

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**CHRISTOPHER P NICHOLAS**  
Claimant

**SUPERIOR CLEANING SERVICES LTD**  
Employer

**APPEAL 20A-UI-03776-AW-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**  
**DECISION**

**OC: 03/15/20**  
**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  
PL116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed an appeal from the April 30, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 26, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Lenora Culpepper, Site Supervisor. No exhibits were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

**ISSUES:**

Whether claimant's separation was a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer.  
Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.  
Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.  
Whether claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a part-time custodian from March 2019 until his employment with Superior Cleaning Services ended on December 12, 2019. Claimant's work schedule varied. Claimant's direct supervisor was Lenora Culpepper, Site Supervisor. While claimant was never guaranteed full-time hours, claimant had expressed an interest in additional work, which employer tried to accommodate on several occasions. On December 12, 2019, Culpepper contacted claimant to offer him additional work hours. Claimant told Culpepper that he had applied for other jobs and quit effective immediately. Claimant provided no reason for quitting. There was continuing work available if claimant had not quit. Claimant's job was not in jeopardy. Claimant brought an issue to employer's attention prior to quitting, but that issue had been addressed by employer and resolved.

The administrative record reflects that claimant filed for and has received regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits in the gross amount of \$2,280.00 for eight benefit weeks between March 15, 2020 and May 23, 2020. In addition to regular unemployment insurance benefits, claimant also received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) in the gross amount of \$3,000.00 for the five-week period between March 29, 2020 and May 2, 2020.

Employer participated in the fact-finding interview through Carrie Pasteur, Secretary. (Culpepper Testimony)

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant voluntarily quit his employment without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) provides: An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, if the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W. 2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). 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); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). "Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Indus. Relations Comm'n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). Where a claimant gives numerous reasons for leaving employment the agency is required to consider all stated reasons which might combine to give the claimant good cause to quit in determining any of those reasons constitute good cause attributable to the employer. *Taylor v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 362 N.W.2d 534 (Iowa 1985).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(13), (18) provide:

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:

(13) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the wages but knew the rate of pay when hired.

(18) The claimant left because of a dislike of the shift worked.

Iowa Admin Code r. 871-24.26(1) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(1) A change in the contract of hire. An employer's willful breach of contract of hire shall not be a disqualifiable issue. This would include a change that would jeopardize the worker's safety, health or morals. The change of contract of hire must be substantial in nature and could involve changes in the working hours, shifts, remuneration, location of employment, drastic modification in type of work, etc. Minor changes in a worker's routine on the job would not constitute a change of contract of hire.

It is the duty of the administrative law judge, as the trier of fact, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other evidence you believe; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how I have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. I assessed the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using my own common sense and experience. I find the employer's testimony to be more credible than the claimant's testimony. Specifically, claimant alleged that he quit because it was a hostile work environment which caused him anxiety and mental anguish. Claimant's sole example of what made the work environment unbearable was an argument that occurred approximately a week prior to his quitting. That incident was immediately addressed by employer and had not reoccurred. Furthermore, claimant testified that if employer offered him additional hours, then he would not have quit. Thus, claimant's testimony that the hostile work environment was his reason for quitting lacks credibility.

Claimant's verbal resignation is both evidence of his intention to sever the employment relationship and an overt act of carrying out his intention. Claimant voluntarily quit his employment because he was not satisfied working part-time and wanted additional hours. When claimant began his employment, the parties agreed that claimant would work part-time. Employer did not promise claimant he would work full-time. There was no change in the contract of hire. Claimant has not met his burden of proving he voluntarily quit his employment for good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid UI, whether the claimant must repay UI, and whether the employer's account will be charged for UI. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was overpaid UI, claimant must repay UI and employer's account will not be charged for UI.

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 section 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 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.

(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.

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 Iowa Code section 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 871—subrule 24.32(7). 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 Iowa Code section 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 Iowa Code section 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 Iowa Code section 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 Iowa Code section 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.

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. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, UI was paid to which he was not entitled. Claimant has been overpaid UI in the amount of \$2,280.00. Because the employer participated in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the UI he received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant is eligible for FPUC and whether claimant has been overpaid FPUC. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant is not eligible for FPUC and has been 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 UI, he is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$3,000.00. Claimant is required to repay those benefits.

*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>.

**DECISION:**

The April 30, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. Claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,280.00 and is obligated to repay those benefits to the agency. Employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged. Claimant is not eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. Claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in the gross amount of \$3,000.00, which must be repaid.



---

Adrienne C. Williamson  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
Iowa Workforce Development  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax (515)478-3528

May 29, 2020  
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/scn