

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

NATALIE R HORTON

Claimant

and

GRAPETREE MEDICAL STAFFING INC

Employer

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 20B-UI-08925

**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: 96.4-3

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. Two members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Board 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 BUT WITHOUT EFFECT ON THE EMPLOYER:**

**THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S DISCUSSION OF
THE RECOVERY OF OVERPAID FPUC BENEFITS IS
MODIFIED TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION:**

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

The CARES Act provides:

In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency, **except** that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(A) the payment of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

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

PL116-136, Sec. 2104(f)(2). In this case the Claimant was allowed benefits and the Employer appealed. After the hearing, the Employer prevailed. We note that Claimants are advised throughout the appeal process to continue to file weekly claims even if denied benefits. The Claimant here did so and was paid benefits until the Administrative Law Judge issued the appeal decision locking the claim. The Claimant was paid FPUC in addition to regular state benefits. We now consider whether the FPUC 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. In deciding equity and good conscience we consider whether the overpayment was the result of a decision on appeal, and the financial hardship caused by a decision requiring overpayment. *Cf.* 871 IAC 24.50(7) (setting out factors for similar issue under TEUC from 2002). 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 **FPUC overpayment** should be waived.

The Employer should note that the Employer will not be charged for any waived FPUC.

THE BOARD PROVIDES THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES:

We point out to the Claimant that although the Claimant is denied benefits under state unemployment law, **this does not bar receipt of certain special pandemic related benefits**. In fact, being ineligible from state unemployment benefits is a prerequisite to some of these benefits. Of particular interest to the Claimant is Pandemic Unemployment Assistance [PUA]. That law provides benefits to persons who are unavailable for work due to certain pandemic related reasons, or who lost work as a direct result of the Pandemic. Such persons may be able to collect PUA during any week this situation persists, going back to February 8, 2020 (for a maximum of 39 weeks). The federal Department of Labor has instructed that **eligible persons would include:**

- a) The individual has been diagnosed with COVID-19 or is experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and is seeking a medical diagnosis. ...
- b) A member of the individual's household has been diagnosed with COVID-19. ...
- c) The individual is providing care for a family member or a member of the individual's household who has been diagnosed with COVID-19. ...
- d) A child or other person in the household for which the individual has primary caregiving responsibility is unable to attend school or another facility that is closed as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency and such school or facility care is required for the individual to work....
- e) The individual is unable to reach the place of employment because of a quarantine imposed as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency. ...
- f) The individual is unable to reach the place of employment because the individual has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19. ...
- g) The individual was scheduled to commence employment and does not have a job or is unable to reach

the job as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency. ...

h) The individual has become the breadwinner or major support for a household because the head of the household has died as a direct result of COVID-19. ...

i) The individual has to quit his or her job as a direct result of COVID-19. ...

j) The individual's place of employment is closed as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency. ...

k) The individual meets any additional criteria established by the Secretary for unemployment assistance under this section....

UIPL 16-20, Attachment 1.

https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/UIPL/UIPL_16-20_Attachment_1.pdf.

It is further our understanding that federal law requires all PUA claims to be backdated to as early as February 8, depending on when the applicant's COVID-related unavailability or job loss began. The upshot is that if Claimant can make the necessary PUA showing Claimant may very well be eligible for PUA for any qualifying week. **Our ruling today is no bar to PUA.**

Notably today we have made a decision that denies regular unemployment, but allows regular benefits once the Claimant offers to return to work, but is rejected. 871 IAC 24.22(2)(j)(1) ('If at the end of a period or term of negotiated leave of absence the employer fails to reemploy the employee-individual, the individual is considered laid off and eligible for benefits.'). This means if the Claimant can get PUA the Claimant would receive the PUA benefit so long as the Claimant is unavailable because on a leave of absence for COVID reasons. Claimant might then receive regular state benefits if Claimant returns and offers services once that COVID leave ends but Claimant is not rehired. The Employer should note it can avoid charges by bringing the Claimant back to work at the end of the COVID leave.

Should the Claimant wish to apply for PUA, and the information on how to do so is found at:
<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>.

DECISION:

The decision of the Administrative Law Judge dated **October 15, 2020** is **AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED IN THE CLAIMANT'S FAVOR** but with **NO EFFECT ON THE EMPLOYER**.

The overpayment of \$6,600 in FPUC benefits is hereby waived, and the Claimant has no obligation to pay back those benefits. The Claimant continues to be obliged to repay the overpayment of \$1,276 in state benefits at this time. The Employer will not be charged for waiver of FPUC since FPUC is a federally funded benefit. In all other respects the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is affirmed.

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohmman