IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ERIN L MALONEY

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-12581-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

L A LEASING INC

Employer

OC: 07/25/10

Claimant: Respondent (4-R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1)j – Voluntary Leaving (Temporary Assignment)

Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the August 31, 2010 (reference 01) decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on December 1, 2010. Claimant participated. Employer participated through area manager Kathy Hutchinson and was represented by Colleen McGuinty.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant voluntarily left the employment with good cause attributable to the employer, whether claimant is able to and available for work effective July 25, 2010, and whether she is overpaid benefits as a result.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant most recently worked full-time until she had problems with her hip when pregnant and she went to part-time as a laborer at Medplast and was separated from employment on July 23, 2010. She was terminated from employment due to medically excused absences. Kathy Hutchinson called her and told her she was discharged from the assignment and indicated there was nothing available for additional assignments. Her baby was born on October 28, 2010. She was excused to return to work without restriction on November 29, 2010. She has child care arranged if she obtains either full- or part-time work.

Claimant has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of July 25, 2010.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from the assignment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

- 2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:
- a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

- (1) Definition.
- a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

871 IAC 24.32(7) provides:

(7) Excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct and absences due to properly reported illness or injury, even if excessive, cannot constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional and are excused. *Cosper v. lowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). Since employer has not established misconduct with respect to the separation from the assignment, benefits are allowed on that basis. The next question is whether claimant's separation from the temporary agency employer is disqualifying.

Iowa Code § 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.

871 IAC 24.26(19) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(19) The claimant was employed on a temporary basis for assignment to spot jobs or casual labor work and fulfilled the contract of hire when each of the jobs was completed. An election not to report for a new assignment to work shall not be construed as a voluntary leaving of employment. The issue of a refusal of an offer of suitable work shall be adjudicated when an offer of work is made by the former employer. The provisions of lowa Code § 96.5(3) and rule 24.24(96) are controlling in the determination of suitability of work. However, this subrule shall not apply to substitute school employees who are subject to the provisions of lowa Code § 96.4(5) which denies benefits that are based on service in an educational institution when the individual declines or refuses to accept a new contract or reasonable assurance of continued employment status. Under this circumstance, the substitute school employee shall be considered to have voluntarily quit employment.

The purpose of the statute is to provide notice to the temporary agency employer that the claimant is available for work at the conclusion of the temporary assignment. In this case, the employer had notice of the claimant's availability because they notified her of the end of the assignment and opted not to talk to her about the availability of job assignments, or lack thereof. Since there were no additional assignments, benefits are allowed.

Iowa Code § 96.4-3 provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while

employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Since claimant's baby was born on October 28, 2010, she was not available for work the weeks ending October 30 through November 27, 2010. Because she was released to return to work without restriction on November 28, 2010, benefits are allowed as of that date.

Iowa Code § 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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.

Because claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of lowa law.

DECISION:

The August 31, 2010 (reference 01) decision is modified in favor of the appellant. The claimant's separation from the assignment was not disqualifying and because the claimant had adequate contact with the employer about her availability as required by statute, the separation from the employment was attributable to the employer. Benefits are allowed, except for the period from October 24 through November 27, 2010. She is overpaid benefits for those five weeks in the amount of \$780.00. The overpayment may be offset against future benefits claimed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
dml/kjw	