

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ANGELINA M JACOBSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-10686-MT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SALLY BEAUTY SUPPLY LLC
Employer

OC: 06/27/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated July 21, 2010, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on September 15, 2010. Employer participated by Janet Goodell, Manager. Claimant responded to the hearing notice and did not participate, as she did not answer the telephone on either of the two calls made to her number. Claimant called in after the hearing was over to request participation. Claimant thought that her telephone might not have been working. Claimant indicated that it may have done this before. Claimant had no proof of telephone malfunction. Furthermore, if claimant had a similar issue, she was on notice to solve the problem prior to her hearing. Claimant was also instructed by the Appeals Bureau to call if not contacted within five minutes of the start of hearing. Claimant was given an 800 number to call. Claimant asserts that the number was busy on at least five of her calls. The 800 number does not have a busy signal, instead callers are transferred into a recording and told that their call will be answered in order of receipt. Claimant called after the hearing was over at about 13 minutes after the hour.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on June 20, 2010. Claimant missed three days of work in a row without calling in. Claimant started missing work June 22, 2010 and never came back to offer herself for further employment. Employer's policy deems three no call absences as a voluntary quit.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has failed to establish that claimant voluntarily quit for good cause attributable to employer when claimant terminated the

employment relationship because she missed three days of work in a row without calling in. This is job abandonment and not a quit for good cause attributable to employer.

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 24.25(4) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

871 IAC 26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals section with the names and telephone numbers of its witnesses by the scheduled time of the hearing, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

At issue is a request to reopen the record made after the hearing had concluded. The request to reopen the record is denied because the party making the request failed to participate by reading and following the instructions on the hearing notice.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated July 21, 2010, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. Claimant's request to reopen the record is denied.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/kjw