IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

TARRAH DIOP Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-15949-CL-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SEDONA STAFFING INC Employer

> OC: 06/21/20 Claimant: Respondent (2)

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(b) – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation PL 116-136, Sec. 2107 – Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On November 30, 2020, the employer filed an appeal from the November 20, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 29, 2021. Claimant participated. Employer participated through unemployment benefits administrator Colleen McGuinty.

ISSUES:

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer? Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

Was the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

Was the claimant eligible for Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Employer is a temporary staffing firm. Claimant was last assigned to work at Sterile-lite as a full-time general laborer from July 10, 2019, until October 30, 2019. Employer had an on-site coordinator at Sterile-lite. The on-site coordinator documented that claimant walked off her shift on October 30, 2019, and never returned. Employer has a policy stating that when an assignment ends, employees are required to request another assigning within three business days or will be considered to have voluntarily resigned. Claimant signed a copy of the policy in July 2019. Claimant did not request another assignment within three days of the assignment ending.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$3,164.18, since filing a claim with an effective date of June 21, 2020, for the 12

weeks ending September 12, 2020. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview because it did not receive a notice of the fact finding interview or an opportunity to do so.

Claimant received Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC) benefits in the amount of \$3,458.00 for the 13 weeks ending December 12, 2020.

Claimant received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) benefits in the amount of \$3,000.00 for the five weeks ending July 25, 2020.

Claimant also received Lost Wage Assistance benefits.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was separated from employment without good cause attributable to employer.

lowa Code section 96.5-1-j 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, But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

j. The individual is a temporary employee of a temporary employment firm who notifies the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment and who seeks reassignment. Failure of the individual to notify the temporary employment firm of completion of an employment assignment within three working days of the completion of each employment assignment under a contract of hire shall be deemed a voluntary quit unless the individual was not advised in writing of the duty to notify the temporary employment firm upon completion of an employment assignment or the individual had good cause for not contacting the temporary employment firm within three working days and notified the firm at the first reasonable opportunity thereafter.

To show that the employee was advised in writing of the notification requirement of this paragraph, the temporary employment firm shall advise the temporary employee by requiring the temporary employee, at the time of employment with the temporary employment firm, to read and sign a document that provides a clear and concise explanation of the notification requirement and the consequences of a failure to notify. The document shall be separate from any contract of employment and a copy of the signed document shall be provided to the temporary employee.

For the purposes of this paragraph:

(1) "Temporary employee" means an individual who is employed by a temporary employment firm to provide services to clients to supplement their work force during absences, seasonal workloads, temporary skill or labor market shortages, and for special assignments and projects.

(2) "Temporary employment firm" means a person engaged in the business of employing temporary employees.

Iowa Admin. Code 871—24.26(15) provides:

The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

Employee of temporary employment firm.

- a. The individual is a temporary employee of a temporary employment firm who notifies the temporary employment firm within three days of completion of an employment assignment and seeks reassignment under the contract of hire. The employee must be advised by the employer of the notification requirement in writing and receive a copy.
- b. The individual shall be eligible for benefits under this subrule if the individual had good cause for not contacting the employer within three days and did notify the employer at the first reasonable opportunity.
- c. Good cause is a substantial and justifiable reason, excuse or cause such that a reasonable and prudent person, who desired to remain in the ranks of the employed, would find to be adequate justification for not notifying the employer. Good cause would include the employer's going out of business; blinding snow storm; telephone lines down; employer closed for vacation; hospitalization of the claimant; and other substantial reasons.
- d. Notification may be accomplished by going to the employer's place of business, telephoning the employer, faxing the employer, or any other currently accepted means of communications. Working days means the normal days in which the employer is open for business.

In this case, the claimant was given a copy of employer's policy requiring her to request another assignment within three working days of the assignment ending. Claimant did not request another assignment within three working days of her assignment ending. Therefore, she is considered to have voluntarily resigned and is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

The next issue is whether claimant was overpaid benefits and should have to repay those benefits. 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 § 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 § 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 states pursuant to § 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 lowa Code § 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 <u>871—subrule 24.32(7)</u>. 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 § 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 § 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 § 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 § 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. 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 \S 96.3(7), lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by claimant. Additionally, employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Thus, claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received.

The law also states that an employer is to be charged if "the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits..." lowa Code § 96.3(7)(b)(1)(a). Here, employer did not fail to respond timely or adequately, as it did not receive a notice of the fact finding interview. Employer thus cannot be charged. Since neither party is to be charged then the overpayment of regular unemployment insurance benefits is absorbed by the fund.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant was eligible for FPUC and whether claimant has been overpaid FPUC. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was not eligible for FPUC and was overpaid FPUC, which must be repaid.

PL116-136, 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 regular unemployment insurance benefits, she is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. While lowa law does not require a claimant to repay regular unemployment insurance benefits when the employer does not participate in the fact-finding interview, the CARES Act makes no such exception for the repayment of FPUC. Therefore, the determination of whether the claimant must repay FPUC does not hinge on the employer's participation in the fact-finding interview. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$3,000.00 for the five-week period ending July 25, 2020. Claimant must repay these benefits.

The final issue is whether claimant was eligible for PEUC benefits and should be required to repay those benefits. PL116-136, Sec. 2107 provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Federal-State Agreements

(2) Provisions of Agreement. Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of pandemic emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who—

(A) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under the Federal law with respect to a benefit year (excluding any benefit year that ended before July 1, 2019);

(B) have no rights to regular compensation with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law;

(C) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada; and

(D) are able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work.

• • • •

(e) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of pandemic emergency unemployment compensation under thi section to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such pandemic emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency...

Here, the claimant was disqualified from receiving regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits and she is therefore not eligible for PEUC benefits. Like FPUC, there is no provision in

the CARES Act waiving the requirement to overpay the benefits based on employer's participation in the fact finding interview. Therefore, claimant will be required to repay PEUC benefits in the amount of 3,458.00, as she was not entitled to those benefits.

DECISION:

The November 20, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was separated from employment without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$3,164.18 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview through no fault of its own and its account shall not be charged. The overpayment must be charged to the fund. Claimant was also overpaid FPUC benefits in the amount of \$3,000.00 and PEUC benefits in the amount of \$3,458.00 and is required to repay those benefits.

6 KU

Christine A. Louis Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

February 16, 2021 Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/scn

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 due to disqualifying separations, 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 on how to apply for PUA can be found at https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information.