

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

ERIC M HAGEN

Claimant

APPEAL 15A-UI-02149-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

KINGLAND SYSTEMS CORP

Employer

OC: 01/25/15

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Leaving
Iowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the February 6, 2015, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 18, 2015. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Shanna York, Human Resources Generalist and Deb Blaser-Gretillat, Managing Director of Human Resources. Department Exhibit D-1 was entered and received into the record. Employer's Exhibit One was entered and received into the record.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant file a timely appeal?

Did the claimant voluntarily quit his employment without good cause attributable to the employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as an employee systems operator in the control system beginning on March 17, 2014 through January 16, 2015 when he voluntarily quit.

The claimant received the fact-finder's decision a few days after it was mailed to him on February 6, 2015. He had ample opportunity to file a timely appeal but did not do so due to an electrical fire in his house and he forgot about his appeal. The claimant faxed in his appeal on February 17, but it was due on February 16. February 16 was not a state holiday. The claimant did not file a timely appeal.

The claimant voluntarily quit his employment because he thought he was being subjected to a hostile work environment. He was not. The employer had instituted progressive discipline for the claimant because he was failing to properly perform his job duties. The claimant thought his supervisor should give him additional training, but the employer chose to have two other employees train him. It was not up to the claimant to decide who should provide his training.

The claimant wanted his supervisor to respond to his emails in a particular way. It was not up to the claimant to decide how the supervisor or when the supervisor should respond to his e-mails.

The claimant was not given a disciplinary warning in front of other employees. While being given his final written warning on November 18, 2014, when another employee entered the area, the discussion stopped. It was not unreasonable for the claimant's supervisor to tell him when he returned from a leave that he wanted to discuss issues or concerns with him.

The claimant made no complaints to anyone about a hostile work environment until his exit interview. His allegation that he could not go to the head of human resources because she was on the board of directors is simply not believable as she is not on the board of directors.

Continued work was available for the claimant if he had not quit.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant's appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. *Gaskins v.*

Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev., 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Board of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The Iowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. *Hendren v. IESC*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to 871 IAC 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

Should a higher authority find the claimant's appeal timely, the administrative law judge enters the following conclusions with respect to the claimant's separation from his employment.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily left the employment without good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(22), (26), (33) 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:

(22) The claimant left because of a personality conflict with the supervisor.

(26) The claimant left to go to school.

(33) The claimant left because such claimant felt that the job performance was not to the satisfaction of the employer; provided, the employer had not requested the claimant to leave and continued work was available.

The claimant has not established a hostile, intolerable or detrimental work environment. No work place is perfect, but the claimant's issues, do not rise to the level to give good rise to the employer for him leaving his employment. He was not harassed or subjected to a hostile work environment.

Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). 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).

While claimant's decision to quit may have been based upon good personal reasons it was not a good-cause reason attributable to the employer for leaving the employment. Benefits must be denied.

DECISION:

The February 6, 2015 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant did not file a timely appeal. The claimant voluntarily left his employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs