# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

**JAYNE M LASOVICH** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-09780-DGT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

MOBILIS HOME MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

Employer

OC: 08/07/16

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 - Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated September 1, 2016, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on September 26, 2016. Employer participated by Trisha Gillespie, Vice President. Claimant did not answer when called on multiple occasions and did not participate.

### ISSUES:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer. Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived? Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?

## **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 August 8, 2016.

Claimant had an altercation with a co-worker on or about August 8, 2016. Claimant spoke with Ms. Gillespie on that date and indicated that she no longer wanted to work for employer, and that she wanted to work someplace else. Employer accepted claimant's oral resignation at that time. Claimant was taken to her desk and allowed to box up her personal items, and then she was escorted from the building. There was work available to her at that time.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$2,235.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of August 7, 2016, for the Six weeks ending September 17, 2016. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview.

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

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has failed to establish that claimant voluntarily quit for good cause attributable to employer when claimant terminated the employment relationship because she was having difficulties with a co-worker.

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 Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(6) and (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 lowa 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 lowa 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:

- (6) The claimant left as a result of an inability to work with other employees.
- (21) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the work environment.

Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). 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).

Individuals who leave their employment due to disparate treatment are considered to have left work due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions and their leaving is deemed to be for good cause attributable to the employer. The test is whether a reasonable person would have quit under the circumstances. See *Aalbers v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 431 N.W.2d 330 (lowa 1988) and *O'Brien v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (lowa 1993).

While claimant's leaving the employment may have been based upon good personal reasons, it was not for a good-cause reason attributable to the employer. Benefits must be denied.

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. 871-24.10 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

### **DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated September 1, 2016, reference 01, is reversed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid

Appeal No. 16A-UI-09780-DGT

wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,235.00, and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

Duane L. Golden Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/pjs