

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

MELINDA R SANDEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-10280-VST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

BIOLIFE PLASMA LLC
Employer

OC: 06/07/09
Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated July 13, 2009, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on August 4, 2009. Employer participated by Deanna Engrav, assistant manager. Claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. The record consists of the testimony of Deanna Engrav.

ISSUES:

Whether the claimant voluntarily left for good cause attributable to the employer; and
Whether the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witness and having considered all of the evidence in the record, makes the following findings of fact:

The employer in this case is a plasma donation facility. The claimant was hired on July 22, 2008, as a full time plasma center technician. The employer has a written policy that if an employee is going to be absent for a scheduled shift that the employee must call within one hour after the start of a scheduled shift. This policy was contained in the employee handbook and the claimant received a copy of that handbook at the time she was hired.

The claimant was a no call, no show on June 8, 2009. She was scheduled to work at 5:30 a.m. on June 9, 2009. She did not call in within one hour of the start of her shift and did not show up for work. At 9:30 a.m. she called Deanna Engrav and informed Ms. Engrav that she was sorry but she and her boyfriend had decided that it was not in her best interest to keep working. The claimant then asked Ms. Engrav to terminate her, which Ms. Engrav refused to do. The claimant was then a no-call no-show on June 10, 2009. Since the claimant had had three no call, no show days, she was considered a voluntary quit by the employer.

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.

871 IAC 24.25(4) 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:

(4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

A quit is a separation initiated by the employee. 871 IAC 24.1(113)(b). In general, a voluntary quit requires evidence of an intention to sever the employment relationship and an overt act carrying out that intention. See Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer, 289 N.W.2d 698, 612 (Iowa 1980) and Peck v. EAB, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa App. 1992). 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. See 871 IAC 24.25.

The evidence in this case established that the claimant intended to sever the employment relationship. She failed to show up for work three days in a row when scheduled and did not follow the employer's policy for calling in to report her absence. In addition, she told Ms. Engrav that she had decided that working was not in her best interest and went so far as to ask that she be terminated. This is clear evidence that the claimant no longer wished to be in an employment relationship with the employer.

The claimant did not participate in the hearing and there is no evidence that the claimant quit with good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

The next issue is overpayment of benefits. 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.

This matter is remanded to the Claims Section for determination of an overpayment.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated July 13, 2009, reference 01, 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 matter is remanded to the Claims Section for determination of an overpayment.

Vicki L. Seeck
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

vls/pjs