

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

MARIA A RAMOS

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 17A-UI-12006-B2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

JENNIE EDMUNDSON MEMORIAL HOSPIT

Employer

OC: 10/22/17

Claimant: Appellant (2R)

Section 96.5-7 – Vacation Pay

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant appealed a representative's decision dated November 14, 2017, reference 04, that concluded claimant was ineligible for the one week ending October 28, 2017 for unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$376.00. A telephone hearing was scheduled and held on December 7, 2017 pursuant to due notice. Claimant did participate. Employer participated by Cameron Lind.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether vacation pay was deducted for the correct period and amount from unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant's employment with employer was separated on October 22, 2017. Claimant voluntarily quit on that date giving no notice in advance of her quit. Claimant stated that she left to go to El Salvador from the dates of October 25, 2017 through October 31, 2017. Claimant had accrued 59.889 hours of personal time off at the time of job separation.

Claimant and employer agreed that claimant did not receive accrued vacation pay as claimant did not give employer one month notice prior to her resignation, thereby eliminating accrued vacation hours. Claimant acknowledged that she knew of this rule.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that vacation pay was not deducted for the correct period. As claimant was not given vacation pay, vacation pay should not be deducted from claimant's unemployment benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.5(7) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

7. Vacation pay.

a. When an employer makes a payment or becomes obligated to make a payment to an individual for vacation pay, or for vacation pay allowance, or as pay in lieu of vacation, such payment or amount shall be deemed "wages" as defined in section 96.19, subsection 41, and shall be applied as provided in paragraph "c" hereof.

b. When, in connection with a separation or layoff of an individual, the individual's employer makes a payment or payments to the individual, or becomes obligated to make a payment to the individual as, or in the nature of, vacation pay, or vacation pay allowance, or as pay in lieu of vacation, and within ten calendar days after notification of the filing of the individual's claim, designates by notice in writing to the department the period to which the payment shall be allocated; provided, that if such designated period is extended by the employer, the individual may again similarly designate an extended period, by giving notice in writing to the department not later than the beginning of the extension of the period, with the same effect as if the period of extension were included in the original designation. The amount of a payment or obligation to make payment, is deemed "wages" as defined in section 96.19, subsection 41, and shall be applied as provided in paragraph "c" of this subsection 7.

c. Of the wages described in paragraph "a" (whether or not the employer has designated the period therein described), or of the wages described in paragraph "b", if the period therein described has been designated by the employer as therein provided, a sum equal to the wages of such individual for a normal workday shall be attributed to, or deemed to be payable to the individual with respect to, the first and each subsequent workday in such period until such amount so paid or owing is exhausted. Any individual receiving or entitled to receive wages as provided herein shall be ineligible for benefits for any week in which the sums, so designated or attributed to such normal workdays, equal or exceed the individual's weekly benefit amount. If the amount so designated or attributed as wages is less than the weekly benefit amount of such individual, the individual's benefits shall be reduced by such amount.

d. Notwithstanding contrary provisions in paragraphs "a", "b", and "c", if an individual is separated from employment and is scheduled to receive vacation payments during the period of unemployment attributable to the employer and if the employer does not designate the vacation period pursuant to paragraph "b", then payments made by the employer to the individual or an obligation to make a payment by the employer to the individual for vacation pay, vacation pay allowance or pay in lieu of vacation shall not be deemed wages as defined in section 96.19, subsection 41, for any period in excess of one week and such payments or the value of such obligations shall not be deducted for any period in excess of one week from the unemployment benefits the individual is otherwise entitled to receive under this chapter. However, if the employer designates more than one week as the vacation period pursuant to paragraph "b", the vacation pay, vacation pay allowance, or pay in lieu of vacation shall be considered wages and shall be deducted from benefits.

e. If an employer pays or is obligated to pay a bonus to an individual at the same time the employer pays or is obligated to pay vacation pay, a vacation pay allowance, or pay in lieu of vacation, the bonus shall not be deemed wages for purposes of determining

benefit eligibility and amount, and the bonus shall not be deducted from unemployment benefits the individual is otherwise entitled to receive under this chapter.

DECISION:

The November 14, 2017, reference 04, decision is reversed. The vacation pay was not deducted for the correct period. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements. This matter is remanded to the fact finder for a determination of whether claimant was able and available for work for the one week period ending October 28, 2017. In companion case # 17A-UI-12006, the administrative law judge has ruled that claimant's quit was not with good cause attributable to employer.

Blair A. Bennett
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn