

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

**JATINDER KAUR**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 19A-UI-04263-S1-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CAREER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT CORP**  
Employer

**OC: 04/21/19**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit  
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Career Systems Development Corp (employer) appealed a representative's May 13, 2019, decision (reference 01) that concluded Jatinder Kaur (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 June 19, 2019. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where she could be reached and, therefore, did not participate. The employer was represented by Malia Maples, Hearings Representative, and participated by Lindsay Cale, Human Resources Manager, and Mark Douglas, Center Director. The employer offered and Exhibit 1 was received into evidence.

**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 claimant was hired on August 15, 2006, and at the end of her employment she was working as a full-time career development director in Ottumwa, Iowa.

The claimant asked to meet with the employer on March 8, 2019, to seek suggestions about how to rebuild trust with her team. She previously told her team she was selling her house in hopes of transferring/promoting into a job in Oklahoma. The claimant did not get the job and now said she was downsizing and moving into an apartment. She professed a desire to retire in the Ottumwa, Iowa, job.

On Wednesday, March 20, 2019, the employer asked to meet with the claimant for a status update on her ability to rebuild trust with her team. The claimant expressed she felt unsafe/insecure in the center. She did not provide any specific information other than "looks" she received. The claimant did not give the name of an employee who gave "looks". The employer sensed the claimant felt alone since a co-worker/friend was promoted to another location and she was not.

The claimant took approved vacation days on March 27, 28, and 29, 2019. On March 29, 2019, the claimant sent the employer an e-mail of resignation effective immediately. The claimant said, "With regret I have to take the decision to submit my resignation because racism, discrimination and intolerance and insensitivity, towards other races, cultures and ethnicities prevalent on center makes me feel unsafe and vulnerable." The employer was unaware of any instances of her complaint. Continued work was available for the claimant had she not separated from employment.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of April 21, 2019. She received \$2,802.00 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer participated personally at the fact finding interview on May 9, 2019, by Lindsay Cale and Mark Douglas.

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

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(4) 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:

(4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). The claimant's intention to voluntarily leave work was evidenced by her words and actions. She told the employer she was leaving and quit work. The law presumes a claimant has left employment with good cause when she quits because of intolerable or detrimental working conditions. 871 IAC 24.26(4).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(21) 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:

(21) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the work environment.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(13) 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:

(13) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the wages but knew the rate of pay when hired.

When an employee quits work because she is dissatisfied with the work environment or because she is dissatisfied with her wages and knew the rate of pay when hired, her leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because she wanted a different job even though she knew the job she was hired for. She did not provide the employer with any specific problems in her work environment. Employee who receives reasonable expectation of assistance from employer after complaining about working conditions must complain further if conditions persist in order to preserve eligibility for benefits. *Polley v. Gopher Bearing Company*, 478 N.W.2d 775 (Minn. App. 1991). The claimant only provided vague complaints once during her employment and quit shortly thereafter. The employer could not correct any issues without knowing the specific problem. Her leaving was without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness

with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that she was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative's May 13, 2019, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that she was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/rvs