

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LESLIE J FRANKLIN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-09249-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

RM ENTERPRISES INC
Employer

OC: 04/07/13
Claimant: Respondent (1)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

RM Enterprises (employer) appealed a representative's August 1, 2013, decision (reference 02) that concluded Leslie Franklin (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for September 16, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Rhonda Coborn, 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 was a temporary agency. The claimant worked for the employer, from November 9, 2012, to June 14, 2013, as a production assistant assigned to work at Petro Blend. The employer sold its business on June 17, 2013, and the claimant worked for the business that purchased the employer's business.

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 on June 14, 2013. 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 so long as he is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's August 1, 2013, decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits so long as he is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs