# IOWA DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION, UI APPEALS BUREAU

MICHELLE MIESEN

Claimant

APPEAL 22A-UI-11027-CS-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**CATHOLIC HEALTH INITIATIVES** 

Employer

OC: 07/04/21

Claimant: Appellant (2)

lowa Code §96.5(2)a-Discharge/Misconduct

lowa Code §96.5(1)- Voluntary Quit

lowa Code § 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On April 30, 2022, the claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the August 30, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based on claimant voluntarily quitting on May 26, 2021. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 15, 2022. The hearing was held together with appeals 22A-Ul-11025-CS-T and 22A-Ul-11026-CS-T, and combined into one record. Claimant participated. Employer did not participate. Administrative notice was taken of claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records.

## **ISSUES:**

- I. Is claimant's appeal timely?
- II. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on August 30, 2021. The reference 01 decision found claimant was denied benefits as of May 26, 2021, because the lowa Work Force Development Representative found claimant had voluntarily quit work because of a nonwork-related illness or injury. Claimant did not receive the decision. Claimant became aware of the decision when she received an overpayment decision dated April 21, 2022. The appeal was filed April 30, 2022.

Claimant began working for employer on January 31, 2016. Claimant last worked as a full-time Registered Nurse. Beginning on October 1, 2020, claimant went on a leave of absence so she could have reconstructive hip surgery. Claimant's hip issues where not due to her employer. The employer agreed to claimant's leave of absence. Claimant was on a leave of absence and then

came back to work in January and February 2021. Claimant performed office work for the employer when she returned. Claimant then went back on her leave of absence again so she could have a second surgery due to having complications from her first surgery.

Claimant returned to work for the employer in May 2021. Claimant was put on a work restriction by her doctor that she could only work four hour shifts. After a period of time she would gradually build up to returning to work her normal twelve hour shifts. The employer accommodated her request for a few of her shifts. On May 26, 2021, claimant was terminated from her position because the employer could no longer accommodated her work restriction.

The employer had an on call nursing position open that claimant was able to fill.

Claimant had no prior verbal or written warnings prior to her discharge.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the appellant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

lowa Code section 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disgualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsections 10 and 11, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The appellant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The claimant timely appealed the overpayment decision, which was the first notice of disqualification. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

The next issue that must be determined is if claimant's separation disqualifies her from receiving benefits. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant did not quit but was effectively discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

lowa Code section 96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits: 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.

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 (lowa 1980).

Claimant was restricted by her doctor to work a reduced schedule and to work up to working twelve-hour shifts. The employer accommodated the restriction for a brief period of time. Claimant was called into a meeting and was informed the employer could not longer accommodate her work restriction. Claimant was informed that she was discharged. As a result, claimant did not voluntarily quit but was discharged.

Next it must be determined if claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct. The administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reasons.

lowa Code § 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

- (1) Definition.
- a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the lowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (lowa 1979).

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.871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits

related to that separation. The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (lowa Ct. App. 1988). A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

In this case there was no final act of misconduct that the claimant committed that would disqualify her from receiving benefits. The employer did not prove that claimant was in violation of any rule or policy.

The next issue that must be determined is if claimant is able and available for work effective May 26, 2021. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant is able to work and available for work, effective May 26, 2021.

lowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(1)a provides:

Benefits 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.

(1) Able to work. An individual must be physically and mentally able to work in some gainful employment, not necessarily in the individual's customary occupation, but which is engaged in by others as a means of livelihood.

a. *Illness, injury or pregnancy.* Each case is decided upon an individual basis, recognizing that various work opportunities present different physical requirements. A statement from a medical practitioner is considered prima facie evidence of the physical ability of the individual to perform the work required. A pregnant individual must meet the same criteria for determining ableness as do all other individuals.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(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. Since, under unemployment insurance laws, it is the availability of an individual that is required to be tested, the labor market must be described in terms of the individual. A labor market for an individual means a market for the type of service which the individual offers in the geographical area in which the individual offers the service. Market in that sense does not mean that job vacancies must exist; the purpose of unemployment insurance is to compensate for lack of job vacancies. It means only that the type of services which an individual is offering is generally performed in the geographical area in which the individual is offering the services.

To be able to work, "[a]n individual must be physically and mentally able to work in some gainful employment, not necessarily in the individual's customary occupation, but which is engaged in by others as a means of livelihood." Sierra v. Employment Appeal Board, 508 N.W.2d 719, 721 (lowa 1993); Geiken v. Lutheran Home for the Aged, 468 N.W.2d 223 (lowa 1991); lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(1). "An evaluation of an individual's ability to work for the purposes of determining that individual's eligibility for unemployment benefits must necessarily take into consideration the economic and legal forces at work in the general labor market in which the individual resides." Sierra at 723. This means that when evaluating whether a person with a protected disability is able and available to work we must take into account the reasonable accommodation requirements imposed on employers under federal, state, and local laws. *Id.* Code § 216.6 (previously 601A.6) requires employers to make "reasonable accommodations" for employees with disabilities. Reasonable accommodation is required only to the extent that refusal to provide some accommodation would be discrimination itself. Reasonableness is a flexible standard measured in terms of an employee's needs and desires and by economic and other realities faced by the employer. Sierra v. Emp't Appeal Bd., 508 N.W.2d 719 (lowa 1993). See also, Foods, Inc. v. Iowa Civil Rights Commin, 318 N.W.2d 162 (lowa 1982) and Cerro Gordo Care Facility v. Iowa Civil Rights Comm'n, 401 N.W.2d 192 (lowa 1987).

Some employees with restrictions will be disabled and thus protected by the lowa Civil Rights Act and the American's with Disabilities Act. Although disabled these employees may still be "able and available" if reasonable accommodation by employers would make them so. *Sierra v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 508 N.W.2d 719, 721 (lowa 1993). The employee is not automatically be deemed to be unduly restricted from employment under lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)m.

Claimant had a work restriction that prohibited her from working more than a four-hour shift. The restriction provided that claimant would gradually work towards working her normal twelve-hour shift. Claimant was able to perform the duties of her nursing job but in shorter shifts. Claimant also testified that she could perform office work and other jobs as long as they were in four-hour increments. Claimant has established that she is able to and available for work effective May 26, 2021. Benefits are allowed effective May 23, 2021.

## **DECISION:**

Claimant's appeal is timely.

The August 30, 2021, reference 01, decision is REVERSED. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is able to work and available for work effective May 23, 2021. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Carly Smith

Administrative Law Judge

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

August 17, 2022

Decision Dated and Mailed

cs/mh

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 4<sup>th</sup> Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

#### AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at low a Code §17A.19, which is online at <a href="https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf">https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf</a> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <a href="https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/">https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/</a>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a law yer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a law yer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

#### SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

#### UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de low a §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

#### SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.