IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

69 01ET (0.06) 2001079 EL

Claimant: Respondent (2R)

	00-0157 (9-00) - 3091078 - EI
ANDREW L ALTMAN Claimant	APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-04467-PT
	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION
CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY Employer	
	OC: 06/07/10

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit 871 IAC 24.25(4) – Three-day No-call/no-show

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated March 29, 2011, reference 04, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on May 2, 2011. Claimant failed to respond to the notice of hearing and did not participate. Employer participated by Penny Hewlett, Store Manager. Employer's Exhibit 1 was received in evidence.

ISSUES:

The issues in this matter are whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer, or was discharged for misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was employed from August 31, 2010 through September 14, 2010 as a kitchen helper. He quit his employment by abandoning his job. He was scheduled for work but did not call or come to work.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

Claimant abandoned his job. He stopped reporting for scheduled work without a call or other explanation. This is a quit without good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, 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) 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. 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. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(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.

The issue of overpayment is remanded for determination.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated March 29, 2011, reference 04, is reversed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The issue of overpayment is remanded for determination.

Ron Pohlman Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/css