# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEM PLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

**YVETTE JACKSON** 

Claimant

**APPEAL 21A-UI-17189-LJ-T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

R C CASINO LLC

Employer

OC: 04/11/21

Claimant: Respondent (2R)

lowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit from Employment lowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer Participation in Fact-Finding

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On August 5, 2021, employer R. C. Casino, L.L.C., filed an appeal from the July 30, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on a determination that claimant's separation on February 6, 2021, was not disqualifying. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephonic hearing was held at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 28, 2021. The claimant, Yvette Jackson, did not register a telephone number and did not participate. The employer, R. C. Casino, L.L.C., participated through Courtney Remley, HR Business Partner. No exhibits were offered or admitted into the record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

# **ISSUES:**

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer? Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived? Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

# **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed part time, most recently as a server, from November 6, 2017, until May 25, 2021, when she guit by failing to return to work following a leave of absence.

Claimant last worked a shift for the employer on January 22, 2021. After that day, claimant went on leave related to COVID-19. Claimant remained on approved leave through some date in May 2021. In May, the employer began calling her and sending her text messages, and claimant refused to respond to these contacts. Claimant was not speaking to the employer, and she had not returned to work after the expiration of her leave of absence. Therefore, the employer considered her to have voluntarily quit her employment. Remley stated that to date, claimant still has not made contact with the employer.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$3,312.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of April 11, 2021, for the sixteen weeks ending July 31, 2021. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. The fact-finding documents indicate the agency was not able to make contact with the employer for the interview.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

lowa 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.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)j(1) and (2) provides:

Benefit eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

- (2) Available for work. The availability requirement is satisfied when an individual is willing, able, and ready to accept suitable work which the individual does not have good cause to refuse, that is, the individual is genuinely attached to the labor market...
- j. Leave of absence. A leave of absence negotiated with the consent of both parties, employer and employee, is deemed a period of voluntary unemployment for the employee-individual, and the individual is considered ineligible for benefits for the period.
- (1) If at the end of a period or term of negotiated leave of absence the employer fails to reemploy the employee-individual, the individual is considered laid off and eligible for benefits.
- (2) If the employee-individual fails to return at the end of the leave of absence and subsequently becomes unemployed the individual is considered as having voluntarily quit and therefore is ineligible for benefits.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(20) 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:

(20) The claimant left for compelling personal reasons; however, the period of absence exceeded ten working days.

Here, the evidence in the record establishes that claimant went on a voluntary leave of absence in January 2021. This leave of absence was related somehow to COVID-19. Claimant's leave of absence expired in May 2021. Claimant refused contact with the employer in May 2021 and did not report back to work at the expiration of her leave of absence. While she may have had good personal reasons for failing to go back to work, there is no evidence in the record indicating she had a good-cause reason that is fairly attributable to the employer. Benefits must be withheld.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. lowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b, 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) (a) 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. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.
- (b) 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.
- (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.

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 lowa Code section 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 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa Code section 96.3(7) "b" as amended by 2008 lowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. 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. lowa Code § 96.3(7), lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits.

Here, the employer did not participate in the fact-finding process with the agency. Since the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall be charged.

Based on the dates when claimant received unemployment insurance benefits, it appears she would have received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation ("FPUC") benefits to which she would not be entitled, based on her separation from employment. This matter will be remanded for calculation of an overpayment of FPUC benefits.

## **DECISION:**

The July 30, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant separated from 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 has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$3,312.00 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

## **REMAND:**

The determination of claimant's overpayment of FPUC benefits is remanded to the Benefits Bureau of lowa Workforce Development.

Elizabeth A. Johnson

Administrative Law Judge

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

October 1, 2021

**Decision Dated and Mailed** 

lj/mh