IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

GREGORY A RICE

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-03238-H2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SHRIVER CONSTRUCTION CO

Employer

Original Claim: 01-10-10 Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(3)a – Work Refusal Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the February 19, 2010, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on April 13, 2010. The claimant did participate along with his wife, Shelia Rice. The employer did participate through Sam Harding, President. Employer's Exhibit One was entered and received into the record.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant refuse a suitable offer of work?

Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a laborer, full-time, beginning June 13, 2000. When he was hired, the claimant was told that he would sometimes have to travel overnight for different jobs. On those occasions, the employer would pay for his hotel room and give him a stipend for his meals. The claimant did travel out of town on prior occasions and stay overnight to perform the work. The employer's business slowed down with the poor economy and the employer was forced to look for work all over the state to keep the employees busy. The employer assigned the claimant to a job in Mason City beginning on January 25, 2010 that would have required the claimant stay out from Monday through Thursday night. The work was the same type of work the claimant has always performed, and the claimant's pay would not have changed. The employer would pay for the claimant's hotel room and for his meals. The claimant refused the offer of work because he did not want to travel out of town for personal family reasons.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did refuse a suitable offer of work.

Iowa Code § 96.5-3-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

- 3. Failure to accept work. If the department finds that an individual has failed, without good cause, either to apply for available, suitable work when directed by the department or to accept suitable work when offered that individual. The department shall, if possible, furnish the individual with the names of employers which are seeking employees. The individual shall apply to and obtain the signatures of the employers designated by the department on forms provided by the department. However, the employers may refuse to sign the forms. The individual's failure to obtain the signatures of designated employers, which have not refused to sign the forms, shall disqualify the individual for benefits until requalified. To requalify for benefits after disqualification under this subsection, the individual shall work in and be paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.
- a. In determining whether or not any work is suitable for an individual, the department shall consider the degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety, and morals, the individual's physical fitness, prior training, length of unemployment, and prospects for securing local work in the individual's customary occupation, the distance of the available work from the individual's residence, and any other factor which the department finds bears a reasonable relation to the purposes of this paragraph. Work is suitable if the work meets all the other criteria of this paragraph and if the gross weekly wages for the work equal or exceed the following percentages of the individual's average weekly wage for insured work paid to the individual during that quarter of the individual's base period in which the individual's wages were highest:
- (1) One hundred percent, if the work is offered during the first five weeks of unemployment.
- (2) Seventy-five percent, if the work is offered during the sixth through the twelfth week of unemployment.
- (3) Seventy percent, if the work is offered during the thirteenth through the eighteenth week of unemployment.
- (4) Sixty-five percent, if the work is offered after the eighteenth week of unemployment.

However, the provisions of this paragraph shall not require an individual to accept employment below the federal minimum wage.

The claimant knew when he was hired that, on occasion, he would be required to travel and spend the night away from home. He had done so before on prior occasions. The claimant's family issues are not good cause for refusing the otherwise suitable offer of work. The offer was suitable, as it was for the same work at the same wage, just away from the claimant's home town, and claimant did not have a good-cause reason for the refusal. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant 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 employer will not be charged for benefits whether or not the overpayment is recovered. lowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits.

DECISION:

The February 19, 2010, reference 02, decision is reversed. The claimant did refuse a suitable offer of work. Benefits are withheld until such time as the claimant works in and has been paid wages equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

REMAND:

The	matter	of	determining	the	amount	of	the	potential	overpayment	and	whether	the
over	payment	sh	ould be recov	ered	under lov	va (Code	§ 96.3(7)k	is remanded t	o the	Agency.	

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/kjw