

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

STACIA L PATTEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-05797-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

JELD-WEN INC
Employer

OC: 07/13/08
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Jeld-Wen (employer) appealed a representative's April 2, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded Stacia Patten (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for May 11, 2009. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer was represented by Barbara Hamilton, Hearings Representative, and participated by Eric Pederson, Production Manager, and Kelly Willett, Interior Manager. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

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 March 26, 2009, as a full-time interior cart stocker. On March 16, 17 and 18, the claimant did not appear for work and did not call to inform the employer of the reason for the failure to appear for work. The employer has a policy that an employee will be considered to have quit if the employee is absent for three days without giving notice to the employer. The claimant was considered to have quit on March 18, 2009, for failing to appear for work without notice for three days.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge finds the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

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.

The claimant was absent from work for three days without giving notice to the employer. The employer has a rule that if the employee is absent without notice to the employer for three days the employee is deemed to have voluntarily quit. The claimant is deemed to have voluntarily quit based on her absence from work for three days without giving notice to the employer. There is no evidence of good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. 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.

b. (1) 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. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The claimant has received benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits may now constitute an overpayment. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

DECISION:

The representative's April 2, 2009 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 issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs