IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

DOUG L LOZANO

Claimant

APPEAL 15A-UI-13409-H2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

HUB CITY-WIN PROPANE LLC

Employer

OC: 11/08/15

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Able and Available

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the December 1, 2015, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on December 28, 2015. Claimant participated along with his son Chris Lozano. Employer did not participate. Claimant's Exhibit A was entered and received into the record.

ISSUES:

Is the claimant able to and available for work, and was he an on-call worker?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time beginning on June 1, 2015 as a general laborer. The claimant has back problems which require he take expensive medication. He was not happy with the health insurance benefits from this employer. The claimant asked to be taken from a full-time employee to an on-call or as-needed employee so that he could qualify for title 19 and state assistance to pay for his expensive medications. The claimant could have continued to work full time if he wanted to, but he chose not to do so that he could get state medical assistance. When he asked to go to an on-call or as-needed status, he knew that there would not be regular work available for him.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant is not able to work and available for work.

Iowa Code § 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in § 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in § 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of § 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under § 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)i(1) and (2) provide:

Benefit eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

- i. On-call workers.
- (1) Substitute workers (i.e., post office clerks, railroad extra board workers), who hold themselves available for one employer and who do not accept other work, are not available for work within the meaning of the law and are not eligible for benefits.
- (2) Available for work. The availability requirement is satisfied when an individual is willing, able, and ready to accept suitable work which the individual does not have good cause to refuse, that is, the individual is genuinely attached to the labor market....
- i. On-call workers.
- (3) An individual whose wage credits earned in the base period of the claim consist exclusively of wage credits by performing on-call work, such as a banquet worker, railway worker, substitute school teacher or any other individual whose work is solely on-call work during the base period, is not considered an unemployed individual within the meaning of Iowa Code § 96.19(38)"a" and "b." An individual who is willing to accept only on-call work is not considered to be available for work.

Because claimant chose to work only on call or as needed, he is not considered to be unemployed within the meaning of the law. When an individual is hired to work on call, the implied agreement is that they will only work when work is available and that work will not be regularly available. The claimant could have continued to work full time, but chose not to do so in order to obtain Title 19 health benefits from the state of lowa. Thus any diminution in hours is directly related to the on-call status when work is not available as no regular hours were quaranteed. Accordingly, benefits are denied.

ח	F	C	IS	I	N	-

The December	1, 2015,	(reference 01) decision is	affirmed.	The	claimant	is not	considered
unemployed bec	ause of h	is on-call emp	loyment statu	s. Benefit	s are	denied.		

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/css