

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

CASEY C HAAS
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-07376-AT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

L A LEASING INC
Employer

**Original Claim: 03/29/09
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)**

Section 96.5-1-g – Voluntary Quit from Temporary Employment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

L.A. Leasing, Inc., doing business as Sedona Staffing, filed a timely appeal from an unemployment insurance decision dated May 12, 2009, reference 01, that allowed benefits to Casey C. Haas. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held June 8, 2009, with Colleen McGuinty and Kathy Hutchinson participating for the employer. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence. Although Mr. Haas provided a telephone number at which he could be contacted, that number was answered by a recording when called at the time of the hearing. The administrative law judge left instructions for the claimant to call while the hearing was still in progress if he wished to participate. He did not do so.

ISSUE:

Did the claimant leave employment with a temporary employment agency under circumstances that would disqualify him for benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Casey C. Haas was employed by Sedona Staffing on May 12, 2006. On May 11, 2006, he signed an availability statement that advised him that he must contact Sedona within three working days after the end of each assignment in order to seek reassignment. The availability statement put him on notice that failure to do so could have adverse unemployment insurance consequences.

On February 27, 2009, Mr. Haas completed an assignment at MedPlast of Monticello. February 27, 2009, was a Friday. Mr. Haas had not contacted Sedona Staffing by the close of business on Wednesday, March 4, 2009.

Mr. Haas has received unemployment insurance benefits is filing a claim effective March 29, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the claimant's separation from employment was a disqualifying event. It was.

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 evidence in this record persuades the administrative law judge that Sedona Staffing met the requirements set out in the law section set forth above. It also establishes that Mr. Haas did not contact the employer within three working days after the end of his assignment at MedPlast of Monticello. Under these circumstances, the law requires that benefits be 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 question of repayment of unemployment insurance benefits is remanded to the Unemployment Insurance Services Division.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated May 12, 2009, reference 01, is reversed. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided that he is otherwise eligible. The question of repayment of benefits is remanded to the Unemployment Insurance Services Division.

Dan Anderson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

srs/kjw