

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DAVID C KISNER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-10577-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

LEISURE LANES INC
Employer

OC: 08/11/13
Claimant: Respondent (1)

871 IAC 24.1(113)a – Separations From Employment
Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Leaving – Layoff

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Leisure Lanes (employer) appealed a representative's September 10, 2013, decision (reference 01) that concluded David Kisner (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 scheduled for October 9, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Brett Baldwin, Proprietor.

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 claimant was hired on October 1, 1997, as a full-time night manager. The employer sold the business. The claimant worked his last day on August 3, 2013. The employer paid the claimant one week vacation pay and one week severance pay. The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of August 11, 2013. He reported all earnings to the agency.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was laid off due to a lack of work.

Iowa Code section 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 24.1(113)a provides:

Separations. All terminations of employment, generally classifiable as layoffs, quits, discharges, or other separations.

a. Layoffs. A layoff is a suspension from pay status (lasting or expected to last more than seven consecutive calendar days without pay) initiated by the employer without prejudice to the worker for such reasons as: lack of orders, model changeover, termination of seasonal or temporary employment, inventory-taking, introduction of laborsaving devices, plant breakdown, shortage of materials; including temporarily furloughed employees and employees placed on unpaid vacations.

The employer laid the claimant off for lack of work. When an employer suspends a claimant from work status, the separation does not prejudice the claimant. The claimant's separation was attributable to a lack of work by the employer. The claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's September 10, 2013, decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant was laid off due to a lack of work. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css