

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

GREGORY S BRADBURY
Claimant

KINSETH HOTEL CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 19A-UI-02137-SC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 02/10/19
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Kinseth Hotel Corporation (employer) filed an appeal from the March 1, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Gregory S. Bradbury (claimant) voluntarily quit due to detrimental working conditions which constitutes good cause attributable to the employer. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing began on March 27, 2019 and concluded on April 10, 2019. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Coral Erickson, Claims Specialist with Employers Unity, and Lori Faught, General Manager. It was represented by Diana Perry-Lehr, Hearing Representative with Employers Unity. The Claimant's Exhibit A was admitted into the record without objection.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to the employer?
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed part-time in the Maintenance Department beginning on April 9, 2018, and was separated from employment on January 5, 2019, when he quit.

The claimant has a bad back and hip and walks with a limp. At some point prior to December 1, 2018, he had an argument with his supervisor General Manager Lori Faught. There had been a discrepancy about a room needing repair and a guest complaint about the claimant. While walking to Faught's office, the claimant was in pain, walking slowly, and groaning with each step. (Exhibit A) During the conversation, Faught mentioned that the claimant had spoken to others at the hotel about how he was having difficulty doing his job and she told him to go home that day as he appeared to be in pain she did not want guests to see him like that. They had previously had a discussion during which the claimant told Faught he was having difficulty

climbing the ladder and she asked him to bring in a doctor's note with restrictions. The claimant left work that day.

On or about December 1, the claimant saw his doctor who outlined the amount of time he could spend on a ladder. However, the employer never received a doctor's note with the claimant's restrictions. The employer was willing to accommodate the claimant, but needed a doctor's note as climbing ladders was an essential function of his maintenance job.

The claimant began performing his work slower, as instructed by his doctor. On January 3, 2019, the claimant did not timely complete the tasks he had been assigned. Faught spoke with him about his work progress. The claimant argued he had been paid more in other jobs. He did not request any additional assistance from Faught and did not mention any requested accommodations.

On January 5, the claimant notified Faught he was resigning effective immediately. He told her that he was leaving because she did not understand his disability.

The administrative record reflects that the claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$564.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of February 10, 2019, for the two weeks ending February 23, 2019. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. The notice of fact-finding was mailed to the employer's address of record care of Employers Unity at a PO Box in Denver, Colorado. Coral Erickson, Claims Specialist with Employers Unity, did not have the notice of fact-finding in her records. However, she is not the one who collects the mail and it is distributed by other employees. The fact-finder contacted the employer's phone number of record, which is the employer's corporate office, on the day and time of the interview. The fact-finder left a voice message for the employer with appeal rights but did not receive any return communication from the employer.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant's separation from the employment was without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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. 871-24.25 provides, in relevant part:

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:

(13) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the wages but knew the rate of pay when hired.

...

(21) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the work environment.

(22) The claimant left because of a personality conflict with the supervisor.

...

(28) The claimant left after being reprimanded.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26 provides, in relevant part:

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:

...

(4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

...

(6) Separation because of illness, injury, or pregnancy.

...

b. Employment related separation. The claimant was compelled to leave employment because of an illness, injury, or allergy condition that was attributable to the employment. Factors and circumstances directly connected with the employment which caused or aggravated the illness, injury, allergy, or disease to the employee which made it impossible for the employee to continue in employment because of serious danger to the employee's health may be held to be an involuntary termination of employment and constitute good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant will be eligible for benefits if compelled to leave employment as a result of an injury suffered on the job.

In order to be eligible under this paragraph "b" an individual must present competent evidence showing adequate health reasons to justify termination; before quitting have informed the employer of the work-related health problem and inform the employer that the individual intends to quit unless the problem is corrected or the individual is reasonably accommodated. Reasonable accommodation includes other comparable work which is not injurious to the claimant's health and for which the claimant must remain available.

The claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). "Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Indus. Relations Comm'n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). 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).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how the disputed factual issues were resolved. After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, the reliability of the evidence submitted, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge attributes more weight to the employer's version of events.

The claimant has not established that he was subjected to intolerable working conditions and his impairment which was not accommodated by the employer. The claimant was struggling with his job duties and the employer properly asked for a note from his doctor if he had restrictions. The employer did not receive the doctor's note and the claimant did not tell the employer that if he was not accommodated then he would quit his employment. The claimant left following a disagreement with his supervisor when she reprimanded him for the speed of his work and he expressed displeasure with his rate of pay. The claimant's decision to leave following that conversation does not constitute good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

Payment – determination – duration – child support intercept.

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) (a) 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. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) 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.

(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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall be charged.

DECISION:

The March 1, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left the employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$564.00. However, he is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits because the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Stephanie R. Callahan
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn