

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

STYLIANOS N ORFANOS

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-05869-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SAC & FOX TRIBE

Employer

OC: 05/11/14

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Sac & Fox Tribe (employer) appealed a representative's May 30, 2014, decision (reference 01) that concluded Stylianos Orfanos (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 1, 2014. The claimant was represented by Barry Kaplan, Attorney at Law, and participated personally. The employer participated by Lucie Roberts, Human Resources Director; Brian Ehrig, Executive Chef; and Michael Matney, Sous Chef. The employer offered and Exhibits One and Two were received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on July 31, 2012, as a full-time cook. The supervisor thought the claimant was a good worker but had a temper and abused other workers. The claimant did not follow rules and the claimant became upset when other employees questioned him. If a worker questioned the claimant, the claimant became angry. The supervisor had to step between workers from time to time. The claimant sometimes threatened to quit or walked off the job but always returned. On May 18, 2013, the claimant became upset with a co-worker and the supervisor had to step between the two.

The claimant did not like working with co-worker, Anton. The claimant thought Anton's behavior was threatening and the claimant complained to the employer frequently about Anton. On March 21, 2014, the claimant yelled at a co-worker for not keeping enough food on the line but the claimant did not tell Anton food was running low. Anton was angry the claimant did not talk to him directly. Anton had words with the claimant. He raised his fists and asked the claimant to show him what he had. The claimant complained to the employer and the employer issued Anton a reprimand. Anton never bothered the claimant again.

On April 28, 2014, the claimant completed a Voluntary Resignation form effective May 12, 2014. The claimant said he was quitting for personal reasons and hoped the door would be open him in the future. He said he was pleased working for the employer. The claimant worked through May 12, 2014. Continued work was available had the claimant not resigned.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of May 11, 2014. He received \$2,208.00 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer participated personally at the fact-finding interview on May 29, 2014, by Lucie Roberts.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the 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 Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(21) 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:

(21) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the work environment.

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). The claimant's intention to voluntarily leave work was evidenced by his words and actions. He told the employer that he was leaving and quit work. When an employee quits work because he is dissatisfied with the work environment, His leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because he did not like his work environment. His leaving was without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in

the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code section 96.3-7-a, -b.

871 IAC 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 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa Code section 96.3(7)“b” as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid \$2,208.00 in unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative’s May 30, 2014, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant’s weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid \$2,208.00 in unemployment insurance benefits.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css