# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

**JENSEN H WATTS** 

Claimant

**APPEAL 20A-UI-10084-AW-T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**MENARD INC** 

Employer

OC: 03/08/20

Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

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

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

PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the August 12, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 7, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. Claimant did not participate. Employer participated through Dale Baum, First Assistant General Manager. Employer's Exhibits 1 – 3 were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

### **ISSUES:**

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct or a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer.

Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.

Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.

Whether claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a part-time Cashier from December 5, 2019 until his employment with Menard ended on January 12, 2020.

On January 8, 2020, claimant received additional training for poor work performance. Claimant left work two hours early without telling anyone or obtaining permission. On January 9, 2020 or January 10, 2020, claimant emailed employer his resignation. Claimant said that he was unable to work for employer because he felt he was treated differently and singled out. Claimant had not brought these issues to employer's attention prior to his resignation. Employer attempted to contact claimant in order to further discuss claimant's concerns; claimant was not available. Claimant was scheduled to work on January 11, 2020 and January 12, 2020 and did not attend work or contact employer. Employer accepted claimant's resignation on January 12, 2020.

Employer had continuing work available for claimant if he had not quit. Claimant had a prior warning for attendance but his job was not in immediate jeopardy.

The administrative record reflects that claimant filed for and has received regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits in the gross amount of \$1,814.00 for the 11-week period between March 8, 2020 and May 23, 2020. In addition to regular unemployment insurance benefits, claimant also received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) in the gross amount of \$4,800.00 for the eight-week period between March 29, 2020 and May 23, 2020. Claimant has also received Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC) and associated FPUC benefits.

Employer provided the name and contact information of a representative to participate in the fact-finding interview.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant voluntarily quit his employment without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

lowa Code § 96.5(1) provides: An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, if the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W. 2d 137, 138 (lowa 1989). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (lowa 1980); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (lowa Ct. App. 1992). Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa 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).

Claimant's tendering a written resignation, leaving work prior to the end of his shift and failing to report to work without notice to employer are evidence of his intention to sever the employment relationship and overt acts of carrying out his intention. Claimant voluntarily quit his employment. Claimant attributes his resignation to disparate treatment, but has provided no other information about his reason for quitting. Claimant has not met his burden of proving he voluntarily quit his employment for good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was overpaid, claimant must repay those benefits and employer's account will not be charged.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(a)-(b) 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) (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 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 Iowa 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.

- (2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.
- (3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to lowa Code section 17A.19.
- (4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

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. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation 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. 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.

Because claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which claimant was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid UI in the gross amount of \$1,814.00 for the 11-week period between March 8, 2020 and May 23, 2020. Because employer participated in the fact-finding interview, claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

### (b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

- (A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus
- (B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as "Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation").

. . . .

- (f) Fraud and Overpayments
- (2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...

Because claimant is disqualified from receiving UI, claimant is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$4,800.00 for the eight-week period between March 29, 2020 and May 23, 2020. Claimant is required to repay those benefits.

This issue of whether claimant has been overpaid PEUC and associated FPUC benefits will be remanded to the Benefits Bureau of Iowa Workforce Development for an investigation and decision.

NOTE TO CLAIMANT: This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. 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 are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. Additional information how for PUA on to apply can he 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.

## **DECISION:**

The August 12, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied 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.

Claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits in the gross amount of \$1,814.00 for the 11-week period between March 8, 2020 and May 23, 2020, and is obligated to repay those benefits to the agency. Employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged. Claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in the gross amount of \$4,800.00 for the eight-week period between March 29, 2020 and May 23, 2020, which must be repaid.

## **REMAND:**

The issue of whether claimant has been overpaid Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation and associated Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation benefits is remanded to the Benefits Bureau of Iowa Workforce Development for an investigation and decision.

Adrienne C. Williamson Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau Iowa Workforce Development 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

Middin

October 14, 2020

Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/scn