

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

RANDALL S STACEY

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-11599-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HOLIDAY INN-CEDAR FALLS

Employer

**OC: 07/06/08 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (2/R)**

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Holiday Inn-Cedar Falls (employer) appealed a representative's December 3, 2008 decision (reference 02) that concluded Randall Stacey (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for December 29, 2008. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Diane Milani, Bookkeeper, and Donald Weathermon, Chief Maintenance Engineer.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

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 on June 27, 2007, as a part-time maintenance person. On or about June 8, 2008, the claimant asked for time off to take care of his house that had flooded. The employer said the claimant could take a leave and he might not have work available until school started again. The claimant did not remember that the employer asked him to stay in touch but the claimant knew that keeping in touch with your employer was something that an employee should do. In July 2008, the claimant stopped by work but could not find his supervisor.

On August 4, 2008, the employer considered the claimant to have abandoned his job because it had not heard from him since approximately June 8, 2008. Continued work was available had the claimant not resigned. The claimant was unable to return to work until approximately August 15, 2008, because he was working on his home.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

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(20) 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:

(20) The claimant left for compelling personal reasons; however, the period of absence exceeded ten working days.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). The claimant's intention to voluntarily leave work was evidenced by his actions. He was absent from work for personal reasons for more than ten working days. When an employee is absent from work for more than ten working days for compelling personal reasons, his leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work for more than ten working days for compelling personal reasons. His leaving was without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

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 states pursuant to section 602.10101.

The claimant has received benefits since filing the claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits may now constitute an overpayment. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

The issue of whether the claimant was able and available for work is remanded for determination.

DECISION:

The representative's December 3, 2008 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination. The issue of whether the claimant was able and available for work is remanded for determination.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css