

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

OPHELIA CLEMONS
Claimant

SEATON LLC
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-02526-DG-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 02/12/17
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1)d – Voluntary Quitting/Illness or Injury
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(35) – Separation Due to Illness or Injury

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 27, 2017, (reference 01) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on March 29, 2017. Claimant participated. Employer failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on January 20, 2017. Claimant quit on that date because she believed her work environment was exacerbating her medical condition.

The claimant was employed as a full-time packing laborer beginning on December 5, 2015 through January 20, 2017 when she quit. Claimant suffers from asthma and has been receiving treatment for that illness for years. Claimant was having difficulty breathing and she sought medical attention during the fall of 2016. She did not receive a doctor's note that suggested she should quit her employment at that time.

Claimant continued having issues with her asthma through December, 2016. Claimant did not seek additional care during that time. In January, 2017 her asthmatic symptoms became worse and claimant believed she should quit at that time. Claimant requested a different job assignment from her employer, but other work was not available.

On January 20, 2017 claimant decided it was in her best interest to quit. She did not seek additional medical treatment or a doctor's note prior to resigning from the employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was separated from the employment without good cause attributable to employer.

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.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1)d 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. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

- d. The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(35) 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:

(35) The claimant left because of illness or injury which was not caused or aggravated by the employment or pregnancy and failed to:

- a. Obtain the advice of a licensed and practicing physician;
- b. Obtain certification of release for work from a licensed and practicing physician;
- c. Return to the employer and offer services upon recovery and certification for work by a licensed and practicing physician; or
- d. Fully recover so that the claimant could perform all of the duties of the job.

The court in *Gilmore v. Empl. Appeal Bd.*, 695 N.W.2d 44 (Iowa Ct. App. 2004) noted that:

"Insofar as the Employment Security Law is not designed to provide health and disability insurance, only those employees who experience illness-induced separations that can fairly be attributed to the employer are properly eligible for unemployment benefits." *White v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 487 N.W.2d 342, 345 (Iowa 1992) (citing *Butts v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 328 N.W.2d 515, 517 (Iowa 1983)).

The statute provides an exception where:

The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the

necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and ... the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible. Iowa Code § 96.5(1)(d).

Section 96.5(1)(d) specifically requires that the employee has recovered from the illness or injury, and this recovery has been certified by a physician. The exception in section 96.5(1)(d) only applies when an employee is fully recovered and the employer has not held open the employee's position. *White*, 487 N.W.2d at 346; *Hedges v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 368 N.W.2d 862, 867 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985); see also *Geiken, supra* (noting the full recovery standard of section 96.5(1)(d)).

The statute specifically requires that the employee has recovered from the illness or injury, and this recovery has been certified by a physician. The exception in section 96.5(1)(d) only applies when an employee is *fully* recovered and the employer has not held open the employee's position. *White*, 487 N.W.2d at 346; *Hedges v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 368 N.W.2d 862, 867 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985); see also *Geiken v. Lutheran Home for the Aged Ass'n.*, 468 N.W.2d 223, 226 (Iowa 1991) (noting the full recovery standard of section 96.5(1)(d)). In the Gilmore case he was not fully recovered from his injury and was unable to show that he fell within the exception of section 96.5(1)(d). Therefore, because his injury was not connected to his employment and he had not fully recovered, he was considered to have voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer and was not entitled to unemployment benefits. See *White*, 487 N.W.2d at 345; *Shontz*, 248 N.W.2d at 91.

Claimant did not present evidence in writing to employer that a physician suggested leaving the employment prior to the separation. Employer was not given an opportunity to find the claimant other employment based on a medical opinion prior to her resignation. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The February 27, 2017, (reference 01) decision is affirmed. Claimant quit her employment without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as she works in and has been paid wages equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Duane L. Golden
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/