

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**JEFFREY A KOPRIVA**  
Claimant

**CENTRAL IA LAWN & HOME CARE INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 19A-UI-08605-JC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 10/06/19  
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting  
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:**

The employer/appellant, Central Iowa Lawn and Home Care Inc., filed an appeal from the October 25, 2019 (reference 01) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on November 25, 2019. The claimant, Jeffrey A. Kopriva, participated. The employer participated through Marcia Hofsommer, office manager. Jason Hofsommer and E. Dean Hofsommer also testified.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Employer Exhibits 1-3 were admitted. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUES:**

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with 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:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a small engine mechanic and was separated from employment on July 26, 2019, when he quit the employment.

Prior to separation, the claimant informed the employer for months that he intended to quit the employment and move to Texas. The claimant did not pinpoint an exact date until summer of 2019, when he informed the employer his last day would coincide with the last Friday in July, which was July 26, 2019. The employer accepted the claimant’s resignation and hired his replacement while the claimant worked his resignation period, so that the claimant could train

him. After tendering his resignation, the claimant learned that due to family issues, he would not be able to move to Texas in July as planned. The employer did not rescind the resignation, but instead told the claimant that after July 26, 2019, work may be offered to him on an as needed basis.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$2,478.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of October 6, 2019. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview or make a witness with direct knowledge available for rebuttal. The employer held its mail in the week leading up to the fact-finding interview and then did not feel it had adequate time to prepare between October 22, 2019 (when the fact-finding notice was opened) and the October 24, 2019 fact-finding interview.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(37) 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:

(37) The claimant will be considered to have left employment voluntarily when such claimant gave the employer notice of an intention to resign and the employer accepted such resignation. This rule shall also apply to the claimant who was employed by an educational institution who has declined or refused to accept a new contract or reasonable assurance of work for a successive academic term or year and the offer of work was within the purview of the individual's training and experience.

The claimant has the burden of proof to establish he quit with good cause attributable to the employer, according to Iowa law. "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. *Uniweld Products v. Industrial Relations Commission*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. App. 1973). Ordinarily, "good cause" is derived from the facts of each case keeping in mind the public policy stated in Iowa Code section 96.2. *O'Brien v. EAB*, 494 N.W.2d 660, 662 (Iowa 1993)(citing *Wiese v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 389 N.W.2d 676, 680 (Iowa 1986)). "The term

encompasses real circumstances, adequate excuses that will bear the test of reason, just grounds for the action, and always the element of good faith.” *Wiese v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 389 N.W.2d 676, 680 (Iowa 1986) “[C]ommon sense and prudence must be exercised in evaluating all of the circumstances that lead to an employee’s quit in order to attribute the cause for the termination.” *Id.*

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness’s testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness’s appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness’s interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.* After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge finds the weight of the evidence in the record establishes claimant has not met his burden of proof to establish he quit for good cause reasons within Iowa law.

In this case, the claimant initiated the separation with the employer when he informed the employer he was quitting to move. The employer was reasonable in asking the claimant to select a final day of work so it could make staffing arrangements. The parties agreed on July 26, 2019 and the claimant worked through July 26, 2019. The employer also hired a new employee to work for after July 26, 2019 based upon accepting the claimant’s resignation. The administrative law judge recognizes that the claimant’s personal circumstances changed during the resignation and he could no longer move as planned, but the employer was not required to allow him to rescind the resignation or provide him work beyond July 26, 2019. The claimant may have had personally compelling reasons to tender his resignation but he has not established he quit for good cause attributable to the employer according to Iowa law. Accordingly, benefits are denied.

**The next issues to address are whether the claimant must repay the benefits he received and whether the employer’s account is relieved of charges.**

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b 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 § 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 § 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.

(1) 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 § 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 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 received benefits but has been denied benefits as a result of this decision. The claimant, therefore, was overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,478.00. 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.

The employer failed to participate in the fact-finding interview and did not provide evidence that it was due to Agency or Postal Service error. Therefore, the employer cannot be relieved of charges. Because the claimant did not receive benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation and the employer failed to participate in the fact finding interview, the claimant is not required to repay the overpayment, and the employer remains subject to charge for the overpaid benefits.

**DECISION:**

The October 25, 2019 (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,478.00 but is not required to repay the benefits because the employer did not satisfactorily participate in the fact-finding interview. Because the employer failed to satisfactorily participate in the fact-finding interview, its account cannot be relieved of charges.

---

Jennifer L. Beckman  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
Iowa Workforce Development  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax 515-478-3528

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn