IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

ADEROMOLA OLALEKAN

Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-04782-JCT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

MENTOR NETWORK

Employer

OC: 04/02/17

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the April 21, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 23, 2017. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Teresa Middendorf, Manager. Department Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Is the appeal timely?

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: This is the first time the claimant has ever sought to claim unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant was mailed and received a copy of the reference 01 initial decision, dated April 21, 2017 within the ten day period to appeal the decision. Between April 12, 2017, and April 25, 2017, the claimant received six different initial decisions regarding his eligibility of unemployment benefits. The reference 01 decision (at issue here) denied the claimant benefits. Then the reference 02, 03, 04 and 05 decisions found the claimant eligible for benefits. The reference 06 decision, dated April 25, 2017, stated the claimant was not eligible for benefits, and stated "each protest on your unemployment insurance claim has been determined separately and you have received a decision on each one. These separate decisions could cause confusion." Based upon the claimant's confusion, he contacted IWD on May 5, 2017, for guidance. The administrative law judge would note that May 5, 2017 is ten days from the date of mailing of the initial 05 and 06

decisions. The claimant then filed his appeal on the same day after learning he was in fact denied benefits (Department Exhibit D-1.)

The undisputed evidence is the claimant was employed from December 1, 2016 until February 27, 2017 as a full-time life skill trainer. He voluntarily quit the employment to move to Texas, effective February 28, 2017. Continuing work was available.

The claimant and his wife both suffer from medical conditions and determined warmer weather would be best for their health. The claimant intends to remain in Texas, not just visit seasonally.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the claimant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is. lowa Code § 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5. except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

In this case, the claimant has never established a claim for benefits and received six decisions including the reference 01 decision at hand, within a two week period. The decisions were conflicting regarding the claimant's eligibility for benefits. The claimant was denied benefits based upon separation with this employer, (Reference 01 decision) but then received four decisions in a row stating he was eligible for benefits based upon other employer, before the reference 06 decision, dated April 25, 2017, summarized the claimant's eligibility and confirmed he was not eligible. Two of the conflicting decisions (For example reference 05 and 06) were mailed on the same day. This is reasonably confusing. The claimant contacted IWD within 10 days of the receipt of the summary decision for guidance and filed his appeal on the same day

(Department Exhibit D-1). For these reasons, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal shall be accepted as timely.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's separation from the employment was without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(2) 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:

(2) The claimant moved to a different locality.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(23) 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:

(23) The claimant left voluntarily due to family responsibilities or serious family needs.

The claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). 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. "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. Industrial Relations Commission*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. App. 1973).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996).

In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.*. In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.* After assessing the credibility of the claimant who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge finds the weight of the evidence in the record fails to establish the claimant has met his burden of proof to establish he quit for good cause reasons within lowa law.

In this case, the claimant quit to move to Texas. The claimant and his wife have health conditions which respond better in a warmer climate. The administrative law judge is sympathetic to the claimant's balancing of his employment and family needs. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's leaving the employment may have been based upon good personal reasons, but it was not for a good-cause reason attributable to the employer according to lowa law. Benefits must be denied.

DECISION:

The April 21, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. The claimant filed a timely appeal. The claimant voluntarily left the employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn