

**BEFORE THE  
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
Lucas State Office Building  
Fourth floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

---

**BORIS REBAC**

Claimant

and

**IWD INVESTIGATIONS & RECOVERY**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**HEARING NUMBER: 21B-UI-13098**

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
DECISION**

**NOTICE**

**THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL** unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION: 116-136**

**DECISION**

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. All members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. A majority of the Appeal Board, one member dissenting, finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. With the following modification, the administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED** with the following **MODIFICATION IN THE CLAIMANT'S FAVOR**:

The Administrative Law Judge's discussion of the recovery of overpaid LWA benefits is modified to be consistent with the following discussion:

The CARES Act, as amended, provides:

9021(d)(4) **WAIVER AUTHORITY**.- In the case of individuals who have received amounts of pandemic unemployment assistance to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such pandemic unemployment assistance to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that-

(A) the payment of such pandemic unemployment assistance was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(B) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.".

15 U.S.C. §9021(d)(4) *as amended by Continued Assistance Act*, H.R. 133, 116 Congress, Sec. 201(d). In this case the Claimant was paid PUA benefits. We now consider whether the PUA overpayment can be waived.

In deciding the question of fault, we will consider factors such as whether a material statement or representation was made by the Claimant in connection with the application for benefits, whether the Claimant knew or should have known that a fact was material and failed to disclose it, whether the Claimant should have known the Claimant was not eligible for benefits, and whether the overpayment was otherwise directly caused by the knowing actions of the Claimant. *Cf.* 871 IAC 24.50(7) (setting out factors for similar issue under TEUC from 2002). In deciding equity and good conscience we utilize the federal directives by considering the following:

- It would cause financial hardship to the person for whom it is sought; or
- The recipient of the overpayment can show (regardless of their financial circumstances) that due to the notice that such payment would be made or because of the incorrect payment either they have relinquished a valuable right or changed positions for the worse; or
- Recovery would be unconscionable under the circumstances.

[UIPL 20-21](#), p. 6-7 (DOL ETA 5/5/2021).

Applying these factors to the totality of the circumstances in this case including that there is no evidence of material misrepresentation, we find on this individualized basis that the **PUA overpayment** should be waived on the ground that the Claimant's knowing actions were not directly at fault for the overpayment, and recovery would be unconscionable.

If after today the Claimant should receive an overpayment decision concerning the overpayment(s) we have waived then the Claimant should appeal that decision. The Claimant should retain our decision to present to IWD in response to any such decision. The Claimant likewise should present this order to IWD if the Claimant should receive a bill for a waived overpayment.

#### **DECISION:**

The decision of the Administrative Law Judge dated September 1, 2021 is **AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED IN THE CLAIMANT'S FAVOR.**

**The overpayment of \$25,012 in PUA benefits is hereby waived, and the Claimant has no obligation to pay back those benefits.** In all other respects, the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is affirmed.

---

James M. Strohman

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

**DISSENTING OPINION OF MYRON R. LINN:**

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board. After careful review of the record, I would affirm the decision of the administrative law judge without modification.

---

Myron R. Linn

AMG/fnv