

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**DAVID A ESTABROOK**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-13772-S1-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**R J PERSONNEL INC**  
Employer

**OC: 11/15/15  
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5-1-j – Separation from Temporary Employer  
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

R. J. Personnel (employer) appealed a representative's December 7, 2015, decision (reference 01) that concluded David Estabrook (claimant) was 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 January 7, 2016. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Mike Thomas, Account Manager, and Crissy Shoemaker, Office Coordinator. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

**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 employer is a temporary employment service. The claimant was assigned to work at Fresh Ideas from July 8, 2014, through November 13, 2015. He signed a document on July 7, 2014, indicating he was to contact the employer within three days following the completion of an assignment to request placement in a new assignment. The claimant was given a copy of the document which was separate from the contract for hire. On October 21, 2015, the claimant talked to the employer about giving Fresh Ideas a two-week notice of resignation after it increased his workload. The claimant told the employer he did not want to work for a temporary agency again. The claimant completed his last assignment on November 13, 2015. The claimant's discussions of quitting if he were not made full time or did not get a raise may have caused Fresh Ideas to end his assignment. On May 13, 2015, the claimant told the employer his assignment ended and that he did not want to work for a staffing service again. On May 16, 2015, the claimant told the employer he had returned all his items to Fresh Ideas. The employer asked him if he wanted another assignment. The claimant said he did not want to work for a staffing service again.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of November 15, 2015. He received \$2,177.00 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer participated personally at the fact-finding interview on December 4, 2015, by Mike Thomas.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was separated from employment for a disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1)j 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. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

j. The individual is a temporary employee of a temporary employment firm who notifies the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment and who seeks reassignment. Failure of the individual to notify the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment within three working days of the completion of each employment assignment under a contract of hire shall be deemed a voluntary quit unless the individual was not advised in writing of the duty to notify the temporary employment firm upon completion of an employment assignment or the individual had good cause for not contacting the temporary employment firm within three working days and notified the firm at the first reasonable opportunity thereafter.

To show that the employee was advised in writing of the notification requirement of this paragraph, the temporary employment firm shall advise the temporary employee by requiring the temporary employee, at the time of employment with the temporary employment firm, to read and sign a document that provides a clear and concise explanation of the notification requirement and the consequences of a failure to notify. The document shall be separate from any contract of employment and a copy of the signed document shall be provided to the temporary employee.

For the purposes of this paragraph:

(1) "Temporary employee" means an individual who is employed by a temporary employment firm to provide services to clients to supplement their work force during absences, seasonal workloads, temporary skill or labor market shortages, and for special assignments and projects.

(2) "Temporary employment firm" means a person engaged in the business of employing temporary employees.

Under the Iowa Code the employer must advise the claimant of the three-day notice requirement and give the claimant a copy of that requirement. The notice requirement must be separate from the contract for hire. The employer followed the requirements of the code. The claimant did not. He did not request reassignment. Therefore, benefits are denied.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault.

However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code section 96.3-7-a, -b.

871 IAC 24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative's December 7, 2015, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant was separated from the employer for no good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css