IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

NEVILLE D FULLER

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-01527-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

LABOR READY MIDWEST INC

Employer

OC: 12/18/11

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Leaving

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the January 31, 2012 (reference 01) decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on March 5, 2012. Claimant participated. Employer opted not to participate.

ISSUE:

Did claimant voluntarily leave the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed on a casual or daily labor basis, most recently as a car detailer, and was separated from employment on December 22, 2011. He went each day for the next five work days to find other work but none was available.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's separation was not the result of a disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 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.

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 § 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 § 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.

Inasmuch as the claimant completed the daily contract of hire with the employer as contemplated, no disqualification is imposed.

DECISION:

The January 31, 2012 (reference 01), decision is reversed. The claimant's separation from employment was for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs