IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

BRADY J BERANEK

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-05368-SC-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

PAUL REVERES PIZZA

Employer

OC: 10/18/20

Claimant: Respondent (2)

lowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

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

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On February 10, 2021, Paul Reveres Pizza (employer) filed an appeal from the February 4, 2021, reference 02, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Brady J. Beranek (claimant) did not voluntarily quit, but was discharged and the employer failed to show it was for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing held by telephone on April 22, 2021. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. The employer participated through Jeffrey Schuster, Owner. No exhibits were offered into the record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, specifically the claimant's claim history.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant voluntarily quit employment with good cause attributable to the employer? Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived and charged to the employer's account?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed part-time as a Delivery Driver beginning on October 16, 2019, and his last day worked was October 11, 2020. The claimant was scheduled to work on October 13 and 15; however, he did not report to work or notify the employer he would not be there. The employer has not had any contact from the claimant since October 11.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received \$1,616.00 in regular unemployment benefits, since filing a claim with an effective date of October 18, 2020, for the 16 weeks ending February 6, 2021. Jeffrey Schuster, Owner, participated in the fact-finding interview on behalf of the employer.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

I. Did the claimant voluntarily quit employment with good cause attributable to the employer?

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant's separation from the employment was without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

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.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(27) 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:

(27) The claimant left rather than perform the assigned work as instructed.

The claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. lowa Code § 96.6(2). "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. Indus. Relations Comm'n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The claimant's failure to report to work or contact the employer is job abandonment. The claimant has not established that the quit with good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

II. Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived and charged to the employer's account?

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge finds the claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits, which must be repaid, because the employer participated in the fact-finding interview.

lowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

Payment – determination – duration – child support intercept.

- 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(1) 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he 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. lowa Code § 96.7. However, an overpayment, which results from a reversal of an initial allowance of benefits based on a separation, will not be recovered 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. lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10(1). The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. lowa Code § 96.3(7), lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits, but he was not eligible for those benefits. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview through first-hand testimony. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The February 4, 2021, reference 02, unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left the employment 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 \$1,616.00 in regular unemployment insurance benefits, and he is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

Stephanie R. Callahan Administrative Law Judge

uphanie R Can

April 30, 2021

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/ol

Note to Claimant:

This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance be nefits. If you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits, but who unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). You will need to self-certify for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. Additional information on how to self-certify for PUA can be found at https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information. If this decision becomes final or if you are not eligible for PUA, you may have an overpayment of benefits.