# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

TRACY L KEMNITZ

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-09565-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**GOOD SAMARITAN SOCIETY INC** 

Employer

OC: 05/24/09

Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Good Samaritan Society (employer) appealed a representative's June 23, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded Tracy Kemnitz (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 21, 2009. The claimant participated personally and through Danielle Allen, Former Co-Worker. The employer was represented by Tom Kuiper, Hearing Representative, and participated by John Kern, Administrator, and Carol Funnemark, Director of Nursing. The claimant offered and Exhibit A was received into evidence.

### **ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

#### 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 October 17, 2006, as a full-time nurse. She felt a subordinate was questioning her, undermining her authority and arguing with her. On September 24, 2008, the claimant complained about the subordinate to her employer. The employer reprimanded the subordinate.

On January 15, 2009, the claimant filed a fair treatment resolution act against the subordinate. She cited general behaviors that the claimant found to be "badgering". The employer issued the subordinate an improvement plan, educated the subordinate about her job duties and told the subordinate there was zero tolerance for further inappropriate behavior. The paperwork given to the claimant indicated she was to notify the employer of any further incidents by calling a specific telephone number. The employer visited with the claimant approximately two weeks later. The claimant told the employer there were no concerns even though the subordinate was starting to display negative behavior.

On February 21, 2009, the claimant gave the subordinate a note indicating that the subordinate was not to call the claimant at home to ask for help at work. The employer also told the subordinate not to call the claimant at home.

On April 9, 2009, the claimant submitted her letter of resignation indicating she enjoyed working for the employer. When asked why she was quitting she told the employer she was moving to Georgia to be close to family. The claimant's last day of work was May 18, 2009. She moved to Georgia at the end of May 2009. Continued work was available had the claimant not resigned.

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

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

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 24.26(4) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. <u>Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer</u>, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (lowa 1980). The law presumes a claimant has left employment with good cause when she quits because of intolerable or detrimental working conditions. 871 IAC 24.26(4). The claimant argues that she quit due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions. The conditions that she believes were intolerable or detrimental related to a personality conflict with a subordinate.

## 871 IAC 24.25(22) 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:

(22) The claimant left because of a personality conflict with the supervisor.

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.

When an employee quits work because she is dissatisfied with the work environment, has a personality conflict or moves to another location, her leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because she was dissatisfied with her work environment because of a personality conflict with her subordinate and she moved to another location. The issues that comprise the claimant's description of an intolerable or detrimental workplace when taken individually are presumed to be 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 claimant has received benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits may now constitute an overpayment. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

### **DECISION:**

The representative's June 23, 2009 decision (reference 01) is reversed. 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. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css