

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

PIERRE T BAUGH
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-03633-HT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CAMBRIDGE TEMPOSITIONS INC
Employer

OC: 03/23/08
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Section 96.5(1) – Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Cambridge Tempositions, filed an appeal from a decision dated March 4, 2009, reference 02. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Pierre Baugh. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on April 1, 2009. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where he could be contacted and did not participate. The employer participated by Account Manager Stephanie Matteson. Exhibit One was admitted into the record.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant quit work with good cause attributable to the employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Pierre Baugh was employed by Cambridge Tempositions from January 8, 2009 until February 19, 2009. His assignment was as an on-call employee with Heinz. He was scheduled to work the entire week beginning Monday, February 16 through Friday, February 20, 2009. He worked on Monday and was no-call/no-show the rest of the week. He was considered a voluntary quit for being no-call/no-show for three working days.

Pierre Baugh has received unemployment benefits since filing an additional claim with an effective date of February 1, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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(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 Iowa 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:

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

The claimant was no-call/no-show to work for more than three consecutive workdays. He had been advised he was to contact the employer if he was not able to come to work. Under the provisions of the above Administrative Code section, this is a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to the employer and the claimant is disqualified.

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 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 unemployment benefits to which he is not entitled. The question of whether the claimant must repay these benefits is remanded to the UIS division.

DECISION:

The representative's decision of March 4, 2009, reference 02, is reversed. Pierre Baugh is disqualified and benefits are withheld until he has earned ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The issue of whether the claimant must repay the unemployment benefits is remanded to UIS division for determination.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/css