

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**LILLIAN SANDERS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-06406-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**NCS PEARSON INC**  
Employer

**OC: 04/21/13**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(1)d – Voluntary Quitting/Illness or Injury

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed an appeal from the May 20, 2013, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on July 11, 2013. Claimant participated. Employer participated through human resources coordinator, Troy Simmons and human resources generalist, Maggie Hodgson.

**ISSUE:**

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed temporary seasonal full time as a sealer/packager from November 26, 2012 and was separated from employment on February 26, 2013. She quit because of personal health issues (arthritis in left knee and hip). She did not provide medical documentation to the employer or at hearing. She began working in the office in a sedentary sealing position but when that work was exhausted, the employer assigned her and other employees to packaging on the floor, which requires standing seven-and-a-half hours per day. She was physically unable keep up with the packaging work. She quit in order to avoid her attendance falling below 90 percent and being fired without possibility of being rehired for the next season. The season lasted until mid-April 2013.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant is separated from the employment without good cause attributable to employer.

Iowa Code § 96.5-1-d 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. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

d. The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.25(35) 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 § 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 § 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:

(35) The claimant left because of illness or injury which was not caused or aggravated by the employment or pregnancy and failed to:

- (a) Obtain the advice of a licensed and practicing physician;
- (b) Obtain certification of release for work from a licensed and practicing physician;
- (c) Return to the employer and offer services upon recovery and certification for work by a licensed and practicing physician; or
- (d) Fully recover so that the claimant could perform all of the duties of the job.

The court in *Gilmore v. Empl. Appeal Bd.*, 695 N.W.2d 44 (Iowa Ct. App. 2004) noted that:

"Insofar as the Employment Security Law is not designed to provide health and disability insurance, only those employees who experience illness-induced separations that can fairly be attributed to the employer are properly eligible for unemployment benefits." *White v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 487 N.W.2d 342, 345 (Iowa 1992) (citing *Butts v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 328 N.W.2d 515, 517 (Iowa 1983)).

Subsection d of Iowa Code § 96.5(1) provides an exception where:

The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and ... the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

The statute specifically requires that the employee has recovered from the illness or injury, and this recovery has been certified by a physician. The exception in section 96.5(1)(d) only applies when an employee is *fully* recovered and the employer has not held open the employee's position. *White*, 487 N.W.2d at 346; *Hedges v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 368 N.W.2d 862, 867 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985); see also *Geiken v. Lutheran Home for the Aged Ass'n.*, 468 N.W.2d 223, 226 (Iowa 1991) (noting the full recovery standard of section 96.5(1)(d)). In the Gilmore case he was not fully recovered from his injury and was unable to show that he fell within the exception of section 96.5(1)(d). Therefore, because his injury was not connected to his employment and he had not fully recovered, he was considered to have voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer and was not entitled to unemployment benefits. See *White*, 487 N.W.2d at 345; *Shontz*, 248 N.W.2d at 91.

Claimant has not established that the medical condition was work related, as is her burden; thus, she must meet the requirements of the administrative rule cited above. Accordingly, although the separation was for good personal reasons, it was without good cause attributable to the employer and benefits must be denied.

**DECISION:**

The May 20, 2013, (reference 02) decision is affirmed. Claimant separated from the employment without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as she works in and has been paid wages equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible or until such time as she obtains a full release to return to regular duties without restriction, offers services to employer, and it has no comparable, suitable work available.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css