IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ZACHARY CURLEY

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-14280-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

CENTRAL SCOTT TELEPHONE CO

Employer

OC: 09/19/10

Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Central Scott Telephone Company (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated October 13, 2010, reference 01, which held that Zachary Curley (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on December 29, 2010. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Deb Egli, General Manager, and Julie Anderson, Office Manager. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant's voluntary separation from employment qualifies him to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time director of business development from September 2, 2009 through September 14, 2010. Prior to being hired, he informed the employer that he intended on returning to school in August 2010. In spring of 2010, the claimant told the employer he was delaying his school and wanted to stay another year, which was agreed upon.

After the claimant returned from vacation in June 2010, he informed the employer that he had decided to stay only until August 2010 as he had originally planned. The employer repeatedly asked the claimant to stay and there was continuing work available, but the claimant quit and moved to New York. His last day of employment was September 14, 2010.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective September 19, 2010 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant's voluntary separation from employment qualifies him to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

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.

871 IAC 24.25(2) and (26) 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 lowa Code § 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving lowa Code § 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:

- (2) The claimant moved to a different locality.
- (26) The claimant left to go to school.

The claimant was originally hired with the knowledge that he would be leaving work in August 2010. However, he changed the term of employment when he told the employer in spring of 2010 that he wanted to stay for another year and it was agreed upon. His subsequent voluntary separation was not attributable to the employer.

It is the claimant's burden to prove that the voluntary quit was for a good cause that would not disqualify him. Iowa Code § 96.6-2. He has not satisfied that burden and benefits are denied.

lowa Code § 96.3(7) 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. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an

overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated October 13, 2010, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

Susan D. Ackerman Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
sda/kjw	