

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DESHAUN A SMITH
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-02917-MT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**L A LEASING INC
SEDONA STAFFING**
Employer

OC: 02/03/13
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 March 6, 2013, reference 02, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on April 8, 2013. Employer participated by Colleen McGuinty, Unemployment Benefits Specialist and Nichole Onken, Account Coordinator. Claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

Claimant called after the hearing was over to request participation. Claimant failed to participate because he did not read and follow the instructions on the hearing notice.

ISSUES:

The issues in this matter are whether the claimant quit for good cause attributable to the employer and whether claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on September 6, 2012. Claimant failed to call in and report for three days in a row. Employer deems three no-call absences as job abandonment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has failed to establish that claimant voluntarily quit for good cause attributable to the employer when claimant terminated the employment relationship because of job abandonment. This is a quit without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits withheld.

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.

The next issue concerns an overpayment of unemployment insurance 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.

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.

At issue is a request to reopen the record made after the hearing had concluded. The request to reopen the record is denied because the party making the request failed to participate by reading and following the instructions on the hearing notice.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated March 6, 2013, reference 02, is reversed and remanded for determination of overpayment. Unemployment insurance benefits are 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. This matter is remanded to Claims Section for determination of overpayment. Claimant's request to reopen the record is denied.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/css