### IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

VANE T OREY Claimant

# APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-13870-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

WAL-MART STORES INC Employer

> OC: 11/10/13 Claimant: Appellant (2)

lowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct lowa Code § 96.5(1)d – Voluntary Quitting/Illness or Injury lowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the December 17, 2013, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon voluntarily quitting the employment on October 14, 2013. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 13, 2014. Claimant participated with his spouse Marilyn Orey. Employer, in a letter through its agent Talx, opted not to participate.

# **ISSUES:**

Did claimant voluntarily leave the employment with good cause attributable to employer or did employer discharge claimant for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits?

Is the claimant able to and available for work?

# FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a garden center employee since February 1993, and was separated from employment on November 8, 2013. His last day of work was July 9, 2013. He started full-time and went to part-time in 2011. He fell at work on March 21, 2013, and tore his rotator cuff. William Jacobson, M.D. performed surgery on July 29, and allowed him to return to light duty work on October 7, 2013, but restricted him from lifting over five pounds above his waist. The doctor's letter about light duty restrictions was not provided to claimant so he was not aware he was supposed to return to work. When store manager Steve Kopf contacted him about light duty work, he told Kopf he could not climb ladders to dust or pull up his pants if he went to the bathroom. The employer said he would not assist him so he did not return to work. Kopf called claimant on November 8, and told him he was fired for not returning to light duty work and his workers' compensation benefits would be cut off.

Claimant continued to see Dr. Johnson and has made progress such that he can lift ten pounds below waist and five pounds above waist. He is searching for work answering the phone or making deliveries.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant did not quit but was discharged for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5-1-d 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. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

d. The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

#### 871 IAC 24.25(35) 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:

(35) The claimant left because of illness or injury which was not caused or aggravated by the employment or pregnancy and failed to:

- (a) Obtain the advice of a licensed and practicing physician;
- (b) Obtain certification of release for work from a licensed and practicing physician;

(c) Return to the employer and offer services upon recovery and certification for work by a licensed and practicing physician; or

(d) Fully recover so that the claimant could perform all of the duties of the job.

Where an employee did not voluntarily quit but was terminated while absent under medical care, the employee is allowed benefits and is not required to return to the employer and offer services pursuant to the subsection d exception of Iowa Code section 96.5(1). *Prairie Ridge Addiction* 

*Treatment Servs. v. Jackson and Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 810 N.W.2d 532 (Iowa Ct. App. 2012). The Iowa Court of Appeals has also informally interpreted the Iowa Code § 96.5(1) subsection (d) exception not to require a claimant to return to the employer to offer services after a medical recovery if the employment has already been terminated. *Porazil v. Jackman Corp.*, No. 3-408/02-1583 (Iowa Ct. App. Aug. 27, 2003).

The court in Gilmore v. Empl. Appeal Bd., 695 N.W.2d 44 (Iowa Ct. App. 2004) noted that:

Insofar as the Employment Security Law is not designed to provide health and disability insurance, only those employees who experience illness-induced separations that can fairly be attributed to the employer are properly eligible for unemployment benefits.

*White v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 487 N.W.2d 342, 345 (Iowa 1992) (citing *Butts v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 328 N.W.2d 515, 517 (Iowa 1983)).

While the claimant declined light duty work, he did not voluntarily quit his job, but was told his employment was terminated and his workers' compensation benefits would cease. Thus, the separation was a discharge and the question is whether claimant's decision to decline light duty work amounted to disqualifying 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. The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. lowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). Absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute work-connected misconduct since they are not volitional, even if the employer was fully within its rights to assess points or impose discipline up to or including discharge for the absence under its attendance policy. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); *Cosper*, supra; *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 734 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007).

Although an employer is not obligated to provide light duty work for an employee whose illness or injury is not work related, the involuntary termination from employment while under medical care was a discharge from employment. In spite of the light duty work release, the employer expected claimant to climb ladders and perform other job duties inconsistent with his medical restrictions. His refusal did not amount to misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Code section 96.4-3 provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

#### 871 IAC 24.22(1)a provides:

Benefits eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

(1) Able to work. An individual must be physically and mentally able to work in some gainful employment, not necessarily in the individual's customary occupation, but which is engaged in by others as a means of livelihood.

a. Illness, injury or pregnancy. Each case is decided upon an individual basis, recognizing that various work opportunities present different physical requirements. A statement from a medical practitioner is considered prima facie evidence of the physical ability of the individual to perform the work required. A pregnant individual must meet the same criteria for determining ableness as do all other individuals.

871 IAC 24.23(35) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(35) Where the claimant is not able to work and is under the care of a physician and has not been released as being able to work.

Inasmuch as the injury is considered work-related for the purposes of unemployment insurance benefits only and the treating physician has released the claimant to return to work, even with restrictions the claimant has established his ability to work in the areas where he is seeking work. Because the employer had no work available or was not willing to accommodate and abide by the work restrictions, benefits are allowed.

### DECISION:

The December 17, 2013, (reference 03) decision is reversed. The claimant did not quit but was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Claimant is able to and available for work effective October 14, 2013. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs