# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**CRYSTAL L WILHELM** 

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-07174-S2T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TIMBERLAND PARTNERS MANAGEMENT COMPANY INC

Employer

OC: 06/29/08 R: 02 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Timberland Partners Management Company (employer) appealed a representative's July 29, 2008 decision (reference 01) that concluded Crystal Wilhelm (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits from June 29 through July 5, 2008. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for August 25, 2008. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Sue Swanson, Human Resources Assistant.

## ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer or was discharged for misconduct.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on June 17, 2007, as a full-time leasing agent. On June 18, 2008, the claimant offered a two-week notice of her resignation effective July 2, 2008. She was resigning to start a new job. Later the claimant discovered the job would not start until July 17, 2008. The claimant asked the employer if she could continue working longer. The claimant told the employer she was unwilling to work weekends after July 2, 2008. The claimant took a previously scheduled vacation from July 26 through 30, 2008. On July 30, 2008, the employer told the claimant it had accepted her resignation effective July 2, 2008. The claimant was not able to complete two days of work to meet her resignation day. 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 quit work without good cause attributable to the employer. Prior to her last day of work the employer discharged the claimant but has not proven misconduct.

Iowa 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.

871 IAC 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 intentional 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.

# 871 IAC 24.25(38) 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 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:

(38) Where the claimant gave the employer an advance notice of resignation which caused the employer to discharge the claimant prior to the proposed date of resignation,

no disqualification shall be imposed from the last day of work until the proposed date of resignation; however, benefits will be denied effective the proposed date of resignation.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. <u>Cosper v. lowa Department of Job Service</u>, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). The employer has not met its burden of proof to show job-related misconduct. The claimant was terminated after giving notice of her resignation. The claimant was unable to work July 1 and 2, 2008, due to the termination, less than a majority of the workweek. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits for those two days because it is not a majority of the workweek.

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) 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 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.

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 her words and actions. She told the employer that she was leaving in two weeks. When an employee quits work because she is taking another job, her leaving is without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant left work because she was taking another job but did not start the job until July 17, 2008. Her leaving was without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after July 2, 2008.

Iowa 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

Appeal No. 08A-UI-07174-S2T

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 states pursuant to section 602.10101.

The claimant has received benefits in the amount of \$213.00 since filing her claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits now constitute an overpayment which must be repaid.

#### **DECISION:**

The representative's July 29, 2008 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job-related misconduct. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits for the week ending July 5, 2008, because she did not work the majority of the week. 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. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$213.00.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css