

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**KIRK J LADEHOFF**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-09077-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**R J PERSONNEL INC  
TEMP ASSOCIATES**  
Employer

**OC: 08/10/08 R: 04**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(3)a – Work Refusal  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the October 1, 2008, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on October 22, 2008. Claimant did not respond to the hearing notice instructions and did not participate. Employer participated through Mike Thomas.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether claimant refused a suitable offer of work and if so, whether the refusal was for a good cause reason and if not, whether he is overpaid benefits as a result.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Employer made three offers of work to claimant on August 25, 2008. Those offers included the following terms: PSC in Muscatine, second shift \$8.50 per hour full-time (\$340.00) laborer light industrial; Schenker Logistics in West Branch on third shift paying \$11.00 per hour for full-time (\$440.00) work as a laborer; and OFC in Muscatine, first shift, full-time at \$8.52 per hour (\$340.80) as a laborer. Claimant's average weekly wage is \$335.84. The offer was made in the third week of unemployment. He declined because he wanted to wait to be recalled to Pretium Packaging in Muscatine where he had worked second shift 40 hours per week making \$8.00 per hour until August 12, 2008. As of the hearing date a Pretium recall is indefinite. Claimant began working in Wilton on September 19, 2008 at Wilton Precision Steel full-time at \$9.00 per hour.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of August 10, 2008.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did refuse suitable offers of work.

Iowa Code § 96.5-3-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

3. Failure to accept work. If the department finds that an individual has failed, without good cause, either to apply for available, suitable work when directed by the department or to accept suitable work when offered that individual. The department shall, if possible, furnish the individual with the names of employers which are seeking employees. The individual shall apply to and obtain the signatures of the employers designated by the department on forms provided by the department. However, the employers may refuse to sign the forms. The individual's failure to obtain the signatures of designated employers, which have not refused to sign the forms, shall disqualify the individual for benefits until requalified. To requalify for benefits after disqualification under this subsection, the individual shall work in and be paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

a. In determining whether or not any work is suitable for an individual, the department shall consider the degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety, and morals, the individual's physical fitness, prior training, length of unemployment, and prospects for securing local work in the individual's customary occupation, the distance of the available work from the individual's residence, and any other factor which the department finds bears a reasonable relation to the purposes of this paragraph. Work is suitable if the work meets all the other criteria of this paragraph and if the gross weekly wages for the work equal or exceed the following percentages of the individual's average weekly wage for insured work paid to the individual during that quarter of the individual's base period in which the individual's wages were highest:

(1) One hundred percent, if the work is offered during the first five weeks of unemployment.

(2) Seventy-five percent, if the work is offered during the sixth through the twelfth week of unemployment.

(3) Seventy percent, if the work is offered during the thirteenth through the eighteenth week of unemployment.

(4) Sixty-five percent, if the work is offered after the eighteenth week of unemployment.

However, the provisions of this paragraph shall not require an individual to accept employment below the federal minimum wage.

The offers were suitable as they were within the area he had worked in the past, of a similar nature, and the full-time pay met the statutory requirement to be considered suitable. The fact-finding decision referred to a "prevailing wage" which is vague and not defined by statute. Accordingly, claimant did not have a good cause reason for the refusals. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 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 unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The matter of whether the overpayment should be recovered under Iowa Code § 96.3(7)b is remanded to the Agency.

**DECISION:**

The October 1, 2008, reference 01, decision is reversed. Claimant did refuse a suitable offer of work. Claimant did refuse an offer of work made outside of his benefit year; thus, the administrative law judge has no jurisdiction to determine suitability of the offer. Benefits are

withheld until such time as the claimant works in and has been paid wages equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$731.00.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs