

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

RANDI R BLOODSWORTH
Claimant

ADVANCE SERVICES INC
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-01344-JCT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 01/08/17
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1)j – Voluntary Quitting – Temporary Employment
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the February 3, 2017, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 28, 2017. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Melissa Lewien, Risk Manager. Whitney Reinier also testified for the employer. Department Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant quit by not reporting for an additional work assignment within three business days of the end of the last assignment?
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as an assembler, last assigned at Pella Corporation from April 25, 2016, and was separated from the assignment, but not the employment, on January 6, 2017. The assignment representative notified the claimant that the assignment had ended due to a lack of work. On January 5, 2017, a day before the assignment ended, the claimant visited the employer office and spoke to Whitney Reinier. The evidence is disputed as to whether she inquired about a future assignment since the Pella assignment was ending. The assignment ended on January 6, 2017, and the claimant left a voicemail for the employer to notify the assignment was over. The employer stated the claimant did not inquire about new employment in the message. The claimant stated she spoke to Ms. Reinier when she returned to the office on January 9, 2017, who again advised the claimant that there were no additional assignments available. In addition, the employer reported the claimant discussed having the employer help with housing paperwork and inquired about unemployment. The employer has a documentation system to record contact with its employees. There was no note on January 5, 2017 about the claimant's inquiry for work, nor was there any reference made by Ms. Reinier or any other

employee about the claimant's visit to the office on January 9, 2017. The employer does have a policy that complies with the specific terms of Iowa Code § 96.5(1)j.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$576.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of January 8, 2017. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview by way of Melissa Lewien.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's separation was with good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code § 96.5-(1)-j provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

j. (1) The individual is a temporary employee of a temporary employment firm who notifies the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment and who seeks reassignment. Failure of the individual to notify the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment within three working days of the completion of each employment assignment under a contract of hire shall be deemed a voluntary quit unless the individual was not advised in writing of the duty to notify the temporary employment firm upon completion of an employment assignment or the individual had good cause for not contacting the temporary employment firm within three working days and notified the firm at the first reasonable opportunity thereafter.

(2) To show that the employee was advised in writing of the notification requirement of this paragraph, the temporary employment firm shall advise the temporary employee by requiring the temporary employee, at the time of employment with the temporary employment firm, to read and sign a document that provides a clear and concise explanation of the notification requirement and the consequences of a failure to notify. The document shall be separate from any contract of employment and a copy of the signed document shall be provided to the temporary employee.

(3) For the purposes of this paragraph:

(a) "Temporary employee" means an individual who is employed by a temporary employment firm to provide services to clients to supplement their workforce during absences, seasonal workloads, temporary skill or labor market shortages, and for special assignments and projects.

(b) "Temporary employment firm" means a person engaged in the business of employing temporary employees.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(19) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(19) The claimant was employed on a temporary basis for assignment to spot jobs or casual labor work and fulfilled the contract of hire when each of the jobs was completed. An election not to report for a new assignment to work shall not be construed as a voluntary leaving of employment. The issue of a refusal of an offer of suitable work shall be adjudicated when an offer of work is made by the former employer. The provisions of Iowa Code section 96.5(3) and rule 24.24(96) are controlling in the determination of suitability of work. However, this subrule shall not apply to substitute school employees who are subject to the provisions of Iowa Code section 96.4(5) which denies benefits that are based on service in an educational institution when the individual declines or refuses to accept a new contract or reasonable assurance of continued employment status. Under this circumstance, the substitute school employee shall be considered to have voluntarily quit employment.

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.* Assessing the credibility of the witnesses and reliability of the evidence in conjunction with the applicable burden of proof, as shown in the factual conclusions reached in the above-noted findings of fact, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant's testimony to be more credible than the employer, and that she did request a new assignment on January 9, 2017, by way of meeting with Whitney Reinier at the local office. The purpose of the statute is to provide notice to the temporary agency employer that the claimant is available for and seeking work at the end of the temporary assignment. Since she contacted the employer within three working days of the notification of the end of the assignment, requested reassignment, and there was no work available, no disqualification is imposed.

Because the claimant is eligible for benefits, the issues of overpayment and relief of charges are moot.

DECISION:

The February 3, 2017, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The claimant's separation from employment was attributable to the employer. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant has not been overpaid benefits. The employer's account is not relieved of charges.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/rvs