IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section 1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319 **DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**

68-0157 (7-97) - 3091078 - EI

KAK R THOAN $1423 - 7^{TH} ST$ **PERRY IA 50220**

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC c/o TALX UC EXPRESS **PO BOX 283** ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-12623-RT

OC: 10-31-04 R: 02 Claimant: Appellant (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor-Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

- The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
- A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken
- 3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)	
(Decision Dated & Mailed)	

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant, Kak R. Thoan, filed a timely appeal from an unemployment insurance decision dated November 22, 2004, reference 01, denying unemployment insurance benefits to him. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held on December 22, 2004, with the claimant participating. Terry Carmichael, Community Liaison, participated in the hearing for the employer, Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc. Mike Cleaver, Training Coordinator, was available to testify for the employer but not called because his testimony would have been repetitive and The administrative law judge takes official notice of Iowa Workforce unnecessary. Development unemployment insurance records for the claimant.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed by the employer as a full-time production worker and interpreter from August 18, 2003 until he voluntarily separated from his employment on October 5, 2004. The claimant was incarcerated from September 27, 2004 until November 2, 2004 for matters unrelated to his employment or his employer. During the first five working days following the date of his incarceration, the claimant was absent from work and did not notify the employer. The employer treated the claimant as abandoning his job and treated the claimant as a quit. The claimant had never expressed any concerns to the employer about his working conditions, nor had he ever indicated or announced an intention to quit if any of his concerns were not addressed by the employer. Since being released from jail the claimant has placed no restrictions on his ability to work, nor has he placed any restrictions on his availability for work and he is earnestly and actively seeking work.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The questions presented by this appeal are as follows:

- 1. Whether the claimant's separation from employment was a disqualifying event. It was.
- 2. Whether the claimant is ineligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he is and was at relevant times not able, available, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The claimant is not ineligible for benefits for this reason.

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(16) 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 lowa 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 lowa 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:

(16) The claimant is deemed to have left if such claimant becomes incarcerated.

The first issue to be resolved is the character of the separation. The employer maintains that the claimant voluntarily quit when he was incarcerated and was absent from work and did not notify the employer. The claimant does not seem to maintain any particular form of incarceration, but stated that he did go to jail. The claimant is deemed to have left his employment when he becomes incarcerated. Accordingly, the administrative law judge

concludes that the claimant left his employment voluntarily on October 5, 2004, because he was incarcerated. The issue then becomes whether the claimant left his employment without good cause attributable to the employer.

The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant has the burden to prove that he has left his employment with the employer herein with good cause attributable to the employer. See lowa Code section 96.6-2. The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant has failed to meet his burden of proof to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that he left his employment with the employer herein with good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant concedes that he was incarcerated from September 27, 2004 through November 2, 2004, and that the reason for his incarceration had nothing to do with his employment or his employer. This is not good cause attributable to the employer. There is no evidence that the claimant's working conditions were unsafe, unlawful, intolerable or detrimental, or that he was subjected to a substantial change in his contract of hire. There is also no evidence that the claimant ever expressed any concerns to the employer about his working conditions or indicated or announced an intention to guit if any of his concerns were not addressed by the employer. Accordingly, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant left his employment voluntarily without good cause attributable to the employer and, as a consequence, he is disqualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits. Unemployment insurance benefits are denied to the claimant until or unless he requalifies for such benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.4-3 provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant has the burden of proof to show that he is able, available, and earnestly and actively seeking work under lowa Code section 96.4-3 or is otherwise excused. New Homestead v. lowa Department of Job Service, 322 N.W.2d 269 (lowa 1982). The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant has met his burden of proof to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that he is and was, at relevant times, able, available, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The claimant testified that he had placed no restrictions on his ability to work, nor had he placed any restrictions on his availability for work. The claimant also testified that he was earnestly and actively seeking work. The claimant did not file for unemployment insurance benefits until an effective date of October 31, 2004, which followed his release from incarceration. Accordingly, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant is able, available, and earnestly and actively seeking work and is not ineligible for that reason. However, as noted above, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant is disqualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he left his employment voluntarily without good cause attributable to the employer

DECISION:

The representative's decision dated November 22, 2004, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant, Kak R. Thoan, is not entitled to receive unemployment insurance benefits until or unless he requalifies for such benefits, because he left his employment voluntarily without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant is able, available, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

b/tjc