# IOWA DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION, UI APPEALS BUREAU

MINH N GIANG Claimant

# APPEAL 22A-UI-17103-AR

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

HYVEE INC Employer

> OC: 03/15/20 Claimant: Appellant (2)

lowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct lowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting lowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work lowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On August 29, 2022, the claimant filed an appeal from the February 23, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based on the determination that claimant voluntarily quit employment without a showing of good cause. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. An in-person hearing was held on November 17, 2022, in Des Moines, Iowa. Appeal numbers 22A-UI-17103-AR and 22A-UI-17104-AR were heard together and created one record. Claimant, Minh N. (Giang) Dawson participated, and was represented by attorney Jim Quilty. Testifying witness John Dawson also participated on claimant's behalf. Employer, Hy-Vee, Inc., participated through Hearing Representative Barbara Buss, who did not testify, with testifying witness HR Manager Amber Nelsen. Vietnamese language services were provided by Phung Nguyen from International Translation Services. Department Exhibit D-1 was admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

### **ISSUES:**

Is the claimant's appeal timely? Did claimant voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer, or was claimant discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct? Is claimant able to and available for work?

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the claimant's address of record on February 23, 2021. The claimant did not receive the decision. The first notice of disqualification was the overpayment decision dated August 25, 2022. The appeal was sent on August 29, 2022, within ten days of the mailing date of the overpayment decision.

Claimant was employed full-time as a sushi chef from January 28, 2017, until August 22, 2019, when she was discharged.

In approximately June 2019, claimant inquired with her manager about whether she could be scheduled in such a way that she could attend school two mornings per week. The manager said claimant could change to part-time status. However, thereafter, the full-time schedule continued even into the new school year. Claimant followed up with her manager regarding her request for a part-time schedule, but the manager continued to schedule claimant full-time. Then, in early August 2019, claimant was suddenly not on the schedule. She inquired multiple times with her manager regarding whether she would be scheduled and whether she would be scheduled part-time as requested. She received no response. She did not know when to work, so she did not return to work.

Claimant did begin school thereafter, but only attended part-time. She began working in her family's nail salon after her employment with this employer ended. She filed her claim for unemployment benefits with an effective date of March 15, 2020, when the COVID-19 pandemic affected the nail salon, and it was shut down pursuant to the governor's emergency order. The administrative law judge notes claimant was coded in Group Code 8 during the 2020 claim year, indicating that she was unemployed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

lowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part: "[u]nless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision."

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

1. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

(a) If transmitted via the United States Postal Service on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.

(b) If transmitted via the State Identification Date Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.

(c) If transmitted by any means other than [United States Postal Service or the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES)], on the date it is received by the division.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871–24.35(2) provides:

2. The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

The lowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); *see also In re Appeal of Elliott* 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982).

The appellant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The claimant timely appealed the overpayment decision, which was the first notice of disqualification. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did not quit but was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

lowa 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.

lowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer or who are discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1) and 96.5(2)a. The burden of proof rests with the employer to show that the claimant voluntarily left the employment. *Irving v. Empl. App. Bd.*, 15-0104, 2016 WL 3125854, (Iowa June 3, 2016). A voluntary quitting of employment requires that an employee exercise a voluntary choice between remaining employed or terminating the employment relationship. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W.2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438, 440 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). It 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). Where there is no expressed intention or act to sever the relationship, the case must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

Claimant testified that she repeatedly followed up with her manager, first regarding her request to work part-time, then to obtain her schedule. She would not have done so had she intended to sever the employment relationship.

The employer separated claimant from employment due to three consecutive missed shifts without notice.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871—24.25(4) 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 lowa Code § 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 § 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:

(4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

While three such missed shifts would constitute a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to the employer, there is no evidence that claimant knew she was scheduled for these shifts. Accordingly, she could not have knowingly missed them. The employer did not provide a witness with knowledge of the events that occurred in August 2019; the employer could only rely on the few documents created during that time period, which did not reflect whether anyone reached out to claimant. Claimant testified that her manager failed to communicate with her regarding when she was scheduled after a period of not being on the schedule. The rule regarding three no call/no shows does not apply here. The separation was effectively a discharge.

The administrative law judge applies lowa Code section 96.5(2)a as it existed at the time of these events.

lowa Code section 96.5(2) a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intention al

and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all, provided the discharge is not contrary to public policy. However, if the employer fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation.

There is no testimony that claimant was separated from employment for disciplinary reasons. It appears that there was a lack of communication from claimant's manager, despite some efforts by claimant. Claimant did not know when she should work, so she did not report for work. There is no evidence that the manager reached out to claimant to notify her of the employer's expectation regarding her schedule. The employer has not demonstrated that claimant was discharged due to job-related misconduct, as is its burden. The separation is not disqualifying.

The next question is whether claimant was able to and available for work. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes she was.

lowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.1A, subsection 37", paragraph "b", subparagraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.1A, subsection 37, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2) provides:

Benefits eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

(2) Available for work. The availability requirement is satisfied when an individual is willing, able, and ready to accept suitable work which the individual does not have good cause to refuse, that is, the individual is genuinely attached to the labor market. Since, under unemployment insurance laws, it is the availability of an individual that is required to be tested, the labor market must be described in terms of the individual. A labor market for an individual means a market for the type of service which the individual offers in the geographical area in which the individual offers the service. Market in that sense does not mean that job vacancies must exist; the purpose of unemployment insurance is to compensate for lack of job vacancies. It means only that the type of services which the individual is offering is generally performed in the geographical area in which the individual is offering the services.

The reason for claimant's unemployment beginning in March 2020 was the COVID-19 pandemic. She remained otherwise able to and available for work. She testified that she continued to look for work during that period, as well. Claimant was able to and available for work effective March 15, 2020. Benefits are allowed. Claimant is listed as a Group Code 8 in the 2020 claim year, which signifies that claimant was unemployed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. During the time of claimant's 2020 unemployment, the Agency had made the policy determination not to charge employers for unemployment insurance benefits paid to Group Code 8 claimants.

## **DECISION:**

The claimant's appeal is accepted as timely. The February 23, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is REVERSED. Claimant did not quit but was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is able to work and available for work effective March 15, 2020. Benefits are allowed.

AuDRe

Alexis D. Rowe Administrative Law Judge

<u>November 22, 2022</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

ar/mh

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

### Employment Appeal Board 4<sup>th</sup> Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.

2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.

3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.

4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at low a Code §17A.19, which is online at https://w ww.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf Or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court\_https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a law yer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a law yer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

**Note to Claimant:** It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

#### SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

### Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.

4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de low a §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://w w w.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https://w w w.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

**Nota para el reclamante:** es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

#### SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.