person. The claimant inadvertently indicated otherwise while filing her claim for the week in question.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the warning should be removed from the claimant's record. For the reasons which follow, the administrative law judge concludes that it should.

lowa Code section 96.4-3 establishes the requirement that claimants must make an active work search each week that they request benefits. The Agency ordinarily interprets this provision as requiring a minimum of two in-person job contacts each week. The evidence in this record persuades the administrative law judge that the claimant conducted the requisite work search but inadvertently indicated otherwise. The warning shall be removed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated September 13, 2005, reference 01, is reversed. The warning is removed from the claimant's record.

kkf/kjw