Augyst 31, 1988

# RECEIVED 

Re: Request for a Legal Opinion

SEP 11988
Lobor \$tondords Enforcement Administrative Offico San froncisco

In belated xesponse to your lettex of Maxch 31, 1988, seeking an opinion as to whether an employer's policy which provides accrual of vacation pay only on hours in excess of in the opinion of the Division, meet the requinements of accrual set out in the case of Suastez v. Plastic Dress-Up Co. (1982) 31 CaI.3d774.

Frankly, I think the policy you subunt fs a subterfuge to avoid the promata vesting requirements of Suastez. Since the normal work year "is approximately 2080 hours, I believe that beginuing accrual at 1400 hours $f s$ simply too late in the year. In effect, full time engloyees are eaming a full year of vacation entitlement in the last 600 hours of the year. The unfairness of this can be seen in the situation of an employee who works 1 1/2 years, takes no vacation and is then temminated. The employee is clearly a full-time employee but would only receive vacation pay for one year.

I do think you can distinguish between parttime and fuli-time employees but not in such a way that so obsiousiy discriminates-against fuil-time employees who do not reach the 1409-hour mark. They have been denied their pro-rated vesting rights guaranteed by guastez. It is also possible that some lower hourly Eigure would be acceptable as a cutoff, but 1400 hours is simply too great, espectally in your ciient"s sftuation where the cutoff of hours do not appear to have a reasonable repationship to the length of time the seasonal emplowees work.

Because the policy violates Suastez, we would ignore it and the employer would be obliged to provide pro rata vacation pay to any terminated employee who has worked 1 ess than 1,700 hours in any one year.
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If you have any questions regarding this issue, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Yours eruly,
A. Alomas Pa whil
H. THOMAS CADELI, JR.

Chief Counsel
c.c. LIoyd w: Aubry, Jx.

