

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

ASHLEY E ANDERSEN
708 PREACHERS DR APT B
CLARKSVILLE TN 37042

MENARD INC
4777 MENARD DR
EAU CLAIRE WI 54703

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-00271-HT
OC: 11/30/03 R: 02
Claimant: Appellant (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-1 - Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant, Ashley Andersen, filed an appeal from a decision dated December 31, 2003, reference 02. The decision disqualified her from receiving unemployment benefits. After due notice was issued a hearing was held by telephone conference call on February 2, 2004. The claimant participated on her own behalf. The employer, Menard, did not provide a telephone number where a representative could be contacted and did not participate.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witness and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Ashley Andersen was employed by Menard from August 5, 2002 until November 5, 2003. She worked part-time in the millwork department.

The claimant notified the employer, first by phone then by letter, that she was quitting. Her husband is in the military and was transferred to Kentucky. She accompanied him as a dependent.

The employer received the hearing notice prior to the February 2, 2004 hearing. The instructions inform the parties that if the party does not contact the Appeals Section and provide the phone number at which the party can be contacted for the hearing, the party will not be called for the hearing. The first time the employer directly contacted the Appeals Section was on February 2, 2004, after the scheduled start time for the hearing. The employer had not read all the information on the hearing notice, and had assumed that the Appeals Section would initiate the telephone contact even without a response to the hearing notice.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant is disqualified. The judge concludes she is.

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(10) 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:

(10) The claimant left employment to accompany the spouse to a new locality.

The claimant's decision to quit was based solely on the fact her spouse had been transferred to another state and she was to accompany him. Although this may be good personal cause, it does not constitute good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant is disqualified.

The next issue is whether the record should be reopened. The judge concludes it should not.

871 IAC 26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals section with the names and telephone numbers of its witnesses by the scheduled time of the hearing, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

The first time the employer called the Appeals Section for the February 2, 2004 hearing was after the hearing had been closed. Although the employer may have intended to participate in the hearing, the employer failed to read or follow the hearing notice instructions and did not contact the Appeals Section as directed prior to the hearing. The rule specifically states that failure to read or follow the instructions on the hearing notice does not constitute good cause to reopen the hearing. The employer did not establish good cause to reopen the hearing. Therefore, the employer's request to reopen the hearing is denied.

DECISION:

The representative's decision of December 31, 2003, reference 02, is affirmed. Ashley Andersen is disqualified and benefits are withheld until she has earned ten times her weekly benefit amount provided she is otherwise eligible.

bgh/kjf