

Notwithstanding the circumstances under which claimant's employment was terminated as aforesaid, claimant insisted at the hearing that she had become involuntarily unemployed, contending that the leave of absence had been granted on the initiative of the employer and that she was not desirous of obtaining a leave of absence. She insisted that she could have continued in the employment if the employer had permitted and that in that event she would have used taxicabs to travel to and from work.

Claimant had advised the insurance office and employment office representatives repeatedly that she could not give consideration to the acceptance of any employment other than homework because she was without any means of transportation to enable her to commute to any place of possible employment. There are no public transportation facilities operating out of Haines Falls. Persons residing in that area usually operate their own automobiles or share rides in traveling to and from work. Although claimant is qualified for various phases of clerical work, she made no effort whatever to ascertain whether there were any opportunities for the procurement of such work by her in the village of Haines Falls during the period at issue. She inquired about employment as librarian in two other communities of Greene County but when she made such inquiries she had no means of traveling to and from those libraries in the event work were offered to her. On one occasion she was offered employment at the library in a village in Greene County other than Haines Falls but claimant refused such offer because of her lack of transportation.

Claimant believed that she was qualified to do rewrite work or work as a ghost writer, and she believed that work of that nature would be performed by her at her home. She, therefore, concentrated her efforts on attempts to procure that type of work to be performed by her in her home. She made contact with various agents in New York City seeking assignments to do ghost writing or rewriting, but so far as she reported to the insurance office representatives, she obtained no such work except that she had indicated one day of work at home during April but refused to divulge the nature of the work or the identity of her employer. On or about May 15, claimant resumed work at the Haines Falls library. She resumed such work when the truck service commenced to operate.

OPINION: Claimant has variously claimed that she could have arranged for transportation to enable her to commute to and from work and that she had no transportation and, therefore, should not be deemed unavailable solely because the lack of transportation prevents her from engaging in work. On the basis of the credible evidence here adduced, I am convinced that claimant had no transportation available to enable her to engage in any employment anywhere including the village of Haines Falls. Her contention that she was not without transportation when her employment was terminated in January, and that she was prepared to continue in the employment, has not been sustained. Irrespective of who may have initiated the idea of the leave of absence, the fact nevertheless remains that claimant accepted the leave of absence without protest. If, as she now contends, she was anxious to continue at work and was not compelled to leave the job because of lack of transportation, it is reasonable to assume that she would have made those facts known to the employer and would have informed the employer that it was not necessary for her to have a leave of absence because she could get to and from work either by taxicab or otherwise. The evidence indicates that claimant gave no such information to the employer. I, therefore, conclude that the cessation of work by claimant in January was voluntary and stemmed from her inability to arrange for transportation.

(continued)