

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CARL REAVES**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-08255-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CRST VAN EXPEDITED INC**

Employer

**OC: 05/03/09**

**Claimant: Respondent (2/R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit

Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

CRST Van Expedited, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated June 2, 2009, reference 02, which held that Carl Reaves (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on June 24, 2009. The claimant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which he could be contacted, and therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Sandy Matt, Human Resources Specialist and Charm White, Fleet Manager. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant's voluntary separation qualifies him to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired as a full-time over-the-road truck driver on October 22, 2008 and worked through January 9, 2009. After that date, he was scheduled for 'home time' and was due to return on January 16, 2009. The claimant never returned to work nor did he contact the employer. The employer repeatedly tried to reach the claimant but was unsuccessful. The claimant had parked the tractor and trailer at a previously approved, secure parking location but since he effectively abandoned the equipment, the employer had to have it towed. The claimant spoke with the employer after the fact and said he had family issues. Continuing work was available had the claimant not quit.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective June 2, 2009 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the claimant's voluntary separation from employment qualifies him to receive unemployment insurance benefits. He is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if he voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.5-1.

In general, a voluntary quit requires evidence of an intention to sever the employment relationship and an overt act carrying out that intention. Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980) and Peck v. Employment Appeal Bd., 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). The claimant demonstrated his intent to quit and acted to carry it out by failing to call the employer or return to work on or after January 16, 2009. He abandoned the employer's equipment and abandoned his job, even though continuing work was available.

It is the claimant's burden to prove that the voluntary quit was for a good cause that would not disqualify him. Iowa Code § 96.6-2. He failed to participate in the hearing and has not satisfied his burden. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) 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. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

## **DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated June 2, 2009, reference 02, is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are

withheld until he has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

---

Susan D Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/pjs