroll processing delays linked to external banking integration but denies systemic non-payment. Any temporary delay was corrected within operational windows. Commission payments are contractually tied to collected receivables, not merely signed deals. Several deals referenced by the claimant had

unresolved customer disputes and delayed settlement, so commission was not yet payable under policy.

The disciplinary process followed internal policy. The claimant attended the meeting and was allowed to respond. Termination was based on cumulative policy breaches and documented performance concerns, not retaliation for salary complaints.

## SECTION 8: FINANCIAL CLAIM BREAKDOWN

### 8.1 Unpaid Base Salary Components (Claimant Position)

October 2025 shortfall: SAR 3,100

November 2025 shortfall: SAR 2,450

December 2025 shortfall: SAR 1,900

January 2026 shortfall: SAR 0 (paid with delay)

Total claimed salary shortfall: SAR 7,450

### 8.2 Transport Allowance Disputes

October missing allowance: SAR 1,200

November missing allowance: SAR 1,200

December late allowance (not missing): SAR 0 net

Total allowance claimed: SAR 2,400

### 8.3 Commission Dispute (Claimant Position)

Contract CP-7743: SAR 18,600

Contract EP-2291: SAR 24,300

Contract AG-4408: SAR 13,750

Total commission claimed: SAR 56,650



#### 8.4 Payment in Lieu of Notice

60-day contractual notice equivalent:

Base salary + transport for two months

$$(16,500 + 1,200) \times 2 = \text{SAR } 35,400$$

#### 8.5 End-of-Service Benefits (Estimated by Claimant)

Service period counted from March 1, 2023 to February 1, 2026

Estimated entitlement claimed: SAR 26,950

#### 8.6 Arbitrary Dismissal Compensation

Claimant requests 3 months compensation benchmark:

$$(16,500 + 1,200) \times 3 = \text{SAR } 53,100$$

#### 8.7 Expense Reimbursement

Unreimbursed client visit expenses with receipts:

SAR 8,740

#### 8.8 Total Claimed by Claimant

SAR 190,690

### SECTION 9: RESPONDENT FINANCIAL POSITION

Respondent admits potential reconciliation required for:

- One transport allowance cycle: SAR 1,200
- Miscellaneous expense claims pending verification: up to SAR 2,100

Respondent disputes:

- Majority of commission claims (contingent receivable condition)

- Arbitrary dismissal compensation
- Full notice payment due to “for-cause” termination argument

## SECTION 10: PROCEDURAL AND EVIDENTIARY ISSUES

### Issue 1:

Whether delayed payroll entries amount to wage violation and damages.

### Issue 2:

Whether commission clause requires actual customer collection or mere contract execution.

### Issue 3:

Whether warnings were proportionate and properly documented.

### Issue 4:

Whether disciplinary meeting complied with internal due-process standards.

### Issue 5:

Whether immediate termination without notice was lawful under alleged breach category.

### Issue 6:

Whether claimant proved business expenses were pre-approved or later ratified.

## SECTION 11: SAMPLE EMAIL EXCERPTS (PARAPHRASED RECORD)

Email dated November 4, 2025 from claimant to payroll:

Subject: Urgent salary processing delay.

Body indicates salary not received, rent obligations due, requests immediate resolution.

Email dated November 6, 2025 from payroll to claimant:

Acknowledges processing backlog due to bank integration migration and promises completion.

Email dated December 19, 2025 from claimant to HR:

Disputes warning and requests manager meeting with supporting CRM system logs.

Email dated January 15, 2026 from claimant to HR and finance:

Formal demand for commission reconciliation and wage shortfall correction.

Email dated January 22, 2026 from HR to claimant:

Invites claimant to disciplinary hearing scheduled January 27, 2026.

## SECTION 12: WITNESS SUMMARIES

Witness 1: Laila M. (Payroll Specialist)

Confirms two payroll runs were delayed due to external banking API failures.

States all core salaries were eventually processed.

Cannot confirm commission eligibility criteria interpretation.

Witness 2: Saad R. (Sales Operations Analyst)

States CRM completion rates for claimant dropped in Q4 2025.

Notes internal support backlog could have contributed to incomplete attachments.

Witness 3: Huda A. (HR Director)

Confirms warning letters were issued according to policy matrix.

States claimant attended disciplinary meeting and signed attendance sheet.

Witness 4: Faisal K. (Senior Account Manager, former team lead)

Claims claimant regularly secured high-value deals and that back-office delays often affected reconciliation.

### SECTION 13: PRELIMINARY LEGAL ANALYSIS MEMO (INTERNAL DRAFT)

The case appears mixed on liability. Payroll delay evidence is credible but financial magnitude remains contested. Commission entitlement depends heavily on contract language and historical payment practice. If prior commissions were routinely paid upon invoice issuance rather than cash collection, claimant may establish implied practice argument. If policy text and prior records confirm cash-collection trigger, respondent defense strengthens.

Termination proportionality is a central risk area for respondent. If evidence shows process defects, missing disclosure, or pretextual motive linked to wage complaints, arbitrary dismissal exposure increases. Respondent should preserve complete CRM logs, warning issuance workflow records, and attendance documents from disciplinary proceedings.

Claimant should consolidate:

- bank statements showing payroll delay effects,
- historical commission payment timing examples,
- manager approvals for disputed discounts and expenses,
- communication proving attempts to cure alleged non-compliance.

### SECTION 14: SETTLEMENT HISTORY

Without prejudice meeting #1 (February 12, 2026):

Claimant demanded SAR 180,000 all-inclusive.

Respondent offered SAR 22,000 as final settlement.

No agreement reached.

Without prejudice meeting #2 (February 18, 2026):

Claimant reduced demand to SAR 145,000.

Respondent increased offer to SAR 35,000 with confidentiality clause.

No agreement reached.

Without prejudice meeting #3 (February 22, 2026):

Mediator proposed SAR 72,500 midpoint.

Claimant requested minimum SAR 95,000.

Respondent capped at SAR 45,000.

No agreement reached.

#### SECTION 15: REQUESTED RELIEF (CLAIMANT FORM)

The claimant requests:

- 1) Payment of salary and allowance shortfall totaling SAR 9,850.
- 2) Payment of disputed commissions totaling SAR 56,650.
- 3) Payment in lieu of 60-day notice totaling SAR 35,400.
- 4) End-of-service entitlement estimated at SAR 26,950.
- 5) Arbitrary dismissal compensation of SAR 53,100.
- 6) Reimbursement of expenses totaling SAR 8,740.
- 7) Statutory costs and any further relief deemed appropriate.

#### SECTION 16: RESPONDENT RELIEF REQUEST

The respondent requests:

- 1) Dismissal of arbitrary dismissal claim.
- 2) Rejection of commission claims pending receivable trigger satisfaction.
- 3) Set-off rights for any policy breach losses if proven.
- 4) Limitation of any award to verified, unpaid contractual amounts only.

## SECTION 17: ADDITIONAL FACTUAL NARRATIVE FOR NLP CHUNKING

During Q4 2025 the company experienced operational strain related to a finance system migration, including delayed reconciliation exports and temporary interruption in payroll validation scripts. Multiple employees raised concerns about timing of salary credits, but claimant alleges he was disproportionately affected and singled out after escalating concerns. Internal meeting minutes indicate management instructed teams to “prioritize client collections” and “defer non-critical payouts pending audit clearance,” language the claimant interprets as intentional withholding.

The claimant’s line manager’s chat messages, if authenticated, may show informal approval of discount structures later used as grounds for warning letters. The respondent counters that only formal system approvals are valid and that informal chats cannot override policy. The dispute therefore includes a governance mismatch between practical field operations and formal compliance controls.

The claimant also alleges reputational harm after termination because access badges were deactivated immediately and colleagues were informed that he had committed serious misconduct. The respondent denies defamatory communication and states standard access deactivation is required for information security at termination.

## SECTION 18: TECHNICAL EXTRACTION TEST PARAGRAPHS

Paragraph Alpha:

The employee contends that compensation components were delayed and inconsistently paid, with payroll shortfalls recurring over multiple months. The employer contends that delays were temporary and corrected.

Paragraph Beta:

Commission entitlement is disputed because one side relies on signed contracts and performance contribution, while the other side relies on collected receivables and strict policy triggers.

Paragraph Gamma:

The termination process is challenged as procedurally deficient, with allegations of limited evidence disclosure and immediate enforcement despite contractual notice provisions.

Paragraph Delta:

Potential remedies include wage reconciliation, commission adjudication, end-of-service calculations, notice compensation, and assessment of arbitrary dismissal damages.

## SECTION 19: CLOSING SUMMARY

This file captures a structured employment dispute suitable for extraction, chunking, embedding, retrieval, and insight generation workflows. It contains factual chronology, legal issues, quantified claims, conflicting narratives, and repeated terminology relevant to labor dispute analysis. The content is intentionally dense and sectioned to support RAG validation, including citation extraction and retrieval metadata generation.

END OF FILE