IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

KAREN A MELBY

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-07150-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

GOLD SLIPPER

Employer

OC: 05/12/13

Claimant: Respondent (1)

871 IAC 24.1(113)a – Separations From Employment Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Leaving - Layoff

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Gold Slipper (employer) appealed a representative's June 11, 2013, decision (reference 01) that concluded Karen Melby (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 29, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Nick Behrendt, Former Owner.

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 claimant was hired in the summer of 2010, as a part-time cleaning lady and kitchen helper. The employer sold the business and the employer had no more work for the claimant after April 19, 2013.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was laid off due to a lack of work.

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 24.1(113)a provides:

Separations. All terminations of employment, generally classifiable as layoffs, quits, discharges, or other separations.

a. Layoffs. A layoff is a suspension from pay status (lasting or expected to last more than seven consecutive calendar days without pay) initiated by the employer without prejudice to the worker for such reasons as: lack of orders, model changeover, termination of seasonal or temporary employment, inventory-taking, introduction of laborsaving devices, plant breakdown, shortage of materials; including temporarily furloughed employees and employees placed on unpaid vacations.

The employer laid the claimant off for lack of work on April 19, 2013. When an employer suspends a claimant from work status, the separation does not prejudice the claimant. The claimant's separation was attributable to a lack of work by the employer. The claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's June 11, 2013 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant was laid off due to a lack of work. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	

bas/css