IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

SIERRA A JUNGBLUT

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-15318-S2-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

PETSMART INC

Employer

OC: 04/04/21

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quit

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

PL 116-136 – Federal Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the June 28, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a finding that claimant was discharged but there was no evidence willful or deliberate misconduct. A hearing was scheduled for August 30, 2021, after due notice was issued. Employer requested the hearing be rescheduled due to witness unavailability. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 21, 2021. Claimant Sierra A. Jungblut did not register for the hearing and did not participate. Employer Petsmart, Inc. participated through store leader Bryce Freidrich. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Is the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a pet groomer from February 20, 2020, and was separated from employment on March 21, 2021.

Employer has a policy in place which requires employees to call in if they are not going to be at work. There is also a policy in place which states that if employees are a no-call/no-show for three consecutive work days, they are considered to have abandoned their jobs and are separated from employment. Claimant was made aware of the policy upon hire.

Claimant left her shift early on March 13, 2021, without explanation. She called into work on Monday, March 15, 2021, and notified employer she would not be in due to weather. Claimant was scheduled to work March 16, 18, 19, and 20, 2021, but was absent from work without notifying employer each day. Employer reached out to claimant by telephone on March 16 and 18, 2021, and left voice messages, but received no return call from claimant. On Sunday, March 21, 2021, claimant came to the store and took her supplies and left without speaking to anyone. Claimant never returned to work. Continuing work was available for claimant and her job was not in jeopardy.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$8,874.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of April 4, 2021, for the eighteen weeks ending September 11, 2021, and Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) benefits in the amount of \$2,700 for the nine weeks ending June 5, 2021. Employer did not participate in a fact-finding interview because it received no notice.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes as follows:

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.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W. 2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). 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); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

In this case claimant was absent from work on the following dates: March 16, 18, 19, and 20, 2021. Claimant knew that she was supposed to report any absences prior to her scheduled shift start time. Claimant failed to report these absences in violation of the employer's policy.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(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 § 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 § 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.

An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. Inasmuch as the claimant failed to report for work or notify the employer for three consecutive workdays in violation of the employer policy, the claimant is considered to have voluntarily left employment without good cause attributable to the employer.

The next issue in this case is whether claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) provides, in pertinent part:

- 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.

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 § 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted 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 lowa Code § 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 § 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 § 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 lowa Code § 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 § 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes the claimant has been overpaid regular state unemployment insurance (UI) in the gross amount of \$8,874.00 for the eighteen weeks ending September 11, 2021. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

The administrative law judge further concludes the employer did not satisfactorily participate in the fact-finding interview pursuant to lowa Code \S 96.3(7), lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. The law states that an employer is to be charged if "the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits." lowa Code \S 96.3(7)(b)(1)(a).

Here, the employer did not receive the notice of fact-finding interview, and did not have notice to be available and participate in the fact-finding interview. Benefits were not allowed because the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to IWD's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. Instead, benefits were allowed because the employer did not receive proper notice to participate in the fact-finding interview. Employer thus cannot be charged. Since neither party is to be charged, any potential charges for this claim should be absorbed by the fund. Claimant does not have to repay the regular unemployment insurance benefits.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant was eligible for FPUC and whether claimant has been overpaid FPUC. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was not eligible for FPUC and was overpaid FPUC, which must be repaid.

PL116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

- (b) Provisions of Agreement
- (1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to
- (A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus
- (B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as "Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation").

. . . .

- (f) Fraud and Overpayments
- (2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...

Because claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits, he is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. While lowa law does not require a claimant to repay regular unemployment insurance benefits when the employer does not participate in the fact-finding interview, the CARES Act makes no such exception for the repayment of FPUC. Therefore, the determination of whether the claimant must repay FPUC does not hinge on the employer's participation in the fact-finding interview. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$2,700.00 for the nine weeks ending June 5, 2020. Claimant must repay these benefits.

DECISION:

The June 28, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left her employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid \$2,700.00 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation which must be repaid.

Claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$8,874.00 but does not have to repay the benefits. The employer was not given an opportunity to participate in the fact-finding interview; therefore, its account may not be charged for those benefits.



Stephanie Adkisson Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

September 23, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

sa/ol

NOTE TO CLAIMANT:

- This decision determines you have been overpaid FPUC benefits. If you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.
- You may also request a waiver of this overpayment. The written request must include the following information:
 - 1. Claimant name & address.
 - 2. Decision number/date of decision.
 - 3. Dollar amount of overpayment requested for waiver.
 - 4. Relevant facts that you feel would justify a waiver.
- The request should be sent to:

Iowa Workforce Development Overpayment waiver request 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, IA 50319

- This Information can also be found on the Iowa Workforce Development website at: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-overpayment-and-recovery.
- If this decision becomes final and you are not eligible for a waiver, you will have to repay the benefits you received.