

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**LISA L AADAMOVICZ**

Claimant

**APPEAL 21A-UI-06951-S1-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**ADVANCE SERVICES INC**

Employer

**OC: 04/19/20**

**Claimant: Respondent (2/R)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit  
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 – Overpayment  
Iowa Code § 96.5-1-j – Separation from Temporary Employer

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Advance Services (employer) appealed an Iowa Workforce Development March 3, 2021, decision (reference 02) that concluded Lisa Adamovicz (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 May 17, 2021. The claimant did not provide a telephone number and, therefore, did not participate in the hearing. The employer participated by Melissa Lewien, Risk Management. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative file.

**ISSUE:**

The issues include whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason, whether the claimant was overpaid benefits, and which party should be charged for those benefits.

**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. She signed a document on October 7, 2020, indicating she was to contact the employer within three working days following the completion of an assignment to request placement in a new assignment. The document indicated the consequences of a failure to notify the employer. The claimant was given a copy of the document, which was separate from the contract for hire.

The claimant performed services from October 8, 2020, through December 11, 2020, at Loffredo Fresh Foods, as a full-time produce packer. On December 9, 2020, the employer notified the claimant that her assignment would end on December 11, 2020. Work was available at a new client company but the claimant did not seek reassignment from the employer until January 6, 2021.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of April 19, 2020. Her weekly benefit amount was determined to be \$116.00. She filed an additional claim for benefits on December 13, 2020. The Agency did not schedule a formal fact-finding interview. It sent the parties questionnaires. The employer returned its questionnaire to the agency on February 23, 2021.

The claimant received benefits of \$116.00 per week off and on from December 27, 2020, to the week ending April 17, 2021. This is a total of \$1,044.00 in state unemployment insurance benefits after the separation from employment. She also received \$2,700.00 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation as of the week ending April 17, 2021.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was separated from employment for a disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1)j provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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. (1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) For the purposes of this paragraph:

(a) "Temporary employee" means an individual who is employed by a temporary employment firm to provide services to clients to supplement their workforce during absences, seasonal workloads, temporary skill or labor market shortages, and for special assignments and projects.

(b) "Temporary employment firm" means a person engaged in the business of employing temporary employees.

Under the Iowa Code the employer must advise the claimant of the three-day notice requirement and give the claimant a copy of that requirement. The notice requirement must be separate from the contract for hire. The employer followed the requirements of the code. The claimant did not. She did not request reassignment. Therefore, benefits are denied.

The next issue is whether claimant has been overpaid benefits. Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b, 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) (a) 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 employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) 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.

(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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in [871—subrule 24.32\(7\)](#). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by claimant. Additionally, the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Thus, claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received.

The law also states that an employer is to be charged if "the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. . ." Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b)(1)(a). Here, the employer responded to the fact-finding questionnaire but did not receive notice of a fact-finding interview. Benefits were paid, but not because the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the agency's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. Instead, benefits were paid because employer did not receive a call from the agency. Employer thus cannot be charged. Since neither party is to be charged then the overpayment is absorbed by the fund.

The issue of whether claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation is remanded to the Benefits Bureau of Iowa Workforce Development for an initial investigation and decision.

**DECISION:**

The representative's March 3, 2021 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 been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,044.00 but is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview due to no fault of its own and its account shall not be charged. Rather, the overpayment should be charged to the fund.

The issue of whether claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation is remanded to the Benefits Bureau of Iowa Workforce Development for an initial investigation and decision.



---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

July 7, 2021  
Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/scn