

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**LEONCIO BOLLAS**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-04127-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**JASPER CONSTRUCTION SERVICES INC**

Employer

**OC: 12/07/08**

**Claimant: Respondent (2/R)**

Section 96.5-3-a – Refusal to Accept Suitable Work

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Jasper Construction Services (employer) appealed a representative's April 9, 2012 decision (reference 07) that concluded Leoncio Bollas (claimant) eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for May 4, 2012. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated by Don Van Dusseldorp, Vice President. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant refused suitable work.

**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 on April 26, 2010, as a full-time seasonal laborer. He worked through December 1, 2011. On February 10, 2012, the claimant told the employer he has been hired elsewhere and would not be coming back to work. On March 16, 2012, the employer left the claimant a message offering the claimant work. The employer did not hear back from the claimant.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the claimant is able and available for work. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he is not. Before a claimant can be disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits for refusing an offer of suitable work, the claimant must be able and available for work. 871 IAC 24.24(4). The claimant was not able and available for work.

871 IAC 24.23(23) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(23) The claimant's availability for other work is unduly limited because such claimant is working to such a degree that removes the claimant from the labor market.

The claimant found other work. The claimant could not work for the employer because he was working to such an extent as to remove him from the workforce. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits because he was not available for work.

Iowa 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 benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits may now constitute an overpayment. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

**DECISION:**

The representative's April 9, 2012 decision (reference 07) is reversed. The claimant is disqualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he is not available for work. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css