

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

MIRANDA R EDFORS  
318 – 16<sup>TH</sup> AVE S  
CLINTON IA 52732

DM SERVICES INC  
1515 S 21<sup>ST</sup> ST  
CLINTON IA 52732

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-06304-S2T  
OC: 05/29/05 R: 04  
Claimant: Respondent (1)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-3-a – Refusal of Suitable Work

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

DM Services (employer) appealed a representative's June 10, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded Miranda Edfors (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 held on July 5, 2005. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Sheree Banks, Human Resources Administrator.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on April 14, 2004, as a full-time credit specialist.

The employer offered the claimant work on or about December 3, 2004, by leaving a message on the claimant's cellular telephone. The claimant did not receive the message.

The claimant filed her claim for unemployment insurance benefits on May 29, 2005.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant refused an offer of suitable work. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes she did not.

Iowa Code Section 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.

871 IAC 24.24(8) provides:

(8) Refusal disqualification jurisdiction. Both the offer of work or the order to apply for work and the claimant's accompanying refusal must occur within the individual's benefit year, as defined in subrule 24.1(21), before the Iowa code subsection 96.5(3) disqualification can be imposed. It is not necessary that the offer, the order, or the

refusal occur in a week in which the claimant filed a weekly claim for benefits before the disqualification can be imposed.

The offer of work was made by the employer to the claimant on December 3, 2004. The claimant filed her claim for benefits on May 29, 2005. The claimant refused work before she had a claim for unemployment insurance benefits on file. If there is no valid claim for unemployment insurance benefits on file, there can be no disqualification if work is refused. The claimant is qualified to receive benefits provided she is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The representative's June 10, 2005 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive benefits provided she is otherwise eligible.

bas/kjf