

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

EVAN L HOWING

Claimant

and

MATA ENTERPRISES INC

Employer

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 20B-UI-11445

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

N O T I C E

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-1, 96.3-7

D E C I S I O N

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. All members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. A majority of the Appeal Board, one member dissenting, finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. With the following modification, the administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED** with the following **MODIFICATION IN THE CLAIMANT'S FAVOR BUT WITHOUT EFFECT ON THE EMPLOYER**:

**Division I:
Clarifying Duty To Request
Accommodation Before Quitting**

The Board adds the following discussion to the Administrative Law Judge's analysis of good cause for quitting.

Viewing this as a case where the Claimant quit over medical concerns, and even viewing those concerns as being aggravated by the job environment and therefore work related, still we cannot grant benefits.

As stated in the above quoted regulation even in cases of quitting over work-related health conditions a claimant must "inform the employer that the individual intends to quit unless the problem is corrected or the individual is reasonably accommodated." 871 IAC 24.26(6)(b). The Claimant neither requested changes as an *accommodation*, nor made clear he would quit if not accommodated. Failure to do *either* one would mean that allowed benefits should be denied, even if he quit over a work-related medical condition.

**Division II:
Waiver of FPUC Overpayment**

The Administrative Law Judge's discussion of the recovery of overpaid FPUC benefits is modified to be consistent with the following discussion:

The CARES Act provides:

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, **except** that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(A) the payment of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(B) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience

PL116-136, Sec. 2104(f)(2). In this case the Claimant was allowed benefits and the Employer appealed. After the hearing, the Employer prevailed. We note that Claimants are advised throughout the appeal process to continue to file weekly claims even if denied benefits. The Claimant here did so and was paid benefits until the Administrative Law Judge issued the appeal decision locking the claim. The Claimant was paid FPUC in addition to regular state benefits. We now consider whether the FPUC overpayment can be waived.

In deciding the question of fault, we will consider factors such as whether a material statement or representation was made by the Claimant in connection with the application for benefits, whether the Claimant knew or should have known that a fact was material and failed to disclose it, whether the Claimant should have known the Claimant was not eligible for benefits, and whether the overpayment was otherwise directly caused by the knowing actions of the Claimant. In deciding equity and good conscience we consider whether the overpayment was the result of a decision on appeal, and the financial hardship caused by a decision requiring overpayment. *Cf.* 871 IAC 24.50(7) (setting out factors for similar issue under TEUC from 2002). Applying these factors to the totality of the circumstances in this case including that there is no evidence of material misrepresentation, we find on this individualized basis that the **FPUC overpayment** should be waived.

The Employer should note that the Employer will not be charged for any waived FPUC.

If after today the Claimant should receive an overpayment decision concerning the overpayment(s) we have waived then the Claimant should appeal that decision. The Claimant should retain our decision to present to IWD in response to any such decision. The Claimant likewise should present this order to IWD if the Claimant should receive a bill for a waived overpayment.

DECISION:

The decision of the Administrative Law Judge dated **November 20, 2020** is **AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED IN THE CLAIMANT'S FAVOR** but with **NO EFFECT ON THE EMPLOYER**.

The overpayment of \$600 in FPUC benefits is hereby waived, and the Claimant has no obligation to pay back those benefits. The Claimant continues to be obliged to repay the overpayment of \$4,920 in state benefits since the law does not permit us to waive the regular state benefit overpayment. The Employer will not be charged for waiver of FPUC since FPUC is a federally funded benefit. In all other respects the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is affirmed.

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

CONCURRING & DISSENTING OPINION OF MYRON R. LINN:

I concur in Division I of the majority decision. I respectfully dissent from Division II of the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board. After careful review of the record, I would not waive any FPUC overpayment.

Myron R. Linn

RRA/fnv