IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

SHERRY L SAGER

Claimant

APPEAL 14A-UI-12602-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

BWC INDUSTRIAL SERVICES LC

Employer

OC: 06/08/14

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the December 2, 2014, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon voluntarily quitting the employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 5, 2015. Claimant participated. Employer participated through office administrator Tammy Baker.

ISSUE:

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a general laborer from October 30, 2014, and was separated from employment on October 30, 2014, when she quit after one day of paid orientation. While going through orientation she heard about incidents with a vacuum truck and thought it might be more than she could handle. She called IWD about the situation but did not speak to the employer about her concerns. Claimant passed a physical exam but did not receive the results and was not told the reason for the weight lifting testing. She did not receive information about the physical requirements. Continued work was available.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant voluntarily left the employment with good cause attributable to the employer.

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 Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(23) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(23) The claimant left work because the type of work was misrepresented to such claimant at the time of acceptance of the work assignment.

A notice of an intent to quit had been required by *Cobb v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 506 N.W.2d 445, 447-78 (lowa 1993), *Suluki v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 503 N.W.2d 402, 405 (lowa 1993), and *Swanson v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 554 N.W.2d 294, 296 (lowa Ct. App. 1996). Those cases required an employee to give an employer notice of intent to quit, thus giving the employer an opportunity to cure working conditions. However, in 1995, the lowa Administrative Code was amended to include an intent-to-quit requirement. The requirement was only added to rule 871-24.26(6)(b), the provision addressing work-related health problems. No intent-to-quit requirement was added to rule 871-24.26(4), the intolerable working conditions provision. Our supreme court recently concluded that, because the intent-to-quit requirement was added to rule 871-24.26(6)(b) but not 871-24.26(4), notice of intent to quit is not required for intolerable working conditions. *Hy-Vee, Inc. v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 710 N.W.2d 1 (lowa 2005).

The inaccurate or lack of information about the physical requirements of the job amounted to misrepresentation that gave rise to a good cause reason for leaving the employment. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The December 2, 2014, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily left the employment with good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible and the benefits withheld shall be paid. Since this employment does not fall within the claimant's base period, this employer is not liable for benefits paid during this claim year.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
dml/pjs	