IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

SHALISA F BARBER

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-07537-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

MAINSTREAM LIVING INC

Employer

OC: 05/24/09

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Shalisa Barber (claimant) appealed a representative's June 30, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she voluntarily quit work with Mainstream Living (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for June 16, 2010. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Marcanne Lynch, Human Resources Director, and Erica Voll, Team Leader. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal was filed in a timely manner and, if so, 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 April 1, 2008, as a full-time supported living technician. The claimant complained once of a moldy smell in a facility. The employer transferred her to another facility. The claimant complained once about another employee and the employer took care of the situation. The employee left work with the employer. The claimant worked full time through January 9, 2009. From January 9 through March 14, 2009, the claimant's hours were reduced because she requested time off.

On March 9, 2009, the claimant told the employer she was quitting effective March 27, 2009, because she was moving to Georgia and seeking different employment. The employer offered the claimant the opportunity to tell the claimant about any concerns she had at work but the claimant did not offer any information. The claimant worked through March 27, 2009. She moved to Georgia on April 2, 2009. Continued work was available had the claimant not resigned.

A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's address of record on June 30, 2009. The claimant did not receive the decision. The claimant received an overpayment decision dated April 23, 2010, which was her first notice of the disqualification decision

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Iowa 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. The 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 disqualified 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, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disgualified 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 claimant 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 Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 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 is whether the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer. The administrative law judge concludes she did.

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.

871 IAC 24.25(2) and (21) provide:

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:

- (2) The claimant moved to a different locality.
- (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 her words and actions. She told the employer that she was leaving and quit work. When an employee quits work because she is moving to a different location, her leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. Likewise, when an employee quits work because she is dissatisfied with the work environment, her leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because she was moving to a different locality and she was dissatisfied with her environment of bickering her co-workers created. Her leaving was without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The representative's June 30, 2009 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant's appeal is timely. 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.

Beth A. Scheetz	
Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	