

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CHARLES L MANNING**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-12595-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**FAIRFIELD ALUMINUM CASTING  
COMPANY**  
Employer

**OC: 06/27/10  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(7) – Vacation Pay

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Charles Manning (claimant) appealed a representative's September 2, 2010 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits for the one week period ending July 3, 2010, due to the receipt of vacation pay from Fairfield Aluminum Casting Company (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for October 26, 2010. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Kris Boling, Human Resources Manager.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether claimant received vacation pay at separation, if that amount is deductible from benefits, and if so, for what period.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on January 10, 1984, as a full-time maintenance lead man working first shift. Every year the employer pays employees their vacation pay for the coming year on a date certain. On June 3, 2010, the employer paid the claimant four weeks of vacation pay. The claimant could choose which four weeks he wanted to take as vacation.

The employer laid the claimant off for a plant shut down the week ending July 3, 2010. The employer called it a "vacation shut down". The claimant could still take four weeks of vacation in addition to the "vacation shut down". The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of June 27, 2010. The claimant is still employed by the employer. He began a voluntary lay off after working August 20, 2010.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the vacation pay was not deducted for the correct period.

Iowa Code § 96.5-7 provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits: ...

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.

The employer did not pay the claimant vacation pay specifically in connection with the layoff and cannot be attributed to the layoff week. The vacation pay was not deducted for the correct period of time.

**DECISION:**

The September 2, 2010, reference 01, decision is reversed. The vacation pay was not deducted for the correct period.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs