IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

NICOLASA TOPETE

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-05873-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE NUNC PRO TUNC DECISION

ADVANCE SERVICES INC

Employer

OC: 04/15/12

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Nicolasa Topete (claimant) appealed a representative's May 17, 2012 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she voluntarily quit work with Advance Services (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for June 14, 2012. The claimant participated personally through Interpreter Steven Rhodes. The employer participated by Michael Payne, Unemployment Specialist.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The employer is a temporary employment service. The claimant performed services from August 26 through November 11, 2011. She signed a document on August 25, 2011, indicating that she was to contact the employer within three days following the completion of an assignment to request placement in a new assignment. The claimant was given a copy of the document. The employer considered this to be separate and part of the contract for hire. The claimant completed her last assignment on November 11, 2011. She sought reassignment from the employer on November 11 and 14, 2011. No work was available.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not separated from the employer for any disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 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:

NUNC PRO TUNC Page 2 Appeal No. 12A-UI-05873-S2T

j. 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.

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.

For the purposes of this paragraph:

- (1) "Temporary employee" means an individual who is employed by a temporary employment firm to provide services to clients to supplement their work force during absences, seasonal workloads, temporary skill or labor market shortages, and for special assignments and projects.
- (2) "Temporary employment firm" means a person engaged in the business of employing temporary employees.

Under the lowa Code the employer must advise the claimant of the three-day notice requirement and give the claimant a copy of that requirement. The notice requirement cannot be a part of the contract for hire. The employer did not provide the claimant with the proper notice requirements but the claimant did follow the employer's notice instructions. No work was available. The employer has, therefore, failed to satisfy the requirements of lowa Code section 96.5-1-j. Benefits are allowed.

NUNC PRO TUNC DECISION:

bas/css/css

The representative's May 17, 2012 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant was not separated from work for any disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	