# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

TIMOTHY R KLOSTER

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 080-UI-07915-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**ACTION WAREHOUSE CO LTD** 

Employer

OC: 01/13/08 R: 02 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Leaving

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the June 27, 2008, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on September 17, 2008. Claimant participated. Employer did not participate.

#### ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a temporary laborer to tear off a roof for another company on May 8, 2008. While there debris got in his eyes and the assignment supervisor told him to go home. He notified employer of the situation the same day and again the following day. When he called back on the third day after his eyes were starting to feel better the employer told him the job was already filled and there was no work available.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant's separation was not disqualifying.

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 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.

871 IAC 24.26(19 and (22) provide:

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 lowa Code § 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 lowa Code § 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.
- (22) The claimant was hired for a specific period of time and completed the contract of hire by working until this specific period of time had lapsed. However, this subrule shall not apply to substitute school employees who are subject to the provisions of Iowa Code § 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 employees shall be considered to have voluntarily quit employment.

Inasmuch as the claimant completed the contract of hire with employer, no disqualification is imposed.

## **DECISION:**

The June 27, 2008, reference 02, decision is reversed. Claimant's separation from employment was for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
dml/css	