IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

BRENDA S MOORE

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-10900-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

HY-VEE INC

Employer

OC: 07/04/10

Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Hy-Vee (employer) appealed a representative's July 29, 2010 decision (reference 01) that concluded Brenda Moore (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for October 25, 2010. The claimant participated personally and through her step-father, James Secor, and friend, Donnie McGee. The employer was represented by Tim Speir, Employer Representative, and participated by Rose Kline, Assistant Director; Dan Stream, Kitchen Manager; and Teri Jo Stream, Kitchen Helper. The claimant offered and Exhibit A was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on November 5, 2008, as a part-time kitchen helper. The claimant noticed that the day shift workers were not completing their work duties. She thought money was missing from her purse and perhaps her car keys were borrowed. The work environment stressed the claimant and she went to her doctor in March 2010. Her doctor thought she suffered from depression and referred her to another physician for treatment of depression in June 2010. The claimant's physicians did not indicate to the claimant that she should quit work. The claimant's step-father and friend noticed the claimant was not happy. The claimant mentioned the day shift's failure to clean to her supervisor but did not mention anything else.

On July 3, 2010, the claimant thought the manager and his wife, a co-worker, were making fun of her by leaving a pill on the serving ledge. The claimant asked them what it was but they did not know what she was talking about. On July 4, 2010, the claimant told the assistant director that she was quitting due to personal issues. The claimant said she thought people may be

talking about her but gave no specifics. Continued work was available had the claimant not resigned.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily left the employment 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 24.26(4) 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:

(4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. <u>Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer</u>, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). The law presumes a claimant has left employment with good cause when she quits because of intolerable or detrimental working conditions. 871 IAC 24.26(4). The claimant argues that she quit due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions. The conditions that she believes were intolerable or detrimental are her work environment and the personality conflict with the supervisor.

871 IAC 24.25(21) and (22) 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 lowa 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 lowa 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:

- (21) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the work environment.
- (22) The claimant left because of a personality conflict with the supervisor.

When an employee quits work because she is dissatisfied with the work environment or has a personality conflict with her supervisor, her leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because she was dissatisfied with her work environment and because of a personality conflict with her supervisor. The issues that comprise the claimant's

description of an intolerable or detrimental workplace when taken individually are presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer.

The second issue that the claimant addresses for her resignation is her medical condition.

871 IAC 24.26(6)b 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:

- (6) Separation because of illness, injury or pregnancy.
- b. Employment related separation. The claimant was compelled to leave employment because of an illness, injury, or allergy condition that was attributable to the employment. Factors and circumstances directly connected with employment which caused or aggravated the illness, injury, allergy, or disease to the employee which made it impossible for the employee to continue in employment because of serious danger to the employee's health may be held to be an involuntary termination of employment and constitute good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant will be eligible for benefits if compelled to leave employment as a result of an injury suffered on the job.

In order to be eligible under this paragraph "b" an individual must present competent evidence showing adequate health reasons to justify termination; before quitting have informed the employer of the work-related health problem and inform the employer that the individual intends to quit unless the problem is corrected or the individual is reasonably accommodated. Reasonable accommodation includes other comparable work which is not injurious to the claimant's health and for which the claimant must remain available.

An individual who voluntarily leaves their employment due to an alleged work-related illness or injury must first give notice to the employer of the anticipated reasons for quitting in order to give the employer an opportunity to remedy the situation or offer an accommodation. <u>Suluki v. Employment Appeal Board</u>, 503 N.W.2d 402 (Iowa 1993). An employee who receives a reasonable expectation of assistance from the employer after complaining about working conditions must complain further if conditions persist in order to preserve eligibility for benefits. <u>Polley v. Gopher Bearing Company</u>, 478 N.W.2d 775 (Minn. App. 1991).

Inasmuch as the claimant did not give the employer an opportunity to resolve her complaints prior to leaving employment, the separation was without good cause attributable to the employer. The employer was unaware of the claimant's medical condition. Benefits are denied.

lowa 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.

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.

DECISION:

bas/kiw

The representative's July 29, 2010 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied. The issue of the overpayment is remanded for determination.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed