## BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD

Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

CHRISTIANA PENNINGTON

**HEARING NUMBER:** 17BUI-12122

Claimant

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD** 

DECISION

**ANJOY INC** 

and

**Employer** 

## NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a request for a REHEARING is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within 20 days of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION:** 96.5-1

## DECISION

## **UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED**

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

The Employment Appeal Board would comment that quitting to take care of the Claimant's boyfriend does not come under one of the legally recognized exceptions (...quitting for the sole purpose of taking care of a family member), as a boyfriend is not included in the definition of a family member. See, 871 IAC 24.26(8) Additionally, the Board would note that the Claimant's quit occurred on September 17, **2016**.

Lastly, the Claimant submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the

admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by the Claimant was not presented at hearing. Accordingly all the new and additional information submitted has not been relied upon in making our decision, and has received no weight whatsoever, but rather has been wholly disregarded.

Kim D. Schmett	
Ashley R. Koopmans	
James M. Strohman	

AMG/fnv