IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

KELLY L PITTMAN

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-10184-HT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

RIVERSIDE STAFFING SERVICES INC

Employer

OC: 05/24/09

Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Section 96.5(1) – Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Riverside Staffing Services, Inc. (Riverside), filed an appeal from a decision dated July 6, 2009, reference 02. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Kelly Pittman. After due notice was issued a hearing was held by telephone conference call on August 3, 2009. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where she could be contacted and did not participate. The employer participated by Office Manager Stacy Dixon.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant quit work with good cause attributable to the employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Kelly Pittman was employed by Riverside from March 10 until April 28, 2009. She had one assignment from March 10 through April 6, 2009, at RR Donnelly. The client laid her off because there was no more work for her and she contacted the employer on April 9, 2009, for another assignment.

Riverside offered Ms. Pittman an assignment on April 15, 2009, which she declined because it was only part-time. On April 28, 2009, she was offered another assignment at RR Donnelly at the same hours, duties and wages she had performed on her prior assignment. She declined because she wanted to "take time" to look for another job on her own and currently had a job interview with another company.

Kelly Pittman has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of May 24, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 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 24.25(3) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to lowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving lowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(3) The claimant left to seek other employment but did not secure employment.

The claimant quit her employment with Riverside to seek other employment on her own. Continuing work was available to her had she not quit. Under the provisions of the above Administrative Code section, this is a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to the employer and the claimant is disqualified.

lowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

- 7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.
- a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.
- b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits to which she is not entitled. The question of whether the claimant must repay these benefits is remanded to the UIS division.

DECISION:

bgh/pjs

The representative's decision of July 6, 2009, reference 02, is reversed. Kelly Pittman is disqualified and benefits are withheld until she has earned ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The issue of whether the claimant must repay the unemployment benefits is remanded to UIS division for determination.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeyer
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed