IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

LISA M LIVINGSTON

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-07236-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

DOLLAR TREE STORES INC

Employer

OC: 06/05/16

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits 871 IA Admin. Code 24(10) – Employer Participation in Fact Finding Iowa Code § 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated June 22, 2016, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on July 19, 2016. Employer participated by Eric Mansmith. Claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant guit for good cause attributable to employer?

Whether claimant was overpaid benefits?

If claimant was overpaid benefits, should claimant repay benefits or should employer be charged due to employer's participation or lack thereof in fact finding?

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 April 4, 2016. Claimant quit on April 4, 2016 because of dissatisfaction claimant had with the store manager and corporate's unwillingness to allow claimant to transfer stores.

Claimant complained to the corporate office about her treatment by her store manager, whom she said harassed her and called her a "retard." A corporate representative came down and interviewed all employees. Claimant's store manager was told that he needed to calm down. All of this happened in late February.

Claimant had requested that she be transferred to another store. She was not able to be transferred as the store manager had written up claimant for incorrect actions regarding assignments.

It is unknown whether claimant has received unemployment benefits in this matter as claimant did not participate in the hearing.

The employer did substantially participate in fact finding through participation in the phone call.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa 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.

Iowa 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. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

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

An administrative law judge examining a voluntary quit matter must determine whether claimant quit for good cause. "Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. <u>Uniweld Products v. Industrial Relations Commission</u>, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. App. 1973). Each case must turn around its own facts. <u>Wolfe v. IUCC</u>, 232 Iowa 1254 7 N.W.2d 799 (Iowa 1943).

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence established that claimant voluntarily quit for good cause attributable to employer when claimant terminated the employment relationship because she was harassed by employer. As employer offered the only evidence, employer's statements regarding investigations by the corporate office which resulted in the statement that the store manager needed to calm down carry great weight. This was added to the fact that claimant requested to transfer to another store, but was not allowed to transfer because the same store manager that called claimant a "retard" also wrote up claimant for not doing her job. This situation creates a good cause for claimant to voluntarily quit her employment.

The overpayment issue is moot.

The issue of employer participation is moot.

DECISION:

bab/pjs

The decision of the representative dated June 22, 2016, reference 01, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

Blair A. Bennett Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	