IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

TIMOTHY L SMITH

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-02098-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE AMENDED DECISION

LABOR READY MIDWEST INC

Employer

OC: 01/06/08 R: 03 Claimant: Respondent (4)

Section 96.5-1-j – Separation from Temporary Employer

Section 96.4-3 - Able and Available

Section 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Labor Ready Midwest (employer) appealed a representative's February 20, 2008 decision (reference 01) that concluded Timothy L. Smith (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits based on his separation from work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for March 18, 2008. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Rebecca Dripps, Branch 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 considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The employer is a temporary employment service. The claimant performed services off and on from July 9, 1999, through December 5, 2007, while working full-time third shift for Twin City Concrete. He signed a document, part of his contract for hire, indicating that he was to contact the employer within three days following the completion of an assignment to request placement in a new assignment. The claimant completed his last assignment on December 5, 2007, but did not seek reassignment from the employer.

The claimant did not seek reassignment from the employer because his full-time employer, Twin City Concrete, changed his hours from third to first shift. The claimant was no longer available for spot jobs during the daytime.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not separated from the employer for any 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.

As an employee of a temporary service, the employer must advise the claimant, apart from his contract for hire, of a three-day notice requirement and give the claimant a copy of that requirement. The employer did not provide the claimant with the proper notice requirements and has, therefore, failed to satisfy the requirements of lowa Code section 96.5-1-j. Benefits are allowed based on the claimant's separation from employment.

Additionally the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not available for work after December 6, 2007.

871 IAC 24.23(23) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(23) The claimant's availability for other work is unduly limited because such claimant is working to such a degree that removes the claimant from the labor market.

The claimant was working as a full-time employee during daytime hours after December 6, 2007. He was working to such a degree that removed him from the labor market. The claimant is not considered unemployed. He is disqualified for being unavailable for work.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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.

The claimant has received benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits now constitute an overpayment which must be repaid.

DECISION:

The representative's February 20, 2008 decision (reference 01) is modified in favor of the appellant. The claimant was not separated from the employer on December 5, 2007, for any disqualifying reason. The claimant is not considered unemployed because he is working to such a degree that makes him unavailable for work. He is disqualified for being unavailable for work. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,862.00.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs/pjs