# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

**TOYON VALENTINE** 

Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-00174-SC-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**TIMBERLINE MANUFACTURING COMPANY** 

Employer

OC: 12/08/19

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

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:

On January 6, 2020, Timberline Manufacturing Company (employer) filed an appeal from the December 31, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Toyon Valentine (claimant) was not discharged for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 31, 2020. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. The employer participated through Craig Schroeder, Director of HR. The Employer's Exhibits 1 through 3 were admitted into the record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, including the fact-finding documents and the claimant's claim history.

## **ISSUES:**

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

Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived and charged to the employer's account?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as an Assembler beginning on March 4, 2019, and his last day worked was November 21, 2019. The employer has a policy stating employees will be deemed to have abandoned their job after three days of no-call/no-show absences. The claimant was given a copy of that policy.

The claimant's regularly scheduled shift was Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The claimant was absent on November 22, 25, and 26 without notice to the employer. On

November 27, Craig Schroeder, Director of HR, sent the claimant a letter stating that the employer was accepting his resignation. The employer has not had any contact from the claimant since November 21.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,900.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of December 8, 2019, for the four weeks ending January 25, 2020. The fact-finder attempted to reach Schroeder for the fact-finding interview; however, he was on vacation and was not available. He did not make arrangements to have another employee participate in the fact-finding interview. The employer did not submit any documents for the fact-finding interview. They had previously submitted a copy of the November 27 letter to the claimant with the employer's protest.

# **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged but voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.5 provides, in relevant part:

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.

. . .

- 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 disqualification shall continue 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(4) 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 section 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 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:

(4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

lowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer or who are discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1) and 96.5(2)a. The burden of proof rests with the employer to show that the claimant voluntarily left his employment. *Irving v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 883 N.W.2d 179 (Iowa 2016). A voluntary quitting of employment requires that an employee exercise a voluntary choice between remaining employed or terminating the employment relationship. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W.2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438, 440 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). It 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). Where there is no expressed intention or act to sever the relationship, the case must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

If an individual who misses work without notice to the employer and the employer has a policy prohibiting such conduct stating it will be considered job abandonment, the individual is presumed to voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(4). In this case, the employer's policy states an employee who misses three days of work without notice will be deemed to have abandoned their jobs. The claimant missed three days of work without notice to the employer; therefore, he was not discharged but voluntarily quit.

While the employer has the burden to establish the separation was a voluntary quitting of employment rather than a discharge, 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). An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. As the claimant failed to report for work or notify the employer for three consecutive workdays in violation of the employer policy, the claimant is considered to have voluntarily left employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Accordingly, benefits are denied.

II. Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived and charged to the employer's account?

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, but he is not obligated to repay the benefits as the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). 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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10(1). 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. The employer did not provide live testimony for the fact-finding interview. The employer also failed to provide sufficient documentation to be deemed to have participated. Specifically, they failed to provide a copy of the policy related to no-call/no-show absences. Without that policy, a decision could not be made as to whether the claimant quit or was discharged and, if he quit,

whether that violated the employer's policy. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview; therefore, the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall be charged.

#### **DECISION:**

The December 31, 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 \$1,900.00, but is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Stephanie R. Callahan Administrative Law Judge

tuphanie R Can

February 5, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn

# NOTE TO EMPLOYER:

If you wish to change the address of record, please access your account at: <a href="https://www.myiowaui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/">https://www.myiowaui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/</a>.

Helpful information about using this site may be found at: <a href="http://www.iowaworkforce.org/ui/uiemployers.htm">http://www.iowaworkforce.org/ui/uiemployers.htm</a> and <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v="mpCM8FGQoY">http://watch?v="mpCM8FGQoY">http://watch?v="mpCM8FGQoY">http://watch