## **IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT** UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-00826-S2T **TROY M STEENSEN** Claimant ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION WEB GRAPHICS INC Employer

Section 96.5-3-a – Refusal of Suitable Work

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Web Graphics (employer) appealed a representative's January 13, 2015, decision (reference 05) that concluded Troy Steensen (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 February 12, 2015. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated by Ken Hanson, Owner.

### **ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant refused an offer of suitable work.

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on July 21, 2014, as a salesman. The claimant was separated from employment on October 29, 2014. The claimant filed his claim for unemployment insurance benefits on October 26, 2014. On December 11, 2014, the employer heard that the claimant refused a job with KMEG.

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

The issue is whether the claimant refused an offer of suitable work. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he did not.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.24(1)a provides:

(1) Bona fide offer of work.

a. In deciding whether or not a claimant failed to accept suitable work, or failed to apply for suitable work, it must first be established that a bona fide offer of work was made to the individual by personal contact or that a referral was offered to the claimant by

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

OC: 06/29/14 Claimant: Respondent (1)R personal contact to an actual job opening and a definite refusal was made by the individual. For purposes of a recall to work, a registered letter shall be deemed to be sufficient as a personal contact.

No offer of work was made to the claimant by this employer. The claimant is qualified to receive benefits because no offer of suitable work was made to the claimant.

The issue of whether the claimant refused suitable work by another employer is remanded for determination.

# **DECISION:**

The representative's January 13, 2015, decision (reference 05) is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive benefits. The issue of whether the claimant refused suitable work by another employer is remanded for determination.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs