# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**CARLOS A CRUZ** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-09412-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**FARMLAND FOODS INC** 

Employer

OC: 10/16/11

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit Section 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Carlos Cruz (claimant) appealed a representative's April 11, 2012 decision (reference 02) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he voluntarily quit work with Farmland Foods (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on August 28, 2012. The claimant participated personally through Anna Pottobaum. The employer participated by Jessica Garcia, human resources assistant manager. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

### ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal was filed in a timely manner and, if so, 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 December 16, 2009, as a full-time production employee. The claimant had problems with a supervisor and the employer transferred the claimant to a different department that did not have anything to do with the supervisor.

On February 10, 2012, the claimant resigned. He told the employer that he was too old to work the job any longer. Continued work was available had the claimant not resigned.

A decision was mailed to the claimant's address of record on April 11, 2012. The claimant did not receive the decision.

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

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

Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5. except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disgualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8. subsection 5.

The claimant 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. lowa Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The claimant appealed the decision as soon as he discovered the decision. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

The next issue is the claimant's separation from employment. 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(21) & (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 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:

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

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 words and actions. He told the employer that he was leaving and quit work. When an employee quits work because he is dissatisfied with the work environment or has a personality conflict with his supervisor, his leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because he did not like his work environment and had a personality conflict with his supervisor. His leaving was without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

#### **DECISION:**

The representative's April 11, 2012 decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The claimant's appeal is timely. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
bas/kjw	