IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

GREGORY O KIERSTEAD Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-01262-H2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

LABOR READY MIDWEST INC Employer

> OC: 02-22-09 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Leaving 871 IAC 24.26(19) – Casual Labor Job

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the January 12, 2010, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on March 5, 2010. The claimant did participate. The employer did not participate.

ISSUE:

Did the claimant voluntarily quit his employment without good cause attributable to the employer or was he a causal or spot laborer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the testimony and all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a spot laborer through November 29, 2009. In order to obtain work the claimant was to report on a daily basis to the Labor Ready worksite. From there he would be sent out on any jobs that might be available that day. He was not given a continuing assignment but was required to show up each day to obtain work. He was paid at the end of each day for the completion of his work.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was a spot laborer who elected not to report for a new assignment.

871 IAC 24.26(19) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(19) The claimant was employed on a temporary basis for assignment to spot jobs or casual labor work and fulfilled the contract of hire when each of the jobs was completed.

An election not to report for a new assignment to work shall not be construed as a voluntary leaving of employment. The issue of a refusal of an offer of suitable work shall be adjudicated when an offer of work is made by the former employer. The provisions of lowa Code section 96.5(3) and rule 24.24(96) are controlling in the determination of suitability of work. However, this subrule shall not apply to substitute school employees who are subject to the provisions of lowa Code section 96.4(5) which denies benefits that are based on service in an educational institution when the individual declines or refuses to accept a new contract or reasonable assurance of continued employment status. Under this circumstance, the substitute school employee shall be considered to have voluntarily quit employment.

The claimant was hired and paid on a day-by-day basis thus making him a spot laborer. The claimant completed all of the jobs he accepted. Under the terms of the spot labor employment relationship, and pursuant to the regulation cited above, the claimant did not quit and the employer did not discharge the claimant but was a spot laborer who elected not to report for any additional assignments. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The January 12, 2010, reference 02, decision is reversed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits based on his employment relationship with the employer. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs