

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**RICK BALL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-00809-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**LABOR READY MIDWEST INC**  
Employer

**OC: 11-29-09**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the January 5, 2010, reference 03, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 25, 2010. The claimant did not participate. The employer did participate through Rick Bartlett, District Manager.

**ISSUE:**

Did the claimant voluntarily quit his employment without good cause attributable to the employer or was he a casual 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 last assigned to work at the Marriott Hotel as a dishwasher on November 1, 2008. The claimant was only given work for one day which he completed and was paid for at the end of the day. In order to obtain additional work the claimant only needed to return to the Labor Ready site and sign up for additional work. He was given a one-day assignment and completed that assignment. The claimant was not guaranteed any ongoing work if he were to show up at Labor Ready. The employer characterizes the claimant's work as day labor.

**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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 5, 2010, reference 03, decision is affirmed. 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