

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

BRENDA M PUCCIO
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08O-UI-10396-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
AMENDED DECISION**

**L A LEASING INC
SEDONA STAFFING**
Employer

**OC: 05/04/08 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5-1-j – Separation from Temporary Employer

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Sedona Staffing (employer) appealed a representative's June 6, 2008 decision (reference 02) that concluded Brenda Puccio (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits based on her separation from work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for November 20, 2008. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Colleen McGuinty, Unemployment Benefits Administrator, and Kathy Hutchinson, Area Manager.

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 having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The employer is a temporary employment service. The claimant performed services from September 14, 2007, through April 25, 2008. She signed a document before her first assignment on October 24, 2006, indicating that she 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 part of the contract for hire. The claimant completed her last assignment on April 25, 2008, but did not seek reassignment from the employer.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was separated from the employer 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.

The claimant did not request reassignment and has, therefore, failed to satisfy the requirements of Iowa Code section 96.5-1-j. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits

were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The claimant has received benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits would constitute an overpayment. In this case, there is no overpayment, due to the double-affirmance rule.

DECISION:

The representative's June 6, 2008 decision (reference 02) 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 benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits would constitute an overpayment. In this case, there is no overpayment, due to the double-affirmance rule.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw