# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

**JESSICA L REICHERT** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-06525-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**TSI ENTERPRISES INC** 

**Employer** 

OC: 05/15/16

Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit Iowa Code § 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits 871 IA Admin. Code 24(10) – Employer Participation in Fact Finding

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated June 6, 2016, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on June 28, 2016. Employer participated by Sarah Fiedler and Charity Garrison. Claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate.

### **ISSUES:**

Whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer.

Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.

If claimant was overpaid benefits, should claimant repay benefits or should employer be charged due to employer's participation or lack thereof in fact finding?

# **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on December 4, 2015. Claimant voluntarily quit work on May 12, 2016 because claimant refused to take the 'fit for duty' tests required by employer prior to claimant resuming work after an extended leave.

Claimant had been on leave multiple times for injuries sustained outside of work while claimant worked for employer. Previously after claimant returned from a period of leave, she had to take a 'fit for work' test to ensure employer that she was ready to return to work. In December 2015, claimant again asked for and received a period of leave for a wrist injury which occurred outside of work. On or around May 5, 2016, claimant received a doctor's release which permitted claimant to return to work with no restrictions. Claimant brought this release to her employer, who planned on placing claimant back into her job. At the time claimant brought the release to employer, employer asked claimant to complete the company's 'fit for work' test she had done before when she returned from leave. Claimant stated that she had incurred a new foot injury and as a result, she would not be able to do the 'fit for work' testing as she was not in a condition to do the test.

Employer did not have other jobs available for claimant.

Claimant did not participate in this hearing so it is unknown if the claimant has received benefits in this matter. Claimant was found to not be able and available for work in another matter (R 2).

Employer did substantially participate in fact finding in this matter.

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

Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Code § 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.

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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Claimant knew that she must complete the 'fit for work' test prior to her return from an extended leave of absence. Claimant's inability or lack of desire to participate in the 'fit for work' test meant that claimant could not be brought back into the work force for employer. As claimant would not do the 'fit for work' test, claimant is deemed to have voluntarily quit her employment. Said quit was not caused by any particularized action of employer, as claimant knew of the testing requirement prior to a return to work, and claimant had completed the testing in the past when she'd returned from a previous leave of absence. As such, claimant is not eligible to receive benefits in this matter.

The overpayment issue is remanded to the fact finder as claimant did not participate in the hearing.

The issue of employer participation was addressed. Employer did substantially participate in fact finding such that employer's account shall not be charged for any overpayments accrued.

## **DECISION:**

bab/can

The decision of the representative dated June 6, 2016, reference 01, is reversed and remanded to the fact finder on the issue of overpayment of benefits. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. Employer's account shall not be charged for any overpayments received by claimant.

Blair A. Bennett Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	