

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**SANEVAR M YEM**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-06033-DT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IAC IOWA CITY LLC**

Employer

**OC: 12/07/08**

**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-7 – Vacation Pay  
Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Sanevar M. Yem (claimant)) appealed a representative's March 25, 2009 decision (reference 02) that concluded the claimant was ineligible for benefits for the week January 3, 2009 due to receipt of vacation pay from IAC Iowa City, L.L.C. (employer). Hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record for a telephone hearing to be held at 2:00 p.m. on May 14, 2009 in conjunction with two related appeals, 09A-UI-06032-DT and 09A-UI-06034-DT. The claimant received the hearing notice and responded by calling the Appeals Section on April 23, 2009. He indicated that he would be available at the scheduled time for the hearing at a specified telephone number. However, when the administrative law judge called that number at the scheduled time for the hearing, the claimant was not available; therefore, the claimant did not participate in the hearing. The employer failed to respond to the hearing notice and provide a telephone number at which a witness or representative could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing. Based on a review of the information in the administrative file and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant's appeal timely? Was the claimant's vacation pay properly allocated and deducted?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The representative's decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on March 25, 2009. No evidence was provided to rebut the presumption that the claimant received the decision within a few days thereafter. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by April 4, 2009, a Saturday. The notice also provided that if the appeal date fell on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, the appeal period was extended to the next working day, which in this case was Monday, April 6. The appeal was not filed until it was postmarked on April 15, 2009, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. No explanation was offered to attempt to excuse the delay.

The claimant established an unemployment insurance benefit year effective December 7, 2008. His weekly benefit amount was calculated to be \$361.00. He filed a weekly claim for the week ending December 13, 2008; a warrant/check was issued on December 22; however, that warrant/check was damaged before it could be deposited, so the warrant/check was cancelled, and on December 22 a replacement warrant/check was issued for that week.

A notice of the claimant's claim was sent to the employer's representative on January 6, 2009, and on January 12 the representative responded by reporting, in part, that the claimant received \$512.32 in vacation pay and \$233.92 in holiday pay for the pay period ending January 3, 2009 (the Saturday of the unemployment claim week). The claimant make a weekly claim for the week ending January 3.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

If a party fails to make a timely appeal of a representative's decision and there is no legal excuse under which the appeal can be deemed to have been made timely, the decision as to the merits has become final and is not subject to further review. Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides that unless the affected party (here, the claimant) files an appeal from the decision within ten calendar days, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied as set out by the decision.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev., 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); Johnson v. Board of Adjustment, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976). Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The Iowa court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in this case then becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. Hendren v. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

A party does not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal if the delay is due to Agency error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service. 871 IAC 24.35(2). Failing to read and follow the instructions for filing an appeal is not a reason outside the appellant's control that deprived the appellant from having a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the prescribed time was not due to a legally excusable reason so that it can be treated as timely. The administrative law judge further concludes that because the appeal was not timely, the

administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal, regardless of whether the merits of the appeal would be valid. See, Beardslee, supra; Franklin, supra; and Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company v. Employment Appeal Board, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

Even if the appeal was treated as timely, the result would be the same. If vacation pay was or will be received by the claimant and was properly allocated to a period of unemployment, it must be deducted from the claimant's unemployment insurance benefit eligibility; the vacation pay paid or owed "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." Iowa Code § 96.5-7.

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.

Where a payout of vacation occurs during a period of separation, so long as the amount paid out properly correlates to the period the claimant was off work, it is properly allocated to the period as designated by the employer; it is not dependent on when the actual pay check including the vacation pay out is issued to the claimant. The claimant did receive vacation pay properly allocated to the benefit week ending January 3 in an amount resulting in his having no remaining eligibility for benefits for that week.

**DECISION:**

The representative's March 25, 2009 decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The claimant's appeal was not timely, and the representative's decision has become final. The vacation pay was correctly allocated to the week ending January 3, 2009, and the claimant was not eligible for benefits that week.

---

Lynette A. F. Donner  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/css